

Baseline-improved Economic Model Predictive Control for Optimal Microgrid Dispatch

Avik Ghosh^a, Adil Khurram^a, Jan Kleissl^a, Sonia Martínez^a

^aDepartment of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, University of California, San Diego, California 92093-0411, USA

Abstract

As opposed to stabilizing to a reference trajectory or state, Economic Model Predictive Control (EMPC) optimizes economic performance over a prediction horizon, making it particularly attractive for economic microgrid (MG) dispatch. However, as load and generation forecasts are only known 24 – 48 h in advance, economically optimal steady states or periodic trajectories are not available and the EMPC-based works that rely on these signals are inadequate. In addition, demand charges, based on maximum monthly grid import power of the MG, cannot be easily casted as an additive cost, which prevents the application of the principle of optimality if introduced naively. In this work, we propose to close this mismatch between the EMPC prediction horizon and existing monthly timescales by means of an appropriately generated baseline reference trajectory. To do this, we first propose an EMPC formulation for a generic deterministic discrete non-linear time-varying system subject to hard state and input constraints. We then show that, under mild assumptions on the terminal cost and region, the asymptotic average economic cost of the proposed method is no worse than a baseline given by any arbitrary reference trajectory that is only known online. In particular, this results into a practical, finite-time upper bound on the average economic cost difference with the baseline that decreases linearly to zero as time goes to infinity. We then show how the proposed EMPC framework can be used to solve optimal MG dispatch problems, introducing various costs and constraints that conform to the required assumptions. By means of this framework, we conduct realistic simulations with data from the Port of San Diego MG, which demonstrate that the proposed method can reduce monthly electricity costs in closed-loop with respect to reference trajectories; which are either generated by the optimization of the electricity cost over the prediction horizon, or by tracking an ideal grid import curve.

Key words: Economic model predictive control; Tracking model predictive control; Reference trajectory; Discrete nonlinear systems; Microgrids; Battery energy storage systems.

1 Introduction

Economic Model Predictive Control (EMPC) has recently gained popularity in real-time optimal control of microgrids (MG) with high penetration of variable renewable energy (VRE) [13]. Instead of stabilizing to a reference trajectory or state as in Tracking MPC, EMPC optimizes the actual economic performance over the prediction horizon. As lowering MG operating costs, i.e., electricity costs paid by the MG to the utility, is one of the primary control objectives of MG operators, EMPC, thus becomes particularly attractive.

There are three crucial bottlenecks that exist in certifying and designing *practically useful* controllers with provable performance guarantees for EMPC, especially for applications such a optimal MG dispatch. First, the

stage cost (i.e., electricity cost) function, is generally neither quadratic, nor positive definite (as the electricity costs can be negative when a MG exports energy back to the main grid). This imposes significant difficulty in designing control invariant terminal regions, and Lyapunov-like terminal cost functions — which are standard requirements for performance guarantees.

Second, a crucial component of the monthly electricity cost of MGs is the demand charge penalty [18]. Demand charges, as opposed to volumetric energy charges, are the cost levied for the peak load demanded by the MG from the main grid (i.e., grid import) in a month.¹ Demand charges can cause a considerable discrepancy between the predicted open-loop solutions in MPC and the

Email addresses: avghosh@ucsd.edu (Avik Ghosh), akhurram@ucsd.edu (Adil Khurram), jkleissl@ucsd.edu (Jan Kleissl), soniamd@ucsd.edu (Sonia Martínez).

¹ For commercial and industrial customers, demand charge costs are typically 30 – 70% [19], and can get as high as 90% of the monthly electricity cost [7, 15]. Demand charge rates per unit (in \$/kW) are typically 200 – 300 times the energy charge rate (in \$/kWh).

actual closed-loop realization, even under nominal (i.e., uncertainty-free) conditions, which hinders transparent controller tuning. This occurs because naively incorporating the demand charge term into the objective function violates the principle of optimality [14], which hinders the representation of the electricity cost by an additive stage cost function dependent on the current state, control input, and time—which again, is a standard requirement for performance guarantees.

Third, there is a significant mismatch between EMPC prediction horizons for MG dispatch and monthly timescales, over which demand charges are billed. EMPC prediction horizons are typically between 24 – 48 h, because load and VRE generation forecasts are only accurate one or two days ahead [6]. Due to this timescale mismatch, there can be significant differences between the performance of an infinite-horizon optimal control problem² and real-time receding horizon EMPC. This is because the former will adjust its prior grid import to account for future demand peaks, which the finite horizon standard EMPC would be oblivious to, suggesting an avenue for improvement during real-time operation.

Thus, it is of particular importance to MG operators to devise EMPC algorithms with no-worse, and potentially better, performance guarantees over *any* arbitrarily generated online reference trajectory or baseline.³ These performance guarantees can be important because the mismatch of timescales can give rise to online reference trajectories with lower monthly electricity costs than the closed-loop standard EMPC. Note that notwithstanding our motivating application, we also aim to propose a generic framework suitable for analysis of EMPC applied to a wide class of discrete non-linear time varying systems subject mild assumptions.

The recent literature on EMPC methods is extensive, and focuses both on asymptotic performance and stability guarantees, generally with respect to an optimal economic steady state [2, 3, 20]. Studies such as [3, 20] have also looked into asymptotic stability with respect to an a-priori known optimal periodic trajectory. However, asymptotic stability guarantees require strict dissipativity assumptions with respect to an optimal economic steady state/trajectory [2, 3, 20, 21], which is hard to satisfy in practice, and is of less importance than economic performance [11, 16], especially for MG operators.

Thus, in this study we focus solely on studies with asymptotic performance guarantees for various EMPC formulations, as assumptions required for asymptotic

performance guarantees are mild, and are more useful for MG operators as they can be practically guaranteed. The asymptotic performance guarantees for EMPC with the existence of an optimal economic steady state or optimal periodic trajectory as explored in [2, 3, 20], cannot be straightforwardly extended to EMPC for MGs because of: (i) difficulty of expressing the demand charge term in the electricity cost of MGs as an additive stage cost; (ii) the possible non-existence of an optimal economic steady state and optimal periodic trajectory respectively in MG dispatch, and, more generally, for generic time-varying non-linear systems. An optimal economic steady state is not useful for MG dispatch as directly minimizing economics usually leads to non-steady operating regimes. For example, in a MG, the BESS (where BESS SOC is the state) is expected to operate in a non-steady region, constantly charging and discharging to reduce costs. Having better economic performance with respect to a case where the state is steady [2, 3, 20] is trivial, and thus not *practically useful*. The existence and a-priori knowledge of an optimal periodic trajectory for MG dispatch is impractical under high temporal (i.e., daily or seasonal) variability of load and VRE, and where accurate forecasts are typically known only 24 – 48 h ahead [6].

While the studies [2, 3, 20] considered stage costs that are time-invariant, the authors in [4, 5] extended the former works to prove asymptotic performance guarantees for stage costs that are time varying but either periodic or fulfilling certain average behavior. Stage cost functions that are periodic or the existence and a-priori knowledge of an averaged stage cost function are not guaranteed and are likely to be violated for VRE dominated MGs where real-time electricity tariffs that are non-periodic, and anticipated only 24 h ahead [1]. In addition, the studies [4, 5], like [3, 20], still prove asymptotic performance guarantees with respect to an a-priori known optimal periodic reference trajectory, retaining its restrictiveness.

Grüne [11] provided approximate optimal performance guarantees for both the infinite-horizon and transient (i.e., finite-time) closed-loop operation of a receding horizon EMPC. The result is powerful and is achieved without setting a terminal constraint to the EMPC, contrary to [2–5, 20], which may increase the feasible region of operation of the controller. However, the sufficient conditions provided in [11] require strict dissipativity and controllability conditions that imply optimal steady state operation (which further implies the turnpike property), which is unrealistic for MGs.

None of the above works [2–5, 11, 20] consider the system dynamics to be time-varying making it unsuitable for handling demand charges in MGs, as certain demand charges are based on the time-of-day when peaks are reached.⁴ The authors in [12] extend the work in [11]

² That is, a one-shot optimization of monthly electricity cost using perfect forecast data over the entire month.

³ An online reference trajectory is one which is not known a-priori for all times under consideration, but continuously generated online at each time-step, while satisfying the dynamics and constraints.

⁴ See Section 5.3 for details.

to encompass time-varying system dynamics. This work resorted to the time-varying turnpike property notion and the continuity of the value function to provide a bound on the deviation of the finite-horizon closed-loop EMPC cost from the infinite horizon optimal control trajectory, which is assumed to exist but unknown. The time-varying turnpike property assumption guarantees that the solutions to both problems remain close most of the time. However, in MGs with demand charges, an infinite-horizon optimal trajectory is significantly different from a finite-horizon EMPC one, violating the turnpike property.

More recently, the authors in [22] propose an EMPC framework for generic non-linear time-varying systems with asymptotic performance guarantees that are no worse than that of an arbitrary reference trajectory. The authors also showed the efficacy of their method for optimal BESS dispatch for demand charge reduction in an MG through a case study where an optimal periodic reference trajectory was assumed. However, the reference trajectory needs to be known a-priori for all future times, making the method impractical for most realistic systems involving forecasts. As a MG always needs to maintain a power balance with the main grid, it operates under a limited forecast of load and VRE generation (if applicable) of 24 – 48 h ahead. In contrast, the authors in [22] assume that forecasts are available months or weeks in advance to fix the reference trajectory a-priori. Thus, further realistic theoretical analyses, in addition to realistic case studies, are required to encourage the design and implementation of EMPC algorithms by MG operators.

The present work generalizes the asymptotic performance guarantees in [22] with respect to an arbitrary reference trajectory which is known online only until the current time-step. The proposed EMPC framework is then leveraged to solve an optimal MG dispatch problem with both energy and demand charges incorporating BESS losses.

2 Contributions

The contributions of the present work are the following:

- (1) Under mild assumptions, we first provide an upper bound on the asymptotic average performance of the proposed scheme, which guarantees economic improvement over the baseline provided by a reference trajectory measured online. We then relax this result to a practical finite-time guarantee, with an upper bound that decreases linearly to zero over time. Our assumptions are mild because they only rely on information about the baseline until the current time, reducing dependency on long term accurate forecasts. As the baseline can be continuously

updated at each time-step, we can implicitly improve our scheme's performance.

