

Adaptive Online Optimization for Microgrids with Renewable Energy Sources[★]

Wouter J.A. van Weerelt^{*} Angela Fontan^{**}
Nicola Bastianello^{**}

^{*} *Department of Mathematics, KTH Royal Institute of Technology,
Stockholm, Sweden*

^{**} *School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, and Digital
Futures, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden*

Abstract: In this paper we propose a novel adaptive online optimization algorithm tailored to the management of microgrids with high renewable energy penetration, which can be formulated as a constrained, online optimization problem. The proposed algorithm is characterized by a control-based design that applies the internal model principle, and a system identification routine tasked with identifying such internal model. In addition, in order to ensure the constraints are verified, we integrate a projection onto the constraint set. We showcase promising numerical results for the microgrid use case, highlighting in particular the enhanced adaptability of the proposed algorithm to changes in the internal model. The performance of the proposed algorithm is shown to outperform state-of-the-art alternative in the long-term, ensuring efficient management of the grid.

Keywords: online optimization, online learning, smart grids, control-based optimization, system identification

1. INTRODUCTION

The power grid is undergoing significant changes, driven by the increasing penetration of renewable energy sources and the need to mitigate the climate crisis (Wang et al., 2023). In fact, between 2012 and 2023, renewable electricity expanded at a compound rate of 5.9% compared to the 1.3% of non-renewables (IRENA, 2025). Likewise, renewable energy microgrids have been shown to improve livelihoods, contribute to economic growth as well as enhance both food security and health (Tamasiga et al., 2024). Efficiently exploiting renewable sources to satisfy user demand, while reducing the use of fossil fuels as back-up sources, is however a complex problem. A successful approach to addressing this objective is to leverage *online optimization* (Dall’Anese and Simonetto, 2018; Wang et al., 2023). The key idea is to formulate the grid management problem as an online problem, whose time-variability models the (possibly high frequency) fluctuations in user demand and renewables availability.

Different power grid management problems have been formulated as online optimization problems, and suitable online algorithms have been proposed to solve them. For example, typical optimal power flow problems, which can be solved with online gradient algorithms (Dall’Anese and Simonetto, 2018; Gan and Low, 2016) or ADMM algorithms (Zhang et al., 2017). Likewise, multi-period optimization problems can be solved with other algorithms ranging from dynamic, distributed methods such as (Lesage-Landry and Callaway, 2020) to algorithms grounded in game theory (Vardakas et al., 2015).

These results showcase the promise of the online optimization framework for power grid management. However, there is potential for performance improvements by designing tailored online algorithms. Indeed, online algorithms can be largely divided into two groups: *unstructured*, which are “model-agnostic” in that they do not exploit information on the time-variability of the problem, and *structured*, which are instead “model-based” (Simonetto et al., 2020). By their design, structured methods can achieve higher performance than the unstructured algorithms currently being applied to grid management problems. Therefore the goal of this paper is to showcase the use of a novel, structured algorithm to the solution of these problems.

Our proposed algorithm in particular is designed adopting a “control-based” approach, which has been successfully leveraged to achieve near-zero asymptotic optimality error in a variety of settings, including unconstrained (Bastianello et al., 2024), constrained (Casti et al., 2025), distributed (van Weerelt and Bastianello, 2025) and stochas-

[★] Corresponding author: N. Bastianello (nicolba@kth.se)

The work of W.J.A. van Weerelt was supported by the Digital Futures Summer Research Internship Program.

The work of A. Fontan was supported by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and Software Program (WASP) funded by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation.

The work of N. Bastianello was partially supported by the EU Horizon Research and Innovation Actions program under Grant 101070162.

tic (Casti and Zampieri, 2025). The success of these algorithms comes from exploiting a model of the online problem to enhance performance. However, the knowledge of this internal model might not be available, especially in a power grid context. Therefore, in this paper we build on the algorithm proposed in (van Weerelt et al., 2025) which adapts to the online problem by concurrently identifying the internal model, and applying a control-based algorithm using the identified model. We focus in particular on a demand response application in the context of microgrids with renewable energy sources. Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose a novel, adaptive online algorithm designed using control theory. The algorithm, differently from previous works, incorporates an identification routine which adapts online to changes in the demand and availability profiles.
- We evaluate the performance of the proposed algorithm for a microgrid which integrates renewable energy sources. The results show how our algorithm outperforms, in the long-term, unstructured methods.

