

Tight MIP Formulations for Optimal Operation and Investment of Storage Including Reserves

Maaïke B. Elgersma, Germán Morales-España, Karen I. Aardal, Niina Helistö, Juha Kiviluoma, and Mathijs M. de Weerd

Abstract—Fast and accurate large-scale energy system models are needed to investigate the potential of storage to complement the fluctuating energy production of renewable energy systems. However, the standard Mixed-Integer Programming (MIP) models that describe optimal investment and operation of these storage units, including the optional capacity to provide up/down reserves, do not scale well. To improve scalability, the integrality constraints are often relaxed, resulting in Linear Programming (LP) relaxations that allow simultaneous charging and discharging, while this is not feasible in practice. To address this, we derive the convex hull of the solutions for the optimal operation of storage for one time period, as well as for problems including investments and reserves, guaranteeing that no tighter MIP formulation or better LP approximation exists for one time period. When included in multi-period large-scale energy system models, these improved LP relaxations can better prevent simultaneous charging and discharging. We demonstrate this with illustrative case studies of a unit commitment problem and a transmission expansion planning problem.

Index Terms—Energy storage systems, mixed-integer linear programming (MIP), linear programming (LP), convex hull, tight formulation, optimal investments, reserves.

NOMENCLATURE

An overview of the notation used throughout this paper is given below.

Parameters:

C, D	Maximum investments of charge/discharge capacities
E	Maximum investment of storage capacity
\underline{E}, \bar{E}	Minimum/maximum storage capacities
\bar{E}_0	Initially installed storage capacity
$\overline{P^C}, \overline{P^D}$	Maximum charge/discharge capacities
$\overline{P_0^C}, \overline{P_0^D}$	Initially installed charge/discharge capacities
R^+, R^-	Maximum up/down reserve capacities
η^C, η^D	Charge/discharge efficiencies
Δ	Duration of one time period
θ	Ratio between minimum and maximum storage capacity

Variables:

\bar{c}, \bar{d}	Amount of installed charge and discharge capacity
e_t	State of charge at end of time period t
\bar{e}	Amount of installed storage capacity
p_t^C, p_t^D	Amount that is charged and discharged during time period t
r_t^+, r_t^-	Amount of up and down reserves during time period t
δ_t	Binary variable that indicates when the storage unit is charging ($\delta_t = 1$) or discharging ($\delta_t = 0$)

I. INTRODUCTION

DUE to climate change, our energy system needs to be decarbonized by 2050. To this end, renewable energy systems need to be implemented on a large scale. However, renewable energy generation fluctuates, due to its intrinsic weather dependency. Storage systems have become a promising solution to complement this fluctuating production, by storing energy when there is an energy surplus, and discharging when there is a deficit.

To investigate the optimal investment and operation decisions of storage, we need to formulate realistic models for devices capable of storing energy, such as pumped hydro storage, electric vehicles [1], thermal storage, and some forms of demand response [2]. In some cases, we also want to incorporate reserves, which enable more flexibility by representing the possible increase/decrease to the scheduled amount of charged/discharged energy [3]. Mixed-Integer Programming (MIP) allows us to correctly model the optimal operation of storage, using both binary and continuous variables. Binary variables are required to correctly model reserves and to ensure that the storage cannot charge and discharge simultaneously [4], [5]. Constraints in MIP models can describe the characteristics and capabilities of storage units, such as their minimum and maximum state-of-charge, and their (dis)charging capacity.

Computational problems arise when these MIP storage models are included in larger energy system optimization models, since existing algorithms for finding the optimal solution to MIP models run in exponential time (in the worst case). Therefore, a common practice to reduce the computation time is to relax the integrality restrictions in the MIP formulations, meaning we obtain Linear Programming (LP) relaxations. LP models can be solved much faster (in polynomial time), but simultaneous charging and discharging can occur in the optimal solutions to these LP relaxations, while this is not feasible in practice. To address the computational challenge, the goal of this paper is to obtain tight MIP models for optimal storage investment and operation, including reserves. When incorporated in a large-scale MIP problem, these tight storage MIP formulations can speed up the solving time, since their improved LP relaxations can provide a better lower bound. And when incorporated into a large-scale LP model, the improved LP relaxations can better prevent simultaneous charging and discharging.

Charging and discharging at the same time essentially increases losses. Therefore, the optimal solution to the LP relaxations often avoids this, but it may be beneficial in some

cases, such as in the event of negative prices. In specific cases with multiple and/or fast storage units, simultaneous charging and discharging might actually be feasible, by charging a fraction of the time period or storage units, and discharging another fraction [6].

However, simultaneous charging and discharging is often not possible in practice with generic storage units, so solutions in which this occurs are unwanted and can lead to large errors. For example, Arroyo et al. [7] illustrate in a transmission expansion planning case study that simultaneous charging and discharging can turn an actually infeasible investment plan into a feasible one. In the solution of the relaxed model, a loss of energy is realized, such that an expensive transmission line does not need to be installed to dispose of extra energy by transmitting it elsewhere in this solution. However, this obtained optimal investment and operation plan is actually not feasible in practice, since simultaneous charging and discharging is not feasible. Another example is demand response models with load shifting and immediate load recovery [8], where immediate load recovery cannot be guaranteed when simultaneous up and down shifting of load is allowed. Instead, it allows the load to be shifted through multiple sequential time periods, resulting in wrong solutions that cannot be implemented in practice. When large MIPs are combined with decomposition algorithms to speed up computations, the LP relaxation (of the operations/second stage) is often solved in the process. Thus, simultaneous charging and discharging is allowed in this situation, which can result in significant errors [5].

Several attempts to prevent simultaneous charging and discharging in convex problems have been made, such as including pre-contingency operating costs in the objective function [9] or adding conditions for the roundtrip efficiency [10]. However, Arroyo et al. [7] pointed out that it can still occur using two case studies: a unit commitment problem and a transmission expansion planning problem. Recently, Pozo [11] obtained two different convex hull formulations for the optimal operation of storage in one time period, a vertex representation and a hyperplane representation. They show that incorporating this LP formulation in a multi-period Set-Point Tracking problem prevents simultaneous charging and discharging more than the regular LP relaxation. A downside to these formulations is that they do not contain the binary variable that indicates charging/discharging in each time period, so they cannot be used to solve the original MIP problem for multiple time periods. In conclusion, there is currently no realistic and generic model for the operation of storage, let alone one including investments and reserves, that prevents simultaneous charging and discharging, while still being computationally tractable.

The main contributions of this paper are the following: 1) We present tight MIP formulations for optimal storage operation and investment, including reserves, and prove that their LP-relaxations provide the convex hull of the feasible solutions to the MIP models for one time period. This guarantees that no tighter MIP or better LP approximation for one time period exists. 2) When incorporated in any type of large-scale energy investment/operation system model, we show that

the LP relaxations of the tight MIP formulations decrease the frequency of occurrences of simultaneous charging and discharging. 3) When solving a large-scale MIP model, the tight storage MIP formulations can positively affect the solving time.

The improved MIP formulations and LP relaxations can be used for many different types of planning problems that include storage, as well as for transmission lines. Another added value lies in the combination with decomposition algorithms, which are often used to further speed up the computations of large-scale MIP problems. In these algorithms, a convex problem is continuously solved in the second-stage. Simultaneous charging and discharging in the solutions to these LP subproblems can cause large errors [5]. Thus, a tight LP relaxation can significantly improve the quality of the overall solution when using a decomposition algorithm to speed up computations.

