Allowing Stable Groups of Prosumers to Enter the Market through Proper Aggregation

Nicolas Gensollen
CNRS SAMOVAR,
Institut Mines Telecom

Vincent Gauthier
CNRS SAMOVAR,
Institut Mines Telecom

Michel Marot
and Monique Becker
CNRS SAMOVAR,
Institut Mines Telecom

Abstract—In a smart grid environment, we study coalitions formation of prosumers that aim at selling energy to the grid. It is paramount for the grid operation that the energy producers are able to sustain the grid requirements in term of stability and minimum production requirement in order to enter the energy market. We design an algorithm that seeks to form coalitions that will meet both of these requirements: a minium energy level for the coalition and a production of an uncorrelated source of energy in order to have stable production level during the course of the bidding. We proposed an algorithm that uses graph tools such as correlation graphs or clique percolation to form coalition that meet such complex constraints. We validate the algorithm against a random procedure and show that, it not only performs better in term of social welfare for the power grid, but also that it is more robust against unforeseen production variations to due to changing weather condition for instance.

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the key ideas in the smart grid revolves around the introduction of communication means inside the power grids. This could enable complex improvements in the energy management and lead progressively to a greener energetic system [1] [2]. Distributed energy resources (DER) such as wind turbines or photovoltaic panels are not supposed to emerge only in remote farms, but also in residential areas. Together with electric vehicles, and demand side management tools, they will constitute the building blocks which will help to turn the today pure energy consumers into true actors of the grid operation [1]. Such agents that both consume and produce energy are ready to make concessions (appliances delays, V2G...) to ensure grid stability, and are commonly called prosumers [3] [1].

There seems to have a clear consensus on the benefit of having bidirectional communication flows between prosumers and the grid as most of the demand side management concepts have proposed such an architecture [2]. Nevertheless as the number of active prosumers is expected to rise, it is safe to assume there is a need for more complex communication patterns (such as coalitions) that will help to decrease the communication burden and in the mean time satisfy the multiple requirements of the power grid management. The formation of coalitions inside the smart grid environment could be applied to various types of agents such as self sufficient micro-grids [4], sizable and adjustable virtual power plants (VPP) [5] [1], or fleet of electric vehicles that back up the grid in some emergency situations (V2G) [1]. These are just

a few use cases where the coalition of multiple agents can enhance the grid reliability and in the mean time reduce the communication burden.

In this paper, we focus on how to statistically improve the production stability by carefully forming coalitions of prosumers that have greater probability of staying in acceptable range of production. By using prediction techniques, we form coalitions that meet the contract values ranges proposed by the grid, enabling it to schedule its production accordingly. Meeting contract values for the prosumer are especially relevant in power trade conditions, where energy is traded based on day-ahead predictions. In this context, participants should try to minimize their prediction errors in order to maintain a stable state for the grid. They may even occur some penalties if the productions deviate from the initial contract values. However, it is pertinent for both side to maintain the production as stable as possible : for the prosumer, the stability (with renewable energy source) will impact its net gain, and for the power grid, it will helps to maintain its reliability.

In this paper, we seek at optimizing this tradeoff, that is forming coalitions able to announce "high contract values with high reliability". We thus aim at:

- Realistic prosumers productions with renewable production sources from real traces base from weather measure.
- Minimizing the standard deviations of coalitions production probability distributions through the use of a proper utility function (see section III)
- Being (relatively) scalable with the number of prosumers

In more details, and as will be explained in section III, we consider agents that, depending on meteorological conditions, personal preferences, and their appliances (loads and generators), consume and produce more or less energy (using only wind turbines and PV as generators, which can be quite simply and efficiently modeled). We used real meteorological traces (see section III) to account for seasonal and daily variations in the prosumers energetic output profiles as well as realistic correlations. With these ingredients, we are able to run simulations and record the different output profiles as timeseries.

As correlations play a significant role in our mechanism, we organize the prosumers in a correlation graph, a quite popular approach in market stocks clustering since [6] (see section II). We will see that in such graphs, cliques represent structures of interest. In our settings, it means that cliques

are "good" (from the utility point of view) foundations for high valued coalitions. We thereby use a modified clique percolation algorithm (see section V) that will enable us to expand the cliques as much as needed in order to form proper coalitions that fulfill grid requirements.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows, section II locates our work in the related litterature. Section III explains the model we used to obtain realistic prosumers available power timeseries and introduces some notations. Section IV relates the method for building coalitions based on the agent timeseries. Finally, section V provides some results.

