

Morenet documentation

Tillmann Mühlpfordt

April 16, 2020

Abstract

This documents sketches the idea to solve the distributed power flow problem as a distributed nonlinear least-squares problem.

1 Problem formulation

The mathematical formulation for the decentralized power flow problem reads

$$g_i^{\text{pf}}(x_i, z_i) = 0, \quad (1a)$$

$$g_i^{\text{bus}}(x_i) = 0, \quad (1b)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n^{\text{reg}}} A_i \begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ z_i \end{bmatrix} = 0, \quad (1c)$$

where the consensus matrices $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{4n^{\text{conn}} \times (4n_i^{\text{core}} + 2n_i^{\text{copy}})}$ enforce equality of the voltage angle and the voltage magnitude at the copy buses and their respective original buses. Mathematically speaking, Problem 1 is a system of nonlinear equations; there are as many equations as there are unknowns. In principle, Problem 1 can be solved by Newton's method. However, we would like to explore alternatives to Newton's method, such as distributed optimization.

2 Problem solution

Currently, we solve Problem 1 as a distributed *feasibility* problem, namely

$$\min_{x_i, z_i \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n^{\text{reg}}\}} 0 \quad \text{s. t.} \quad (2a)$$

$$g_i^{\text{pf}}(x_i, z_i) = 0, \quad (2b)$$

$$g_i^{\text{bus}}(x_i) = 0, \quad (2c)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n^{\text{reg}}} A_i \begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ z_i \end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (2d)$$

From our experience so far, we can say that Aladin is a viable method, but ADMM is not. Solving a distributed feasibility problem, however, is not the only way. We can also think of solving Problem 1 as a

Table 1: Our experience so far with solving Problem 1. A “—” indicates further investigations are required.

Method	Solver	Number of iterations	Wall clock time	Remark
ADMM	Casadi & Ipopt	many	not acceptable	
	Casadi & Ipopt	few	acceptable	does not scale well to larger problems ($N \approx 100$)
Aladin	fmincon & Jacobian	few	acceptable	tends to become slow for larger problems ($N \approx 300$)
	Ipopt & Jacobian	—	—	—
Least squares	—	—	—	—

distributed least-squares problem of the form

$$\min_{x_i, z_i \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n^{\text{reg}}\}} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} g_i^{\text{pf}}(x_i, z_i) \\ g_i^{\text{bus}}(x_i) \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2 \quad \text{s. t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n^{\text{reg}}} A_i \begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ z_i \end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (3a)$$

Clearly, the solution to Problem 2 is the solution to Problem 3 (why?). Hence, we can think of solving the least-squares Problem 3 as a necessary condition.

2.1 Next steps

The goal is to explore how to solve the distributed power flow problem via a distributed least-squares Problem 3. To do so, there are a couple of immediate next steps

- Familiarize with nonlinear least-squares (Gauss-Newton, Levenberg-Marquardt, etc)
- Solve a prototypical distributed power flow problem.
- Use the Jacobian matrix that is given analytically as a return value from [generate_distributed_problem](#).
- Work out how the Aladin algorithm simplifies in the absence of both equality and inequality constraints. (Note that inequality constraints in the form of lower/upper bounds might still be necessary, i.e. $\underline{x} \leq x \leq \bar{x}$)
- Exploit the problem structure as much as possible. As a general rule, the bigger the problem, the more it pays off to exploit sparsity etc.

Table 1 lists the experience we have gained thus far. The goal is to fill out everything that is related to least squares.