- (2) For MG power dispatch, we convert the one-time demand charge component of the MG monthly electricity costs into an additive stage cost to be used with the proposed EMPC framework. Then we provide a method to design control invariant terminal regions and Lyapunov-like terminal cost functions, ensuring practical finite-time performance guarantees. In particular, this method avoids unnecessary reductions of the admissible state-control input sequence for the problem, and can be used to generate other variations of terminal regions, control laws, and cost functions. This helps us further improve the finite-time performance of the scheme.
- (3) By exploiting insights from a realistic demand charge rate structure in MGs, we identify online reference trajectories with superior performance in economic objectives than the standard EMPC. These references are then used in our proposed EMPC scheme to improve the system closed-loop performance. In this way, our work introduces an effective mechanism to reduce the MG monthly electricity costs, by considering prediction horizons that are much smaller than a month.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 3 presents the notations used in this study. Section 4 introduces the receding horizon EMPC problem formulation, and provides the related (mild) assumptions and asymptotic performance guarantee proofs. Section 5 presents the optimal MG dispatch problem and its reformulation into the EMPC structure of Section 4. Section 6 presents the case study for a realistic grid-connected MG with PV, load, and BESS, with results and discussions in Section 7. Section 8 concludes the paper summarizing the takeaways of the study and laying down possible future directions of work.

3 Notations

The following is common notation employed throughout the manuscript. The real vector space of dimension n is denoted by \mathbb{R}^n . Similarly, the sets of nonnegative and non-positive real numbers are represented by $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}$, respectively. The set of natural numbers including 0 is denoted by \mathbb{N} , the set of consecutive natural numbers $\{i, i + 1, \dots, j\}$ by \mathbb{N}_i^j , and the set of all natural numbers greater or equal to $k \in \mathbb{N}$ by $\mathbb{N}_{\geq k}$. The n -dimensional vector of zeros and ones is represented by $\mathbf{0}_n$ and $\mathbf{1}_n$, respectively. For matrices A and B of equal dimensions, the operators $\{<, \leq, =, >, \geq\}$ are understood to hold component wise. The i^{th} row, and the element from the i^{th} row and j^{th} column of a matrix A are denoted by A_i and A_{ij} , respectively, while the i^{th} element of a vector x is marked as x_i , unless mentioned otherwise. For a vector x , $|x|$ and $\|x\|$ denote its 1-norm and 2-norm, respectively.

4 Problem formulation

This section introduces the problem setup consisting of the receding horizon EMPC problem we aim to solve, the baseline reference trajectory whose performance we seek to improve upon, the assumptions required to do so, and lastly the associated proof of performance.

4.1 System Description

We consider discrete time-varying systems governed by

$$x(t+1) = f(x(t), u(t), t), \quad \forall t, \quad (1)$$

where the state $x(t)$ at discrete time-step $t \in \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, belongs to a set $\mathcal{X}(t)$, that is, $x(t) \in \mathcal{X}(t)$. Similarly, for control inputs, $u(t) \in \mathcal{U}(t)$. The composite sets \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{U} are defined by $\mathcal{X} := \bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathcal{X}(t)$ and $\mathcal{U} := \bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathcal{U}(t)$, which overall implies $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$.

We denote the solution to (1) over a horizon N starting from an initial state x_0 and time t_0 ⁵; i.e., $x(t_0) = x_0 \in \mathcal{X}(t_0)$, under the control sequence parameterized by x_0 and t_0 ; i.e., $\mathbf{u}(x_0, t_0) = (u(t_0; (x_0, t_0)), u(t_0 + 1; (x_0, t_0)), \dots, u(t_0 + N - 1; (x_0, t_0)))^\top$, as the state sequence $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{u}, x_0, t_0) = (x_0, x(t_0 + 1; (x_0, t_0)), \dots, x(t_0 + N; (x_0, t_0)))^\top$. Hereon, we simplify $u(t_0 + k; (x_0, t_0))$ as $u(t_0 + k)$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$, and, similarly, $x(t_0 + k; (x_0, t_0))$ by $x(t_0 + k)$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let an arbitrary solution of (1) be a reference trajectory, which evolves according to the dynamics

$$x^r(t+1) = f(x^r(t), u^r(t), t), \quad \forall t, \quad (2)$$

where $x^r(t) \in \mathcal{X}(t)$ and $u^r(t) \in \mathcal{U}(t)$. This reference trajectory is known from $x^r(t_0)$ up to and including $x^r(t+1)$ through (2); however, $u^r(t+1)$ is not available. This reference trajectory can be generated online from a separate optimization or a rule-based method based on operator domain knowledge.

4.2 Receding horizon Economic MPC

Given a receding horizon N , at each t we solve an economic MPC problem from state $x(t)$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} V_N^0(x(t), t) &= \underset{\mathbf{u}(x(t), t) \in \mathcal{U}^N}{\text{minimize}} \quad V_N(x(t), \mathbf{u}(x(t), t), t) \\ &= \underset{\mathbf{u}(x(t), t) \in \mathcal{U}^N}{\text{minimize}} \quad \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} l(x(t+k|t), u(t+k|t), t+k) \\ &\quad + V_f(x(t+N|t), t+N), \quad (3a) \end{aligned}$$

⁵ In the sequel, time and (discrete) time-step are used interchangeably for the ease of exposition.

subject to

$$x(t+k+1|t) = f(x(t+k|t), u(t+k|t), t+k), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}, \quad (3b)$$

$$x(t+k|t) \in \mathcal{X}(t+k), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}, \quad (3c)$$

$$u(t+k|t) \in \mathcal{U}(t+k), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}, \quad (3d)$$

$$x(t+N|t) \in \mathcal{X}_f(t+N) \subseteq \mathcal{X}(t+N), \quad (3e)$$

where $V_N : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U}^N \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, consists of the additive economic stage cost function $l : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and the terminal cost function $V_f : \mathcal{X}_f \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The composite terminal constraint set is defined by $\mathcal{X}_f := \bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathcal{X}_f(t)$.⁶

The optimal control sequence from solving (3) is given by $\mathbf{u}^0(x(t), t) = (u^0(t|t), u^0(t+1|t), \dots, u^0(t+N-1|t))^\top$. Similarly, the optimal state sequence after applying the optimal control sequence is given by $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{u}^0, x(t), t) = (x(t), x^0(t+1|t), \dots, x^0(t+N-1|t), x^0(t+N|t))^\top$. The closed-loop control law is given by the first element of $\mathbf{u}^0(x(t), t)$, represented as $\kappa_N(x(t), t) := u^0(t|t)$ which is applied to the system at time t . The closed-loop system is thus represented by,

$$x(t+1) = f(x(t), \kappa_N(x(t), t), t), \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (4)$$

where $\kappa_N : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$, and after $x(t+1)$ is calculated from (4), the optimization in (3) is repeated from the updated state $x(t+1)$, and time $t+1$.

Assumption 1 (Continuity of system and cost). The functions f , l and V_f are continuous. •

Assumption 2 (Properties of constraint sets). For each $t \in \mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}(t)$ is closed, and $\mathcal{U}(t)$ is compact. For each $t \in \mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{X}_f(t)$ is closed. The reference is feasible; i.e. $x^r(t) \in \mathcal{X}(t)$ and $u^r(t) \in \mathcal{U}(t)$. The composite set \mathcal{U} is bounded. •

Remark 3 (Existence of a solution of the optimal control problem). Under Assumptions 1 and 2, a solution to (3) exists for $x(t) \in \mathcal{X}(t)$, $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$, if (3b), (3c), (3d) and (3e) are satisfied over the prediction horizon N [21, Proposition 2.29]. •

Assumption 4 (Properties of the terminal cost, region, and control law). For each $t \in \mathcal{T}$, if $x(t) \in \mathcal{X}_f(t)$, there exists a terminal control law $\kappa_f : \mathcal{X}_f \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$, such that the terminal cost follows a Lyapunov-like adjacent difference condition. Specifically,

$$\begin{aligned} &V_f(f(x(t), \kappa_f(x(t), t), t), t+1) - V_f(x(t), t) \\ &\leq -l(x(t), \kappa_f(x(t), t), t) + l(x^r(t-N), u^r(t-N), t-N). \end{aligned}$$

⁶ Note that from the EMPC problem setup (3), $\mathcal{X}_f(t)$ can be empty, if $t \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}$.

- by the total number of time-steps, T , gives,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=t_0}^{t_0+T-1} \frac{V_N^0(x(t+1), t+1) - V_N^0(x(t), t)}{T} \\ & \leq \sum_{t=t_0}^{t_0+T-1} \frac{-l(x(t), \kappa_N(x(t), t), t) + l(x^r(t), u^r(t), t)}{T}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Rearranging by interchanging the LHS and RHS of (6) and taking the limit superior of both sides as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t=t_0}^{t_0+T-1} \frac{l(x(t), \kappa_N(x(t), t), t) - l(x^r(t), u^r(t), t)}{T} \\ & \leq \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{V_N^0(x(t_0), t_0) - V_N^0(x(t_0 + T), t_0 + T)}{T}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We know from Assumption 5, on the lower boundedness of stage and terminal cost, that $V_N^0(x(t), t)$ is lower bounded by some constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$, $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$, and $V_N^0(x(t_0), t_0)$ is also a constant. Thus, the RHS of (7) can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \left(V_N^0(x(t_0), t_0) - V_N^0(x(t_0 + T), t_0 + T) \right) \\ & \leq \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \left(V_N^0(x(t_0), t_0) - C \right) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Combining (7) and (8) completes the proof with $u(t) = \kappa_N(x(t), t)$, $\forall t$. \square

Remark 7 (Practical applicability of Assumption 4). Assumption 4, on properties of terminal cost, region and control law, modifies [22, Assumption 3] to make analysis and terminal cost function design possible (thereby increasing the practical viability of Assumption 4) when the reference trajectory is not fixed a-priori for all future times, but is only known until the current time. This design implies that the reference trajectory can be continuously updated online at each time-step. If [22, Assumption 3] is used instead of Assumption 4, the last term in the RHS of (5) would be $l(x^r(t+N), u^r(t+N), t+N)$. A fixed apriori reference trajectory cannot adapt to forecast updates for at least N future time-steps (see previous sentence), or at all, which can significantly degrade system performance especially when maximum terms (like demand charges) are involved in the performance function (ultimately risking making the reference cost more), which weakens the performance guarantee. Also, fixing a reference trajectory a-priori for all future times is not always possible when long term forecasts are involved. \bullet

⁷ See more about the increased viability of Assumption 4 as compared to the state-of-the-art [22, Assumption 3] for practical MG operation in Remark 15.

Note that Assumption 4 implies that, applying the terminal control law κ_f to $x(t) \in \mathcal{X}_f(t)$, leads to $f(x(t), \kappa_f(x(t), t), t) \in \mathcal{X}_f(t+1), \forall t \in \mathcal{T}$. In other words, the sequence of sets $\mathcal{X}_f(t), \forall t \in \mathcal{T}$ is sequentially control invariant for (1) [21, Definition 2.27].

Assumption 5 (Lower boundedness of stage and terminal cost). The function l is uniformly bounded from below for $(x(t), u(t), t) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{T}$. Similarly, the function V_f is uniformly bounded from below for $(x(t), t) \in \mathcal{X}_f \times \mathcal{T}$. \bullet

Theorem 6 (Asymptotic average cost guarantee of the receding horizon EMPC). Let Assumptions 1, 2, 4, and 5 hold. The asymptotic average economic cost of the closed-loop system given by (4) is no worse than the asymptotic average economic cost of the reference trajectory given by (2). Specifically,

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t=t_0}^{t_0+T-1} \frac{1}{T} \left(l(x(t), u(t), t) - l(x^r(t), u^r(t), t) \right) \leq 0,$$

where $u(t) = \kappa_N(x(t), t)$, $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$.