2. PROBLEM FORMULATION

In this section we formulate the specific power grid management problem that we address. We focus on deploying online optimization algorithms in the context of demand response in power distribution systems (Lesage-Landry and Callaway, 2020). More precisely, we consider the management of controllable distributed energy resources (DERs) on a microgrid, as done in Ospina et al. (2022).

A microgrid can be seen as a small portion of a larger power distribution network (Bolognani and Zampieri, 2013). Such a microgrid hosts a number of loads and several small modular generation systems, which can provide power and heat (Lopes et al., 2006). Examples of microgrids include small urban areas, a shopping center or an industrial park. With the increased penetration of renewables in microgrids, more controllable DERs must be used to counteract the volatility and uncertainty of the grid (Wang et al., 2023). Examples of DERs in a residential microgrid may include solar panels and battery energy storage systems. Typically, microgrids are considered either directed or undirected graphs with certain topology, connected to the transmission grid at a point of common coupling, or PCC.

We translate the problem of managing the microgrid into an online optimization problem as follows. We consider n controllable inputs $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and unknown exogenous inputs $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^w$. As in (Ospina et al., 2022), we model the microgrid as an algebraic map $\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$ where $\mathcal{M} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^w \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^y$ is well defined. The problem then can be expressed as:

$$\mathbf{x}_{*,k} \in \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_k} := C_k(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}_k) + \mathbf{U}_k(\mathbf{x})). \quad (1)$$

Here, we consider $k \in \mathbb{N}$ to be the time index, $\mathcal{X}_k \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ to be a time-varying, convex constraint set for inputs \mathbf{x} , $\mathbf{x} \mapsto U_k(\mathbf{x})$ to be a cost associated with inputs, and $\mathbf{y} \mapsto C_k(\mathbf{y})$ to be a cost associated with outputs. The time-varying constraint set depends on physical constraints of the system and the DERs. We define the algebraic map as $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}_k) = \mathbf{J}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{H}\mathbf{w}_k$, which is built based on a

linearization of the power flow equations (Ospina et al., 2022; Dall’Anese and Simonetto, 2018). We remark that the matrices \mathbf{J} and \mathbf{H} encode physical information of microgrid and are dependent on the grid’s components and topology. Furthermore, \mathbf{y}_k represents the net real power exchange at some points of common coupling (PCCs). It is further assumed that the power consumed by the uncontrollable loads \mathbf{w} cannot be individually measured, meaning that measurements of \mathbf{y}_k are instead available from meters and sensing units. The function $\mathbf{U}_k(\mathbf{x})$ in (1) represents user dissatisfaction which is considered to be strongly-convex and quadratic. Finally, we assume the cost associated with the outputs to be defined as: $C_k(\mathbf{y}_k) = \frac{\beta}{2} \|\mathbf{y}_k - \mathbf{y}_{k,\text{ref}}\|^2$, where $\mathbf{y}_{k,\text{ref}}$ is a time-varying demand response setpoint for the PCCs and $\beta > 0$ is a given parameter.

With these assumptions in place, problem (1) becomes the following:

$$\mathbf{x}_{*,k} \in \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_k} := \frac{\beta}{2} \|\mathbf{J}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{H}\mathbf{w}_k - \mathbf{y}_{k,\text{ref}}\|^2 + \mathbf{U}_k(\mathbf{x}). \quad (2)$$

However, since we assume uncontrollable loads to be unmeasurable, we need to reformulate this problem into:

$$\mathbf{x}_{*,k} \in \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_k} := \frac{\beta}{2} \|\mathbf{y}_k - \mathbf{y}_{k,\text{ref}}\|^2 + \mathbf{U}_k(\mathbf{x}). \quad (3)$$

Problem (3) is a constrained, online optimization problem, with a smooth cost function and a convex constraint set. This problem in principle can be solved with an online version of projected gradient descent (Nocedal and Wright, 2006). However, the resulting algorithm would be unstructured, and in the next section we design a structured algorithm instead, aiming for improved performance.

