

Optimizing DER Aggregate Flexibility via Network Reconfiguration

Feixiang Zhang, Hongyi Li, *Member, IEEE*, Bai Cui, *Member, IEEE*, and Zhaoyu Wang, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—The aggregate flexibility region of distributed energy resources (DERs) quantifies the aggregate power shaping capabilities of DERs. It characterizes the distribution network’s potential for wholesale market participation and grid service provision at the transmission level. To enhance flexibility and fully exploit the potential of DERs, this paper proposes a method to optimize the aggregate flexibility region through distribution network reconfiguration. First, we formulate the ellipsoidal aggregate flexibility region characterization problem as a two-stage adaptive robust optimization problem and derive an exact convex reformulation with a large number of second-order cone constraints. By exploiting the problem structure, we propose a scalable Benders decomposition algorithm with provable finite convergence to the optimal solution. Finally, we propose an optimal reconfiguration problem for aggregate flexibility region optimization and solve it using the custom Benders decomposition. Numerical simulations on the IEEE 123-bus test feeder demonstrate that, compared to existing approaches, substantial improvements in the aggregate flexibility region can be achieved over multiple scenarios with the optimized topology.

Index Terms—aggregate flexibility, adaptive robust optimization, distributed energy resources, distribution reconfiguration

I. INTRODUCTION

WITH the growing emphasis on sustainable development, the large-scale integration of distributed energy resources (DER) has become increasingly important. Aggregated DERs not only reduce reliance on centralized fossil fuel generation but also enhance grid reliability. For instance, solar photovoltaic (PV) coupled with energy storage (ES) systems can help mitigate voltage fluctuations [1] and support power balance [2]. However, the inherent intermittency of DERs, especially PV and wind, introduces operational uncertainty at both the distribution and transmission levels. In addition, the flexibility of individual DERs is often limited by their sizes and geographic dispersion. As such, the effective aggregation and coordination of heterogeneous DERs become important. In this context, aggregate flexibility, which refers to the power shaping capabilities of aggregated DERs, plays an important role in market participation and ancillary service provision.

There have been extensive research efforts on characterizing and harnessing the flexibility of standalone DERs. These studies focus on characterizing the flexibility of homogeneous DER types, such as controllable loads [3], PV systems, ES systems [4], heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC) units [5], and electric vehicles (EVs) [6]. Although these

studies provide valuable insights into the flexibility of homogeneous DER types at the component level, no grid-level aggregation or coordination are considered. Recent works have progressed toward the quantification of the aggregate flexibility potential of heterogeneous DER ensembles, where several challenging issues need to be considered, including network constraints, load and DER uncertainties, and temporal coupling of aggregate flexibility [7].

Existing works have highlighted the importance of incorporating network constraints in the aggregate flexibility region characterization [8]. Due to the computational challenges associated with power flow convexity, approximate models such as shift factor-based formulations [9], [10] and fixed-point-based linearized power flow model [11] are adopted. However, uncertainties are not considered in these studies.

Stochastic programming and robust optimization methods have been proposed to deal with the impact of DER uncertainties in quantifying aggregate flexibility regions. For instance, chance constraints are introduced in [12] to model the probabilistic violation of network constraints. Wasserstein-based distributionally robust joint chance constraint methods are adopted to model the uncertainty of DER output and loads in [13], [14]. A Chebyshev-based chance constraint is leveraged to construct the joint probability of constraint violations in [15]. In the absence of a probabilistic description of the uncertainty, robust optimization methods can be used to guarantee the validity of the aggregate flexibility region under a given uncertainty set. For instance, an adaptive robust optimization (ARO) framework is employed in [16] to handle the uncertainty of uncontrollable loads.

In pursuit of computational simplicity, many existing research works approximate aggregate flexibility regions using coordinate-aligned hypercubes [17], [18]. However, as noted in [19], this particular geometric representation is often inadequate in capturing the intertemporal coupling effect in many DERs, such as ES, HVAC, and EVs. To effectively capture the coupling effect, alternative flexibility region representations have been proposed, including ellipsoids [19] and storage-like polytopes [20], [21], among others. To address the high computational cost, an ellipsoidal inner approximation based on efficient recourse decision rules was developed in [19].

Operational reconfiguration is effective in managing distribution systems with high DER penetrations, and its capability to provide economic, reliability, and resilience benefits has been extensively analyzed [22]. However, most existing works on aggregate flexibility assessment assume fixed distribution network topology. Since the aggregate flexibility region is constrained not only by DER characteristic but also by net-

F. Zhang, H. Li, B. Cui, and Z. Wang are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Iowa State University, Ames, IA, 50011 USA. Emails: {zfx, hongyili, baicui, zwy}@iastate.edu

work constraints, changes in network topology directly impact the flexibility region and could unlock significant flexibility benefits for energy and grid service provision. Without modeling switching capability explicitly, flexibility may be systematically underestimated and under-utilized, especially in rural areas with long and lightly loaded feeders or for highly congested ones in urban settings.

However, the introduction of binary variables in the radiality constraints complicates the problem since i) the flexibility characterization needs to be adaptive to the variable topology and ii) the resulting problem becomes a mixed-integer optimization problem with significantly higher computational complexity. Due to the technical difficulties, leveraging reconfiguration strategies for aggregate flexibility improvement remains under-explored [23] despite the potential improvement. For example, [24] compares aggregate flexibility by enumerating all candidate topologies. However, this approach is not scalable to realistically sized systems and it does not account for intertemporal coupling of DER operations.

In this paper, we propose a unified and computationally tractable framework to characterize and optimize the aggregate flexibility region by jointly optimizing distribution network topology, modeling intertemporal DER operations, and ensuring robustness against load uncertainties. These components are integrated within a single ARO structure so that a rigorous assessment of the joint impact of topology and DER characteristics on the aggregate flexibility can be made.

The main contributions of this paper are threefold:

First, we introduce the first unified optimization framework that optimizes the aggregate flexibility region through network reconfiguration while capturing intertemporal coupling among DERs and load uncertainties. This contrasts with prior works on aggregate flexibility characterization that either assume a fixed topology, use conservative approximations, ignore intertemporal coupling, or assume a deterministic model.

Second, we derive an exact reformulation of the ARO problem using duality and support functions. The technical approach leads to a convex maximum-volume inscribed ellipsoid problem characterizing the aggregate flexibility region. Unlike existing heuristic or scenario-based methods, the proposed approach yields a provable guarantee that every point in the flexibility region is feasible under all uncertainty realizations. Compared to our earlier ellipsoidal characterization [19], the proposed approach provides a provably stronger characterization of the aggregate flexibility region.

Third, we design a customized Benders decomposition algorithm that handles binary variables and robust feasibility constraints. We also develop an efficient reformulation that significantly improves the global solver's performance in solving the subproblem. This enables the scalability of the proposed ARO for reconfiguration of large-scale feeders. Numerical experiments on the IEEE 123-bus test feeder demonstrate that the reconfiguration improves the aggregate flexibility region by more than 100%, especially under significant uncertainties.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: Section II presents the background, including notations, DER and system modeling, and basic optimization models. Section III develops the ARO formulation and its solution algorithm for

the aggregate flexibility characterization under a fixed topology. Section IV extends the formulation and solution algorithm to consider network reconfiguration. Numerical simulations that demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed approach are presented in Section V. Finally, Section VI concludes the paper and summarizes the main findings.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Network Model and Notation

We model the distribution system (network) as a simple, connected, undirected graph $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ where $\mathcal{N} = \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$ is the set of buses and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$ is the set of distribution lines. Let $\mathcal{N}_1 = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ denote the set of load buses and bus 0 be the substation (slack) bus, so that $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_1 \cup \{0\}$. A feasible network topology is a spanning tree (radial subgraph) of $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$. Each distribution line $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ has resistance r_{ij} and reactance x_{ij} .