Proof. From Remark 3, we know that at time t , an optimal solution to (3) exists and is given by $\mathbf{u}^0(x(t), t)$, with $V_N^0(x(t), t) = V_N(x(t), \mathbf{u}^0(x(t), t), t)$. A feasible control sequence at time $t+1$ is given by the final $N-1$ control inputs of $\mathbf{u}^0(x(t), t)$, and appending a terminal control input by following Assumption 4, as $x(t+N|t) \in \mathcal{X}_f(t+N)$. Specifically, after $\kappa_N(x(t), t)$ is applied to $x(t)$, which makes the system state evolve to $x(t+1)$, a feasible control sequence at $t+1$ for (3) is given by $\mathbf{u}(x(t+1), t+1) = (u^0(t+1|t), \dots, u^0(t+N-1|t), \kappa_f(x^0(t+N|t), t+N))^\top$. As the optimal cost is a lower bound of any feasible cost at any time, we conclude $V_N^0(x(t+1), t+1) \leq V_N(x(t+1), \mathbf{u}(x(t+1), t+1), t+1)$. Thus, it follows that,

$$\begin{aligned} & V_N^0(x(t+1), t+1) - V_N^0(x(t), t) \\ & \leq V_N(x(t+1), \mathbf{u}(x(t+1), t+1), t+1) - V_N^0(x(t), t) \\ & = l(x^0(t+N|t), \kappa_f(x^0(t+N|t), t+N), t+N) \\ & \quad + V_f(f(x^0(t+N|t), \kappa_f(x^0(t+N|t), t+N), t+N), t+N+1) \\ & \quad - l(x(t), \kappa_N(x(t), t), t) - V_f(x^0(t+N|t), t+N) \\ & \leq -l(x(t), \kappa_N(x(t), t), t) + l(x^r(t), u^r(t), t) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The RHS in the last inequality, which only uses information of the reference trajectory until the current time t , follows from Assumption 4, on properties of terminal cost, region and control law. Summing the inequality in (5) from an initial time t_0 to $t_0 + T - 1$ and dividing

Corollary 8 (Practical extension of Theorem 6). When T is sufficiently (even though not infinitely) large, Theorem 6 becomes,

$$\sum_{t=t_0}^{t_0+T-1} \frac{1}{T} \left(l(x(t), u(t), t) - l(x^r(t), u^r(t), t) \right) \leq \epsilon,$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is small. The implication is that the average economic cost difference of the proposed system (4) with the baseline given by the reference trajectory (2) is upper bounded by a small positive constant, $\epsilon \propto \frac{1}{T}$.

Proof. The proof follows similar to the proof of Theorem 6 until (6), and then for T being sufficiently large, and $V_N^0(x(t), t)$ being lower bounded by some constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$, $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$, using,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{T} \left(V_N^0(x(t_0), t_0) - V_N^0(x(t_0 + T), t_0 + T) \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{T} \left(V_N^0(x(t_0), t_0) - C \right) = \epsilon > 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

5 Application of EMPC to optimal MG dispatch

In this section, we apply the EMPC structure from Section 4.2 to the optimal MG dispatch problem. To do this, as explained in Section 5.1, we consider a MG with local gross load demand, PV generation, with an installed BESS and connection to the main grid. Our proposed EMPC formulation will aim to solve the MG dispatch problem as stated below.

Problem 9 At each time t , under a given perfect forecast of load and VRE (PV in this case) generation over a prediction horizon N , compute the optimal control inputs, i.e., BESS dispatch profile and grid import, considering electricity costs over the prediction horizon, and implement the first time-step computed control inputs in a receding horizon fashion in closed-loop, with the final goal of minimizing monthly electricity costs. •

5.1 Microgrid (MG) model

Here, we first consider a standard MG model from the literature (see [6, 8, 9, 17]), which is a linear-time-invariant (LTI) system consisting of one constituent state $x_1(t)$, and two constituent control inputs represented by $u(t) = [u_1(t) \ u_2(t)]^\top$. Later, we will augment this original MG model to add additional states $x_2(t)$, $x_3(t)$, with a motivation and dynamics for $x_2(t)$ and $x_3(t)$ that will become

clear in Section 5.2 and formulations presented in Sections 5.3 and 5.4; respectively. The original MG model is represented in the structure of the receding horizon EMPC as in Section 4.2 as follows,

$$x_1(t+1) = Ax_1(t) + Bu(t), \quad \forall t, \quad (9a)$$

$$Su(t) \leq s, \quad \forall t, \quad (9b)$$

$$Mu(t) = c(t), \quad \forall t, \quad (9c)$$

$$Gx_1(t) \leq g, \quad \forall t, \quad (9d)$$

where $x_1(t) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is the BESS state-of-charge (SOC).

The control inputs are $u(t) = [u_1(t) \ u_2(t)]^\top$, with $u_1(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ being the BESS dispatch power, and $u_2(t) \in \mathbb{R}$, the grid import power. When $u_1(t) > 0$, the BESS is charging, while with $u_2(t) > 0$ denotes power import from the main grid to the MG. The EMPC prediction horizon is subdivided into N equal time-steps of Δt duration (sampling period) each.

The system matrices are $A = [1]$, $B = \left[\frac{\Delta t}{\text{BESS}_{\text{en}}} \ 0 \right]$, where BESS_{en} is the energy capacity of the BESS. The system matrices handle the SOC update of the BESS due to charging/discharging by (9a). For the hard control input constraints (9b),

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } s = \begin{bmatrix} \text{BESS}_{\text{max}} \\ \text{BESS}_{\text{max}} \\ \hat{b} \\ -\hat{a} \end{bmatrix},$$

which constrain the maximum charging/discharging power of the BESS and MG power exchange with the main grid. Practically, $|\hat{a}|$ and $|\hat{b}|$ are chosen to be very large so that the MG power exchange with the grid constraints are never active, negating the risk of violating (9c), which is possible as the main grid can be conceptualized as an infinite bus. The PV generation and gross load are denoted by $\text{PV}(t)$ and $L(t)$; respectively, and are used as forecast inputs to the MPC and assumed to be exactly known for the prediction horizon. For the time-varying equality constraints (9c) coupling the control inputs, we take $M = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$, and $c(t) = [\text{PV}(t) - L(t)]$, which ensures the power balance of the MG with the main grid. The hard state constraints represented by (9d) limit the SOC of the BESS between upper (SOC_{max}) and lower bounds (SOC_{min}), resulting into $G = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}^\top$, and $g = [\text{SOC}_{\text{max}} \ -\text{SOC}_{\text{min}}]^\top$.

5.2 Electricity Cost Structure

In general, the monthly electricity costs for a MG are composed of volumetric energy charges (\$/kWh) and demand charges (\$/kW). Two distinct time-of-use demand

charges are used: one based on maximum grid imports for the whole month called non-coincident demand peak (NCDP), and another one which is based on the maximum grid import between 16:00 – 21:00 h of all days of the month, called on-peak demand peak (OPDP). The demand charges associated with NCDP and OPDP are called non-coincident demand charges (NCDC), and on-peak demand charges (OPDC); respectively. The pricing structure can be extended to other forms of demand charges or be adjusted to account for NCDC only by setting the OPDC terms to 0.

As demand charges are calculated over a monthly window, consider a month being equally subdivided into T equal time-steps of Δt duration each. For each month, let $\mathcal{T}_w \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ be the set of all time-steps corresponding to the monthly window. Specifically, $\mathcal{T}_w = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, T-1\}$. $\mathcal{T}'_w \subset \mathcal{T}_w$ denotes the set of time-steps of the month over which OPDC is calculated.

The monthly electricity costs are formulated as [8, 9],

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left[R_{\text{EC}}(t) \Delta t \left(u_2(t) + \frac{(1-\eta)}{2} |u_1(t)| \right) \right] + R_{\text{NC}} \max_{k \in \mathcal{T}_w} u_2(k) + R_{\text{OP}} \max_{k \in \mathcal{T}'_w} u_2(k), \quad (10)$$

where the first, second, third, and fourth terms cover the energy charges, BESS losses, NCDC, and OPDC; respectively. The time-of-use energy charge rate, NCDC rate, OPDC rate, and BESS round-trip efficiency are denoted by $R_{\text{EC}}(t)$, R_{NC} , R_{OP} , and η ; respectively. Note that demand charges can never be negative.⁸ The first two terms in (10); i.e., the terms inside the summation, can be encapsulated as an additive economic stage cost, depending only on the current input and time. However, because of the presence of demand charges which involve a maximization over multiple time-steps, it is challenging to encapsulate the demand charges, i.e., the third and fourth term in (10) as an additive economic stage cost depending only on the current state, input, and time as in Section 4.2. Thus, to mitigate this issue, inspired by [14], we formulate the dynamics of the second and third constituent state, $x_2(t)$ and $x_3(t)$ respectively by augmenting the original MG model in Section 5.3 to represent the demand charge term as an additive economic stage cost as in Section 4.2.

⁸ In (10), it is implicitly assumed that $\max_{k \in \mathcal{T}_w} u_2(k) \geq 0$, implying that, at some time within the month, the grid import is positive, which is a reasonable assumption for a MG with a BESS installation. The third term in (10) can be generalized further to $R_{\text{NC}} \max\{0, \max_{k \in \mathcal{T}_w} u_2(k)\}$ to incorporate the non-negativity of demand charges explicitly; however, this is avoided here for brevity. A similar implicit assumption entails for the OPDC term, where it is implicitly assumed that $\max_{k \in \mathcal{T}'_w} u_2(k) \geq 0$.

5.3 Augmented System

An additional constituent state $x_2(t) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\forall t$, is defined for the augmented system, which tracks the ‘running’ NCDP (i.e., the maximum grid import until the current time $t \in \mathcal{T}_w$) as,

$$x_2(t+1) = \max(x_2(t), u_2(t)), \quad \forall t. \quad (11)$$

To incorporate the OPDC, we define another state $x_3(t) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\forall t$, which tracks the ‘running’ OPDP (i.e., maximum grid import during OP hours until the current time $t \in \mathcal{T}_w$) as,

$$x_3(t+1) = \max(x_3(t), \beta(t)u_2(t)), \quad \forall t, \quad (12)$$

where

$$\beta(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & t \in \mathcal{T}'_w, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The augmented state is then denoted as $x(t) = [x_1(t) \ x_2(t) \ x_3(t)]^\top$ with the augmented MG dynamics and additive economic stage cost being rewritten in (13a) and (13b); respectively. In all, we have

$$x(t+1) = f(x(t), u(t), t) := \begin{pmatrix} Ax_1(t) + Bu(t) \\ \max(x_2(t), u_2(t)) \\ \max(x_3(t), \beta(t)u_2(t)) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \forall t, \quad (13a)$$

$$l(x(t), u(t), t) := R_{\text{EC}}(t) \Delta t \left(u_2(t) + \frac{(1-\eta)}{2} |u_1(t)| \right) + R_{\text{NC}} \left(a(t+1)x_2(t+1) - a(t)x_2(t) \right) + R_{\text{OP}} \left(b(t+1)x_3(t+1) - b(t)x_3(t) \right), \forall t, \quad (13b)$$

where, $a : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function defining coefficients for $x_2(t)$, $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}_w$ with $a(T) = 1$, and $b : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function defining coefficients for $x_3(t)$, $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}_w$ with $b(T) = 1$.⁹ Equation (13b) has similar form to [22, Remark 8], but relaxes the more restrictive requirement that the coefficients $a(0)$ and $b(0)$ have to be 0.