3. PROPOSED ALGORITHM

As discussed in section 1, in this paper we propose a control-based algorithm design to solve (3). The problem has a quadratic cost but also a constraint set. Therefore, the control-based algorithm proposed in (Bastianello et al., 2024) (and the counterpart for linearly constrained problems of (Casti et al., 2025)) does not apply to it directly. In section 3.1 thus we revise the algorithm design of (Bastianello et al., 2024), based on the internal model principle, to incorporate a projection onto the constraint set \mathcal{X}_t . Additionally, to overcome the unmeasurability of some loads, in section 3.2 we design an identification routine for the internal model. The result is an online algorithm which automatically adapts to the demand and availability profile in the microgrid, while ensuring improved performance through the control-based design.

3.1 Projected control-based algorithm

Abstracting from (3), we are interested in solving the online constrained, quadratic problem

$$\mathbf{x}_{*,k} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_k} f_k(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{b}_k, \quad k \in \mathbb{N} \quad (4)$$

under the following assumptions.

Assumption 1. (Cost and constraint set). The symmetric matrix \mathbf{A} is such that $\underline{\lambda} \mathbf{I} \preceq \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}^\top \preceq \bar{\lambda} \mathbf{I}$, with $0 < \underline{\lambda} < \bar{\lambda} < \infty$. $\mathcal{X}_k \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a convex, non-empty set.

Assumption 2. (Model of \mathbf{b}_k). There exists a rational \mathcal{Z} -transform for the sequence $\{\mathbf{b}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, namely:

$$\mathcal{Z}[\mathbf{b}_k] = \mathbf{B}(z) = \frac{\mathbf{B}_N(z)}{\mathbf{B}_D(z)}, \quad \mathbf{B}_D(z) = z^m + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} d_i z^i, \quad (5)$$

with $\mathbf{B}_N(z) = \sum_{i=0}^p \mathbf{u}_i z^i$, $p \leq m$. We assume that the poles of $\mathbf{B}_D(z)$ are all marginally or asymptotically stable.

Assumption 1 ensures that the cost functions $\{f_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are λ -strongly convex and $\bar{\lambda}$ -smooth for any time $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and that a (unique) solution to (4) always exists. This assumption is verified in the setting of (3). Assumption 2 ensures that the sequence of linear terms $\{\mathbf{b}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ admits a model which can serve as internal model when designing the control-based algorithm.

Disregarding the constraints in (4) for now (*i.e.* $\mathcal{X}_k \equiv \mathbb{R}^n$), we can apply (Bastianello et al., 2024) to design the following algorithm:

$$\mathbf{w}_{k+1} = (\mathbf{F} \otimes \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{w}_k + (\mathbf{G} \otimes \mathbf{I}) \nabla f_k(\mathbf{x}_k) \quad (6a)$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = (\mathbf{K} \otimes \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{w}_{k+1} \quad (6b)$$

where \mathbf{w} is the internal state of the algorithm, and

$$\mathbf{F} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots \\ & & \ddots & \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ -d_0 & \cdots & \cdots & -d_{m-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{G} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

$$\mathbf{K} = [c_0 \ c_1 \ \cdots \ c_{m-1}].$$

The controller \mathbf{K} can be computed in order to stabilize the closed loop if the internal model $\mathbf{B}_D(z)$ is known.

