

Proudly Operated by Battelle Since 1965

Advanced Methods for Security Constrained Financial Transmission Rights (FTR)

Stephen Elbert, Steve.Elbert@PNNL.gov Karan Kalsi, Kurt Glaesemann, Mark Rice, Maria Vlachopoulou, Ning Zhou Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA

FERC Staff Technical Conference on Increasing Real-Time and Day-Ahead Market Efficiency through Improved Software (Docket No. AD10-12-003)

June 25-27, 2012 Washington, DC



Proudly Operated by Battelle Since 1965

Motivation - Challenges with FTR Calculations

- Financial Transmission Rights (FTR) improve power market operation efficiency by providing financial tool to hedge price risk associated with congestion
- Mitigate incentives for inefficient transmission investment
- FTR auction is formulated as a linear programming optimization problem
- FTR calculations are computationally expensive because
 - Large number of security constraints (N-1 contingency analysis)
 - Many FTR variables (obligatory and optional FTR bids)
 - Multiple time periods (security constraints coupled & no. of constraints increase exponentially with no. of categories)
- FTR computation must be finished in time to improve market efficiency

Objectives



- Develop innovative mathematical reformulation of the FTR problem
- Compare multiple solvers for FTR computations
- Developed approaches will be able to
 - Support N-1 Simultaneous Feasibility Test (SFT) e.g. DC contingency analysis
 - Support both optional and obligatory FTR bids
 - Support multi-period FTR calculation (e.g. winter, summer and annual)
- Algorithms designed to solve FTR problem should be parallelizable to support large-scale implementation in a cloud environment

Problem Formulation

Power flow constraints
 B is (singular) admittance matrix
 *θ*_i are the bus voltage angles
 A is FTR location matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} & \cdots & B_{1n} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} & \cdots & B_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ B_{n1} & \cdots & \cdots & B_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \theta_1 \\ \theta_2 \\ \vdots \\ \theta_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & \cdots & A_{1m} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} & \cdots & A_{2m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_{n1} & \cdots & \cdots & A_{nm} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} FTR_1 \\ FTR_2 \\ \vdots \\ FTR_m \end{bmatrix}$$

 $-\begin{vmatrix} L_{1} \\ L_{2} \\ \vdots \\ I \end{vmatrix} \le \begin{vmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} & \cdots & C_{1n} \\ C_{21} & C_{22} & \cdots & C_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ C & & & & C \\ 0 & & & & I \end{vmatrix} \begin{vmatrix} L_{1} \\ \theta_{2} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ I \end{vmatrix} \le \begin{vmatrix} L_{1} \\ L_{2} \\ \vdots \\ I \end{vmatrix}$

Thermal constraints
 C converts voltage angles to line flows
 L_i are transmission line limits

Bid-in constraints

 $\begin{bmatrix} 0\\0\\\vdots\\0 \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} FTR_1\\FTR_2\\\vdots\\FTR_m \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} FH_1\\FH_2\\\vdots\\FH_m \end{bmatrix}$

Combine $\begin{bmatrix}
L_1 \\
L_2 \\
\vdots \\
L_b
\end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix}
C_{12} & C_{13} & \cdots & C_{1n} \\
C_{22} & C_{23} & \cdots & C_{2n} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
C_{b2} & \cdots & \cdots & C_{bn}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
B_{22} & B_{23} & \cdots & B_{2n} \\
B_{32} & B_{33} & \cdots & B_{3n} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
B_{n2} & \cdots & \cdots & B_{nn}
\end{bmatrix}^{-1}
\begin{bmatrix}
A_{21} & A_{22} & \cdots & A_{2m} \\
A_{31} & A_{32} & \cdots & A_{3m} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
A_{n1} & \cdots & \cdots & A_{nm}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
FTR_1 \\
FTR_2 \\
\vdots \\
FTR_m
\end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix}
L_1 \\
L_2 \\
\vdots \\
L_b
\end{bmatrix}$ A dimension is (constraints x bids)





Proudly Operated by Battelle Since 1965

Standard FTR Solvers

CPLEX (industry standard)

- Primal simplex; most basic LP solver method
 - Updates tableau containing objective function and constraint information at every iteration
 - Consistently slower on FTR than dual simplex
- Dual simplex; fastest of the CPLEX methods
 - Similar to primal simplex method, but uses dual formulation of the LP to improve convergence time of optimization
 - Core computation is a linear solve; scales as cube of size
 - Barrier; an interior point method (best for large sparse problems)
 - A primal-dual logarithmic barrier algorithm that generates a sequence of strictly positive primal and dual solutions
 - Fewest iterations but each is more computationally intense



PNNL FTR solver –

Parallel Adaptive Non-linear Dynamical System (NDS)

- Transform LP into coupled set of non-linear dynamical equations
- Dynamical system converges to stable states which are solutions of primal and dual LP problems respectively



Non-linear Dynamical System

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = k_1 \left(c - A^T \left(y + k \frac{dy}{dt} \right) \right)$$
$$\frac{dy}{dt} = k_2 \left(-b + A \left(x + k \frac{dx}{dt} \right) \right)$$
$$k_1 = \frac{\kappa}{i} \qquad i = 1, 2, \dots M \qquad k_2 = \frac{1}{k_1}$$