Proposition 10 (Representing monthly electricity costs via augmented, additive-economic stage costs). *The monthly electricity costs in (10) are exactly represented by the summation of the augmented additive stage cost in (13b), over the demand charge window; i.e., a month.*

⁹ Note that $x(t+1)$ is a function of $\{x(t), u(t), t\}$ by (1). Thus, the terms multiplying R_{NC} and R_{OP} in the R.H.S. of (13b) are still implicitly dependent only on the current state, input, and time.

Proof. Considering the demand charge window as $\mathcal{T}_w = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, T-1\}$, $\mathcal{T}_w' \subset \mathcal{T}_w$, and summing (13b) over all the time-steps in \mathcal{T}_w gives,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} l(x(t), u(t), t) \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left[R_{\text{EC}}(t) \Delta t \left(u_2(t) + \frac{(1-\eta)}{2} |u_1(t)| \right) \right. \\
&\quad + R_{\text{NC}} \left(a(t+1)x_2(t+1) - a(t)x_2(t) \right) \\
&\quad \left. + R_{\text{OP}} \left(b(t+1)x_3(t+1) - b(t)x_3(t) \right) \right] \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left[R_{\text{EC}}(t) \Delta t \left(u_2(t) + \frac{(1-\eta)}{2} |u_1(t)| \right) \right] \\
&\quad + R_{\text{NC}} \left(a(T)x_2(T) - a(0)x_2(0) \right) \\
&\quad + R_{\text{OP}} \left(b(T)x_3(T) - b(0)x_3(0) \right). \tag{14}
\end{aligned}$$

Note, $x_2(0) = 0$, $a(T) = 1$, and $x_2(T) = \max_{k \in \mathcal{T}_w} u_2(k)$. Also, $x_3(0) = 0$, $b(T) = 1$, and $x_3(T) = \max_{k \in \mathcal{T}_w'} u_2(k)$. Substituting the above in (14), makes the last equality in (14) equal to (10) which completes the proof. \square

Remark 11 (Application of Theorem 6 to Problem 9). To be able to apply Theorem 6 to Problem 9, where the MG is modeled as (9), (13a), and the stage cost is modeled as (13b), the T in the demand charge window (i.e., a month) \mathcal{T}_w has to correspond to ∞ . That is, the granularity of the control inputs should be infinitely large, implying $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$. \bullet

In practice, $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ is not possible. Thus, it is important to investigate performance guarantees when Δt is finite (i.e., T in \mathcal{T}_w is finite), which implies application of Corollary 8.

5.4 A 1st-choice problem specification of terminal cost, terminal region, and control law

Having set up the the optimal MG dispatch problem in the standard EMPC form with additive stage costs in the objective function, in this section and Section 5.5, we will investigate terminal cost functions, regions, and control laws which satisfy Assumptions 1, 2, 4, and 5. Satisfaction of the above assumptions ensures that the optimal MG dispatch problem has the same structure as the EMPC of Section 4.2, and, as a consequence, the results of Theorem 6/Corollary 8, on asymptotic/practical economic cost guarantee, hold. To determine a candidate terminal cost function, region, and control law, we first introduce Assumption 12 next.

Assumption 12 (Length of the prediction horizon). For the optimal MG dispatch problem (Problem

9), the prediction horizon N is at least equal to the minimum time required to traverse the entire admissible SOC set. \bullet

Assumption 12, though theoretically limiting, is generally true for MG dispatch problems with prediction horizons generally being 24 – 48h, which is enough to traverse the entire SOC set with the BESS dispatch power. From the MG model in Sections 5.1 and 5.3, the admissible state set can thus be represented as $\mathcal{X}(t) \in [\text{SOC}_{\min}, \text{SOC}_{\max}] \times [0, \hat{b}] \times [0, \hat{b}]$, $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$, where $\hat{b} < \infty$ in any practical scenario. The admissible control input set is given by $\mathcal{U}(t) \in [-\text{BESS}_{\max}, \text{BESS}_{\max}] \times [\hat{a}, \hat{b}]$, $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$, where $-\infty < \hat{a} < 0 < \hat{b} < \infty$, in practical scenarios.

With Assumption 12 active, obvious choices of the terminal cost and region are $V_f(t) := 0$ and $\mathcal{X}_f(t) := \{x^r(t-N)\}$; respectively, $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$.¹⁰ However, such a choice would render a restrictive terminal control law requiring $l(x(t), \kappa_f(x(t), t), t) \leq l(x^r(t-N), u^r(t-N), t-N)$ with $x(t) = x^r(t-N)$, $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$, to satisfy Assumption 4, on properties of terminal cost, function and control law. Because of the structure of the iterated max operation in (13a), the above terminal region makes $x_2^r(t-N)$ and $x_3^r(t-N)$ a hard upper bound on $x_2(t-N+k|t-N)$ and $x_3(t-N+k|t-N)$; respectively, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T}$, within the optimization in (3), which may lead to infeasibility. In addition, the above terminal region gives no incentive to choose $x_2(t-N+k|t-N) < x_2^r(t-N)$ or $x_3(t-N+k|t-N) < x_3^r(t-N)$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T}$, which could be advantageous if the reference trajectory is economically suboptimal. An additional restriction arises for the optimal MG problem with the above terminal region. Note that according to (9a), and the structure of the control input matrix B , the BESS SOC, $x_1(t)$, is only affected by the BESS dispatch, $u_1(t)$. As (9c) has to be satisfied for the optimal MG dispatch at all times to maintain power balance of the MG with the main grid, the above terminal region necessitates the following terminal control law

$$\kappa_f(x(t), t) := \begin{pmatrix} u_1^r(t-N) \\ u_1^r(t-N) - c(t) \end{pmatrix}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \tag{15}$$

where, $\max(x_2(t), u_1^r(t-N) - c(t)) = x_2^r(t-N+1)$, and $\max(x_3(t), \beta(t)(u_1^r(t-N) - c(t))) = x_3^r(t-N+1)$, to ensure sequential control invariance of $\mathbb{X}_f(t)$, $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$. The above equalities are highly restrictive and may not be satisfied in practical applications.

To mitigate the above restrictiveness, we design the following terminal cost function, region and control law,

¹⁰ Here, we implicitly assume $\mathcal{X}_f(t) = \emptyset$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}$.

which allows for the reference bound to be exceeded or not realized depending on the economic objective. The terminal region is defined as

$$\mathcal{X}_f(t) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x_1^r(t-N) \\ x_2(t) \\ x_3(t) \end{pmatrix} \mid x_2(t), x_3(t) \in [0, \hat{b}] \right\}, \quad (16)$$

$\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$, which implies that the BESS SOC in the optimization (3) must terminate (at the end of the prediction horizon) exactly at the current reference SOC, while the running NCDP, $x_2(t)$, and running OPDP, $x_3(t)$ can terminate at any value depending on the economic objective. The terminal control law is still represented by (15), however without the restrictive requirement of the reference and actual demand peaks to be the same – just that the power balance of the MG with the main grid must be satisfied. The 1st-choice terminal cost function is defined by (17) where the operational Assumption 13, has to be enforced by design to satisfy Assumption 4, on the properties of the terminal cost, region, and control law. Our 1st choice for the terminal cost function is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} V_f(x(t), t) &:= R_{\text{NC}} \left[\max \left(a(t)x_2(t), a(t-N+1)x_2^r(t-N+1) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - a(t-N+1)x_2^r(t-N+1) \right] \\ &\quad + R_{\text{OP}} \left[\max \left(b(t)x_3(t), b(t-N+1)x_3^r(t-N+1) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - b(t-N+1)x_3^r(t-N+1) \right] - h(t), \quad (17) \end{aligned}$$

$\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$, where $h : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded strictly increasing function, and the condition given in Assumption 13 holds. The function h is chosen as bounded in (17) to satisfy Assumption 5, on the lower boundedness of the terminal cost. The strictly increasing property of h helps satisfy Assumption 4, on properties of terminal cost, region and control law, as described next.

Assumption 13 (Terminal cost condition). Let $A_1(t) = a(t)x_2(t)$, $B_1(t) = b(t)x_3(t)$, $A_2(t) = a(t)x_2^r(t)$, $B_2(t) = b(t)x_3^r(t)$, $C(t) = u_1^r(t-N)$, and $D(t) = u_1^r(t)$. Then, the following holds $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &h(t+1) - h(t) \\ &\geq R_{\text{EC}}(t)\Delta t \left(C(t) - c(t) + \frac{(1-\eta)}{2}|C(t)| \right) \\ &\quad - R_{\text{EC}}(t-N)\Delta t \left(D(t-N) - c(t-N) + \frac{(1-\eta)}{2}|D(t-N)| \right) \\ &\quad + R_{\text{NC}} \left[A_1(t+1) - A_1(t) + \max \left(A_1(t+1), A_2(t-N+2) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \max \left(A_1(t), A_2(t-N+1) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + A_2(t-N) - A_2(t-N+2) \right] \\ &\quad + R_{\text{OP}} \left[B_1(t+1) - B_1(t) + \max \left(B_1(t+1), B_2(t-N+2) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \max \left(B_1(t), B_2(t-N+1) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + B_2(t-N) - B_2(t-N+2) \right]. \quad (18) \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 14 (Satisfaction of Assumption 4 for the 1st-choice terminal cost). The 1st-choice candidate terminal region, control law, and terminal cost as defined in (16), (15), and (17); respectively, for Problem 9, subject to the dynamics (13a), and the additive stage cost (13b), satisfies Assumption 4, on the properties of terminal cost, region and control law, if Assumption 13 holds. •

Proof. The result follows by substituting $x(t) \in \mathcal{X}_f(t)$ defined in (16), $\kappa_f(x(t), t)$ defined in (15), $V_f(x(t), t)$ defined in (17), $f(x(t), \kappa_f(x(t), t), t)$ from (13a) and $l(x(t), \kappa_f(x(t), t), t)$ and $l(x^r(t-N), u^r(t-N), t-N)$ from (13b) in the inequality of Assumption 4. The above terminal region, control law, and dynamics also ensure the sequential control invariance of $\mathcal{X}_f(t)$. □