In the use case described in section 2, the problem is constrained by \mathcal{X}_k , and thus (6) does not directly apply. The idea then is to incorporate into the algorithm a projection onto \mathcal{X}_k , yielding the following:

$$\mathbf{w}_{k+1} = (\mathbf{F} \otimes \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{w}_k + (\mathbf{G} \otimes \mathbf{I}) \nabla f_k(\mathbf{x}'_k) \quad (8a)$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = (\mathbf{K} \otimes \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{w}_{k+1} \quad (8b)$$

$$\mathbf{x}'_{k+1} = \text{proj}_{\mathcal{X}_k}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) \quad (8c)$$

where the output of (6) is filtered by the projection, ensuring that \mathbf{x}'_k belongs to the constraint set. As observed in (Casti et al., 2025), however, projections act as nonlinearities similar to saturations. But since (6) is designed using linear control tools, a saturation might significantly impact performance. Therefore, following the solution proposed in (Casti et al., 2025), we add an anti-windup module to (8) to reduce the impact of the nonlinear projection. The result is the algorithm:

$$\mathbf{w}_{k+1} = (\mathbf{F} \otimes \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{w}_k + (\mathbf{G} \otimes \mathbf{I}) (\nabla f_k(\mathbf{x}'_k) - \rho(\mathbf{x}'_k - \mathbf{x}_k)) \quad (9a)$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = (\mathbf{K} \otimes \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{w}_{k+1} \quad (9b)$$

$$\mathbf{x}'_{k+1} = \text{proj}_{\mathcal{X}_k}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) \quad (9c)$$

where $\rho > 0$ is the tunable anti-windup parameter. Figure 1 depicts this algorithm as a block diagram.

Algorithm (9) in principle could be applied to solve the microgrid management problem (3). However, Assumption 2 does not hold in practice, due to the presence of unmeasurable loads. This implies that the model of the linear term in (3), which is

$$\mathbf{b}_k = \beta \mathbf{J}^\top (\mathbf{H} \mathbf{w}_k - \mathbf{y}_{k,\text{ref}}) + \mathbf{u}_{2,k},$$




Fig. 1. Block diagram of algorithm (9)

is not known a priori, where $\mathbf{u}_{2,k}$ is the linear time-varying term of \mathbf{U}_k (See section 4 for the details). Indeed, \mathbf{b}_k depends on the uncontrollable and unmeasurable loads \mathbf{w}_k , and on \mathbf{J} , \mathbf{H} , which encode physical information on the microgrid and might not be available.

The solution then, outlined in the next section, is to gather information on \mathbf{b}_k in an online fashion, reconstructing the internal model which can then be used in (9).

3.2 Online identification routine

The goal of this section is to design an online identification routine that reconstructs the internal model of \mathbf{b}_k . We start by introducing the approach proposed in (van Weerelt et al., 2025), and then show how to integrate projections into it. The algorithm of (van Weerelt et al., 2025) is split in two phases, depicted in Figure 2. The first phase




Fig. 2. Flowchart of the proposed algorithm

(top box) involves identifying the internal model based on the output of the online gradient descent (ignoring the projection for now):

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k - h \nabla f_k(\mathbf{x}_k). \quad (10)$$

This can be considered a warm-up phase, where a simple (unstructured) algorithm is applied to start collecting information on the internal model. The specific identification procedure we use is *recursive least squares* (RLS), which is computationally efficient and lends itself to an online implementation (Lai and Wei, 1982). Once the solution output by the online gradient no longer improves, in the sense that the *a posteriori* error given by RL, *i.e.*, how well the identified internal model coefficients match the true ones, settles on a roughly constant value, the second phase (bottom box in Figure 2) is triggered. In this phase, the

internal model identified during the first phase is used to compute the controller (\mathbf{K}) which defines algorithm (6) (again, ignoring the projection for now). However, the internal model at this stage might not be correctly identified or, more importantly, it might be changing over time. Therefore, in the second phase the recursive least squares identification runs concurrently with the online algorithm, to improve identification accuracy or adapt to changes. The re-identified model is then used to recompute the controller when the identification error settles on an approximately constant value.