We denote by $\mathcal{E}_s \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ the subset of lines equipped with controllable switches. For each $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_s$, a binary variable s_{ij} indicates whether the line is closed ($s_{ij} = 1$) or open ($s_{ij} = 0$). For notational uniformity, we also define $s_{ij} = 1$ for all non-switchable lines $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}_s$. The operating topology is the subgraph formed by all non-switchable lines and the closed switchable lines.

We consider aggregate flexibility over a multi-period horizon, where each time step τ may represent 5-, 15-, or 60-minute interval depending on the application. The time horizon is indexed by $\mathcal{T} = \{1, 2, \dots, T\}$. For notational convenience, we also define $\mathcal{T}_2 = \{2, 3, \dots, T\}$ as the time horizon excluding the initial period. For each bus $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and time $t \in \mathcal{T}$, $p_{i,t}$ ($q_{i,t}$) denotes the real (reactive) power injection and $v_{i,t}$ the squared voltage magnitude. For line $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ and time $t \in \mathcal{T}$, $p_{ij,t}$ ($q_{ij,t}$) denotes the real (reactive) power flow from bus i to bus j at time t .

Notations: An all-one vector of appropriate dimension is denoted by $\mathbf{1}$. $\text{diag}(\cdot)$ denotes a diagonal matrix with its argument on the main diagonal. $\langle x, y \rangle := x^\top y$ denotes the standard inner product. $\|x\|_2 := \sqrt{x^\top x}$ denotes the Euclidean (ℓ_2) norm. For a positive semidefinite matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the Q -weighted vector-norm is

$$\|v\|_Q = \|Q^{\frac{1}{2}}v\|_2, \quad v \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (1)$$

where $Q^{1/2}$ is the principal square root of Q .

B. DER Models

We represent each controllable DER by an index $d \in \mathcal{D}$, where \mathcal{D} is the set of all controllable DERs in the system. Let $i(d)$ denote the bus at which DER d is connected. The real power output of DER d at time $t \in \mathcal{T}$ is denoted by $x_{d,t}$. For simplicity, we assume that each DER operates at a constant power factor. Other inverter-based control modes (e.g., volt-var control or PQ -capability curve) can be incorporated without affecting the overall formulation.

Different DER types impose different operational constraints, which we represent through technology-specific feasible sets. For each DER d , its real power trajectory over the time horizon \mathcal{T} satisfies:

$$x_d := (x_{d,t})_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \in \mathcal{X}_d, \quad (2)$$

where \mathcal{X}_d is a polytope. For illustration, the feasible set of a PV system d is defined as

$$\mathcal{X}_d = \{x_d \in \mathbb{R}^T \mid 0 \leq x_{d,t} \leq \bar{p}_{d,t}, t \in \mathcal{T}\}, \quad (3)$$

where $\bar{p}_{d,t}$ is the available PV generation at time t . Detailed definitions of the feasible sets \mathcal{X}_d for other DER types are provided in Appendix A. The overall DER feasible set is therefore the Cartesian product:

$$\mathcal{X} := \prod_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{X}_d. \quad (4)$$

C. Uncertainty Model: Uncontrollable Load

In addition to the controllable DERs, we model the uncontrollable real power load at each bus $k \in \mathcal{N}_1$ and time $t \in \mathcal{T}$ as a multiplicative perturbation of its nominal value $p_{k,t}^{u,0}$:

$$p_{k,t}^u = p_{k,t}^{u,0} (1 + \delta \zeta_{c(k),t}), \quad (5)$$

where $c(k) \in \{\text{res}, \text{com}, \text{ind}\}$ denotes the load category (residential, commercial, and industrial) at bus k ; $\delta > 0$ is the uncertainty level; and $\zeta_{c,t}$ captures the normalized load deviation for load category c at time t . We assume constant power factor for the uncontrollable loads.

To model load uncertainty correlations among load categories, we collect the normalized load deviations for different load categories into a vector:

$$\zeta_t = \begin{bmatrix} \zeta_{\text{res},t} \\ \zeta_{\text{com},t} \\ \zeta_{\text{ind},t} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

We assume ζ_t lies in an ℓ_2 -norm-bounded uncertainty set:

$$\zeta_t \in \mathcal{U} = \{\zeta_t \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \|\zeta_t\|_2 \leq 1\}. \quad (7)$$

It follows that loads in different categories lie within an ellipsoidal uncertainty set. The uncertainty set captures joint deviations across load categories and the correlation within the same load category.

It follows from the preceding models that the net real power injection at load bus $i \in \mathcal{N}_1$ and time t can be represented as

$$p_{i,t} = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}: i(d)=i} x_{d,t} - p_{i,t}^u(\zeta_t). \quad (8)$$

The reactive power injection can be represented similarly.

D. Linear Distribution Power Flow Model

We adopt the LinDistFlow model [25] to approximate power flows in the radial distribution system. This linearized model provides accurate affine relationships between bus power injections and squared voltage magnitudes under nominal operating conditions. It is widely used in distribution system optimization and reconfiguration studies.

We assume the network is radial and assign an orientation to each distribution line $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ by directing all the lines away from the substation bus. Thus, every line is oriented from the upstream bus to the downstream bus along the unique path from the substation bus. The real and reactive power flows $p_{ij,t}$ and $q_{ij,t}$ are defined with respect to this orientation.

For notational simplicity, we omit the time index t in the LinDistFlow model, which can be defined as:

$$p_i = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} p_{ij} - \sum_{(k,i) \in \mathcal{E}} p_{ki}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}_1, \quad (9a)$$

$$q_i = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} q_{ij} - \sum_{(k,i) \in \mathcal{E}} q_{ki}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}_1, \quad (9b)$$

$$v_j = v_i - 2(r_{ij}p_{ij} + x_{ij}q_{ij}), \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{E} \quad (9c)$$

The real power injection p_0 at the substation bus (the power imported from the upstream transmission system) is given by

$$p_0 = - \sum_{i: (0,i) \in \mathcal{E}} p_i. \quad (10)$$

The squared voltages satisfy

$$\underline{v}_i \leq v_i \leq \bar{v}_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (11)$$

with the substation voltage fixed ($v_0 = \bar{v}_0$).

E. Reconfiguration Formulation

To enable flexibility improvements through reconfiguration, explicit modeling of switch statuses and the network radiality constraints are needed. Several widely used radiality formulations exist, including cycle elimination [26], path-based [27], virtual flow [28], [29], and parent-child models [30]. In this work, we adopt the single-commodity flow (SCF) formulation, which can be interpreted as an extended formulation of the cutset description of the spanning tree polytope. The SCF formulation provides a good balance between tightness and model complexity.