We first introduce a basic MIP that describes the optimal operation of storage in Section II, as well as the extended formulations that include investments and reserves. In Section III, we explain how we obtain the convex hulls of the solutions to these MIP models for one time period, and present the obtained tight multi-period MIP models. The performance of these models is illustrated with two case studies in Section IV. Lastly, the conclusions are presented in Section V. A further explanation of the case studies and one of the proofs are given in the Appendix. More tight MIP formulations for storage problems and proof can be found in the online companion [12].

II. BACKGROUND: COMMON STORAGE MODELS

This section introduces and explains the commonly used MIP models to describe the optimal operation and investment of storage, including reserves. These MIP models are usually incorporated in larger power/energy system models, and the objective depends on the context of these larger problems. Since the objective function is not relevant for obtaining the convex hull of the feasible solutions to this model, it is not included in the model representations below.

A. Modeling storage operation problems

Constraints (1a)-(1f) are commonly used to describe the operation of storage in an MIP model, hereafter named the BO-MIP model (Basic Operation MIP model). Here, the index t indicates the time period, and decision variable e_t represents the state of charge of the storage system in time period t , which is tracked in (1a). Decision variables p_t^C and p_t^D represent the amount that is charged and discharged in time period t (with duration Δ), respectively, and parameters η^C/η^D are their corresponding efficiencies. The capacity limits of the storage unit are tracked in (1b), where parameters \underline{E}/\bar{E} are the min/max storage capacities. The upper and lower bounds for charge and discharge are imposed in (1c) and (1d). Parameters \bar{P}^C/\bar{P}^D are the maximum charge/discharge capacities.

Constraints (1c) and (1d) also impose the mutually exclusive condition of charging *or* discharging in each time period, since the binary variable δ_t indicates whether the storage unit is

charging ($\delta_t = 1$) or discharging ($\delta_t = 0$) in time period t . Constraint (1e) defines the variables e_t , p_t^C and p_t^D as non-negative continuous variables, and (1f) defines the variable δ_t as binary. Note that to obtain the LP-relaxation of the BO-MIP model, hereafter called the BO-LP model, the integrality constraint (1f) is relaxed, so it becomes $\delta \in [0, 1]$, which is already enforced by (1c) and (1d).

BO-MIP model: Basic Operation MIP

$$e_t = e_{t-1} + \eta^C p_t^C \Delta - \frac{1}{\eta^D} p_t^D \Delta \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1a)$$

$$\underline{E} \leq e_t \leq \overline{E} \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1b)$$

$$p_t^C \leq \overline{P^C} \delta_t \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1c)$$

$$p_t^D \leq \overline{P^D} (1 - \delta_t) \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1d)$$

$$e_t, p_t^C, p_t^D \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1e)$$

$$\delta_t \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1f)$$

B. Modeling storage operation problems including reserves

As explained earlier, storage can be used to balance the power grid, which is particularly challenging when more renewable energy systems are implemented. Operating reserves, specifically spinning reserves, are useful in this scenario [3]. The up/down reserve provided by a unit is generally defined as the available capacity that the unit can output on top of its scheduled amount in each time period [13]. For storage units specifically, this means that if the storage unit is scheduled to discharge energy, up reserves can be provided by discharging more energy than scheduled, and down reserves by discharging less (or even charging energy). When charging, up reserves can be provided by charging less (or even discharging), and down reserves by charging more.

BOR-MIP model: Basic Operation incl. Reserves MIP

$$e_t = e_{t-1} + \eta^C p_t^C \Delta - \frac{1}{\eta^D} p_t^D \Delta \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1a)$$

$$e_t \geq \underline{E} + \eta^C r_t^{C+} \Delta + \frac{1}{\eta^D} r_t^{D+} \Delta \quad \forall t \in T \quad (2a)$$

$$e_t \leq \overline{E} - \eta^C r_t^{C-} \Delta - \frac{1}{\eta^D} r_t^{D-} \Delta \quad \forall t \in T \quad (2b)$$

$$p_t^C + r_t^{C-} \leq \overline{P^C} \delta_t \quad \forall t \in T \quad (2c)$$

$$p_t^D + r_t^{D+} \leq \overline{P^D} (1 - \delta_t) \quad \forall t \in T \quad (2d)$$

$$p_t^C - r_t^{C+} \geq 0 \quad \forall t \in T \quad (2e)$$

$$p_t^D - r_t^{D-} \geq 0 \quad \forall t \in T \quad (2f)$$

$$r_t^- = r_t^{C-} + r_t^{D-} \leq R^- \quad \forall t \in T \quad (2g)$$

$$r_t^+ = r_t^{C+} + r_t^{D+} \leq R^+ \quad \forall t \in T \quad (2h)$$

$$e_t, p_t^C, p_t^D, r_t^{C+}, r_t^{C-}, r_t^{D+}, r_t^{D-} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \quad \forall t \in T \quad (2i)$$

$$\delta_t \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1f)$$

A common way to model storage operation reserves with an MIP formulation is by adapting the constraints from the BO-MIP model, resulting in the BOR-MIP model (Basic Operation

incl. Reserves MIP model) [14]. Here, (2a) and (2b) replace (1b), since the reserves affect the bounds of the energy storage level and vice versa. Constraint (2c) replaces (1c), bounding the amount of energy that can be charged. Constraint (2c) also bounds the down reserves r_t^{C-} that can be realized by charging more than planned, and (2e) bounds the up reserves r_t^{C+} , which can be realized by charging less energy than the planned p_t^C . Similarly, (2d) replaces (1d), and together with (2f) imposes bounds on p_t^D , r_t^{D+} and r_t^{D-} . Decision variables r_t^- and r_t^+ then represent the total amount of up and down reserves that can be provided in time period t . These total reserves are obtained in (2g) and (2h) and bounded by some value R^+ and R^- , respectively.

In this paper, we obtain the convex hull of the BOR-MIP model for one time period. We want to point out that there is an issue with modeling reserves using the BOR-MIP model, namely that it does not fully exploit the flexibility of a storage unit. It only allows limited reserves. We explain this further in Appendix C. Here we also point out issues with the formulation presented by Momber et al. [15]. This formulation adapts the constraints such that the model does fully exploit the flexibility of the storage unit, but it might not ensure that there is enough capacity to provide the reserves. For those still interested in using the formulation by Momber et al., we provide tight formulations in the online companion [12, Section 4].

C. Modeling storage investment problems including reserves

We can extend the BOR-MIP model, as presented in the previous section, to model investment decisions. The most general way to model the investment of storage is the BIR-MIP model (Basic Investment and operation incl. Reserves MIP model) [16]. The operational problem is similar to that in the BOR-MIP model, but it contains additional investment variables \bar{e} , \bar{c} and \bar{d} . The capacity limits of the storage unit, which now depend on the investment variables, are tracked in (3a) and (3b), where parameter \overline{E}_0 is the initially installed maximum storage capacity. Parameter θ represents the size of the minimum storage capacity as a fraction of the maximum. The upper bounds for charging and discharging and the reserves, also dependent on the investment variables, are imposed in (3c)-(3f), where parameters \overline{P}_0^C and \overline{P}_0^D are the initially installed charge and discharge capacities, and C and D are the maximum amount of invested charge/discharge capacity. Bounds on the maximum amount of invested capacity are imposed in (3g)-(3i), where C , D and E are typically quite large values.