We are now ready to concretely outline the identification routine we apply. To apply recursive least squares (RLS), we need a recurrence relating the output of the online algorithm (be it online gradient descent in phase one or the control-based method in phase two) to the internal model coefficients (Guo, 1994). To this end, consider the \mathcal{Z} -transform of the output of the online gradient descent in phase one, $\mathcal{Z}\{\mathbf{x}_{k+1}\} = \mathcal{Z}\{\mathbf{x}_k - h\nabla f_k(\mathbf{x}_k)\}$, which yields:

$$z\mathbf{X}(z) = (\mathbf{I} - h\mathbf{A})\mathbf{X}(z) - h\mathbf{B}(z). \quad (11)$$

Rewriting the \mathcal{Z} -transforms as infinite sums (Graf, 2004) and using Assumption 2 yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\mathbf{x}_{k+m} + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} d_i \mathbf{x}_{k+i} \right) z^{-k} = \\ -h \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\mathbf{I} - h\mathbf{A})^k z^{-k-1} \sum_{j=0}^p \mathbf{u}_j z^j \end{aligned}$$

which we simplify to

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+m} + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} d_i \mathbf{x}_{k+i} = -h \sum_{j=0}^p (\mathbf{I} - h\mathbf{A})^{k-1+j} \mathbf{u}_j z^j. \quad (12)$$

By Assumption 1, \mathbf{A} is symmetric positive definite, and selecting the stepsize $h < 2/\bar{\lambda}$, it holds that:

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{I} - h\mathbf{A})^{k-1+j} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (13)$$

This results in the following recurrence relation:

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+m} + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} d_i \mathbf{x}_{k+i} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \forall k \geq m+1, \quad (14)$$

where recall that d_i are the coefficients of the internal model $B_D(z)$ (see Assumption 2), and m is its order. It is then possible to apply RLS to this recurrence and identify the coefficients d_i 's. In particular, let $\mathbf{d} = [d_0, \dots, d_{m-1}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be the vector of coefficients of the polynomial $B_D(z)$. Then RLS identifies it using the recursion:

$$\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{k+1} = \hat{\mathbf{d}}_k + \mathbf{L}_k(\mathbf{y}_k - \phi_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{d}}_k), \quad (15)$$

where \mathbf{y}_k denotes the observation data, ϕ_k denotes the regressor, and \mathbf{L}_k denotes the gain (Guo, 1994): with \mathbf{L}_k given by:

$$\mathbf{L}_k = \mathbf{P}_k \phi_k (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \phi_k^\top \mathbf{P}_k \phi_k)^{-1}, \quad (16)$$

and:

$$\mathbf{P}_{k+1} = \frac{1}{\alpha} (\mathbf{P}_k - \mathbf{P}_k \phi_k (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \phi_k^\top \mathbf{P}_k \phi_k)^{-1} \phi_k^\top \mathbf{P}_k). \quad (17)$$

In these equations, $\mathbf{P}_0 > 0$, and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is a forgetting factor which weights recent entries more heavily (Guo, 1994).

A similar identification routine can be applied during phase two, when the control-based algorithm (6) is being applied. The controller is designed using the inexact internal model $\hat{B}_D(z) = z^m + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \hat{d}_i z^i$, computed during phase one, to yield

$$C(z) = \frac{C_N(z)}{\hat{B}_D(z)}. \quad (18)$$

The resulting closed-loop system is then characterized by the \mathcal{Z} -transform:

$$\mathbf{X}(z) = \left(\hat{B}_D(z)\mathbf{I} - C_N(z)\mathbf{A} \right)^{-1} \frac{\mathbf{B}_N(z)C_N(z)}{B_D(z)}$$

and hence

$$B_D(z)\mathbf{X}(z) = \left(\hat{B}_D(z)\mathbf{I} - C_N(z)\mathbf{A} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_N(z)C_N(z). \quad (19)$$

Using again the infinite sum expression for \mathcal{Z} -transforms allows to rewrite (19) as:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\mathbf{x}_{k+m} + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} d_i \mathbf{x}_{k+i} \right) z^{-k} = \\ \left(\hat{B}_D(z)\mathbf{I} - C_N(z)\mathbf{A} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_N(z)C_N(z) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Since the right-hand side of the equation is made up of two anti-causal signals, and $C_N(z)$ is chosen so that $\left(\hat{B}_D(z)\mathbf{I} - C_N(z)\mathbf{A} \right)$ is stable, then the resulting recurrence is:

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+m} + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} d_i \mathbf{x}_{k+i} = \mathbf{0}, \quad k \geq m+1. \quad (21a)$$

which can be written as $\mathbf{x}_k = \phi_k^\top \mathbf{d}$ with $\phi_k = [\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{x}_{k-2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{k-m}]^\top$ and $\mathbf{d} = [d_0, \dots, d_{m-1}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$. We can then apply recursive least squares to identify \mathbf{d} , along the same lines as (15).