Under this formulation, every load bus has one unit of fictitious demand ℓ_i , and the substation bus is the only source of the fictitious flow. We adopt the convention that positive ℓ_i indicates injection. Adopting the same line orientation convention from Section II-D, the SCF formulation is

$$\ell_0 = N, \quad (12a)$$

$$\ell_i = -1, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}_1, \quad (12b)$$

$$\ell_i = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} \ell_{ij} - \sum_{(k,i) \in \mathcal{E}} \ell_{ki}, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (12c)$$

$$-s_{ij}N \leq \ell_{ij} \leq s_{ij}N, \quad (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}, \quad (12d)$$

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} s_{ij} = N, \quad (12e)$$

where ℓ_{ij} is the flow of the fictitious load on line $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$. The flow balance constraints (12c) enforce that every load bus must be connected to the substation, and the cardinality constraint (12e) ensures that the resulting connected topology has exactly N closed lines to form a spanning tree.

To account for topology changes, the following big- M -based constraints are added to the LinDistFlow model (9):

$$-s_{ij}M \leq (p_{ij}, q_{ij}) \leq s_{ij}M, \quad (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}. \quad (13)$$

In addition, (9c) is modified as

$$\begin{aligned} v_i - 2(r_{ij}p_{ij} + x_{ij}q_{ij}) - M(1 - s_{ij}) &\leq v_j \\ &\leq v_i - 2(r_{ij}p_{ij} + x_{ij}q_{ij}) + M(1 - s_{ij}), \quad (i, j) \in \mathcal{E} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

F. Compact Representation of Overall Constraints

All DER, network, voltage, and uncertainty constraints (4)–(14) can be written in the following compact form:

$$Ax \geq d - Bp_0 - D\zeta - Cs, \quad (15a)$$

$$\zeta \in \mathcal{U}^T = \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{3T} \mid \|\zeta_t\|_2 \leq 1, t \in \mathcal{T}\}. \quad (15b)$$

where, for notational simplicity, we slightly abuse notation and overload x as the concatenation of all operational variables, including DER power trajectories, bus voltages, line flows, and any auxiliary device-level state variables.

III. CHARACTERIZATION OF ELLIPSOIDAL AGGREGATE FLEXIBILITY REGION

The aggregate flexibility region characterization is a key building block in the proposed reconfiguration framework. Before presenting the formulation and solution method for the optimal reconfiguration problem, we introduce a new algorithm for this key building block. The algorithm is based on Benders decomposition and differs from our previous policy-based approximation method [19]. By exploiting the problem structure, it guarantees finite convergence to the optimal solution, in contrast to the earlier method that provides only an approximate solution with a bounded tightness factor.

A. Definition and Motivation

The substation power injection across the time horizon $p_0 := (p_{0,t})_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ represents the trajectory of the net real power exchanged with the transmission system. Characterizing the set of feasible trajectories p_0 is challenging due to i) network constraints; ii) DER constraints, many of which introduce intertemporal coupling (HVAC thermal dynamics, ES SoC evolution, EV cumulative energy limits); and iii) uncertainty in uncontrollable loads.

The *aggregate flexibility region* is defined as the set of all power trajectories p_0 for which a feasible second-stage variable x exists under all uncertainty realizations:

$$\mathcal{P} = \{p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^T \mid \forall \zeta \in \mathcal{U}^T, \exists x(\zeta) : Ax(\zeta) \geq d - Bp_0 - D\zeta\}, \quad (16)$$

Notice that the Cs term is omitted since we only consider fixed topologies in this section.

Remark 1 (Convexity and Hardness of Exact Characterization). The aggregate flexibility region \mathcal{P} in (16) is convex. To see this, notice that for any fixed uncertainty realization ζ , the corresponding feasible set $\{p_0 \mid \exists x : Ax \geq d - Bp_0 - D\zeta\}$ is convex since it is the projection of a polyhedral set in the (p_0, x) -space onto the p_0 -coordinates. Since \mathcal{P} is the intersection of these convex sets over all $\zeta \in \mathcal{U}^T$, the overall region is convex.

Despite the convexity, explicitly characterizing \mathcal{P} is computationally intractable. Even computing the exact maximum-volume ellipsoid inscribed in \mathcal{P} amounts to projection of high-dimensional polyhedral, which is known to be NP-hard (see, e.g., [19] and references therein). By exploiting problem structure and using Benders decomposition with global optimization in the subproblem, we detail in the remainder of the

section how we obtain a scalable solution method for finding the max-volume inscribing ellipsoid that remains efficient for large distribution networks. \square

B. Problem Formulation

We denote by $\mathcal{E}(Q, c) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid (x - c)^\top Q^{-1}(x - c) \leq 1\}$ an ellipsoid centered at $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $Q \succeq 0$. The ellipsoidal aggregate flexibility region characterization problem can be formulated as the following robust feasibility problem:

$$\max_{Q \succeq 0, c} \log \det Q \quad (17a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \max_{\xi \in \mathcal{E}(Q, c), \zeta \in \mathcal{U}^T} \min_{x \in \mathcal{W}(\xi, \zeta)} g^\top x \leq 0. \quad (17b)$$

The problem seeks to find the maximum-volume ellipsoid satisfying robust feasibility constraints since maximizing $\log \det Q$ maximizes the ellipsoid's volume [31, Sec. 8.3.1]. Here, the ellipsoid $\mathcal{E}(Q, c)$ is an inner approximation of the aggregate flexibility region \mathcal{P} .

The constraint set for the second-stage variable x is

$$\mathcal{W}(\xi, \zeta) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid Ax \geq d - B\xi - D\zeta\}. \quad (18)$$

The inner minimization problem in (17b) is a feasibility check problem: it checks whether there exists a recourse $x(\zeta) \in \mathcal{W}(\xi, \zeta)$ for a given flexibility trajectory ξ and worst-case uncertainty ζ such that the cost $g^\top x(\zeta) \leq 0$. If such a recourse exists for all $\zeta \in \mathcal{U}^T$, then ξ is feasible ($\xi \in \mathcal{P}$). Otherwise, there is an uncertainty realization ζ such that $g^\top x > 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{W}(\xi, \zeta)$, and $\xi \notin \mathcal{P}$.

We introduce nonnegative slack variables in the recourse feasible set $\mathcal{W}(\xi, \zeta)$ so that every operational constraint is relaxed by a slack variable. The objective function minimizes the sum of these slack variables. This construction ensures complete recourse: the feasibility check problem is feasible for all (ξ, ζ) . For brevity, we use the same notation as (15a) to denote the augmented recourse vector and constraint set.

At first glance, model (17) appears to be a semi-infinite problem because the robust feasibility constraint (17b) is equivalent to the following set of infinitely many constraints:

$$g^\top x^e \leq 0, \quad (19a)$$

$$Ax^e \geq d - B\xi^e - D\zeta^e, \quad \forall (\xi^e, \zeta^e) \in \mathcal{E}(Q, c) \times \mathcal{U}^T \quad (19b)$$

In what follows, we derive an exact finite-dimensional reformulation of (19), replacing the infinite set above with a finite collection of constraints amenable to Benders decomposition.