BIR-MIP model: Basic Investment and operation incl. Reserves MIP

$$e_t = e_{t-1} + \eta^C p_t^C \Delta - \frac{1}{\eta^D} p_t^D \Delta \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1a)$$

$$e_t \geq \theta(\overline{E}_0 + \bar{e}) + \eta^C r_t^{C+} \Delta + \frac{1}{\eta^D} r_t^{D+} \Delta \quad \forall t \in T \quad (3a)$$

$$e_t \leq \overline{E}_0 + \bar{e} - \eta^C r_t^{C-} \Delta - \frac{1}{\eta^D} r_t^{D-} \Delta \quad \forall t \in T \quad (3b)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_t^C + r_t^{C-} &\leq (\overline{P_0^C} + C)\delta_t & \forall t \in T & \quad (3c) \\
p_t^C + r_t^{C-} &\leq \overline{P_0^C} + \bar{c} & \forall t \in T & \quad (3d) \\
p_t^D + r_t^{D+} &\leq (\overline{P_0^D} + D)(1 - \delta_t) & \forall t \in T & \quad (3e) \\
p_t^D + r_t^{D+} &\leq \overline{P_0^D} + \bar{d} & \forall t \in T & \quad (3f) \\
p_t^C - r_t^{C+} &\geq 0 & \forall t \in T & \quad (2e) \\
p_t^D - r_t^{D-} &\geq 0 & \forall t \in T & \quad (2f) \\
\bar{c} &\leq C & & \quad (3g) \\
\bar{d} &\leq D & & \quad (3h) \\
\bar{e} &\leq E & & \quad (3i) \\
e_t, p_t^C, p_t^D, r_t^{C+}, r_t^{C-}, r_t^{D+}, r_t^{D-} &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} & \forall t \in T & \quad (2i) \\
\bar{c}, \bar{d}, \bar{e} &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} & & \quad (3j) \\
\delta_t &\in \{0, 1\} & \forall t \in T & \quad (1f)
\end{aligned}$$

This model, however, contains many more constraints and variables than the others. A simplified investment and operation model is therefore also commonly used [5], [17]. We present tight formulations for simplified investment models in the online companion [12, Section 3].

III. TIGHT STORAGE MODELS

In this section, we present tight MIP formulations for the optimal investment and operation of storage (including reserves). In Section III-A we first explain how we obtained these formulations, and what the parameter requirements are. Note that if one wants to successfully replace their storage formulations with these tight formulations, the parameters might need to be adapted such that they satisfy these requirements. These adaptations are also needed in the case studies, as explained in Appendix B.

A. Method: obtaining the convex hull

The convex hull of an MIP model is a set of constraints that forms the tightest possible formulation of this problem. Every vertex of this convex hull is a feasible solution the MIP model. In general, we cannot expect to generate the convex hull of an NP-hard problem efficiently, even if we allow for constraint types that contain exponentially many constraints [18]. However, for storage operation problems, we are able to use the disjunctive nature of the MIP to find the convex hull of its feasible solutions. In this section, we explain the outline of the process to obtain the convex hull of the solutions to storage operation problems for one time period. Appendix A includes a detailed description of this process applied to the simple storage operation problem in the BO-MIP model, for one time period. The full process and proof for the problems including reserves and investments are given in the online companion [12, Sections 5 and 6]. The resulting formulations are given in Section III. For more background information on general LP and MIP theory, see [19].

The first step is to write two disjunctive sets of constraints of the problem for one time period, where one describes the problem when charging, and the other when discharging. For the second step, we can then obtain the convex hull of

these two disjunctive sets of constraints, as described in [20]. For a detailed explanation of how we did this, we refer to the proof in Appendix A. However, the obtained convex hull formulation is in a higher dimension than the original formulation. Therefore, in the third step, we project the higher-dimensional formulation to the space of the original variables, by eliminating the extra variables using the Fourier-Motzkin elimination procedure [21], [22]. The obtained formulation is then still a convex hull [19, Section 9.2.3].

The Fourier-Motzkin elimination procedure eliminates variables by combining all of their upper and lower bounds. The downside of this procedure is that it results in many extra constraints, of which some are facets (constraints describing the convex hull), but many others are redundant. It can be difficult to identify the redundant constraints and prove that they are indeed redundant, since all combinations of constraints need to be checked. This has been done successfully for the above problems (see Appendix A).

Many constraints are redundant when the parameters satisfy the following reasonable assumptions, which would typically hold in practice. It should always hold that $\overline{P^C}, R^- \leq \frac{1}{\eta^C \Delta}(\overline{E} - \underline{E})$ and $\overline{P^D}, R^+ \leq \frac{\eta^D}{\Delta}(\overline{E} - \underline{E})$, meaning that the charging/discharging capacity and the up/down reserve capacity for one time period cannot be larger than the total storage capacity of the storage unit. Obviously, $\overline{E} > \underline{E} \geq 0$ and $\overline{P^C}, \overline{P^D}, R^+, R^- \geq 0$ here. For the efficiencies, $0 < \eta^C, \eta^D \leq 1$ should hold. Similarly, for the investment problem, it should always hold that $\overline{P_0^C} + C \leq \frac{1}{\eta^C \Delta}(\overline{E}_0 + E)(1 - \phi)$ and $\overline{P_0^D} + D \leq \frac{\eta^D}{\Delta}(\overline{E}_0 + E)(1 - \theta)$, where $0 \leq \phi < 1$ and $\overline{P_0^C}, C, \overline{P_0^D}, D, \overline{E}_0, E \geq 0$. Thus, to successfully replace some storage formulations with the tight formulations presented in this paper, the parameters might need to be adapted to satisfy these requirements.

B. Tight MIP formulation of storage operation

This section presents the TO-MIP model (Tight Operation MIP model) for the optimal operation of storage. Its LP relaxation is obtained by relaxing the integrality constraint (1f), meaning it becomes $\delta_t \in \mathbb{R}, \forall t \in T$.

TO-MIP model: Tight Operation MIP (tight version of BO-MIP model)

$$e_t = e_{t-1} + \eta^C p_t^C \Delta - \frac{1}{\eta^D} p_t^D \Delta \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1a)$$

$$e_{t-1} \geq \underline{E} + \frac{1}{\eta^D} p_t^D \Delta \quad \forall t \in T \quad (4a)$$

$$e_{t-1} \leq \overline{E} - \eta^C p_t^C \Delta \quad \forall t \in T \quad (4b)$$

$$p_t^C \leq \overline{P^C} \delta_t \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1c)$$

$$p_t^D \leq \overline{P^D} (1 - \delta_t) \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1d)$$

$$e_t, p_t^C, p_t^D \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1e)$$

$$\delta_t \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1f)$$

Theorem 1: The LP-relaxation of the TO-MIP model (TO-LP) describes the convex hull of the solutions to the BO-MIP model for one time period.