We are now ready to show how to incorporate the projections into this identification scheme. We do so by changing the data we feed to the RLS. We continue to use the recurrence introduced in (21a) to identify the internal model, however the input data is now the projected outputs of either online gradient descent or the control-based algorithm. In this case, assuming we remain inside the feasible region the assumptions used to identify the system hold. In the case that we remain outside of the constrained solution space for too long, the algorithm will simply fallback to POGD as the identified internal model will not be sufficiently accurate.

4. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section we validate the algorithm design proposed in section 3 for the microgrid management problem described in section 2, comparing it to alternative algorithms.

4.1 Simulation set-up

As discussed in section 2, the objective is to control some number of distributed energy resources within a microgrid, where there are a number of uncontrollable loads present, as well as some number of points of common coupling (PCCs). More concretely, we consider 6 DERs and 2 PCCs, resulting in the following problem dimensions:

$\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^6$, $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $\mathbf{J} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 6}$, $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$, $\mathbf{y}_{k,\text{ref}} \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Furthermore, as we consider the context of demand response in power systems, we consider the uncontrollable loads to be periodic (e.g. each day has a similar user demand profile) (Ospina et al., 2022); in particular: $\mathbf{w}_k = \sin(0.005k)$. The reference signal, $\mathbf{y}_{k,\text{ref}}$, is generated as a portion of a triangular wave. Both the uncontrollable load and the reference signal at each of the two PCCs is shown in Figure 3.




Fig. 3. Reference signal $\mathbf{y}_{k,\text{ref}}$ and overall non-controllable load at PCCs

The matrices \mathbf{H} and \mathbf{J} are randomly generated to ensure a realistic problem formulation, while guaranteeing that Assumption 1 holds. In particular, \mathbf{H} and $\mathbf{J}^\top \mathbf{J}$ are generated positive semi-definite with eigenvalues in $[1, 5]$.

These settings above then define the “engineering” part of the cost in (3), and we need to define the user dissatisfaction part. This function may represent, for example, the charging rate of an electric vehicle, or relative indoor temperature if the DER is an AC unit (Ospina et al., 2022). Mathematically, we define the following model for $U_k(\mathbf{x})$:

$$U_k(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{U}_1 \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{u}_{2,k} + u_{3,k} \quad (22)$$

where the values of $\mathbf{U}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{6 \times 6}$, $\mathbf{u}_{2,k} \in \mathbb{R}^6$, $u_{3,k} \in \mathbb{R}$ are unknown and potentially time-varying. \mathbf{U}_1 is generated as a positive definite matrix with eigenvalues in $(0, 1]$. $\mathbf{u}_{2,k}$ and $u_{3,k}$ instead switch between two randomly generated values (taken from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$) to model changes in the preferences of the DER owners. The first value is used in the first and third quarters of the simulation, the second value in the remaining times. The resulting cost of (3) is then a strongly convex quadratic cost, whose Hessian has eigenvalues in $[\underline{\lambda}, \bar{\lambda}] = [1, 6]$.

To conclude, we need to define the time-varying constraint set \mathcal{X}_k . In particular, we impose the following power limits at the DERs: $\mathcal{X}_k = [-10, 10] \times [-6, 6] \times [3, 13] \times [7, 17] \times [0, 28] \times [3, 32]$.