Remark 15 (Practical satisfaction of Assumption 13 and implications on asymptotic cost guarantee). For practical scenarios under finite-time, it is always possible to satisfy Assumption 13, on the terminal cost condition, by choosing an appropriate strictly increasing h , as the RHS of (18), which is composed of energy and demand charge terms, are finite for a particular site at all times. Note that Assumption 13 might be theoretically limiting as $t \rightarrow \infty$ because $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (h(t+1) - h(t)) = 0$. This theoretical limitation may lead to failure to satisfy Assumption 4, on the properties of terminal cost, region and control law, for all times, leading to not meeting the conditions for the asymptotic cost guarantee in Theorem 6. However, for all finite times, as Assumption 13 is always satisfied, Assumption 4 is also satisfied, with the result that, the practical cost guarantee in Corollary 8 always holds. •

Substituting (13b) and (17) in the objective function of the EMPC (3a) and simplifying yields,

$$\begin{aligned}
V_N(x(t), \mathbf{u}(x(t), t), t) &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left[R_{\text{EC}}(t+k) \Delta t \left(u_2(t+k|t) + \frac{(1-\eta)}{2} |u_1(t+k|t)| \right) \right. \\
&\quad + \left[R_{\text{NC}} \left(a(t+N)x_2(t+N|t) - a(t)x_2(t) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \quad + \max \left(a(t+N)x_2(t+N|t), a(t+1)x_2^r(t+1) \right) \\
&\quad \quad \left. \left. - a(t+1)x_2^r(t+1) \right) \right] \\
&\quad + \left[R_{\text{OP}} \left(b(t+N)x_3(t+N|t) - b(t)x_3(t) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \quad + \max \left(b(t+N)x_3(t+N|t), b(t+1)x_3^r(t+1) \right) \\
&\quad \quad \left. \left. - b(t+1)x_3^r(t+1) \right) \right] - h(t+N). \tag{19}
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 16 (Behavior of the 1st-choice terminal cost in the objective function). The behavior of the 1st-choice terminal cost given in (17) in the objective function V_N can be seen in the third and fourth term inside both the second and third square brackets of (19), which depend on $x^r(t+1)$. The terminal cost terms penalize any increase of the scaled terminal running NCDP, $a(t+N)x_2(t+N|t)$, in the optimization (performed at t) from the scaled (already) realized reference running NCDP, $a(t+1)x_2^r(t+1)$. However, when $a(t+N)x_2(t+N|t) < a(t+1)x_2^r(t+1)$, the terminal cost terms are conservative and do not reward the optimizer, as any reward might be premature which can lead to an undesirable later increase of running NCDP over the reference trajectory (negating the predicted savings), as the complete reference trajectory has not been realized yet, in contrast with [22]. Also note that the first term in the second square bracket of (19), coming from the additive stage cost, already penalizes an increase of $a(t+N)x_2(t+N|t)$ beyond necessary. A similar structure is followed for penalization of scaled running OPDP, $b(t+N)x_3(t+N|t)$, once from the additive stage cost, and a second time from the terminal cost, penalizing $b(t+N)x_3(t+N|t)$ with respect to the scaled (already) realized reference running OPDP, $b(t+1)x_3^r(t+1)$.¹¹ •

The objective function and constraints of Problem 9 are now set up in the EMPC structure of Section 4.2. We refer to the receding horizon EMPC formulation, with (16) and (17) as terminal region and cost function; respectively, as the 1st-choice problem specification, and fully present it in Appendix A (excluded here for brevity).

¹¹ Remark 16 can be understood in a more intuitive way by substituting $a(t) = b(t) = 1, \forall t \in \mathcal{T}$, (thereby removing the effect of scaling by functions $a(t)$ and $b(t)$), but the original formulation is retained here for generality.

Appendix A also shows that the value of h does not affect the optimal control sequence; i.e., the solution \mathbf{u}^0 , on solving the EMPC. Thus, while an h needs to exist to ensure satisfaction of Assumption 13, on the terminal cost condition,¹² as discussed in Appendix A, in practical scenarios h need not be designed at all, and the $h(t+N)$ term can be dropped from the optimization. The result, while counterintuitive, facilitates satisfaction of the practical cost guarantee in Corollary 8, while avoiding design complexity.

5.5 A 2nd and a 3rd-choice problem specification of terminal cost, terminal region, and control law

Although the terminal cost function, terminal region, and control law in Section 5.4 ensure the practical cost guarantee of Corollary 8, the terminal region (specifically the requirement that the SOC at the end of the optimization ends at the current reference SOC as formulated in (A.5) due to terminal constraint (16)) may lead to suboptimal finite-time economic performance. We now seek to take advantage of Assumption 12, on the length of the prediction horizon, to further relax the conditions for constructing alternative problem specifications.

5.5.1 Elements of the 2nd-choice problem specification

As Assumption 12, on the length of the prediction horizon, holds, we can define $\mathcal{X}_f(t) := \mathcal{X}(t), \forall t \in \mathcal{T}$; i.e., each of the terminal SOC and running NCDP and OPDP are free variables. In this case, any admissible control input, $u(t) = \begin{bmatrix} u_1(t) & u_1(t) - c(t) \end{bmatrix}^\top$ and successor state $x(t+1)$, satisfying (9b), and (13a), (9d); respectively, can be a terminal control law (an obvious example is $u(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -c(t) \end{bmatrix}^\top$). Specifically, it means $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\mathcal{X}_f(t) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x_1(t) \\ x_2(t) \\ x_3(t) \end{pmatrix} \left| \begin{array}{l} x_1(t) \in [\text{SOC}_{\min}, \text{SOC}_{\max}] \\ x_2(t), x_3(t) \in [0, \hat{b}] \end{array} \right. \right\}, \tag{20}$$

$$\kappa_f(x(t), t) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u_1(t) \\ u_1(t) - c(t) \end{pmatrix} \left| \begin{array}{l} u_1(t) \in [-\text{BESS}_{\max}, \text{BESS}_{\max}] \\ (u_1(t) - c(t)) \in [\hat{a}, \hat{b}] \end{array} \right. \right\}. \tag{21}$$

The 2nd-choice terminal cost function is defined by (17), where similar to the 1st-choice, the operational Assumption 17, has to be enforced by design to satisfy Assump-

¹² For Problem 9, by inspection we can additionally conclude that in practical scenarios Assumptions 1, 2, and 5 are also satisfied.

tion 4, on the properties of the terminal cost, region, and control law.

Assumption 17 (Terminal cost condition on 2nd-choice problem specification). Let $A_1(t) = a(t)x_2(t)$, $B_1(t) = b(t)x_3(t)$, $A_2(t) = a(t)x_2^r(t)$, $B_2(t) = b(t)x_3^r(t)$, $C(t) = u_1(t)$, and $D(t) = u_1^r(t)$. Then, (18) holds $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$. •

Proposition 18 (Satisfaction of Assumption 4 for the 2nd-choice terminal cost). The 2nd-choice candidate terminal region, control law, and terminal cost as defined in (20), (21), and (17); respectively, for Problem 9, subject to the dynamics (13a), and the additive stage cost (13b), satisfies Assumption 4, on the properties of terminal cost, region and control law, if Assumption 17 holds.

Proof. Similar to the proof of Proposition 14. □

Similar to Remark 15, Assumption 17, on the terminal cost condition on the 2nd-choice problem specification, can be satisfied for all finite times. This implies that, for the 2nd-choice problem specification, the practical cost guarantee in Corollary 8 holds, even if the asymptotic cost guarantee in Theorem 6 fails to hold, because of the possibility of violation of Assumption 17 as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

We refer to the EMPC formulation with (20) and (17) as the terminal region and cost function; respectively, as the 2nd-choice problem specification, and present it fully in Appendix B.1. This formulation is similar that of the 1st choice, but with a relaxed terminal constraint stemming from the fact that the BESS SOC is free. Note that the terminal region and control law for the 2nd choice, subsume those of the 1st choice.

5.5.2 Elements of the 3rd-choice problem specification

The candidate terminal region and control law of the 3rd choice are the same as those of 2nd choice, with the main difference being given by the terminal cost function. As discussed in Remark 16, on the behavior of the terminal cost (17) in the objective function (19), the objective penalizes the terminal running NCDP term $x_2(t+N|t)$, and the terminal running OPDP $x_3(t+N|t)$ twice, once from the additive stage cost and another time from the terminal cost. This can make the second penalization of $x_2(t+N|t)$ and $x_3(t+N|t)$ from the terminal cost (17) practically redundant, when peak demand charges dominate over BESS losses and energy cost within a prediction horizon — e.g., when the peak demand penalty is orders of magnitude higher than the penalty on grid imports or BESS losses.¹³ Thus, in certain cases, it might

¹³ We refer to the redundancy as ‘practical’ since double penalizing already dominant terms in the objective function

be helpful to remove this redundancy in favor of penalizing the increase of $x_2(t+1|t)$. Similarly, penalizing an increase in $x_3(t+1|t)$ rather than the overshoot of $x_3(t+N|t)$ from $x_3^r(t+1|t)$ might be helpful. A motivation for such a penalty is given in Section 6.1. Thus, assuming for now, that such a penalization of $x_2(t+1|t)$ and $x_3(t+1|t)$ holds value in addition to penalizing $x_2(t+N|t)$ and $x_3(t+N|t)$ from the additive stage cost (13b), we can formulate another terminal cost function as defined by (22) where a new operational Assumption 20 to guarantee Assumption 4, on the properties of terminal cost, region, and control law, has to be enforced. Please refer to Appendix B.2 for the statement of the new assumption. The 3rd-choice terminal cost function is given below.

$$\begin{aligned} V_f(x(t), t) &:= R_{NC} \left[\max \left(a(t-N+1)x_2(t-N+1), \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. a(t-N+1)x_2^r(t-N+1) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - a(t-N+1)x_2^r(t-N+1) \right] \\ &\quad + R_{OP} \left[\max \left(b(t-N+1)x_3(t-N+1), \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. b(t-N+1)x_3^r(t-N+1) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - b(t-N+1)x_3^r(t-N+1) \right] - h(t), \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $h : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded strictly increasing function and Assumption 20 (see Appendix B.2) holds.¹⁴

Proposition 19 (Satisfaction of Assumption 4 for the 3rd-choice terminal cost) The 3rd-choice candidate terminal region, control law, and terminal cost as defined in (20), (21), and (22); respectively for Problem 9, subject to the dynamics (13a), and the additive stage cost (13b), satisfies Assumption 4, on the properties of terminal cost, region and control law, if Assumption 20 holds.

Proof. Similar to the proof of Proposition 14. □

For the 3rd-choice terminal cost too, similar to the 1st and 2nd choices, Assumption 20, on the terminal cost condition on the 3rd-choice problem specification, can be satisfied for all finite times, ensuring that the practical cost guarantees of Corollary 8 hold.