II. RELATED WORK

Traditionally, forming coalitions in a pool of agents can be done either in a centralized way where a single central unit is responsible for all the computations or in a distributed way where agents have only local knowledges and take actions accordingly. It is of common use to represent the situation and assess the stability of the solution by using game theoretic tools. Some papers [7] [8] focus then on finding an optimal coalition structure giving a pool of autonomous self interested agents using distributed merge/split algorithms.

Attacking the stability issues of renewable DER, the TradeWind project [9] simulated the impact of wind power on electricity exchange and cross-border congestions by using a flow-based market model. The idea revolves around identifying key european interconnections (already existant or not) in order "to make optimal use of the european spacial de-correlation of wind power". It was indeed shown that geographical aggregation provides smoothening effects and that the amount of prediction errors for wind power in a geographical region diminishes as the region size increases, especially for short forecast horizons.

On a narrower scale, the authors of [10] study the formation of virtual power plants (VPP) composed of multiple self-interested DER. On the grid side, two requirements for the formation of virtual power plants are considered : the reliability of supply and the minimization of entities the grid has to deal with. From this, [10] builds a pricing mechanism that encourages VPP to report true estimates of their aggregated production and penalizes prediction errors. A redistribution scheme of the VPP to the DER is also constructed such that the payoff allocation lies in the core of the game, meaning that no DER has an incentive to leave the coalition.

In this paper and as will be explained in section III, coalitions utilities depend on statistical properties of historical values. The goal being to form coalitions that, statistically speaking, are more likely to exhibit stable behaviors. We will see that, when it comes to the formation of the coalitions, a prosumer is completely interchangeable with the timeserie representing its available production.

The setting is thus similar with some fiancial studies on stock exchanges, where researchers tried to find relevant clusters of stocks based on their daily prices variations. The problem of clustering is usually approached by means of a similarity measure and completed by a clustering technique such as K-means or hierarchical clustering. Nevertheless, in [6] Mantegna introduced another approach where stocks, represented by the timeseries of their daily log returns, are organized in a graph such that stocks exhibiting similar price fluctuation patterns are close to each other. This closeness notion is formalized with a similarity measure based on Pearson correlation coefficient ($d_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2(1 - \rho_{ij})}$ or $d_{ij} = 1 - \rho_{ij}^2$) that enables to weight the edges of the graph.

The idea of ϵ-graphs, in this context, consists in filtering edges based on their weight, only keeping edges whose weights are less than ϵ. In [12] and [11], the authors studied the topological properties (average clustering, connectivity, relative number of cliques...) of the correlation graph against those of growing random graphs, depending on the threshold ϵ. One of the conclusions was that "strong links" (i.e links between strongly correlated timeseries) are responsible for clustering while "weak links" provide network connectivity.

Presented in this way, the timeseries clustering task seems very close to graph community detection. Communities in networks are indeed often seen as groups of nodes exhibiting high internal densities of links as well as a low density across communities [13]. Although several techniques exists (based on different graph properties : modularity [13], edge betweeness [14], spectrum of Laplacian [15]...), the clique percolation algorithm [16] uses directly this observation and employs a greedy expansion rule based on a fitness function. When the algorithm stops, some coalitions may be partially overlapping, meaning that a node can belong to multiple communities. Detection of overlapping communities is actually a very active field of research, especially in social networks where persons often belongs to several communities (family, friends, colleagues...).

The following section of this paper explains the model we built in order to obtain sufficient historical values for our prosumers, such that forming coalitions based on statistics is actually meaningfull.