4.2 Simulation results

We are now ready to test the proposed algorithm in the set-up of the previous section. In particular, we compare the proposed algorithm to the baseline (unstructured) projected online gradient descent (POGD) alternative, as well as to the projected control-based algorithm with anti-windup (PCBW) defined by (9). The proposed algorithm, P-SIMBO, refers to the algorithm represented by Figure 2,

and introduced in section 3.¹ We evaluate the algorithms’ performance in terms of tracking error $\|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_{*,k}\|$ where the optimal solutions $\mathbf{x}_{*,k}$ are computed via static optimization at each timestep using *cvxpy* (Diamond and Boyd, 2016). The simulations were implemented using *tvopt* (Bastianello, 2021).

We start by presenting in Figure 4 the evolution of the tracking error across the simulation. For the control-based algorithm, which does not employ identification, we use the internal model of a sine squared, given as:

$$\mathcal{Z}\{\sin^2(\omega_0 n)\} = \frac{\sin^2(\omega_0) z(z+1)}{(z-1)(z^2 - 2\cos(2\omega_0)z + 1)}, \quad (23)$$

where $\omega_0 = 10$. based on testing. As we can see from




Fig. 4. Tracking error comparison

Figure 4, initially both control-based algorithms perform similarly to the baseline of POGD. This is due to the fact that both control-based algorithms are undergoing a transient where performance is dominated by the suboptimality of the initial conditions (see similar behaviors in (Bastianello et al., 2024; Casti et al., 2025)). Notice also that P-SIMBO coincides with POGD for the first ~ 500 iterations (phase 1 in Figure 2). After ~ 2000 timesteps the user dissatisfaction changes, and both control-based algorithms significantly outperform POGD, both achieving tracking errors close to 10^{-6} . Notice in particular that the tracking error of P-SIMBO consistently stays small. Subsequent changes in the user dissatisfaction cost degrade the performance after ~ 4000 timesteps, but for the most part both control-based algorithms still outperform the POGD baseline. Transients where P-SIMBO yields worse performance are due to the internal model not being precisely identified yet after a change in the cost function.

Clearly a realistic simulation such as this deviates from the theoretical assumptions made in section 3.1, yielding a more complex behavior than e.g. simulations in (Bastianello et al., 2024). Nonetheless, inspecting the long-term performance of the algorithms still allows us to highlight the improvement that control-based algorithms

¹ We remark that we tested projected SIMBO with the addition of anti-windup, but the results were not satisfying. This is an interesting direction of future research.

provide over the unstructured POGD. In particular, Figure 5 depicts the cumulative tracking error across the simulation. We can see that, as observed before, there




Fig. 5. Cumulative tracking error comparison

is an initial transient with similar performance for all algorithms. Then, as time progresses, the control-based algorithms outperform POGD and continue to do so in the long term. This demonstrates that a tailored online algorithm design has better performance than an unstructured algorithm, even in realistic scenarios which do not satisfy modeling assumptions precisely. We remark that between timesteps 2000 and 6000, P-SIMBO and PCBW have largely comparable performance, while P-SIMBO's performance degrades afterwards, but still outperforming POGD. This later degradation of the performance, as discussed above, is due to changes in the user dissatisfaction cost which in turn require re-identification of the model. And while the model is not yet correctly identified, the performance is worse.

One important point to notice, however, is that P-SIMBO is entirely reliant on data about the online problem that is collected in an online fashion. On the other hand, PCBW owes its better performance on a more exact internal model that was selected offline from "historical" data on the problem. But in many practical scenarios, historical data to identify a model might not be available, or the model might change over time. For this reason, identifying the internal model online as in P-SIMBO requires less information on the problem, and ensures adaptability to rapidly changing contexts, such as those which arise in microgrids with a high penetration of renewables. In this sense, PCBW should be seen as an optimal baseline, which the adaptive algorithm would match if the microgrid conditions were to remain constant. The strength of P-SIMBO then lies in its adaptability to the problem.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper we develop a novel online algorithm for problems with a (time-varying) convex constraint set, motivated by the management of microgrids with renewable sources. The algorithm is characterized by a control-based design that applies the internal model principle,

and a system identification routine tasked with identifying such internal model. In addition, in order to ensure the constraints are verified, we integrate a projection onto the constraint set. We showcase promising numerical results for the microgrid use case, highlighting in particular the enhanced adaptability of the proposed algorithm to changes in the internal model. Future work will address the use of more complex internal models (*e.g.* non-linear or stochastic) to design the algorithm, with the goal of improving performance for realistic problems such as the management of a microgrid.