C. Finite-Dimensional Reformulation

We define the cost-to-go function $C(\cdot)$ as the optimal value of the inner minimization problem in (17b) for given (ξ, ζ) :

$$C(\xi, \zeta) = \min_x g^\top x \quad (20a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad Ax \geq d - B\xi - D\zeta \quad (20b)$$

Since the problem has complete recourse, strong duality holds for all (ξ, ζ) pair, so

$$C(\xi, \zeta) = \max_{y \geq 0} (d - B\xi - D\zeta)^\top y \quad (21a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } A^\top y = g \quad (21b)$$

Notice the above dual problem is in standard form, so its feasible region $\mathcal{Y} := \{y \geq 0 \mid A^\top y = g\}$ contains at least one extreme point [32, Col. 2.2]. Let the extreme points be y^1, \dots, y^K , then

$$C(\xi, \zeta) = \max_{i=1, \dots, K} (d - B\xi - D\zeta)^\top y^i. \quad (22)$$

Let the value function $V(Q, c)$ be the optimal value of the max-min problem in (17b), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} V(Q, c) &= \max_{\xi \in \mathcal{E}(Q, c), \zeta \in \mathcal{U}^T} C(\xi, \zeta) \\ &= \max_{\xi \in \mathcal{E}(Q, c), \zeta \in \mathcal{U}^T} \max_{i=1, \dots, K} (d - B\xi - D\zeta)^\top y^i. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

We denote the support function of a set \mathcal{C} by $S_{\mathcal{C}}(y)$, that is, $S_{\mathcal{C}}(y) := \sup \{y^\top x \mid x \in \mathcal{C}\}$. Since the constraint sets \mathcal{Y} and $\mathcal{E}(Q, c) \times \mathcal{U}^T$ are independent, the two maximization problems are interchangeable. Hence $V(Q, c)$ equals the maximum of $\langle d, \cdot \rangle + S_{\mathcal{E}(Q, c)}(\langle -B, \cdot \rangle) + S_{\mathcal{U}^T}(\langle -D, \cdot \rangle)$ over the K extreme points because

$$\begin{aligned} V(Q, c) &= \max_{i=1, \dots, K} \max_{\xi \in \mathcal{E}(Q, c), \zeta \in \mathcal{U}^T} (d - B\xi - D\zeta)^\top y^i \\ &= \max_{i=1, \dots, K} \{d^\top y^i + S_{\mathcal{E}(Q, c)}(-B^\top y^i) + S_{\mathcal{U}^T}(-D^\top y^i)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

To further simplify $V(Q, c)$, we note that the support functions of both the ellipsoid and the Cartesian product of Euclidean unit balls can be represented in the following closed form

$$S_{\mathcal{E}(Q, c)}(z) = z^\top c + \|z\|_Q, \quad (25a)$$

$$S_{\mathcal{U}^T}(z) = \sum_{t=1}^T \|z_{[t]}\|_2, \quad (25b)$$

where $z = (z_{[1]}, \dots, z_{[T]})$ with each block $z_{[t]} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. It follows

$$\begin{aligned} V(Q, c) &= \max_{i=1, \dots, K} \left\{ (d - Bc)^\top y^i + \|B^\top y^i\|_Q \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{t=1}^T \|(D^\top y^i)_{[t]}\|_2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Since K is finite, the robust feasibility constraint (17b) is equivalent to

$$(d - Bc)^\top y^i + \|B^\top y^i\|_Q + \sum_{t=1}^T \|(D^\top y^i)_{[t]}\|_2 \leq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, K, \quad (27)$$

which are convex in (Q, c) since $\|B^\top y^i\|_Q$ is second-order cone (SOC)-representable as $\|Q^{1/2} B^\top y^i\|_2$. Therefore, (17) becomes a convex determinant-maximization problem with a finite (but large) number of SOC cuts. Instead of adding all cuts at once, we generate them on-the-fly using Benders decomposition.

D. Solution Algorithm: Benders Decomposition

Benders decomposition is a classic outer approximation algorithm that partitions a large problem into a master problem and a subproblem. In our case, the master problem solves for the ellipsoid parameters (Q, c) with an incrementally added subset of cuts (27) that shrinks the feasible region from the outside, while the subproblem checks robust feasibility of the candidate ellipsoid by examining its support function over the dual polyhedron. The details of the algorithm are outlined below, along with some remarks on practical implementation.

1) *Master Problem:* The master problem in the k^{th} ($k \leq K$) iteration is

$$\max_{Q \succeq 0, c} \log \det Q \quad (28a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } (d - Bc)^\top y^i + \|B^\top y^i\|_Q + \sum_{t=1}^T \|(D^\top y^i)_{[t]}\|_2 \leq 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}^{(k-1)} \quad (28b)$$

where $\mathcal{I}^{(k-1)} := \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ is the active index set and $y^i, i \in \mathcal{I}^{(k-1)}$ are the added extreme points of \mathcal{Y} . Note the master problem grows by one SOC constraint per iteration. It returns the optimal $(Q^{(k)}, c^{(k)})$ which will subsequently be checked by the subproblem.

2) *Subproblem:* The subproblem employs a separation oracle to examine the feasibility of the candidate ellipsoid and, when the infeasibility is certified, strengthens the master problem by adding a feasibility cut. Specifically, given $(Q^{(k)}, c^{(k)})$ from the master problem, the separation oracle certifies the feasibility of the candidate ellipsoid by verifying the non-positivity of the optimal value $v^{(k)}$ to the following problem:

$$\max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (d - Bc^{(k)})^\top y + \|B^\top y\|_{Q^{(k)}} + \sum_{t=1}^T \|(D^\top y)_{[t]}\|_2 \quad (29)$$

If the optimal value $v^{(k)}$ is non-positive, the feasibility of the candidate ellipsoid to (17) is certified, and the algorithm terminates with the optimal solution $(Q^{(k)}, c^{(k)})$. Otherwise, a new extreme point y^k corresponding to the optimal solution to the subproblem (29) is identified. The index set $\mathcal{I}^{(k-1)}$ is updated, and a new cut is added to the master problem.

3) *Subproblem Reformulation for Improved Global Solver Performance:* It is worth noting that although the master problem (28) is a tractable convex optimization problem, especially when Q has low dimension, the computational bottleneck of the algorithm lies in the subproblem (29), which amounts to solving an ℓ_2 -norm maximization problem over a polytope—a well-known NP-complete problem [33]. Modern global solvers such as Gurobi [34] and BARON [35] handle nonconvex quadratic terms through convex relaxation and spatial branch-and-bound. Simulations show that the solver experiences extremely slow convergence with the subproblem in its original form, even with moderately-sized problems.

To illustrate the issue, let's focus on the sum of ℓ_2 -norm term $\sum_{t=1}^T \|(D^\top y)_{[t]}\|_2$. Internally, the norm expression will be represented in terms of quadratic terms of the form $(d_i^\top y)^2$ where d_i is the i th column of D . When expanded, each such term contains all cross-product terms $y_i y_k$, leading to $O(n_c^2)$ bilinear products, where n_c is the row number of D . Summing over T such norms leads to $O(n_c^2 T)$ distinct bilinear terms. Since modern global solvers build convex relaxation and perform spatial branching for each term, large branch-and-bound trees and weak relaxations ensue.

To mitigate this effect, we introduce an auxiliary vector $u = Dy$. The squared term $(d_i^\top y)^2$ now becomes u_i^2 . We further introduce the auxiliary vector w for the square terms ($w_i = u_i^2$). After additional auxiliary variables for the sum of

$w_{[t]}$ and their square roots are introduced, the maximization of $\sum_{t=1}^T \|(D^\top y)_{[t]}\|_2$ can be reformulated as

$$\max \sum_{t=1}^T v_t \quad (30a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } v_t^2 \leq \left(\frac{\sigma_t + 1}{2}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{\sigma_t - 1}{2}\right)^2, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (30b)$$

$$\mathbb{1}^\top w_{[t]} = \sigma_t, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (30c)$$

$$D^\top y = u, \quad (30d)$$

$$\text{diag}(u)u = w, \quad (30e)$$

where the only nonconvex constraints are (30e). The reformulation reduces the number of bilinear terms from $O(n_c^2 T)$ to $O(T)$. Consequently, it yields significantly tighter convex relaxation for the norms and more efficient branch-and-bound. The computational performance improvements are corroborated in Section V. The reformulation of the Q -weighted vector norm proceeds similarly and is omitted for brevity.