III. MODEL

A major concern while designing our model was its ability to translate correctly realistic patterns (consumption and production) as well as realistic geographical correlations between patterns. Largely because of these reasons (but also because they are easily, and sometimes freely, available online) we chose to use meteorological traces as inputs. In this paper we used namely both french data from 2006 to 2012 sampled every 3 hours [17] (similar data for the United States covering 2010 can also be found at [18]). The weather stations already offer a quite good sampling of a given territory, and, with the growth of personal weather stations constantly updating data bases, the mesh becomes finer and finer. As shown in the first part of figure 1, the first step consists in discretizing the studied zone around well chosen weather stations and gathering traces for these stations. In this paper, we consider that prosumers can only produce through wind turbines and photovoltaic panels (PV). On the other hand, we built their consumption patterns according to two major cycles :

Figure 1: Process diagram

- **Daily cycles** : Consumption is low during night, and higher during the day with two picks in the morning and evening. Some noise is added so that prosumers have similar but not identical cycles.
- **Seasonal cycles** : Consumption is higher in the winter because of heating and low in the summer (air conditioning is not considered). Temperature traces were the principal ingredient for modeling these cycles.

We thus collect for all chosen weather stations three kind of traces (average wind speed, cloudiness, and average temperature), which we will call a climate vector in the following. We consider that cimate vectors are constant over their area, meaning that, if two agents are in the same area, they are exposed to the same climate vector.

At this point, modeling agents consists in fixing a few parameters (most of the time drawn from random distributions) such as the geographical position, the number of wind turbines, PV, appliances, the temperature of confort, and so on... The objective is that, depending on the weather of his zone, the DER and appliances he owns, and the way he decides to heat his home, a given prosumer is able to compute his production/consumption at any time. We thus used simple and known power curve models for linking weather variables to output power, such that a wind turbine (or a PV for instance) takes a wind speed (a solar irradiance) as input and gives an instantaneous output power [10] [19]. Any agent is thus able to compute at any time how much he produces and consumes.

More formally, we denote by $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, ...a_N\}$ the set of agents (the prosumers) and $P_i(t)$ the instantaneous power value of agent i at instant t (its instantaneous production minus consumption, meaning that $P_i(t)$ represents agent i available power at instant t). During the simulation (from t_0 to t_K), all agents record their values with an hour time interval. As expected (because we introduced them), the timeseries exhibit high seasonal patterns, but completely different from agent to agent because they depend both on the energetic mix and habits of a given prosumer. Nevertheless, these macro variations can hide the interesting information in the correlation coefficients and twist the rest of our process. Thereby, we remove these seasonal effects for all agents (see second block of figure 1). We denote by $\mathcal{T}_i = \{P_i(t_0), ..., P_i(t_K)\}$ the resulting timeserie for agent i. For any agent i, we note $\mathcal{P}_i$ the probability distribution drawn from $\mathcal{T}_i$ and by P_i a random variable following $\mathcal{P}_i$.

We now extand these notations to any coalition $S \subset \mathcal{A}$:

- $P_S(t) = \sum_{i \in S} P_i(t)$
- $\mathcal{T}_S = \{P_S(t_0), ..., P_S(t_K)\}$ with $\mathcal{P}_S$ its probability distribution
- A coalition S has the possibility to announce a contract value P_S^{CRCT} on the market.

In this paper, we consider that coalition announcements are constrained by the grid. Namely, the grid has the possibility of fixing two parameters :

- the **reliability** (denoted by $\phi \in [0, 1]$)
- the **minimum contract value** (P_ϕ^{MIN}).

The reliability stipulates that for any coalition S willing to join the market, the probability of S value (at any instant t) being below its contract value should at most be ϕ. That is, $\forall S, \forall t, Pr[P_S(t) \leq P_S^{CRCT}] \leq \phi$ (for consistency we restrict ϕ to small values ($\phi << 0.5$)). The minimum contract value under ϕ states that only coalitions with higher contract values ($P_S^{CRCT} \geq P_\phi^{MIN}$) will be accepted.

At this point, if a coalition S whishes to join the market, it has to choose a contract value that fulfill the two conditions. For simplification, we consider that coalitions will always apply the same economically consistent strategy of announcing the highest possible contract value that obeys the reliability rule (a value we denote by $P_\phi(S)$). If $P_\phi(S) \geq P_\phi^{MIN}$, meaning that it also obeys the minimum contract value rule, then S announces this value on the market : $P_S^{CRCT} = P_\phi(S)$. Otherwise, coalition S is not able to enter. Basically, a coalition S is valid if and only if :

$$\begin{cases} \forall t, Pr[P_S(t) \leq P_\phi(S)] \leq \phi \text{ (reliability rule)} \\ and \ P_\phi(S) \geq P_\phi^{MIN} \text{ (min value rule)} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