REFERENCES

- Bastianello, N. (2021). *tvopt: A python framework for time-varying optimization*. In *2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 227–232.
- Bastianello, N., Carli, R., and Zampieri, S. (2024). Internal model-based online optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 69, 689–696.
- Bolognani, S. and Zampieri, S. (2013). A distributed control strategy for reactive power compensation in smart microgrids. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(11), 2818–2833.
- Casti, U., Bastianello, N., Carli, R., and Zampieri, S. (2025). A control theoretical approach to online constrained optimization. *Automatica*, 176, 112107.
- Casti, U. and Zampieri, S. (2025). Stochastic models for online optimization. In *2025 European Control Conference (ECC)*, 1880–1885.
- Dall'Anese, E. and Simonetto, A. (2018). Optimal power flow pursuit. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 9(2), 942–952.
- Diamond, S. and Boyd, S. (2016). CVXPY: A Python-embedded modeling language for convex optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(83), 1–5.
- Gan, L. and Low, S.H. (2016). An online gradient algorithm for optimal power flow on radial networks. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 34(3), 625–638.
- Graf, U. (2004). *z-Transformation*, 77–113. Birkhäuser Basel, Basel.
- Guo, L. (1994). Stability of recursive stochastic tracking algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 32, 1195–1225.
- IRENA (2025). *Renewable energy statistics 2025*. International Renewable Energy Agency.
- Lai, T.L. and Wei, C.Z. (1982). Least squares estimates in stochastic regression models with applications to identification and control of dynamic systems. *The Annals of Statistics*, 10(1), 154–166.
- Lesage-Landry, A. and Callaway, D.S. (2020). Dynamic and distributed online convex optimization for demand response of commercial buildings. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 4(3), 632–637.
- Lopes, J., Moreira, C., and Madureira, A. (2006). Defining control strategies for microgrids islanded operation. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 21(2), 916–924.
- Nocedal, J. and Wright, S.J. (2006). *Numerical optimization*. Springer.
- Ospina, A.M., Bastianello, N., and Dall'Anese, E. (2022). Feedback-based optimization with sub-weibull gradient errors and intermittent updates. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 6, 2521–2526.

- Simonetto, A., Dall’Anese, E., Paternain, S., Leus, G., and Giannakis, G.B. (2020). Time-varying convex optimization: Time-structured algorithms and applications. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 108, 2032–2048.
- Tamasiga, P., Onyeaka, H., Altaghlibi, M., Bakwena, M., and houssin Ouassou, E. (2024). Empowering communities beyond wires: Renewable energy microgrids and the impacts on energy poverty and socio-economic outcomes. *Energy Reports*, 12, 4475–4488.
- van Weerelt, W.J.A. and Bastianello, N. (2025). Control-based online distributed optimization. arXiv:2508.15498.
- van Weerelt, W.J.A., Zhang, L., Zhang, S., and Bastianello, N. (2025). Self-identifying internal model-based online optimization. arXiv:2511.20411.
- Vardakas, J.S., Zorba, N., and Verikoukis, C.V. (2015). A survey on demand response programs in smart grids: Pricing methods and optimization algorithms. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 17(1), 152–178.
- Wang, Z., Wei, W., Pang, J.Z.F., Liu, F., Yang, B., Guan, X., and Mei, S. (2023). Online optimization in power systems with high penetration of renewable generation: Advances and prospects. *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica*, 10(4), 839–858.
- Zhang, Y., Dall’Anese, E., and Hong, M. (2017). Dynamic admm for real-time optimal power flow. In *2017 IEEE Global Conference on Signal and Information Processing (GlobalSIP)*, 1085–1089.