4) *Stopping Criterion:* The algorithm iterates between the master problem and the subproblem until the optimal value of the subproblem (29) becomes non-positive. Since one distinct extreme point is identified in the subproblem every iteration and the total number of extreme points is finite, the algorithm converges to the optimal solution in finite iterations.

IV. RECONFIGURATION FOR DER AGGREGATE FLEXIBILITY REGION OPTIMIZATION

Most existing works assume fixed distribution network topologies when assessing aggregate flexibility. However, modern distribution networks are reconfigurable. In this section, we formulate an optimal reconfiguration problem that optimizes the aggregate flexibility region, which builds upon the problem formulation (17) and the Benders decomposition algorithm developed in Section III.

A. Incorporation of Topology Optimization

We denote by \mathcal{R} the set of all feasible pairs (s, ℓ) of switch status variables and SCF auxiliary flows that satisfy the SCF radiality constraints (12), i.e.,

$$\mathcal{R} = \{(s, \ell) \in \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{E}_s|} \times \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}|} \mid (s, \ell) \text{ satisfies (12)}\}. \quad (31)$$

1) *Original Formulation:* The problem of finding the optimal topology that optimizes the ellipsoidal inner approximation of the aggregate flexibility region can be formulated as the following three-stage robust optimization problem:

$$\max_{Q \succeq 0, c} \log \det Q \quad (32a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \min_{(s, \ell) \in \mathcal{R}} \max_{\xi \in \mathcal{E}(Q, c), \zeta \in \mathcal{U}^T} \min_{x \in \mathcal{W}(\xi, \zeta, s)} g^\top x \leq 0, \quad (32b)$$

where the constraint set for the recourse variables $\mathcal{W}(\xi, \zeta, s)$ is specified in (15a). Similar to Section III, it contains additional slack variables to ensure complete recourse.

The formulation (32) searches for the largest feasible ellipsoidal flexibility region. The feasibility of the region is implied by the existence of a radial topology (the outer minimization problem in (32b)) that satisfies the robust feasibility check, which is characterized by the inner “max-min” problem.

2) *Reformulation:* We leverage the finite-dimensional reformulation of the “max-min” problem in Section III-C to reformulate the semi-infinite problem above. Following the development therein, we obtain the reformulation below:

$$\max_{Q \succeq 0, c} \log \det Q \quad (33a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \min_{(s, \ell) \in \mathcal{R}} (d - Bc - Cs)^\top y^i + \|B^\top y^i\|_Q + \sum_{t=1}^T \|(D^\top y^i)_{[t]}\|_2 \leq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, K. \quad (33b)$$

It is clear that the minimization in (33b) can be dropped without affecting the feasibility of the master variables (Q, c) . Therefore, (33) can be further simplified to arrive at the final formulation for the optimal reconfiguration problem as

$$\max_{Q \succeq 0, c, s, \ell} \log \det Q \quad (34a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } (d - Bc - Cs)^\top y^i + \|B^\top y^i\|_Q + \sum_{t=1}^T \|(D^\top y^i)_{[t]}\|_2 \leq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, K \quad (34b)$$

$$(s, \ell) \in \mathcal{R}. \quad (34c)$$

Comparing the formulation above with the original one with fixed topology (17a) and (27), we see that the problem structures are almost identical, with the major difference being the inclusion of the SCF radiality constraints (34c). This suggests that the problem is amenable to the same Benders decomposition algorithm described in Section III-D.

B. Overall Solution Algorithm

We now have all the components and are ready to present the full solution procedure for the optimal reconfiguration problem for aggregate flexibility region optimization. First, we discuss why the Benders decomposition algorithm developed in Section III-D remains intact despite the consideration of topological changes. The overall algorithm follows.

1) *Applicability of the Original Benders Algorithm:* At first glance, the reconfiguration problem (32) appears to break the Benders structure due to the three-stage framework. However, we see that the switch status variables s appear in the recourse constraint (15b) only on the right-hand side. Therefore, the dual polyhedron \mathcal{Y} remains intact and is independent of the topologies. Thus, the strong-duality-based reformulation still holds. In addition, the variables s enter the Benders cut (34b) only through the linear term $(Cs)^\top y^i$, which ensures that the cuts are still SOC-representable in the master problem. Finally, the minimization aligns with the signs of the inequality constraints (33b) and can therefore be dropped.

2) *Overall Benders Decomposition Algorithm:* The master problem at iteration k is a mixed-integer semidefinite program (MISDP) as follows:

$$\max_{Q \succeq 0, c, s, \ell} \log \det Q \quad (35a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } (d - Bc - Cs)^\top y^i + \|B^\top y^i\|_Q + \sum_{t=1}^T \|(D^\top y^i)_{[t]}\|_2 \leq 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}^{(k-1)} \quad (35b)$$

$$(s, \ell) \in \mathcal{R}. \quad (35c)$$

Algorithm 1 Overall Benders decomposition algorithm for the optimal reconfiguration problem

- 1: Initialize iteration counter $k \leftarrow 0$, index set $\mathcal{I}^{(k)} \leftarrow \emptyset$, tolerance $\varepsilon > 0$, $Q^{(k)}$, $c^{(k)}$, $s^{(k)}$
- 2: **repeat**
- 3: $k \leftarrow k + 1$
- 4: **Solve subproblem** (36) with $(Q^{(k)}, c^{(k)}, s^{(k)})$ to obtain new extreme point y^k and optimal cost $v^{(k)}$.
- 5: **if** $v^{(k)} \leq \varepsilon$ **then**
- 6: **Terminate** and return the optimal solution to the reconfiguration problem (Q^*, c^*, s^*) as $(Q^{(k)}, c^{(k)}, s^{(k)})$
- 7: **else**
- 8: Update $\mathcal{I}^{(k)} \leftarrow \mathcal{I}^{(k-1)} \cup \{y^k\}$
- 9: Add cut $(d - Bc - Cs)^\top y^i + \|B^\top y^i\|_Q + \sum_{t=1}^T \|(D^\top y^i)_{[t]}\|_2 \leq 0$ to the master problem
- 10: **end if**
- 11: **Solve master problem** (35) to obtain $(Q^{(k)}, c^{(k)}, s^{(k)})$
- 12: **until** convergence

Given a master problem solution $(Q^{(k)}, c^{(k)}, s^{(k)})$, the following subproblem is solved to verify its robust feasibility:

$$\max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (d - Bc^{(k)} - Cs^{(k)})^\top y + \|B^\top y\|_{Q^{(k)}} + \sum_{t=1}^T \|(D^\top y)_{[t]}\|_2. \quad (36)$$

When the optimal value is positive, the candidate ellipsoid is infeasible for the given topology. A new extreme point y^k is identified, and a new cut in the form (35b) is added to the master problem. On the other hand, if the optimal value is non-positive, the ellipsoid is feasible and the optimal topology $s^{(k)}$ has been identified.