Proof: See Appendix A. ■

As a result of Theorem 1, the TO-MIP model is a tighter MIP model describing the optimal operation of storage than the original BO-MIP model. It contains the facets (4b) and (4a), which were also found by Pozo [11]. However, the first advantage of the new TO-MIP model compared to the convex hull (in hyperplane representation) of Pozo is that this new model contains the same variables as the original MIP problem, whereas the variable δ_t is not present in the model by Pozo. Thus, this new formulation can obtain the (mixed-integer) solution in a multi-period problem which guarantees no simultaneous charging and discharging. The second improvement is that this TO-LP model, compared to their convex hull formulation, is more compact: it contains fewer constraints, namely only facets, and no redundant constraints. Note that if we apply Fourier-Motzkin in TO-MIP to eliminate variable δ_t , then we can replace the upper bounds on p_t^C and p_t^D in (1c) and (1d) by $\frac{p_t^C}{P^C} + \frac{p_t^D}{P^D} \leq 1 \forall t \in T$. This results in a model similar to that of Pozo, yet still more compact (4 constraints instead of 8).

C. Tight MIP formulation of storage including reserves

We now present the TOR-MIP model (Tight Operation incl. Reserves MIP model) for the optimal operation of storage including limited reserves.

TOR-MIP model: Tight Operation incl. Reserves MIP (tight version of BOR-MIP model)

$$\begin{aligned}
e_t &= e_{t-1} + \eta^C p_t^C \Delta - \frac{1}{\eta^D} p_t^D \Delta & \forall t \in T & \quad (1a) \\
e_{t-1} &\geq \underline{E} + \frac{1}{\eta^D} p_t^D \Delta + \frac{1}{\eta^D} r_t^{D+} \Delta & \forall t \in T & \quad (5a) \\
e_{t-1} &\leq \bar{E} - \eta^C p_t^C \Delta - \eta^C r_t^{C-} \Delta & \forall t \in T & \quad (5b) \\
p_t^C + r_t^{C-} &\leq \overline{P^C} \delta_t & \forall t \in T & \quad (2c) \\
p_t^D + r_t^{D+} &\leq \overline{P^D} (1 - \delta_t) & \forall t \in T & \quad (2d) \\
p_t^C - r_t^{C+} &\geq 0 & \forall t \in T & \quad (2e) \\
p_t^D - r_t^{D-} &\geq 0 & \forall t \in T & \quad (2f) \\
r_t^{C-} &\leq R^- \delta_t & \forall t \in T & \quad (5c) \\
r_t^{D-} &\leq R^- (1 - \delta_t) & \forall t \in T & \quad (5d) \\
r_t^{C+} &\leq R^+ \delta_t & \forall t \in T & \quad (5e) \\
r_t^{D+} &\leq R^+ (1 - \delta_t) & \forall t \in T & \quad (5f) \\
r_t^- &= r_t^{C-} + r_t^{D-} & \forall t \in T & \quad (5g) \\
r_t^+ &= r_t^{C+} + r_t^{D+} & \forall t \in T & \quad (5h) \\
e_t, p_t^C, p_t^D, r_t^{C+}, r_t^{C-}, r_t^{D+}, r_t^{D-} &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} & \forall t \in T & \quad (2i) \\
\delta_t &\in \{0, 1\} & \forall t \in T & \quad (1f)
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2: The LP-relaxation of the TOR-MIP model (TOR-LP) describes the convex hull of the solutions to the BOR-MIP model for one time period.

Proof: See the online companion [12, Section 5]. ■

As a result of Theorem 2, the TOR-MIP model is an MIP model describing the optimal operation of storage including

reserves which is tighter than the original BOR-MIP model. Constraints (2a) and (2b) are replaced by the facets (5a) and (5b), and (2g) and (2h) are replaced by the facets (5c)-(5h).

D. Tight MIP formulation of storage investment including reserves

We now present the tight models for storage investment and operation including reserves. The tight formulations of these models without reserves can simply be obtained by removing the reserve variables. For clarity, these tight models are given in the online companion [12, Section 2]. We start by presenting the more general TIR-MIP model (Tight Investments and operation incl. Reserves MIP model).

TIR-MIP model: Tight Investments and operation incl. Reserves MIP (tight version of BIR-MIP model)

$$\begin{aligned}
e_t &= e_{t-1} + \eta^C p_t^C \Delta - \frac{1}{\eta^D} p_t^D \Delta & \forall t \in T & \quad (1a) \\
e_{t-1} &\geq \theta(\bar{E}_0 + \bar{e}) + \frac{1}{\eta^D} p_t^D \Delta + \frac{1}{\eta^D} r_t^{D+} \Delta & \forall t \in T & \quad (6a) \\
e_{t-1} &\leq \bar{E}_0 + \bar{e} - \eta^C p_t^C \Delta - \eta^C r_t^{C-} \Delta & \forall t \in T & \quad (6b) \\
p_t^C + r_t^{C-} &\leq (\overline{P^C} + C) \delta_t & \forall t \in T & \quad (3c) \\
p_t^C + r_t^{C-} &\leq \overline{P^C} \delta_t + \bar{c} & \forall t \in T & \quad (6c) \\
p_t^D + r_t^{D+} &\leq (\overline{P^D} + D)(1 - \delta_t) & \forall t \in T & \quad (3e) \\
p_t^D + r_t^{D+} &\leq \overline{P^D} (1 - \delta_t) + \bar{d} & \forall t \in T & \quad (6d) \\
p_t^C - r_t^{C+} &\geq 0 & \forall t \in T & \quad (2e) \\
p_t^D - r_t^{D-} &\geq 0 & \forall t \in T & \quad (2f) \\
\eta^C p_t^C \Delta &\leq (1 - \theta)(\bar{E}_0 \delta_t + \bar{e}) & \forall t \in T & \quad (6e) \\
\frac{1}{\eta^D} p_t^D \Delta &\leq (1 - \theta)(\bar{E}_0 \delta_t + \bar{e}) & \forall t \in T & \quad (6f) \\
\bar{c} &\leq C & & \quad (3g) \\
\bar{d} &\leq D & & \quad (3h) \\
\bar{e} &\leq E & & \quad (3i) \\
e_t, p_t^C, p_t^D, r_t^{C+}, r_t^{C-}, r_t^{D+}, r_t^{D-} &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} & \forall t \in T & \quad (2i) \\
\bar{c}, \bar{d}, \bar{e} &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} & & \quad (3j) \\
\delta_t &\in \{0, 1\} & \forall t \in T & \quad (1f)
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3: The LP-relaxation of the TIR-MIP model (TIR-LP) describes the convex hull of the solutions to the BIR-MIP model for one time period.

Proof: See the online companion [12, Section 6]. ■

As a result of Theorem 3, the TIR-MIP model is a tighter MIP model describing the optimal investment and operation of storage than the original BIR-MIP model. Similar to the case without investments, equations (3a) and (3b) of the BILR model are replaced by the facets (6a) and (6b). Furthermore, equations (3d) and (3f) are replaced by the facets (6c) and (6d) (δ_t appears in these constraints, making them tighter), and (6e) and (6f) are new facets.

IV. ILLUSTRATIVE CASE STUDIES

To illustrate the improved performance of the newly obtained LP approximations, we apply these formulations to a unit commitment (UC) and a transmission expansion planning (TEP) case study, both presented by Arroyo et al. [7]. For a detailed description of the case studies, we refer to [7]. We have slightly adapted these case studies such that they include reserves and investment decisions. A detailed explanation of the adaptations to case studies is given in Appendix B. We have implemented the case studies in Julia using JuMP [23], and solved them to optimality using the Gurobi solver [24, Version 10.0.2].