We refer to the EMPC formulation, with (20) and (22) as terminal region and cost function; respectively, as the 3rd-choice problem specification, and present it fully in

would generally have negligible practical effect on the control law, but there might be slight numerical differences.

¹⁴ Note that V_f in (22) is implicitly a function of only t , as $x(t)$ does not appear in the RHS.

Appendix B.3. Note that dropping the terminal constraint in the 2nd and 3rd choices is supposed to improve the finite-time electricity costs; and will be borne out in the following case study.

6 Case study

In this section, we implement our proposed method given in Appendices A (1st choice) and B (2nd and 3rd choices), for simulating the optimal BESS dispatch strategy for a grid-connected MG with PV and load. The MG setup refers to the real-life MG at the Port of San Diego, described in [6, 8, 9]. This model incorporates electricity prices with non-coincident (NC) and on-peak (OP) demand and energy charges. We assume a perfect day-ahead load and PV forecast for the analyses consistent with our MG model.

It is by definition that the optimal electricity cost for the month can only be achieved if (10) is used as the objective function in an optimization that spans the entire month, which necessitates the availability of a perfect forecast for the entire month. As obtaining this information is unrealistic, the standard method in the literature [6] carries out a receding horizon optimization with an economic objective function that is similar to (10), while employing a day-ahead prediction horizon and information of previous running NCDP and OPDP (see (C.1)), which is more realistic. The trajectory generated by this standard method is henceforth named the *standard reference method*. We discuss other methods to generate a reference trajectories in Section 6.1.

While we theoretically cannot guarantee a better finite-time economic performance in general, this case study provides an example that our proposed method, over and above the practical economic guarantees from Corollary 8, produces better finite-time economic performance, when compared to a variety of reference methods, including (but not limited to) the *standard reference method*, which might be of great importance to MG operators.

6.1 Motivation for the 3rd-choice problem specification for a type of reference trajectories

The *standard reference method* previously outlined, optimizes the actual economic cost over a prediction horizon subject to input and state constraints. As we perform a finite-horizon optimization over a much smaller time scale than a month, the standard reference method might provide a solution that performs poorly in closed-loop despite its *a-priori*, open-loop, optimality.¹⁵ For

¹⁵ Additionally, sometimes, terminal constraints are imposed on the standard reference method by the MG operator from rule-of-thumb or domain knowledge expertise to compensate

example, once the standard reference method optimizer concludes that a predicted peak will be reached within the prediction horizon (howsoever far from the present it might be), the optimizer does not have any incentive to aggressively discharge the BESS at the first time-step to beyond what is necessary to equalize the grid import with the future predicted peak. However, the future predicted peak might never be realized in closed-loop as more forecast data becomes available while moving ahead in time. And once a poor decision has been made in the present time-step, as MPC applies the first time-step computed control in closed-loop, the solution cannot be corrected later, resulting in higher NCDP and OPDP overall.

It is discussed in [10] that if $\frac{R_{NC}}{R_{OP}} < \frac{\mu_{off}}{\mu_{on}}$, where μ_{off} hours, and μ_{on} hours, are the number of off-peak,¹⁶ and on-peak hours of the day; respectively, it is economical to spread the grid import over the off-peak hours and keep the on-peak load at 0. The intuition behind this condition lies in the analysis of an increase of NCDP, P_{NCDP} kW, and an increase of the OPDP, P_{OPDP} kW, from importing ω_{GI} kWh from the grid in either off-peak or on-peak hours. If $R_{NC}P_{NCDP} < R_{OP}P_{OPDP}$, then adding the grid import over the off-peak hours is more economical than adding it over the on-peak hours. As uniform addition of grid import over the layover hours, by definition, leads to least peak load, we substitute $P_{NCDP} = \frac{\omega_{GI}}{\mu_{off}}$ and $P_{OPDP} = \frac{\omega_{GI}}{\mu_{on}}$ in the above inequality, which gives the condition $\frac{R_{NC}}{R_{OP}} < \frac{\mu_{off}}{\mu_{on}}$.

Thus, drawing inspiration from the above discussion, as $\frac{R_{NC}}{R_{OP}} < \frac{\mu_{off}}{\mu_{on}}$ holds for most realistic electricity tariff structures [10], we calculate another reference trajectory by solving the receding horizon optimization with an objective function that measures the deviation from a reference trajectory corresponding to an ideal grid import. This ideal grid import just spreads the entire forecast net load over the off-peak hours. The objective function for such a reference trajectory is given in (C.2) in Appendix C. The reference trajectory created from the method in this section is referred to as the *tracking reference method*, as opposed to the *standard reference method*.

As the tracking reference method tries to minimize the deviation from an ideal grid import trajectory, it typically dispatches the BESS more aggressively than the standard reference method (specifically leading to lower $x_2^r(t+1|t)$ and $x_3^r(t+1|t)$, but, higher $x_2^r(t+N|t)$

for this time scale mismatch (see Section 7.1 later). These terminal constraints, although intended to limit the aggressive discharge of BESS during a prediction horizon in anticipation of future peak loads, can often worsen system performance by being overtly conservative.

¹⁶ Off-peak hours are all hours of the day except the on-peak hours, i.e., all hours except 16:00-21:00 h.

and $x_3^r(t + N|t)$ than the standard reference method). Therefore, in open-loop, the tracking reference method might be worse (or at best no better) than the standard reference method, but in closed-loop, the tracking reference method might be superior. Note, however, there is no theoretical guarantee that the closed-loop economic costs of the tracking reference method are always lower than the standard reference method – and it is based only on empirical findings. Thus, the 3rd-choice problem specification incorporates the best aspects of the reference tracking method while including the economic cost explicitly in the objective function (Appendix B.3). The objective function in the 3rd-choice problem in (B.2) – instead of redundantly double penalizing the predicted terminal peaks as in the 1st and 2nd choice problems (see (A.6)) – penalizes both the predicted terminal peaks and the increase of the predicted peaks up to the next time-step (i.e., $x_2(t+1|t)$ and $x_3(t+1|t)$, which will be realized in closed-loop because of perfect forecasts) from the (already realized) reference peaks $x_2^r(t+1)$ and $x_3^r(t+1)$. This gives the proposed 3rd choice problem the ability to relatively weigh the penalty on the predicted peaks in the prediction horizon temporally, as a peak predicted later has lesser significance than a peak predicted closer to the current time in closed-loop. As explained earlier, this is because a peak predicted later may not be realized at all, as more forecast data becomes available while the EMPC moves forward.

6.2 EMPC Optimization Framework

The EMPC-based optimization framework for our proposed method for the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choices are given in Appendices A, B.1, and B.3; respectively. The standard reference method has (C.1) as the objective function, with (A.1), (A.2), (A.3), (A.4) as constraints with superscript ‘ r ’ in the state and control input variables signifying the reference trajectory. Similarly, the tracking reference method has (C.2) as the objective function with (A.1), (A.2), (A.3), (A.4) as constraints. Terminal constraints are sometimes added to both the reference methods based on varied scenarios of MG operator’s operational choices and are described in Section 7. Note that while the 1st-choice problem specification has terminal constraints, the 2nd and 3rd choices do not, with all the proposed methods still preserving the guarantee of Corollary 8.

The MPC prediction horizon for both our and the reference method is one-day ahead, subdivided into N equal time-steps of $\Delta t = 0.25$ h (15 minutes) sampling period, implying $N = \frac{24}{\Delta t} = 96$. The predefined design parameters of the MG are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Design Parameters of the MG at the Port of San Diego [9].

| Parameter | Symbol | Value |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------|
| NCDC rate | R_{NC} | \$24.48/kW |
| OPDC rate | R_{OP} | \$19.19/kW |
| Energy rate | $R_{EC}(t), \forall t$ | \$0.1/kWh |
| BESS round-trip efficiency | η | 0.8 |
| BESS energy capacity | $BESS_{en}$ | 2,500 kWh |
| BESS power capacity | $BESS_{max}$ | 700 kW |
| Upper bound of SOC | SOC_{max} | 0.8 |
| Lower bound of SOC | SOC_{min} | 0.2 |
| Initial SOC | $x_1(0)$ and $x_1^r(0)$ | 0.5 |

7 Results and Discussion

7.1 Reference Method Terminal Constraints and Case Study Settings

We analyze the results from January 2019 at the Port of San Diego MG by comparing our proposed method to both the (*standard* and *tracking*) reference methods, each reference method being further subdivided into three test cases: Case (i), where the terminal constraint set is the entire state space (i.e., no terminal constraints); Case (ii), where the reference methods have its terminal SOC ending at the starting SOC for the MPC given by,

$$x^r(t+N|t) = \begin{pmatrix} x_1^r(t) \\ x_2^r(t+N|t) \\ x_3^r(t+N|t) \end{pmatrix}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T}.$$

This symbolizes a case where the MG operator wants to ensure that the BESS does not have any net energy export or import from the grid over the prediction horizon. Finally, we consider a Case (iii), where the reference methods have a terminal SOC above the 50% SOC for the MPC given by

$$x^r(t+N|t) \geq \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 \\ x_2^r(t+N|t) \\ x_3^r(t+N|t) \end{pmatrix}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T}.$$

This captures the situation where the MG operator is anxious about future demand peaks and wants to have enough storage in the BESS at the terminal time-step of each MPC run. The results for the case study when considering the NCDC only is presented in Section 7.2, where the third component of the constituent state above is dropped. The results when considering both the NCDC and OPDC are presented in Section 7.3. All of our simulations are run with $a(t) = b(t) = 1, \forall t \in \mathcal{T}$.

Note that, as arbitrage is not applied for energy charges, the energy cost differences between these cases are minor, and are only the result of different ending conditions for the SOC of the BESS at the end of the month. Under the sole consideration of the NCDC (Section 7.2), we compare the standard reference method results with those produced by the EMPC method when particularized by the 1st-choice or the 2nd-choice problem specifications. On the other hand, we will evaluate the tracking reference results with those particularized by the 3rd-choice problem specification, when considering both NCDC and OPDC (Section 7.3). This is justified as the comparison of the results from the 3rd-choice method only makes sense when there is an incentive in shifting the grid import power over the off-peak hours from the on-peak hours, which can have a significant impact on the total electricity costs. In Sections 7.2 and 7.3, we abbreviate the standard and tracking reference methods by ‘Std Ref’ and ‘Track Ref’; respectively.