 Kernel is a pair of easily parallelized matrix-vector operations: scale as square of problem size (constraints x variables)

Implementation notes



Proudly Operated by Battelle Since 1965

Obligatory and Optional bids sorted into separate blocks
 Obligatory bids may use dense matrix arithmetic
 Optional bids use sparse matrix arithmetic (up to 50% sparse)
 A matrix segments communicated once at beginning
 A and A^T stored separately to maximize unit stride access

- Global sums for product vectors and distribution of x and y vectors are the only communication after initialization
- Symmetry of Obligatory bids reduces computation by two

Validation test cases



Cases	Constraints	Bids
1a. WECC 230 single period	5,362	5,790
2a. WECC 230 single period & many bids	5,362	100,000
3a. WECC 230 multi-period	10,724	17,370
4a. WECC 230 multi-period & many bids	10,724	300,000
1b. WECC 100 single period	19,094	22,455
2b. WECC 100 single period & many bids	19,094	100,000
3b. WECC 100 multi-period	38,188	67,365
4b. WECC 100 multi-period & many bids	38,188	300,000

- WECC 230 & 100 model power flow on transmission lines operating at min of
 230 kV (1,930 buses and 2,681 branches)
 - 100 kV (7,485 buses and 9,547 branches)
- Multi-period problems have independent periods plus a coupling block

FTR bids	PF (winter)	PF (summer)
Bids (winter)		
Bids (summer)		
Bids (annual,)		

Results – single period cases



Proudly Operated by Battelle Since 1965



WECC 230

- Primal simplex takes 20 min, dual simplex and serial NDS (1 core) takes 2 minutes
- Parallel NDS is six times faster than dual simplex (CPLEX)

▶ WECC 100



- At 4 hours, dual simplex not yet converged
- Parallel NDS 46X faster than dual simplex

Results – single period & many bids (100,000)



Proudly Operated by Battelle Since 1965



NDS scaling well

Results – two period (summer/winter) cases



Proudly Operated by Battelle Since 1965



Serial NDS is faster than CPLEX

NDS 128-core is 17 times faster

The bigger the problem, The faster the relative performance

• WECC 100



- CPLEX no longer practical—time is divided by 10 and not converged
- NDS 256-core is 185 times faster
- 1.7 billion non-zero matrix elem.

Results - two periods & many bids (300,000)



Proudly Operated by Battelle Since 1965



• WECC 100



- Additional cores and code improvements → solution in under 4 hours
- 15.3 billion non-zero matrix elem.

Real-world data 1



Proudly Operated by Battelle Since 1965



CPLEX time per iteration slows by 85x from beginning to end due to backfill

Real World Data 2



Proudly Operated by Battelle Since 1965



CPLEX time per iteration slows by 269x from beginning to end due to backfill

Summary



- Developed novel non-linear dynamical system based FTR solver
- Easily parallelized to solve large linear programming (LP) problems for FTR application within few hours (cloud compatible)
- Parallel NDS more computationally efficient than CPLEX for LP
 - Computational kernel of CPLEX is linear solver that scales as cube of problem size
 - NDS kernel is matrix-vector multiplication that scales as square
 - NDS avoids backfill (filing in zeros) of coupled blocks
 - Maintains numerical stability through using only original matrix
 - Uses dense algorithm for obligatory bids, sparse (50%) for optional bids
 - Half the arithmetic for obligatory bids (two inner products differ only in sign)
 - Data loaded efficiently in parallel
- Further enhancements
 - Further improve parallelization (asynchronous communication, sparse ops)
 - Refine adaptive time stepping and explore ode time stepping for faster convergence

Future



- Develop quadratic programming capability
 - Improved FTR constraints
- Explore other application needing LP and/or QP capability
 - Transmission planning
 - Locational Marginal Pricing (LMP)
 - Optimal Power Flow (OPF)
- Explore using method with discrete problems
 - Mixed Integer Programming (MIP)
 - Resource Scheduling and Commitment (RSC) (aka Unit Commitment)
 - Stochastic RSC

Acknowledgements



Proudly Operated by Battelle Since 1965

For providing Alstom data sets

- Xing Wang
- David Sun

Support

This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Advanced Grid Analytics program at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory is operated for the U.S. Department of Energy by Battelle Memorial Institute under Contract DE-AC05-76RL01830.

References



- Kalsi K, ST Elbert, M Vlachopoulou, N Zhou, and Z Huang. 2012. "Advanced Computational Methods for Security Constrained Financial Transmission Rights." to be presented at the IEEE Power and Energy Society General Meeting 2012. 22-27 July 2012, San Diego.
- Elbert ST, K Kalsi, M Vlachopoulou, MJ Rice, KR Glaesemann, and N Zhou. 2012. "Advanced Computational Methods for Security Constrained Financial Transmission Rights: Structure and Parallelism." to be presented at the IFAC (International Federation of Automatic Control) 8th PP&PSC (Power Plant and Power Systems Control) Symposium, 2-5 Sept. 2012, Toulouse, France.