A. Storage operation in unit commitment case study

In this section, we illustrate the performance of these new multi-period LP relaxations for storage operation (including reserves) to other LPs by embedding them in a unit commitment (UC) case study. More specifically, we compare the optimal solution of the *basic* MIP storage operation models BO-MIP and BOR-MIP, and of their LP relaxations, to the optimal solution of our LP relaxations TO-LP and TOR-LP. To this end, we replaced constraints (11)-(15) in the formulation by [9] in [7], which describe the basic operation of a storage unit, by the tight storage operation formulations (with reserves) from this paper.

The unit commitment case study describes an optimal operation problem of two generators and a storage unit over two hourly periods with demands equal to 10MW and 36MW, respectively. The objective is to minimize the operational costs of the generators and the storage unit.

TABLE I
UNIT COMMITMENT - OPTIMAL SOLUTIONS

Variable	BO-MIP		BO-LP		TO-MIP		TO-LP	
	Hour		Hour		Hour		Hour	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
p_{1t}^G (MW)	12.3	27.3	13.8	28.8	12.3	27.3	12.3	27.3
p_{2t}^G (MW)	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	2.4
p_t^C (MW)	2.3	0.0	5.8	0.0	2.3	0.0	2.3	0.0
p_t^D (MW)	0.0	6.3	2.0	7.2	0.0	6.3	0.0	6.3
e_t (MW)	12.0	5.0	13.0	5.0	12.0	5.0	12.0	5.0
Total cost (\$)	173.2		130.3		173.2		173.2	

Table I shows the optimal solutions to the basic unit commitment case study, as obtained from different formulations for the storage operation part. It can be observed that the optimal solution to the TO-MIP model is the same as the optimal solution to the BO-MIP model, showing that our MIP formulation represents the exact same problem. More importantly, it can be observed that in the optimal solution to the LP relaxation of this model (the BO-LP model), both variables p_t^C and p_t^D have a positive value in the first hour (highlighted in bold), meaning that simultaneous charging and discharging occurs. However, our LP relaxation (TO-LP) finds the same solution as the MIP models, so it has successfully prevented simultaneous charging and discharging, as desired.

The storage has a maximum capacity of 13.0MWh. Due to simultaneous charging and discharging in the first hour,

energy is lost. This enables generator 1 (with a maximum ramp up rate of 15MW/h) to ramp up its generation (p^G) fast enough to satisfy the demand in the second hour. The expensive generator 2 is then not needed, resulting in a cheaper solution. However, simultaneous charging and discharging is not feasible in practice. Thus, the BO-LP model finds an operation plan that cannot be implemented.

TABLE II
UNIT COMMITMENT INCL. RESERVES - OPTIMAL SOLUTIONS

Variable	BOR-MIP		BOR-LP		TOR-MIP		TOR-LP	
	Hour		Hour		Hour		Hour	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
p_{1t}^G (MW)	12.3	27.3	12.9	27.9	12.3	27.3	12.5	27.3
p_{2t}^G (MW)	0.0	3.3	0.0	2.7	0.0	3.3	0.0	3.3
p_t^C (MW)	2.3	0.0	5.1	0.0	2.3	0.0	2.3	0.0
p_t^D (MW)	0.0	5.4	2.3	5.4	0.0	5.4	0.0	5.4
e_t (MW)	12.1	6.1	12.1	6.1	12.1	6.1	12.1	6.1
r_t^{C+} (MW)	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
r_t^{D+} (MW)	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
r_t^{C-} (MW)	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
r_t^{D-} (MW)	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Total cost (\$)	191.0		184.1		191.0		191.0	

To include reserves, we added constraints that ensure that there are reserves available of at least 1.0MW in each time period. Table II shows the different optimal solutions to the unit commitment case study including storage reserves. In the optimal solution to the BOR-MIP model, we can see that the minimum up and down reserves of 1.0MW in both hourly periods are satisfied. In the second hour, more energy is generated by generator 2 and less energy is discharged (compared to the problem without reserves) to achieve this, resulting in a higher total cost.

It can be observed that our TOR-MIP model results in the same optimal solution as the BOR-MIP model, confirming the correctness of our formulation. In the first hour of the solution to the BOR-LP model, simultaneous charging and discharging occurs again. In the optimal solution to our TOR-LP, simultaneous charging and discharging is prevented. However, it can be observed (highlighted in bold) that down reserves are provided by charging in the second period, though this would not be feasible in practice since the storage is discharging in this period. So the optimal solution to the TOR-LP relaxation still contains some error, but less than for the BOR-LP model. This issue is prevented in the alternative reserves formulation given in Appendix C (the BOF-MIP model) since this model does not need a binary variable to model reserves accurately.

B. Storage investment in transmission expansion planning case study

In this section, we illustrate the performance of our multi-period storage investment LP relaxation including reserves compared to other LPs in a transmission expansion planning case study. More specifically, we compare the optimal solution of the *basic* MIP storage investment and operation model BIR-MIP, and of its LP relaxation, to the optimal solution of our LP relaxation TIR-LP. To this end, we replaced constraints

(24)-(28) in the formulation presented by Arroyo et al. [7] (formulation originally by Zhou et al. [10]), which describe the basic operation of a storage unit, by the tight storage investment and operation formulations (with reserves) from this paper.

The transmission expansion planning problem describes an optimal transmission investment problem of a candidate line of \$5000 between two disconnected buses, with a different generator in each and a storage unit in bus 1. For illustration purposes, the operating condition consists of two hourly periods with both nodal demands respectively equal to 25MW and 100MW. We slightly adapted the case study to also include storage investment decisions and reserves. We substituted the storage capacities by investment variables and changed the objective function to minimize the investment costs of the storage unit, instead of its operational costs. To include reserves, we added constraints that ensure that there are reserves available of at least 10% of the energy demand in each time period.

Table III shows the different optimal solutions to the unit commitment case study with storage investment decisions. Simultaneous charging and discharging occurs in the second hour of the solution to the BIR-LP model, but it is prevented by our TIR-LP model.

TABLE III
TRANSMISSION EXPANSION PLANNING - OPTIMAL SOLUTIONS

Variable	BIR-MIP		BIR-LP		TIR-MIP		TIR-LP	
	Hour		Hour		Hour		Hour	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
p_{1t}^G (MW)	135.4	145.4	125.0	115.0	135.4	145.4	135.4	145.4
p_{2t}^G (MW)	0.0	0.0	25.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
p_t^C (MW)	82.9	0.0	97.5	17.5	82.9	0.0	82.9	0.0
p_t^D (MW)	0.0	64.6	0.0	12.5	0.0	64.6	0.0	64.6
e_t (MW)	74.6	10.0	87.8	91.1	74.6	10.0	74.6	10.0
r_t^{C+} (MW)	2.5	0.0	2.5	10.0	2.5	0.0	2.5	0.0
r_t^{D+} (MW)	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.0
r_t^{C-} (MW)	2.5	0.0	2.5	10.0	2.5	0.0	2.5	0.0
r_t^{D-} (MW)	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.0
\bar{e} (MWh)	85.4		100.0		85.4		85.4	
\bar{d} (MWh)	74.6		12.5		74.6		74.6	
\bar{e} (MWh)	100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0	
Total cost (\$)	5882		3205		5882		5882	

Here, the storage unit in bus 1 has a maximum capacity of 100MWh. Similar to the UC case study, simultaneous charging and discharging in the second hour causes a loss of energy. This allows generator 1 (with a maximum ramp down rate of 10MW/h) to ramp down fast enough in the second hour, without needing a transmission line to get rid of the excess energy. This results in a cheaper solution, where a line investment is not needed. However, simultaneous charging and discharging is not feasible in practice. Thus, the BIR-LP model finds an investment plan that does not allow a feasible operation plan in practice, but our TIR-LP model does find a feasible plan.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we obtained the convex hull of feasible MIP solutions for the optimal operation of storage problem for one

time period, as well as for the optimal investment problem, both including reserves. We provide a step by step proof for these convex hull formulations. This guarantees that no tighter MIP formulation exists, meaning no better LP approximation exists for one time period. The presented case studies illustrate the improved ability of the LP relaxations of the tight MIP formulations to prevent simultaneous charging and discharging in a multi-period problem, compared to other LP models.