7.2 Exclusive Non-Coincident Demand Charges

Table 2 shows that for Case (i), the 1st-choice method has higher NCDC as compared to the Std Ref method. This is due to the 1st-choice terminal constraints, which are absent in the Std Ref method for Case (i). However, the 1st-choice method (almost completely) compensates for its excess NCDC by a lower BESS usage loss. The reason for this is that, once a higher demand peak has been reached, the BESS has no incentive to discharge aggressively, as reducing the grid import below the already realized peak incurs no benefit. Overall, ignoring energy costs—as they are irrelevant for comparative analysis in the long run—the total costs for the 1st-choice method are the same as that of the Std Ref method. The results for the 2nd-choice method are practically equivalent to the standard reference as expected, as the only difference between them is the ‘practically redundant’ double penalization on the terminal running NCDP, $a(t + N)x_2(t + N|t)$. We say the double penalization of $a(t + N)x_2(t + N|t)$ is practically redundant because the demand charge terms dominate the costs inside the prediction horizon, and are already considered in the additive stage cost. Thus, the double penalization has negligible added effects with the cost difference with Std Ref being 0.08%.

In Case (ii), the 1st-choice method has similar costs to the Std Ref method. This is expected, as the formulations of both the 1st-choice and Std Ref methods are practically equivalent. As both the 1st-choice and Std Ref methods start from the same initial SOC, the terminal constraints for Case (ii) are the same in both, and the only difference lies in the terminal cost of the 1st-choice method. Here, similar to above, the redundant double penalization of the terminal running NCDP in the 1st-choice method accounts for only 0.14% total cost decrease with respect to Std Ref, which can be consid-

ered equivalent for practical purposes. The 2nd-choice method outperforms both the Std Ref and 1st-choice because of the relaxation in the terminal region in 2nd-choice as compared to both Std Ref and 1st-choice. Overall, the 2nd-choice method shows a $\approx 13.3\%$ and 13.0% NCDC reduction; and an $\approx 3.3\%$ and 3.2% total cost reduction; as compared to the Std Ref and 1st-choice methods; respectively.

The largest performance improvement comes from Case (iii), which shows a 4.1% reduction of NCDC in the 1st-choice as compared to the Std Ref method; and a total cost reduction of 0.8%. As the 2nd-choice method does not have terminal constraints, it leads to the best cost reduction with an additional 4.7% and 1.3% reduction in NCDC and total cost respectively over the 1st-choice. Overall, the 2nd-choice method performs similarly to or better than the 1st-choice and Std Ref in all the cases.

7.3 Simultaneous Non-Coincident and On-Peak Demand Charges

When both the NCDC and OPDC are considered in the MG, the results in Table 3 follow almost the same trends as when exclusively considering NCDC (see Table 2); a detailed discussion is avoided here for brevity. The key takeaways are: (i) the 2nd-choice method, as in Section 7.2, is either better or at least as good as the 1st-choice and Std Ref methods for all cases; (ii) the largest performance improvement is seen in Case (iii), with the 1st-choice method outperforming Std. Ref, and the 2nd-choice method outperforming the 1st-choice.

However, an interesting performance improvement is observed by using the Track Ref method over the Std Ref method for Cases (ii) and (iii)—as seen by comparing Track Ref in Table 4 with Std Ref in Table 3.¹⁷ However, the performance improvement in Track Ref as compared to Std Ref in Cases (ii) and (iii), as elucidated in Section 6.1, is empirical, without theoretical guarantees, with the objective function (C.2) not having economic meaning at all. The 3rd-choice method however, includes economic criteria in the cost function while accounting for the reference trajectory (i.e., demand peaks) laid out by the Track Ref method. The inclusion of this tradeoff in the 3rd-choice method is important as in cases when the Track Ref fails to give good economic performance, it prevents the occurrence of *pathological* solutions due to the explicit consideration of economics.

The advantage of including an economic term in the cost can be seen in Table 4 where the 3rd-choice method outperforms the Track Ref in all the cases. The 3rd-choice method also additionally outperforms the Std Ref in all

¹⁷ Note that Track Ref has the same terminal constraints as in Std Ref for all the cases.

Table 2

Result comparison for the Std Ref, 1st-choice, and 2nd-choice methods for the 3 test cases considering only NCDC for January 2019.

| Costs | Case (i) | | | Case (ii) | | | Case (iii) | | |
|-------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Std Ref | 1 st -choice | 2 nd -choice | Std Ref | 1 st -choice | 2 nd -choice | Std Ref | 1 st -choice | 2 nd -choice |
| NCDC | \$3,450 | \$3,569 | \$3,459 | \$3,983 | \$3,970 | \$3,453 | \$3,782 | \$3,627 | \$3,455 |
| Energy Cost | \$5,676 | \$5,683 | \$5,675 | \$5,716 | \$5,715 | \$5,676 | \$5,718 | \$5,719 | \$5,676 |
| BESS loss | \$385 | \$268 | \$385 | \$137 | \$139 | \$385 | \$220 | \$298 | \$385 |
| Total Cost | \$9,511 | \$9,519 | \$9,519 | \$9,837 | \$9,823 | \$9,514 | \$9,721 | \$9,644 | \$9,516 |

cases except Case (i), where the 3rd-choice method has 1.1% more total costs than the Std Ref (compare for Case (i), 3rd-choice in Table 4 with Std Ref in Table 3).

One might argue that the finite-time performance improvement of the proposed methods (either the 1st/2nd/3rd-choices) over the Std Ref is a the result of the change (as in 1st-choice) or, the removal of the terminal constraints (as in 2nd and 3rd-choices) in the optimization. However, it is important to note that adding terminal constraints in Std Ref is an MG operator's prerogative, reflecting both their conservativeness and experience. The MG operator would not know in real-time if the decision to keep terminal constraints (as in Cases (ii) and (iii) for Std Ref method) is good from a closed-loop monthly cost perspective until the end of the month has been reached (which is too late to make any changes). As forecasts are only known 24 h in advance, it is possible to encounter situations where addition of terminal constraints as in Cases (ii) and (iii) outperform Case (i) with a Std Ref technique in closed-loop monthly electricity cost.¹⁸ There, our proposed methods hold value in the long term because of the guarantees provided by Theorem 6 and Corollary 8. This is especially true if reference trajectories like Track Ref are used by an MG operator, which has empirically been shown to outperform Std Ref in some cases, and whose performance can be further improved upon by the utilization of a 3rd-choice method.

8 Conclusions and future work

The paper presents an economic MPC (EMPC) formulation for a generic deterministic discrete non-linear time-varying system. We first prove that under some mild assumptions, the asymptotic average closed-loop cost of the proposed EMPC is no worse than the asymptotic

average closed-loop cost of an arbitrary reference trajectory for the same system. A practical finite-time guarantee is also derived which quantifies the upper bound as a function of time that decreases linearly to zero as time goes to infinity. Unlike previous works, we do not assume that the reference trajectory is known a-priori for all future times, which is critical in applications.

We then solve an optimal MG dispatch problem, which can be reformulated to the conditions for our proposed EMPC formulation ensuring practical performance guarantees. A realistic case study using PV and load forecast data from the microgrid at the Port of San Diego shows that our method is capable of reducing monthly electricity costs as compared to reference trajectories generated by directly optimizing the electricity cost function over the prediction horizon or by tracking an ideal grid import curve.

Future work would focus on the design of terminal cost functions, control laws and regions which will be able to ensure not only practical, but also asymptotic performance guarantees for generic stage costs and non-linear time varying systems. Investigation into techniques which can extend similar guarantees as this work for stochastic systems are also needed.

References

- [1] Stefan Ambec and Claude Crampes. Real-time electricity pricing to balance green energy intermittency. *Energy economics*, 94:105074, 2021.
- [2] Rishi Amrit, James B Rawlings, and David Angeli. Economic optimization using model predictive control with a terminal cost. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 35(2):178–186, 2011.
- [3] David Angeli, Rishi Amrit, and James B Rawlings. On average performance and stability analysis of economic model predictive control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, DOI, 10, 2012.
- [4] David Angeli, Alessandro Casavola, and Francesco Tedesco. On average performance of economic model predictive control with time-varying cost and terminal constraints. In *2015 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 2974–2979. IEEE, 2015.
- [5] David Angeli, Alessandro Casavola, and Francesco Tedesco. Theoretical advances on economic model predictive control with time-varying costs. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 41:218–224, 2016.

¹⁸ We have not demonstrated this in our case study but it is possible that such situation arises with different prediction horizons and/or forecast data. A case in point would be a short prediction horizon where a large demand exists just beyond the current prediction horizon. Here, the Std Ref in Case (i) might be unable to handle the large load demand in closed-loop, but Case (ii) or (iii) might be more prepared to do so because of the conservative terminal constraints.

Table 3

Result comparison for the Std Ref, 1st-choice, and 2nd-choice methods for the 3 test cases considering both NCDC and OPDC for January 2019.

| Costs | Case (i) | | | Case (ii) | | | Case (iii) | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Std Ref | 1 st -choice | 2 nd -choice | Std Ref | 1 st -choice | 2 nd -choice | Std Ref | 1 st -choice | 2 nd -choice |
| NCDC | \$4,358 | \$3,438 | \$4,357 | \$3,988 | \$3,978 | \$4,357 | \$5,000 | \$4,760 | \$4,357 |
| OPDC | \$0 | \$2,217 | \$0 | \$3,081 | \$3,079 | \$0 | \$972 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Energy Cost | \$5,652 | \$5,697 | \$5,652 | \$5,717 | \$5,714 | \$5,652 | \$5,691 | \$5,685 | \$5,652 |
| BESS loss | \$584 | \$380 | \$584 | \$136 | \$138 | \$584 | \$431 | \$518 | \$584 |
| Total Cost | \$10,595 | \$11,733 | \$10,594 | \$12,924 | \$12,910 | \$10,594 | \$12,093 | \$10,964 | \$10,594 |

Table 4

Result comparison for the Track Ref, and 3rd-choice methods for the 3 test cases considering both NCDC and OPDC for January 2019.

| Costs | Case (i) | | Case (ii) | | Case (iii) | |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| | Track Ref | 3 rd -choice | Track Ref | 3 rd -choice | Track Ref | 3 rd -choice |
| NCDC | \$4,803 | \$4,511 | \$4,803 | \$4,511 | \$4,803 | \$4,511 |
| OPDC | \$162 | \$0 | \$162 | \$0 | \$162 | \$0 |
| Energy Cost | \$5,689 | \$5,648 | \$5,689 | \$5,648 | \$5,689 | \$5,648 |
| BESS loss | \$847 | \$560 | \$843 | \$560 | \$847 | \$560 |
| Total Cost | \$11,502 | \$10,719 | \$11,498 | \$10,719 | \$11,502 | \$10,719 |