The overall algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 1.

V. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

A. Experiment Setup

1) *Test Feeder Model*: In this paper, the modified IEEE 123-node test feeder [36], [37] with 6 controllable switches is used to verify the effectiveness of the proposed approach. Fig. 1 shows the position of each switch. Bus 1 is the substation bus. The load bus voltage ranges are $[0.95, 1.05]$ p.u., with the reference voltage set at 4.16 kV. The base power is 1 MVA. The DERs include 5 HVAC units, 5 PV systems, 5 ES systems, 5 controllable loads, and 5 EVs, whose locations are shown in Table I. Loads at the remaining buses are assumed to be uncontrollable. The capacity of each ES system is 100 kWh, with a charge and discharge range of 0 to 100 kW. Their SoCs are constrained between 0.05 and 0.95. The battery capacities of the EVs are assumed to follow a gamma distribution [38], $\Gamma(4.5, 6.3)$. All EVs use level-1 (slow) charging, consistent with typical residential behavior. The maximum and minimum battery capacities are 72 kWh and 10 kWh, respectively. The time interval from 12:00 to 15:00 is selected for illustration purposes in this study, with a 1-hour interval. The power factor of both uncontrollable loads and DER outputs is assumed to be 0.95. For DER parameters, $\alpha_d = 0.9$, $\beta_d \in [-0.011, -0.008]$, and $\eta_d = 0.9$ for all $d \in \mathcal{D}$.

TABLE I
LOCATIONS OF VARIOUS DERs IN THE TEST FEEDER

DER	Node
HVAC	92, 93, 94, 95, 96
Controllable Load	52, 53, 56, 60, 61
PV	11, 13, 34, 42, 55
ES	14, 15, 43, 54, 118
EV	18, 21, 22, 117, 128




Fig. 1. IEEE 123-node test feeder.

2) *Simulation Environment and Software*: All numerical experiments are conducted in MATLAB R2021a on a workstation with an Intel® Xeon® W-1370 CPU (2.90 GHz) and 16 GB of RAM. The MISOCP master problem is solved using YALMIP's branch-and-bound [39], with MOSEK 10.2 [40] as the node solver for the continuous SDP relaxations. Gurobi 12.0 [34] is used to solve the nonconvex subproblem.

B. Improvement of Aggregate Flexibility

We set up three scenarios to compare the aggregate flexibility regions under different topologies with 5% load uncertainty. The open switches for each scenario are listed below:

- Reference topology with linear policy method (LP-REF): (13, 118), (54, 94).
- Reference topology with proposed method (BD-REF): (13, 118), (54, 94).
- Optimal topology with proposed method (BD-OPT): (13, 118), (60, 119).

Fig. 2 shows the power bound of each scenario. Each plot displays the flexibility region ellipsoids for adjacent periods in each scenario. The aggregate flexibility region of LP-REF is 0.110, whereas that for BD-REF reaches 0.264. Thus, the proposed method has a 139% increase over the linear policy method. The linear policy imposes a linear coupling between the second-stage variables and the uncertainty, yielding a conservative feasible region than the proposed method. With topology reconfiguration enabled, BD-OPT achieves a volume of 0.506, representing a 91.56% increase over BD-REF. We see the aggregate flexibility region almost doubles in size after the reconfiguration, which demonstrates the effectiveness of distribution reconfiguration in unlocking DER flexibility.




Fig. 2. Flexibility region comparison.




Fig. 3. Voltage distribution of all samples.

C. Disaggregation-Based Validation of Flexibility Region

To further validate the benefits of network reconfiguration, a disaggregation analysis is conducted. Nine thousand disaggregation cases are simulated by randomly sampling the aggregate power trajectory p_0 and uncertainty realizations ζ . With p_0 and ζ specified, a feasibility problem is formulated to determine whether there exist recourse variables that enable the system to realize the aggregate power trajectory while satisfying all operational constraints. Figure 3 reports the distribution of nodal voltages for all buses and times under BD-OPT. The histogram shows that all bus voltages remain feasible. This disaggregation check suggests the feasibility of the aggregate flexibility region produced by the reconfigured network.

In addition, certain aggregate power trajectories that are achievable under the optimal topology are infeasible under the reference topology. For example, consider the aggregate power demand vector $p_0 = [0.297, 1.000, 0.800, 0.416]$. Figure 4 shows the voltage distribution at 13:00 under the reference topology and the optimal topology. This operating point satisfies all operational constraints under the optimal topology, while the voltages are lower than 0.8 p.u. at bus 117 under the reference topology.

D. Flexibility Under Different Uncertainty Levels

The increase in uncertainty levels shrinks the aggregate flexibility region. Table II illustrates the impact of varying uncertainty levels on flexibility volume. As uncertainty increases, the flexibility region volumes in all three scenarios decline. Despite the uniform decline, there is a clear improvement due to reconfiguration: the improvements of BD-OPT on BD-REF range from 91.67% to 108.3% when the uncertainty levels lie between 5% and 20%. In addition, the results also demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed aggregate flexibility region characterization method. The flexibility region characterized by the proposed method (BD-REF) improves the baseline method based on our previous study (LP-REF) by percentages ranging from 140.0% to 151.2% between 5% and 20%




Fig. 4. Bus voltages at 13:00 (above: reference; below: optimal).

TABLE II
COMPARISON OF AGGREGATE FLEXIBILITY IMPROVEMENT UNDER DIFFERENT UNCERTAINTY LEVELS

Uncertainty Level	LP-REF	BD-REF	BD-OPT
5%	0.110	0.264	0.506
10%	0.083	0.203	0.401
15%	0.061	0.149	0.307
20%	0.043	0.108	0.225

TABLE III
TOPOLOGY UNDER DIFFERENT UNCERTAINTIES

Uncertainty Level	Switches Status			
	(13,118)	(60,109)	(54,94)	(117,123)
5%,10%,20%	0	0	1	1
15%	1	1	0	0

uncertainty. Overall, while the aggregate flexibility shrinks with higher uncertainty, the improvement through Benders decomposition and reconfiguration increases. Additionally, it is important to note that the optimal topology may vary under different uncertainty levels. For instance, Table III presents a comparison of the optimal switch statuses at all four uncertainty levels, with all other switches remaining closed.

E. Computation Time

1) *Comparison of Subproblem Solution Time:* As mentioned above, Gurobi handles nonconvex quadratic terms using a spatial branch-and-bound framework built on convex relaxations. In this process, Gurobi solves convex relaxed problem, whose optimal cost lower bounds that of the original problem and is referred to as Objbound. It also derives feasible solution for the nonconvex problem, whose optimal cost is referred to as Objval. The search terminates when the gap

TABLE IV
COMPARISON OF SUBPROBLEM SOLUTION TIME AND GAP

	Time (s)	Gap (%)	Objval	Objbound
Original	7200.8	24.9	-13.929	-14.276
Reformulation (30)	0.187	0.072	-13.929	-13.930