The improved MIP and LP relaxation can be used as a better proxy of many different types of energy storage systems, as well as transmission lines, in many different large-scale energy system models. Incorporating the improved LP relaxation into large-scale LP models will result in more accurate models, that better prevent simultaneous charging and discharging. Additionally, the tighter MIP formulation has the potential to speed up the solving time of large-scale MIPs. Moreover, it allows the direct application of certain decomposition algorithms, which could further improve the solving time. Thus, the improved models can support the energy transition by accurately modeling the optimal operation of energy storage systems.

In this work, we obtained the convex hull for different storage optimization models for one time period. Future work could attempt to find facets for these problems in multiple time periods, resulting in a tighter multi-period formulation. The issue with current reserve models that we pointed out in Section II-B can also be investigated further. It is desired to have a formulation that accurately models the full flexibility of a storage unit to provide reserves, ideally one that is tight and compact.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research received funding from the Dutch Research Council (NWO).

APPENDIX

A. Proof of convex hull formulation optimal storage operation in one time period

In this section, we will obtain the convex hull formulation of the solutions to the basic storage operation problem, as given by the BO-MIP model, for one time period. We can write the constraints of this model in the following way for one time period t^* :

$$\underline{E} \leq e_{t^*} = e_{t^*-1} + \eta^C p_{t^*}^C \Delta - \frac{1}{\eta^D} p_{t^*}^D \Delta \leq \bar{E} \quad (\text{from 1a and 1b})$$

$$\underline{E} \leq e_{t^*-1} \leq \bar{E} \quad (\text{from 1b})$$

$$p_{t^*}^C \leq \bar{P}^C \delta_{t^*} \quad (\text{from 1c})$$

$$p_{t^*}^D \leq \bar{P}^D (1 - \delta_{t^*}) \quad (\text{from 1d})$$

$$e_{t^*-1}, p_{t^*}^C, p_{t^*}^D \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \quad (\text{from 1e})$$

$$\delta_{t^*} \in \{0, 1\}. \quad (\text{from 1f})$$

We will follow the method described in III-A to obtain the convex hull. First, we write two disjunctive sets of constraints in Section A1. We then obtain the convex hull of these two disjunctive sets of constraints in Section A2, as explained

by [20]. Lastly, we obtain the convex hull in the dimension of the original formulation by eliminating the extra variable using the Fourier-Motzkin elimination procedure in Section A3.

1) *Disjunctive constraints sets: charging - discharging:*

The two disjunctive sets of constraints of the problem for one time period are given in (7). We dropped the subscripts t^* and $t^* - 1$ from the notation for simplicity. Note that some constraints are redundant. For example: when charging, $e \leq \bar{E}$ is dominated by $e + \eta^C p^C \Delta \leq \bar{E}$, since the second constraint is a tighter bound on e , so it is redundant.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Charging:} & \text{Discharging:} \\
\delta = 1 & \delta = 0 \\
p^D = 0 & p^C = 0 \\
\underline{E} \leq e + \eta^C p^C \Delta \leq \bar{E} & \text{or } \underline{E} \leq e - \frac{1}{\eta^D} p^D \Delta \leq \bar{E} \\
\underline{E} \leq e \leq \bar{E} & \underline{E} \leq e \leq \bar{E} \\
p^C \leq \bar{P}^C & p^D \leq \bar{P}^D \\
e \geq 0 & e \geq 0 \\
p^C \geq 0 & p^D \geq 0
\end{array} \tag{7}$$

2) *Convex hull of disjunctive constraint sets:* We can then obtain the convex hull of these two disjunctive sets of constraints, as described in [20] in the following way. We rename all variables from one set to \square^1 and variables from the other to \square^2 , and we multiply all parameters in one set with δ^1 , and the others with δ^2 . We also need to include the additional constraint $\delta^1 + \delta^2 = 1$. This gives us the constraints in (8), which describe the convex hull of the solutions to the BO-MIP model for one time period.

$$\begin{array}{l}
e^1 \geq \underline{E}\delta^1 \\
e^1 + p^{C1}\eta^C \leq \bar{E}\delta^1 \\
p^{C1} \leq \bar{P}^C\delta^1 \\
p^{C1} \geq 0 \\
e^2 - \frac{p^{D2}}{\eta^D} \geq \underline{E}\delta^2 \\
e^2 \leq \bar{E}\delta^2 \\
p^{D2} \leq \bar{P}^D\delta^2 \\
p^{D2} \geq 0 \\
\delta^1 + \delta^2 = 1
\end{array} \tag{8}$$

We can rewrite this problem, such that it looks more similar to the original formulation. We can write $p^{C1} = p^C$ and $p^{D2} = p^D$. We also rename variable δ^1 as δ , and write δ^2 as $1 - \delta$. Furthermore, we let $e = e^1 + e^2$, so we can write e^2 as $e - e^1$. This results in (9b)-(9f). Constraints (9c) and (9f) only contain variables that are also in the BO-MIP model, and they are not redundant, thus they are needed in the convex hull (CH) formulation.

$$e^1 \geq \underline{E}\delta \text{ bound on } e^1 \tag{9a}$$

$$e^1 + \eta^C p^C \Delta \leq \bar{E}\delta \text{ bound on } e^1 \tag{9b}$$

$$0 \leq p^C \leq \bar{P}^C\delta \text{ in CH} \tag{9c}$$

$$(e - e^1) - \frac{1}{\eta^D} p^D \Delta \geq \underline{E}(1 - \delta) \text{ bound on } e^1 \tag{9d}$$

$$e - e^1 \leq \bar{E}(1 - \delta) \text{ bound on } e^1 \tag{9e}$$

$$0 \leq p^D \leq \bar{P}^D(1 - \delta) \text{ in CH} \tag{9f}$$

3) *Eliminating variable e^1 :* To reduce the dimensionality of the problem, we eliminate variable e^1 by applying Fourier-Motzkin. The lower bounds on e^1 are (9a) and (9e), which we can rewrite in the following way:

$$e^1 \geq \underline{E}\delta \tag{from 9a}$$

$$e^1 \geq e - \bar{E}(1 - \delta). \tag{from 9e}$$

The upper bounds on e^1 are (9b) and (9d), which we can rewrite as

$$e^1 \leq -\eta^C p^C \Delta + \bar{E}\delta \tag{from 9b}$$

$$e^1 \leq e - \frac{1}{\eta^D} p^D \Delta - \underline{E}(1 - \delta). \tag{from 9d}$$