We now choose a very simple utility function (eq. 2) that derives directly from the above remarks. If a coalition cannot provide a valid contract value, it receives naturally a utility of zero. Furthermore, it seems obvious that the utility should

increase with the contract value. The $1/|S|$ term in eq. 2 indicates that we favorise small coalitions, mainly because they are easier to maintain in terms of communications.

$$\mathcal{U}_{\phi,\ P_\phi^{MIN}}(S) = \mathbf{1}_{S\ valid}\frac{P_\phi(S)}{|S|} \tag{2}$$

Obviously, maximising this utility function amounts to maximizing the coalition contract value with the minimum possible number of agents.

In order to illustrate what is done in the following, lets consider a very simple example with two agents, say i and j, with gaussian value probability distributions $\mathcal{P}_i = \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma_i)$ and $\mathcal{P}_j = \mathcal{N}(\mu_j, \sigma_j)$, such that the joint probability distribution $\mathcal{P}_{ij}$ of the coalition $\{ij\}$ is also a gaussian with the following parameters :

$$\begin{cases} \mu_{ij} = \mu_i + \mu_j \\ \sigma_{ij} = \sqrt{\sigma_i^2 + \sigma_j^2 + \rho_{ij}\sigma_i\sigma_j} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

with ρ_{ij} the Pearson correlation coefficient between P_i and P_j. We can easily write the reliability condition $Pr[P_{ij}(t) \le P_\phi(ij)] \le \phi$ as :

$$\frac{1}{2}\left[1 + erf\left(\frac{P_\phi(ij) - \mu_{ij}}{\sigma_{ij}\sqrt{2}}\right)\right] \le \phi \tag{4}$$

The strategy of $\{ij\}$ consists in maximizing its contract value as long as it respects the inequality 4, e.g to annonce $P_\phi(ij) = \mu_{ij} - \sigma_{ij}\sqrt{2}erf^{-1}(1-2\phi)$. It thus appears (as it was intuitively understandable) that, for equivalent sizes, coalitions with low relative standard deviations (σ_{ij}/μ_{ij}) are able to announce higher contract values.

What this paper investigates in the following is the developement of an algorithm that organizes prosumers such that the synergy term of the standard deviation ($\rho_{ij}\sigma_i\sigma_j$ in the example above) is minimized. In such settings, and through the clique percolation procedure (section IV), we will show that coalitions with low relative standard deviation, e.g high utility coalitions, can be computed.

IV. FORMING COALITIONS

This section explains the process with which we form the coalitions (see the third block of Figure 1). First, we need to simulate the timeseries of available power (first two blocks of Figure 1). We consider a pool $\mathcal{A}$ of 200 agents, whose parameters were chosen randomly. The prosumers are positioned (also randomly) on a square lattice previously filled with climate vectors obtained from the french data sets (see section III). Simulations were run from february 2006 to december 2010 such that we are dealing with 200 hourly sampled timeseries of available power over this period. Removing season trends finally leads us to the formation of coalitions.

The model we used in order to simulate timeseries of available production provides some diversity because of the combination between the energetic mix and the climate vectors. Nevertheless, as the number of agents grows, the timeseries tend to exhibit similar patterns. This is apparent when creating

a correlation graph $G_1(\mathcal{A}, E_1, \omega_1)$ with the same kind of metric as [12] or [11] ($d_{ij} = 1 - \rho_{ij}^2$), where well defined clusters appear in the ϵ-graph for any values of ϵ.

However, these clusters of strongly correlated timeseries are the exact opposite of what we are seeking. We can indeed consider them directly as coalitions and compute their utilities, and the results show, as expected, terrible values (far worse than a random split of the agents in the same number of coalitions).

We thus opt for reversing the metric ($d'_{ij} = \rho_{ij}^2$) such that uncorrelated timeseries are close to each other and (anti)correlated timeseries are distant in $G_2(\mathcal{A}, E_2, \omega_2)$. As expected [11], independently of the ϵ parameter, the resulting ϵ-graph exhibits henceforth much less clustering than in G_1 and communities seem hardly visible. Therefore, using classical clustering or community detection algorithms seem to provide poor results.

