

Robust Transmission Planning – An Application to the Case of Germany in 2050





Alexander Weber, Clemens Gerbaulet, Mario Kendziorski,

Christian von Hirschhausen, Jens Weibezahn

Research funded through grant "LKD-EU", FKZ 03ET4028A, German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy

europäischen Kontext

How should uncertainty be tackled in transmission planning?

What role can robust optimization play?

 What decision calculus is appropriate from a social perspective?

Introduction: Robust Optimization

Some Decision-Making Strategies

- (Deterministic)
- Stochastic Optimization; Expected value
 - Minimize the average (expected) cost.
- Robust Optimization
 - Minimize the cost of the worst case realization
 - Alternatively: "Minimax Regret" to minimize the highest extra cost of "notknowing"

Types of Uncertainties

- (Certainty)
- Risk vs. Knightian Uncertainty
 - Sometimes, this may be a data problem...
- "High" vs. "low" frequency uncertainties
 - "High frequency" uncertainties allow for bad outcomes to be compensated by good outcomes

Other Issues

- Implementation of solution subject to "tolerances"
- Problem/Model very sensitive to (small) parameter changes

dynELMOD –Investment and Dispatch model for Europe

dynELMOD: dynamic Electricity Model

- Open source (soon)
 - diw.de/elmod
- Objective: System Cost minimization
 - Investment
 - Operation and Maintenance
 - Generation
 - Cross-border line expansion

Investment options

- Conventional power plants
- Renewables (PV, Wind On/Offshore, CSP)
- Storage and DSM technologies (endogenous P/E Ratio)
- Grid expansion (increase of NTCs)



Boundary conditions

• CO₂ budget over time

• Renewable availabilities

Characteristics

- 33 European Countries
- Flow-based market coupling
- **Investment**: five-year steps 2020 2050
- **Dispatch during optimization**: hourly resolution for about 2 weeks
- **Dispatch during validation**: hourly resolution for entire year: 8760 hours

CO₂ Emission Constraint



Electricity demand development

CO₂ storage potential per country

• Renewable investment potentials

The Case of Transmission Planning in Germany

- Scenarios for generation and exchanges are generated using "dynELMOD" (Gerbaulet & Lorenz, 2017)
 - European-scale, country-level fully fledged generation and transmission investment model (EU-28 + CH + NO + Balkans)

Scenarios (2x2)

- "FAST" -> 2050 carbon emission reduction of 98% (rel. to 2015)
- "SLOW" -> only 80% reduction
- "DE" no interconnector expansion
- "XB" cost-minimal interconnector expansion



Transmission Planning in Germany: Model

Model

- Simple 6-node Model (transport, zero initial transport capacity)
- Int'l Exchanges fixed
- 179 time steps
- Allocation of generation capacities using potential maps/existing sites; Storages at RES-Sites
- Four scenarios
 - FAST-DE and FAST-XB
 - SLOW-DE and SLOW-XB
- Four optimization strategies
 - "Pure" Robust Optimization
 - minimax Regret ("pure" and min regret)
 - Deterministic (FAST-DE/-XB, SLOW-DE/-XB)
 - expected costs (uniform probability)



Applications of Robust Optimization to Transmission Planning

There are only few 'advanced' publications on robust TEP

- Jabr (2013)
 - Uncertainty set: Load and Generation (continous)
 - 24/96 nodes
- Ruiz/Conejo (2015)
 - (smaller) extension to Jabr (2013), investment budgets, larger uncertainty set
- Chen/Wang (2016)
 - Uncertainty set: generation retirements and replacement (large discrete set)
 - 240 nodes
 - 5 investment periods

Challenges

- Tri-level structure
- Adequate uncertainty sets!



Backup

Results: Annual System Costs (1/2)



Results: Annual System Costs (2/2)



Results: Transmission Investment

	Line investment levels [GW]							Line	
Decision Strategy	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	cost [bn€]	
ROBUST	2	9	7	4	19	29		70	
det_FAST-DE	2	9	7	4	19	29	2	72	
det_FAST-XB	2	9	8	5	18	28	2	72	
det_SLOW-DE	1	13	11	8	15	25		73	
det_SLOW-XB	3	10	7	4	19	29		72	
MINREGRET	3	9	7	4	19	29		71	
EV	3	9	7	4	19	29	1	72	
EXPREGRET	2	10	8	5	18	28	_		I ~



Backup

Results: Transmission Investment

Conclusion

- Basic application of robust optimization to TEP in Germany
- Scenarios have a high "intrinsic" cost impact => different transmission expansion strategies play are comparatively narrow role. (Full DCLF may change this)
- When overall costs are targeted at, robust optimization will direct all its efforts on the alternative which is overall most expensive.
 - => "minimum regret" strategies may be more adequate here

Further extensions

- Full transmission network representation (should increase value of robust decision making)
- Adaptive decision-making! (should decrease reduce the contribution of robust decision making while increasing overall efficiency)

• "Philosophical"(?) question:

- From a "social" perspective what is the correct decision calculus?
 - "Robust" vs. "Minimax Regret" vs. X?
 - Is there a well-grounded concept of social decision-making under uncertainty (except for the notion of risk-neutrality)?

Literature

- **Chen, B. & Wang, L. (2016).** Robust Transmission Planning Under Uncertain Generation Investment and Retirement. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, PP(99), pp. 1–9.
- Conejo, A.J., Baringo Morales, L., Kazempour, S.J. & Siddiqui, A.S. (2016). Investment in Electricity Generation and Transmission: Decision Making under Uncertainty. Heidelberg, New York: Springer.
- Gerbaulet, C. & Lorenz, C. (2017). dynELMOD: A Dynamic Investment and Dispatch Model for the Future European Electricity Market. DIW Berlin, Data Documentation forthcoming, Berlin, Germany.
- Jabr, R.A. (2013). Robust Transmission Network Expansion Planning With Uncertain Renewable Generation and Loads. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 28(4), pp. 4558–4567.
- Ruiz, C. & Conejo, A.J. (2015). Robust Transmission Expansion Planning. European Journal of Operational Research, 242(2), pp. 390–401.