We now combine the upper and lower bounds on e^1 according to the Fourier-Motzkin procedure to eliminate the variable. By combining the first lower bound and first upper bound, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\underline{E}\delta &\leq -\eta^C p^C \Delta + \bar{E}\delta \\
\Rightarrow \eta^C p^C \Delta &\leq (\bar{E} - \underline{E})\delta \text{ dominated by (9c)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{10a}$$

Note that this constraint is redundant by (9c) under reasonable assumptions about the parameter values, as explained in Section III-A. By combining the first lower bound and second upper bound, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\underline{E}\delta &\leq e - \frac{1}{\eta^D} p^D \Delta - \underline{E}(1 - \delta) \\
\Rightarrow e &\geq \underline{E} + \frac{1}{\eta^D} p^D \Delta \text{ in CH.}
\end{aligned} \tag{10b}$$

This constraint is not redundant, thus it is needed in the convex hull formulation. Following this procedure, we obtain the following constraints by combining the second lower bound and all upper bounds on e^1 :

$$e \leq \bar{E} - \eta^C p^C \Delta \text{ in CH} \tag{10c}$$

$$\frac{1}{\eta^D} p^D \Delta \leq (\bar{E} - \underline{E})(1 - \delta) \text{ dominated by (9f)}. \tag{10d}$$

In conclusion, we have found (9c), (9f), (10b), and (10c), which describe for the convex hull formulation of the solutions to the BO-MIP model for one time period. This result is further explained in Section III-B.

B. Case studies details

As explained in Section IV, we used the unit commitment and transmission expansion planning case studies by Arroyo et al. [7], and adapted them to include reserves and investment decisions. For a full explanation of the case studies, we refer to the original paper. In this section, we explain how we adapted the case studies.

An overview of all the parameter values in the original UC case study, as well as in our adapted case studies (used to

obtain the results in Tables I and II can be found in Table IV. For the regular optimal operation problem, we slightly adjusted the charging/discharging capacities. As explained at the start of Section III, the LP relaxations of our formulations describe the convex hull of the solutions to the MIP models for one time period under the assumption that $\overline{P^C} \leq \frac{1}{\eta^C \Delta} (\overline{E} - \underline{E})$ and $\overline{P^D} \leq \frac{\eta^D}{\Delta} (\overline{E} - \underline{E})$. In the original case study, the values of $\overline{P^C}$ and $\overline{P^D}$ do not satisfy this, so we changed these values, as can be seen in Table V. Note that this does not affect the optimal mixed-integer solution.

TABLE IV
STORAGE UNIT PARAMETER VALUES OF CASE STUDIES

Parameter	Original	Operation	Reserves
\underline{E}	5	5	5
\overline{E}	13	13	13
$\overline{P^C}$	12	$\frac{1}{\eta^C \Delta} (\overline{E} - \underline{E})$	$\frac{1}{\eta^C \Delta} (\overline{E} - \underline{E})$
$\overline{P^D}$	12	$\frac{\eta^D}{\Delta} (\overline{E} - \underline{E})$	$\frac{\eta^D}{\Delta} (\overline{E} - \underline{E})$
η^C	0.9	0.9	0.9
η^D	0.9	0.9	0.9
R^+	-	-	$\frac{1}{\eta^C \Delta} (\overline{E} - \underline{E})$
R^-	-	-	$\frac{\eta^D}{\Delta} (\overline{E} - \underline{E})$

For the case study including reserves, we also needed to satisfy $R^- \leq \frac{1}{\eta^C \Delta} (\overline{E} - \underline{E})$ and $R^+ \leq \frac{\eta^D}{\Delta} (\overline{E} - \underline{E})$. Thus, we set these parameters equal to these upper limits, as can be seen in Table V. Additionally, we added constraints that ensure that the up/down reserves were at least 10% of the regular energy demand.

TABLE V
STORAGE UNIT PARAMETER VALUES OF CASE STUDIES

Old parameter	value	New parameter
\underline{E}	5	-
\overline{E}	100	E
$\overline{P^C}$	100	C
$\overline{P^D}$	100	D

For the case study including investment decisions, we set the maximum investments of charge/discharge/storage capacity equal to the respective maximum capacities in the other case studies. For θ , we chose to set it to $\underline{E}/\overline{E}$, based on the original case study. The initially installed charge/discharge/storage capacities $P_0^C/P_0^D/\overline{E}_0$ are set to zero, representing a Greenfield scenario. In the objective function, the investment costs of the storage unit are minimized, instead of the operational costs. Here, the investment costs per MWh charging/discharging capacity are set to \$1/MWh.

C. Modeling full flexibility of reserves accurately

We want to point out that there is an issue with modeling reserves using the BOR-MIP model, which is that it does not fully exploit the flexibility of a storage unit. It only allows limited reserves. We illustrate this with an example, sketched in Figure 1. Suppose $\overline{P^C} = \overline{P^D} = 10\text{MW}$. If the storage is discharging $p_t^D = 8\text{MW}$, then the maximum up reserves the

model guarantees is $r_t^{D+} \leq 2\text{MW}$ from (2d), which can be realized in real-life by discharging 2MW extra. Also, since the unit is discharging, $\delta_t = 0$ forces $r_t^{C+}, r_t^{C-}, p_t^C = 0$. So the total down reserves in this instance can be $r_t^- = r_t^{D-} \leq 8\text{MW}$, bounded by (2f). However, in real life, we would be able to provide a total of $r_t^- = 18\text{MW}$ down reserves, namely by not discharging those 8MW ($r_t^{D-} = 8\text{MW}$), and by charging 10MW instead ($r_t^{C-} = 10\text{MW}$). Thus, the BOR-MIP model does not fully exploit the flexibility of the storage unit. In Figure 1 this missing reserves capacity is indicated by the gray box.




Fig. 1. The up and down reserve capacities when discharging, bounded by the charging and discharging capacities, as modeled by different MIP formulations.

The constraints can be adapted such that the model does fully exploit the flexibility of the storage unit, namely by replacing (2e) and (2f) by

$$p_t^C - r_t^{C+} \geq -\overline{P^D} \quad (11a)$$

$$p_t^D - r_t^{D-} \geq -\overline{P^C}. \quad (11b)$$

Constraints (11a) and (11b) together with (2c) and (2d) can be rewritten as (12b) and (12c). This results in the BOF-MIP model (Basic Operation with Flexible Reserves MIP model), as presented by Momber et al. [15]. Now, (12b) and (12c) ensure that the down reserves r_t^- and up reserves r_t^+ , respectively, are essentially bounded by $\overline{P^D} + \overline{P^C}$. Thus, this formulation does fully exploit the flexibility of the storage unit, as illustrated in Figure 1. Lastly, the capacity of the reserves is also bounded by the current state of charge, as modeled by (12a). We provide the tight formulation of this model in the online companion [12, Section 4].