- [6] Cristian Cortes-Aguirre, Yi-An Chen, Avik Ghosh, Jan Kleissl, and Adil Khurram. Economic mpc with an online reference trajectory for battery scheduling considering demand charge management. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 2025.
- [7] Garrett Fitzgerald and Chris Nelder. Evgo fleet and tariff analysis: Phase 1: California. 2017.
- [8] Avik Ghosh, Cristian Cortes-Aguirre, Yi-An Chen, Adil Khurram, and Jan Kleissl. Adaptive chance constrained mpc under load and pv forecast uncertainties. In *2023 IEEE PES Grid Edge Technologies Conference & Exposition (Grid Edge)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023.
- [9] Avik Ghosh, Cristian Cortes-Aguirre, Yi-An Chen, Adil Khurram, and Jan Kleissl. Adaptive relaxation-based nonconservative chance constrained stochastic mpc. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, pages 1–17, 2025.
- [10] Avik Ghosh, Mónica Zamora Zapata, Sushil Silwal, Adil Khurram, and Jan Kleissl. Effects of number of electric vehicles charging/discharging on total electricity costs in commercial buildings with time-of-use energy and demand charges. *Journal of Renewable and Sustainable Energy*, 14(3), 2022.
- [11] Lars Grüne. Economic receding horizon control without terminal constraints. *Automatica*, 49(3):725–734, 2013.
- [12] Lars Grüne and Simon Pirkelmann. Closed-loop performance analysis for economic model predictive control of time-varying systems. In *2017 IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 5563–5569. IEEE, 2017.
- [13] Jiefeng Hu, Yinghao Shan, Yong Yang, Alessandra Parisio, Yong Li, Nima Amjadi, Syed Islam, Ka Wai Cheng, Josep M Guerrero, and José Rodríguez. Economic model predictive control for microgrid optimization: A review. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 15(1):472–484, 2023.
- [14] Morgan Jones and Matthew M Peet. Solving dynamic programming with supremum terms in the objective and application to optimal battery scheduling for electricity consumers subject to demand charges. In *2017 IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 1323–1329. IEEE, 2017.
- [15] Zachary J Lee, John ZF Pang, and Steven H Low. Pricing ev charging service with demand charge. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 189:106694, 2020.
- [16] Robert D McAllister and James B Rawlings. A suboptimal economic model predictive control algorithm for large and infrequent disturbances. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 69(2):1242–1248, 2023.
- [17] Graham McClone, Avik Ghosh, Adil Khurram, Byron Washom, and Jan Kleissl. Hybrid machine learning forecasting for online mpc of work place electric vehicle charging. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 15(2):1891–1901, 2023.
- [18] Yanfang Mo, Qiulin Lin, Minghua Chen, and S Joe Qin. Real-time peak-demand minimization with energy storage using competitive ratio. *Automatica*, 184:112687, 2026.
- [19] Seth Mullendore. An introduction to demand charges. *Clean Energy Group, National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL)*, 2017.
- [20] James B Rawlings, David Angeli, and Cuyler N Bates. Fundamentals of economic model predictive control. In *2012 IEEE 51st IEEE conference on decision and control (CDC)*, pages 3851–3861. IEEE, 2012.
- [21] James Blake Rawlings, David Q Mayne, Moritz Diehl, et al. *Model predictive control: theory, computation, and design*, volume 2. Nob Hill Publishing Madison, WI, 2017.
- [22] Michael J Risbeck and James B Rawlings. Economic model predictive control for time-varying cost and peak demand charge optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(7):2957–2968, 2019.

A EMPC formulation for the 1st-choice problem specification

The receding horizon EMPC formulation of Problem 9 for the 1st-choice problem specification is presented as follows.

$$\underset{\mathbf{u}(x(t),t) \in \mathcal{U}^N}{\text{minimize}} \quad (19)$$

subject to

$$x(t+k+1|t) = \begin{pmatrix} Ax_1(t+k|t) + Bu(t+k|t) \\ \max(x_2(t+k|t), u_2(t+k|t)) \\ \max(x_3(t+k|t), \beta(t+k)u_2(t+k|t)) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$Su(t+k|t) \leq s, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$Mu(t+k|t) = c(t+k|t), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$G'x(t+k|t) \leq g', \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0^N, \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$x(t+N|t) = \begin{pmatrix} x_1^r(t) \\ x_2(t+N|t) \\ x_3(t+N|t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where

$$G' = \begin{bmatrix} G & 0_2 & 0_2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad g' = \begin{bmatrix} g \\ \hat{b} \\ 0 \\ \hat{b} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and Assumption 13 is enforced.

Note that some terms, namely, $a(t)x_2(t)$, $a(t+1)x_2^r(t+1)$, $b(t)x_3(t)$, $b(t+1)x_3^r(t+1)$ and $h(t+N)$ of (19) are independent of $\mathbf{u}(x(t),t)$ for a given initial state $x(t)$, reference states $x^r(t)$, $x^r(t+1)$ and time t , as they are just additive constants. Thus, the optimization with the objective function (19) has the same optimal control input sequence $\mathbf{u}^0(x(t),t)$ (i.e., solution) when using the objective function in (A.6) provided we use the

same constraints (A.1), (A.2), (A.3), (A.4), (A.5), as (19) and (A.6) differ by additive constants.

$$\begin{aligned} V_N(x(t), \mathbf{u}(x(t), t), t) &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left[R_{\text{EC}}(t+k) \Delta t \left(u_2(t+k|t) + \frac{(1-\eta)}{2} |u_1(t+k|t)| \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \left[R_{\text{NC}} \left(a(t+N)x_2(t+N|t) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \max \left(a(t+N)x_2(t+N|t), a(t+1)x_2^r(t+1) \right) \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \left[R_{\text{OP}} \left(b(t+N)x_3(t+N|t) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \max \left(b(t+N)x_3(t+N|t), b(t+1)x_3^r(t+1) \right) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Note that use of (A.6) relaxes the design requirement of choosing $h(\cdot)$ in practical scenarios to satisfy Assumption 13.

B EMPC formulation for the 2nd and 3rd-choice problem specification

B.1 EMPC formulation for the 2nd-choice

The receding horizon EMPC formulation of Problem 9 for the 2nd choice problem specification is presented as follows.

$$\underset{\mathbf{u}(x(t),t) \in \mathcal{U}^N}{\text{minimize}} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

subject to (A.1), (A.2), (A.3) and (A.4). Note that there is no additional terminal constraint like (A.5) in this case on account of (20).

B.2 Statement of Assumption 20 for Choice 3

Assumption 20 (Terminal cost condition on 3rd-choice problem specification). Let $A_1(t) = a(t)x_2(t)$, $B_1(t) = b(t)x_3(t)$, $A_2(t) = a(t)x_2^r(t)$, $B_2(t) = b(t)x_3^r(t)$, $C(t) = u_1(t)$, and $D(t) = u_1^r(t)$. Then, the following holds $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& h(t+1) - h(t) \\
& \geq R_{\text{EC}}(t)\Delta t \left(C(t) - c(t) + \frac{(1-\eta)}{2}|C(t)| \right) \\
& \quad - R_{\text{EC}}(t-N)\Delta t \left(D(t-N) - c(t-N) + \frac{(1-\eta)}{2}|D(t-N)| \right) \\
& \quad + R_{\text{NC}} \left[A_1(t+1) - A_1(t) \right. \\
& \quad \quad + \max \left(A_1(t-N+2), A_2(t-N+2) \right) \\
& \quad \quad - \max \left(A_1(t-N+1), A_2(t-N+1) \right) \\
& \quad \quad \left. + A_2(t-N) - A_2(t-N+2) \right] \\
& \quad + R_{\text{OP}} \left[B_1(t+1) - B_1(t) \right. \\
& \quad \quad + \max \left(B_1(t-N+2), B_2(t-N+2) \right) \\
& \quad \quad - \max \left(B_1(t-N+1), B_2(t-N+1) \right) \\
& \quad \quad \left. + B_2(t-N) - B_2(t-N+2) \right]. \tag{B.1}
\end{aligned}$$

B.3 EMPC formulation for the 3rd-choice

The receding horizon EMPC formulation of the optimal MG dispatch problem for Choice 3 is presented after removing the additive constants similar to (A.6) as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\mathbf{u}(x(t),t) \in \mathcal{U}^N}{\text{minimize}} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left[R_{\text{EC}}(t+k)\Delta t \left(u_2(t+k|t) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \frac{(1-\eta)}{2}|u_1(t+k|t)| \right) \right] \\
& \quad + \left[R_{\text{NC}} \left(a(t+N)x_2(t+N|t) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \quad \left. \left. + \max \left(a(t+1)x_2(t+1|t), \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \quad \quad \left. \left. \left. a(t+1)x_2^r(t+1) \right) \right) \right] \\
& \quad + \left[R_{\text{OP}} \left(b(t+N)x_3(t+N|t) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \quad \left. \left. + \max \left(b(t+1)x_3(t+1|t), \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \quad \quad \left. \left. \left. b(t+1)x_3^r(t+1) \right) \right) \right], \tag{B.2}
\end{aligned}$$

subject to (A.1), (A.2), (A.3) and (A.4). Similar to the 2nd, there is no additional terminal constraint like (A.5) in this case too, on account of (20).

C Objective function for the optimal MG dispatch problem for the reference methods

The objective function for the standard reference method is presented as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{V}_N(x^r(t), \mathbf{u}^r(x^r(t), t), t) \\
& = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left[R_{\text{EC}}(t+k)\Delta t \left(u_2^r(t+k|t) + \frac{(1-\eta)}{2}|u_1^r(t+k|t)| \right) \right] \\
& \quad + R_{\text{NC}} \left(a(t+N)x_2^r(t+N|t) \right) \\
& \quad + R_{\text{OP}} \left(b(t+N)x_3^r(t+N|t) \right). \tag{C.1}
\end{aligned}$$

The objective function for the tracking reference method is given as follows,

$$\tilde{V}_N(x^r(t), \mathbf{u}^r(x^r(t), t), t) = \|P(t)(\mathbf{u}_2^r(x^r(t), t) - \bar{\mathbf{u}}_2^r(t))\|, \tag{C.2}$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_2^r(t)$ is the ideal grid import trajectory over the prediction horizon and $P(t)$ is the penalty matrix. $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_2^r(t)$ is composed of 0 for the on-peak (OP) period time-steps of the prediction horizon, with the off-peak period elements being $\max \left(x_2^r(t), -\frac{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} c(t+k|t)}{N_{\text{off}}} \right)$, where N_{off} is the length of the prediction horizon coinciding with the off-peak period. $P(t)$ is a diagonal matrix that penalizes the deviation of the predicted grid import from the ideal, with more weighing for on-peak periods, as OPDC are charged on top of NCDC. $P(t)$ is composed of 1 for off-peak period time-steps of the prediction horizon, and $\frac{R_{\text{NC}}+R_{\text{OP}}}{R_{\text{NC}}}$ for the OP period time-steps of the prediction horizon, symbolizing that increasing demand during OP periods can increase both NCDC and OPDC.

We do not use the running OPDP, $x_3^r(t)$, in $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_2^r(t)$, as increasing the ideal grid import trajectory in the OP period time-steps further risks aggravating future OP period peaks. However, in some situations, not increasing the ideal grid import trajectory over the OP period time-steps when a prior OPDP has been reached could increase the NCDC beyond necessary, especially if the NCDC happens after the OPDP. If the running OPDP is included in the ideal grid import trajectory, the time-steps of $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_2^r(t)$ corresponding to the OP period would be modified as $\max(0, x_3^r(t))$.