TABLE V
COMPUTATION TIME OVER DIFFERENT TIME SPANS AND UNCERTAINTY LEVELS

Span-level	LP-REF		BD-REF		BD-OPT	
	Time(s)	Volume	Time(s)	Volume	Time(s)	Volume
2-5	13.55	0.567	28.26	0.731	41.14	0.990
2-10	12.59	0.502	23.33	0.647	33.77	0.888
2-15	13.17	0.441	24.17	0.566	39.35	0.790
2-20	12.50	0.383	28.34	0.490	36.52	0.695
3-5	36.77	0.281	66.32	0.486	265.7	0.765
3-10	36.28	0.231	72.79	0.399	114.4	0.644
3-15	42.58	0.187	74.80	0.323	197.9	0.534
3-20	38.34	0.149	138.2	0.259	257.7	0.433
4-5	96.87	0.110	239.9	0.264	654.2	0.506
4-10	95.83	0.083	374.8	0.203	1516	0.401
4-15	93.93	0.061	488.0	0.149	1455	0.307
4-20	95.43	0.043	1019	0.108	2890	0.225

between Objval and Objbound falls below the tolerance or when the time limit is reached:

$$\text{Gap} = \frac{|\text{Objval} - \text{Objbound}|}{|\text{Objval}|} \quad (37a)$$

To show the efficiency of the reformulation (30), a comparison of the computation time between the original subproblem and the reformulation suggested in (30) is shown in Table IV. The results demonstrate that the reformulation can improve computational performance. The original subproblem reaches the time limit (7200 seconds) with a gap of 24.9%. In contrast, the reformulation is solved within 0.187 seconds, achieving a gap of 0.072%. This confirms that the reformulation can decrease computing time and enables Gurobi to converge.

2) *Comparison of Total Time:* The computational efficiency of the proposed method is evaluated by measuring the time taken for each optimization. Table V presents the computing time over varying time horizons under different uncertainty levels. As maximizing aggregate flexibility region is an hours-ahead scheduling problem, even with hourly updates, the computation remains tractable for practical implementation. In this table, none of the three scenarios shows a clear trend when uncertainty levels increase. However, as the time horizon extends, the computation time increases, reflecting the higher computational demands of longer time horizons.

Although the proposed Benders decomposition approach increases aggregate flexibility, they also lead to higher computation time. This effect becomes more evident as the time horizon increases, indicating a trade-off between achieving bigger flexibility regions and computational efficiency.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper proposes a method to optimize the aggregate flexibility region of DERs through network reconfiguration. The optimal reconfiguration problem is formulated as a three-stage ARO problem, which is subsequently reformulated as a

large-scale MISDP problem and solved by a custom scalable Benders decomposition algorithm. The efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed approach are validated using the IEEE 123-bus test feeder. Additionally, the influence of uncertainty levels and computing time on the flexibility region is analyzed.

The simulation results show the improvement in flexibility region characterization by the proposed method. They also show network reconfiguration improves the aggregate flexibility region by over 91.56% compared to the reference topology. The proposed approach effectively alleviates constraint violations by altering the network topology. The results also suggest the benefit of network reconfiguration in improving the aggregate flexibility region as the uncertainty increases.

APPENDIX A TECHNOLOGY-SPECIFIC DER MODELS

A. HVAC Units

The power consumption of an HVAC unit $d \in \mathcal{D}$ depends on the building's temperature setpoint and the ambient temperature, which is modeled as

$$p_{d,t} \leq -x_{d,t} \leq \bar{p}_{d,t}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (38a)$$

$$\underline{\theta}_{d,t} \leq \theta_{d,t} \leq \bar{\theta}_{d,t}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (38b)$$

$$\theta_{d,t} = \alpha_d \theta_{d,t}^{\text{out}} + (1 - \alpha_d) \theta_{d,t-1} - \beta_d x_{d,t}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}_2, \quad (38c)$$

where $p_{d,t}$ and $\bar{p}_{d,t}$ denote the lower and upper bounds of the real power consumption at time t ; $\theta_{d,t}$ denotes the indoor temperature at time t , with its lower and upper bounds denoted by $\underline{\theta}_{d,t}$ and $\bar{\theta}_{d,t}$, respectively; $\theta_{d,t}^{\text{out}}$ denotes the outdoor temperature at time t . Equation (38c) captures the thermal dynamics of the building. The parameters α_d and β_d follow the model in [41]. The feasible set of HVAC unit d is

$$\mathcal{X}_d := \{x_d \in \mathbb{R}^T \mid \exists \theta_d \text{ s.t. } (x_d, \theta_d) \text{ satisfies (38)}\}. \quad (39)$$

B. ES Systems

An ES system provides flexibility by charging or discharging within its power and energy capacity limits. The feasible power injections of an ES system $d \in \mathcal{D}$ are constrained by:

$$p_{d,t} \leq x_{d,t} \leq \bar{p}_{d,t}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (40a)$$

$$\underline{e}_{d,t} \leq e_{d,t} \leq \bar{e}_{d,t}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (40b)$$

$$e_{d,t} = \eta_d e_{d,t-1} - \tau x_{d,t}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}_2, \quad (40c)$$

where $p_{d,t}$ and $\bar{p}_{d,t}$ are the power limits; $e_{d,t}$ denotes the State of Charge (SoC), with bounds $\underline{e}_{d,t}$ and $\bar{e}_{d,t}$; $\eta_d \in (0, 1)$ is the energy retention factor. The feasible set of ES system d is

$$\mathcal{X}_d := \{x_d \in \mathbb{R}^T \mid \exists e_d \text{ s.t. } (x_d, e_d) \text{ satisfies (40)}\}. \quad (41)$$

C. Controllable Loads

A controllable load adjusts its consumption within predefined bounds. Its feasible set is

$$\mathcal{X}_d := \{x_d \in \mathbb{R}^T \mid p_{d,t} \leq -x_{d,t} \leq \bar{p}_{d,t}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T}\}. \quad (42)$$

This simple model captures the generic flexible load behavior; more complex time-coupled load models can also be incorporated if needed, but they are omitted here for simplicity.

D. Electric Vehicles

The flexibility of an EV arises from its allowable charging and its cumulative energy requirement band [6]. The power consumption of EV $d \in \mathcal{D}$ is modeled as:

$$\underline{p}_{d,t} \leq -x_{d,t} \leq \bar{p}_{d,t}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (43a)$$

$$\underline{e}_{d,t} \leq -\tau \sum_{s=1}^t x_{d,s} \leq \bar{e}_{d,t}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (43b)$$

where $\underline{p}_{d,t}$ and $\bar{p}_{d,t}$ denote the charging power limits; $\underline{e}_{d,t}$ and $\bar{e}_{d,t}$ specify the cumulative energy requirement band. The feasible set of EV d is

$$\mathcal{X}_d := \{x_d \in \mathbb{R}^T \mid x_d \text{ satisfies (43)}\}. \quad (44)$$

REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Wang, B. Chen, J. Wang, and J. Kim, "Decentralized energy management system for networked microgrids in grid-connected and islanded modes," *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 1097–1105, Mar. 2016.
- [2] Z. Wang, B. Chen, J. Wang, M. M. Begović, and C. Chen, "Coordinated energy management of networked microgrids in distribution systems," *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 45–53, Jan. 2015.
- [3] L. Zhao, W. Zhang, H. Hao, and K. Kalsi, "A geometric approach to aggregate flexibility modeling of thermostatically controlled loads," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 4721–4731, Nov. 2017.
- [4] M. Alipour, G. B. Gharehpetian, R. Ahmadihangar, A. Rosin, and J. Kilter, "Energy storage facilities impact on flexibility of active distribution networks: Stochastic approach," *Elect. Power Syst. Res.*, vol. 213, Dec. 2022, Art. no. 108645.
- [5] G. Tian, Q. Z. Sun, and W. Wang, "Real-time flexibility quantification of a building HVAC system for peak demand reduction," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 3862–3874, Sep. 2022.
- [6] N. K. Panda and S. H. Tindemans, "Efficient quantification and representation of aggregate flexibility in electric vehicles," *Electric Power Systems Research*, vol. 235, p. 110811, oct 2024.
- [7] Y. Wen, Z. Hu, S. You, and X. Duan, "Aggregate feasible region of DERs: Exact formulation and approximate models," *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 4405–4423, Nov. 2022.
- [8] A. Churkin, W. Kong, J. N. M. Gutierrez, E. A. M. Ceseña, and P. Mancarella, "Tracing, ranking and valuation of aggregated DER flexibility in active distribution networks," *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 1694–1711, Mar. 2024.
- [9] Y. Wen, Z. Hu, and L. Liu, "Aggregate temporally coupled power flexibility of DERs considering distribution system security constraints," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 3884–3896, Jul. 2023.
- [10] Y. Wen, Z. Hu, J. He, and Y. Guo, "Improved inner approximation for aggregating power flexibility in active distribution networks and its applications," *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 3653–3665, Jul. 2024.
- [11] X. Chen, E. Dall'Anese, C. Zhao, and N. Li, "Aggregate power flexibility in unbalanced distribution systems," *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 258–269, Jan. 2020.
- [12] S. Wang, W. Wu, Q. Chen, J. Yu, and P. Wang, "Stochastic flexibility evaluation for virtual power plant by aggregating distributed energy resources," *CSEE J. Power Energy Syst.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 988–999, May 2024.
- [13] Y. Zhou, C. Essayeh, and T. Morstyn, "Aggregated feasible active power region for distributed energy resources with a distributionally robust joint probabilistic guarantee," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 556–571, Jan. 2025.
- [14] Y. Wen, Z. Hu, X. Chen, Z. Bao, and C. Liu, "Centralized distributionally robust chance-constrained dispatch of integrated transmission-distribution systems," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 2947–2959, Mar. 2024.
- [15] S. Wang, L. Du, B. Cui, and Y. Li, "Multi-factor-coupled, ahead-of-time aggregation of power flexibility under forecast uncertainty," *IEEE Trans. Sustain. Energy*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 892–903, Apr. 2025.
- [16] Z. Tan, H. Zhong, Q. Xia, C. Kang, X. S. Wang, and H. Tang, "Estimating the robust PQ capability of a technical virtual power plant under uncertainties," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 4285–4296, Nov. 2020.
- [17] X. Chen and N. Li, "Leveraging two-stage adaptive robust optimization for power flexibility aggregation," *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 3954–3965, Sep. 2021.
- [18] Q. Li, J. Liu, B. Cui, W. Song, and J. Ye, "Distribution system flexibility characterization: A network-informed data-driven approach," *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1188–1191, Jan. 2024.
- [19] B. Cui, A. Zamzam, and A. Bernstein, "Network-cognizant time-coupled aggregate flexibility of distribution systems under uncertainties," *IEEE Control Syst. Lett.*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 1723–1728, Nov. 2021.
- [20] Z. Tan, A. Yu, H. Zhong, X. Zhang, Q. Xia, and C. Kang, "Optimal virtual battery model for aggregating storage-like resources with network constraints," *CSEE J. Power Energy Syst.*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 1843–1847, Jul. 2024.
- [21] S. Wang and W. Wu, "Aggregate flexibility of virtual power plants with temporal coupling constraints," *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 5043–5051, Nov. 2021.
- [22] M. R. Dorostkar-Ghamsari, M. Fotuhi-Firuzabad, M. Lehtonen, and A. Safdarian, "Value of distribution network reconfiguration in presence of renewable energy resources," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 1879–1888, May 2016.
- [23] H. Li, B. Qin, S. Wang, T. Ding, J. Liu, and H. Wang, "Aggregate power flexibility of multi-energy systems supported by dynamic networks," *Appl. Energy*, vol. 377, Jan. 2025, Art. no. 124565.
- [24] A. Churkin, M. Sanchez-Lopez, M. I. Alizadeh, F. Capitanescu, E. A. M. Ceseña, and P. Mancarella, "Impacts of distribution network reconfiguration on aggregated DER flexibility," in *Proc. IEEE Belgrade PowerTech*, Jun. 2023.
- [25] M. Baran and F. Wu, "Optimal sizing of capacitors placed on a radial distribution system," *IEEE Trans. Power Del.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 735–743, Jan. 1989.
- [26] A. Borghetti, "A mixed-integer linear programming approach for the computation of the minimum-losses radial configuration of electrical distribution networks," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 1264–1273, Aug. 2012.
- [27] E. R. Ramos, A. G. Expósito, J. R. Santos, and F. L. Iborra, "Path-based distribution network modeling: Application to reconfiguration for loss reduction," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 556–564, May 2005.
- [28] M. Lavorato, J. F. Franco, M. J. Rider, and R. Romero, "Imposing radiality constraints in distribution system optimization problems," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 172–180, Feb. 2012.
- [29] M. K. Singh, S. Taheri, V. Kekatos, K. P. Schneider, and C.-C. Liu, "Joint grid topology reconfiguration and design of Watt-VAR curves for DERs," in *Proc. IEEE Power Energy Soc. Gen. Meeting*, 2022, pp. 1–5.
- [30] J. A. Taylor and F. S. Hover, "Convex models of distribution system reconfiguration," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 1407–1413, Aug. 2012.
- [31] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [32] D. Bertsimas and J. N. Tsitsiklis, *Introduction to Linear Optimization*. Belmont, MA, USA: Athena Scientific, 1997, vol. 6.
- [33] O. Mangasarian and T. H. Shiao, "A variable-complexity norm maximization problem," *SIAM J. Algebraic Discrete Methods*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 455–461, Jul. 1986.
- [34] Gurobi Optimization, LLC, *Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual*, Gurobi Optimization, LLC, 2024, version 12.0. [Online]. Available: <https://www.gurobi.com>
- [35] N. V. Sahinidis, *The BARON Optimization Software*, The Optimization Firm, LLC, 2024, version 24.1.13. [Online]. Available: <https://minlp.com>
- [36] L. Bobo, A. Venzke, and S. Chatzivasileiadis, "Second-order cone relaxations of the optimal power flow for active distribution grids: Comparison of methods," *Int. J. Electr. Power Energy Syst.*, vol. 127, May 2021, Art. no. 106625.
- [37] W. H. Kersting, "Radial distribution test feeders," in *Proc. IEEE Power Eng. Soc. Winter Meeting*, Jan. 2001, pp. 908–912.
- [38] Y. Mu, J. Wu, N. Jenkins, H. Jia, and C. Wang, "A spatial-temporal model for grid impact analysis of plug-in electric vehicles," *Appl. Energy*, vol. 114, pp. 456–465, 2014.
- [39] J. Löfberg, "YALMIP: A toolbox for modeling and optimization in MATLAB," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robot. Autom.*, 2004, pp. 284–289.
- [40] MOSEK ApS, *MOSEK Optimizer API and User Guide, Version 10.2*, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://docs.mosek.com>
- [41] N. Li, L. Chen, and S. H. Low, "Optimal demand response based on utility maximization in power networks," in *Proc. IEEE Power Energy Soc. Gen. Meeting*, 2011, pp. 1–8.