BOF-MIP model: Basic storage operation incl. flexible reserves MIP

$$e_t = e_{t-1} + \eta^C p_t^C \Delta - \frac{1}{\eta^D} p_t^D \Delta \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1a)$$

$$\underline{E} + \frac{1}{\eta^D} r_t^+ \Delta \leq e_t \leq \overline{E} - \eta^C r_t^- \Delta \quad \forall t \in T \quad (12a)$$

$$p_t^C \leq \overline{P^C} \delta_t \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1c)$$

$$p_t^D \leq \overline{P^D} (1 - \delta_t) \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1d)$$

$$p_t^C - p_t^D + r_t^- \leq \overline{P^C} \quad \forall t \in T \quad (12b)$$

$$-p_t^C + p_t^D + r_t^+ \leq \overline{P^D} \quad \forall t \in T \quad (12c)$$

$$r_t^+ \leq R^+ \quad \forall t \in T \quad (12d)$$

$$r_t^- \leq R^- \quad \forall t \in T \quad (12e)$$

$$e_t, p_t^C, p_t^D, r_t^+, r_t^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \quad \forall t \in T \quad (12f)$$

$$\delta_t \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall t \in T \quad (1f)$$

However, we want to point out that (12a) might not ensure that the reserves are bounded correctly. Thus, it might promise reserves that cannot be realized in practice. Let us consider another example, sketched in Figure 2. The maximum capacity of the storage unit is 10MWh, the maximum charging/discharging capacities are again 10MW, the charging and discharging efficiencies are 50% and 100%, respectively, and $\Delta = 1$. Suppose the state-of-charge is initially at maximum capacity and the storage is scheduled to discharge 8MW, so the storage level becomes 2MWh. Then (12b) would allow a down reserve of 18MW, just like in the previous example in Figure 1. Due to the total battery capacity and the current storage level, (12a) would constrain this down reserve such that $\eta^C r^- \Delta \leq 8$ MW, so $r^- \leq 16$ MW. However, in reality, the down reserve would be provided by not realizing the scheduled discharge, resulting in a down reserve of capacity of 8MW. An error is introduced due to the difference in charging and discharging efficiencies. The promised down reserve of 16MW cannot be provided, showing that (12a) is not restricted enough to model the problem accurately.




Fig. 2. The up and down reserve capacities when discharging, bounded by the total storage capacity, as modeled by different MIP formulations.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Srilakshmi and S. P. Singh, "Energy regulation of EV using MILP for optimal operation of incentive based prosumer microgrid with uncertainty modelling," *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, vol. 134, p. 107353, Jan. 2022.
- [2] H. Singabhattu, A. Jain, and T. Bhattacharjee, "Distributed energy resources optimization for demand response using MILP," in *2017 IEEE Region 10 Symposium (TENSYP)*. Cochin, India: IEEE, Jul. 2017, pp. 1–5.
- [3] G. Morales-España, L. Ramírez-Elizondo, and B. F. Hobbs, "Hidden power system inflexibilities imposed by traditional unit commitment formulations," *Applied Energy*, vol. 191, pp. 223–238, Apr. 2017.
- [4] B. Xu, J. Zhao, T. Zheng, E. Litvinov, and D. S. Kirschen, "Factoring the Cycle Aging Cost of Batteries Participating in Electricity Markets," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 2248–2259, Mar. 2018.

- [5] R. S. Go, F. D. Munoz, and J.-P. Watson, "Assessing the economic value of co-optimized grid-scale energy storage investments in supporting high renewable portfolio standards," *Applied Energy*, vol. 183, pp. 902–913, Dec. 2016.
- [6] Z. Shen, W. Wei, D. Wu, T. Ding, and S. Mei, "Modeling arbitrage of an energy storage unit without binary variables," *CSEE Journal of Power and Energy Systems*, Jun. 2020.
- [7] J. M. Arroyo, L. Baringo, A. Baringo, R. Bolanos, N. Alguacil, and N. G. Cobos, "On the Use of a Convex Model for Bulk Storage in MIP-Based Power System Operation and Planning," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 4964–4967, Nov. 2020.
- [8] G. Morales-España, R. Martínez-Gordón, and J. Sijm, "Classifying and modelling demand response in power systems," *Energy*, vol. 242, p. 122544, Mar. 2022.
- [9] Y. Wen, C. Guo, H. Pandzic, and D. S. Kirschen, "Enhanced Security-Constrained Unit Commitment With Emerging Utility-Scale Energy Storage," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 652–662, Jan. 2016.
- [10] B. Zhao, A. Conejo, and R. Sioshansi, "Using Electrical Energy Storage to Mitigate Natural Gas-Supply Shortages," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. PP, pp. 1–1, Jun. 2018.
- [11] D. Pozo, "Convex Hull Formulations for Linear Modeling of Energy Storage Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 38, no. 6, pp. 5934–5936, Nov. 2023.
- [12] M. B. Elgersma, G. Morales-España, K. I. Aardal, N. Helisto, J. Kiviluoma, and M. M. de Weerd, "Online Companion for Tight MIP Formulations for Optimal Operation and Investment of Storage Including Reserves," Delft University of Technology, Working Paper, 2024, available: <https://research.tudelft.nl/tudelft.idm.oclc.org/en/publications/online-companion-for-tight-mip-formulations-for-optimal-operation>.
- [13] G. Morales-España, A. Ramos, and J. Garcia-Gonzalez, "An MIP Formulation for Joint Market-Clearing of Energy and Reserves Based on Ramp Scheduling," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 476–488, Jan. 2014.
- [14] Y. Liu, L. Wu, Y. Yang, Y. Chen, R. Baldick, and R. Bo, "Secured Reserve Scheduling of Pumped-Storage Hydropower Plants in ISO Day-Ahead Market," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 5722–5733, Nov. 2021.
- [15] I. Momber, G. Morales-España, A. Ramos, and T. Gómez, "PEV Storage in Multi-Bus Scheduling Problems," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 1079–1087, Mar. 2014.
- [16] G. Morales-España, R. Hernández-Serna, D. A. Tejada-Arango, and M. Weeda, "Impact of large-scale hydrogen electrification and retrofitting of natural gas infrastructure on the European power system," *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, vol. 155, p. 109686, Jan. 2024.
- [17] D. A. Tejada-Arango, G. Morales-España, S. Wogrin, and E. Centeno, "Power-Based Generation Expansion Planning for Flexibility Requirements," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 2012–2023, May 2020.
- [18] C. H. Papadimitriou and M. Yannakakis, "The complexity of facets (and some facets of complexity)," in *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing - STOC '82*. San Francisco, California, United States: ACM Press, 1982, pp. 255–260.
- [19] L. Wolsey, *Integer Programming*. Wiley-Interscience, 1998.
- [20] E. Balas, "Disjunctive Programming and a Hierarchy of Relaxations for Discrete Optimization Problems," *SIAM. J. on Algebraic and Discrete Methods*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 466–486, Aug. 1985.
- [21] J. B. J. Fourier, "Solution d'une question particuliere du calcul des inegalités," *Nouveau Bulletin des Sciences par la Société philomatique de Paris*, vol. 99, p. 100, 1826.
- [22] T. S. Motzkin, "Beiträge zur theorie der linearen ungleichungen," (*No Title*), 1936.
- [23] M. Lubin, O. Dowson, J. Dias Garcia, J. Huchette, B. Legat, and J. P. Vielma, "JuMP 1.0: Recent improvements to a modeling language for mathematical optimization," *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 2023.
- [24] Gurobi Optimization, LLC, "Gurobi optimizer reference manual," 2023.