However, as seems intuitively understandable, cliques of this graph tend to exhibit very good utility values. Such structures contain indeed a link between every two nodes, meaning that the overall correlation is quite small. Obviously, the ϵ parameter is indirectly responsible for the sizes of the cliques, if it is too low, the ϵ-graph of G_2 will not provide enough cliques, conversely, if ϵ is too high, we loose important information as the graph becomes very dense and cliques tend to overlap strongly. For large values of ϵ and for non trivial number of agents, finding cliques can even become computationally repulsive. Despite being direct and simple, improving the sizes of the cliques by increasing ϵ seems too brutal. Furthermore, as the utility function is also focused on maximizing $P_\phi(S)$, it might be the case that some cliques benefit from additional agents even if they don't form a clique anymore.

Cliques for small values of ϵ appear thus as good seeds for stable coalitions, but we still have to find a way to bring them above the grid requirements as well as increasing the social welfare, both by incorporating more nodes. This is exactly where clique percolation proves useful for our concerns. The main idea of making the seeds grow as long as it increases a fitness function is exactly what we need. The only difference being that our fitness function is simply chosen as the utility function.

As explained in section II, clique percolation leads generally to overlapping communities. For simplicity, in this paper, we wish to keep the coalitions separated and leave the management of overlapping coalitions for future work. We thus implemented a simple heuristic that consider nodes in multiple seeds one by one and chooses its final coalition as the one that "needs it the most" in terms of utility loss. More formally, for a coalition S and a node $i \in S$, we define :

$$\tau_i(S) = \frac{\mathcal{U}_{\phi,\ P_\phi^{MIN}}(S) - \mathcal{U}_{\phi,\ P_\phi^{MIN}}(S - \{i\})}{\mathcal{U}_{\phi,\ P_\phi^{MIN}}(S)} \tag{5}$$

If node i belongs to multiple coalitions, the only coalition retaining node i is the one that maximizes τ_i.

(a) (ϕ, P_ϕ^{MIN}) space   (b) (N_{COAL}, P_ϕ^{MIN}) space

Figure 2: Utility function in parameters space : In (ϕ, P_ϕ^{MIN}) when N_{COAL} is fixed (fig 2a), and in (N_{COAL}, P_ϕ^{MIN}) for a fixed ϕ (fig 2b)

At this point, we have three degrees of freedom : the reliability (ϕ), the required power to enter the market (P_ϕ^{MIN}), and the prunning parameter (ϵ). For convenience, we introduce the number of desired coalitions (N_{COAL}) and we fix ϵ as the smallest value such that the ϵ-graph contains at least N_{COAL} non overlaping cliques. The overall utility depends now on the grid requirements and on the number of desired coalitions.

The next section shows how the utility behave within the parameters space and provides the results of our 200 agents test.

V. RESULTS

As visible on figure 2a, the parameters ϕ and P_ϕ^{MIN} shape the utility function such that, if ϕ is close to zero, the reliability requirement is very high and only small values of P_ϕ^{MIN} could potentially lead to valid coalitions (and positive utility values). Conversely, the higher ϕ, the less constraints are imposed to the coalitions and valid ones can arise for a larger spectrum of P_ϕ^{MIN}. Obviously, the highest utility values are found for high ϕ, because coalitions are able then to announce higher contract values, yielding higher utilities.

In the following, we fix the reliability to a given empirical value ($\phi = Cste$) and observe how the coalitions evolves for different values of P_ϕ^{MIN}. Note that the opposite is also possible although a little less intuitive, but not shown here because of space limitations and because it leads to similar conclusions.

On figure 2b, we can see that when the grid constraints are fixed ($\phi = 0.08$ and $P_\phi^{MIN} = 2$ for instance) and only the number of coalitions varies, there is an increase in social welfare (sum of coalitions utilities) up to a maximum point (for $N_{COAL} = 3$ here) before a decrease. The reason is that increasing the number of coalitions allows more coalitions to reach stability and enter the market, but there is a point where nodes bringing stability are not sufficient inside the coalitions to make them pass the grid requirements, and some coalitions start to fail with zero utility. Moreover, reckon that increasing N_{COAL} means also increasing ϵ, leading to denser graphs where information is flooded, meaning that the algorithm performances also decrease. Naturally, it is also visible that small values of P_ϕ^{MIN} lead to higher utilities because coalitions are able to announce higher contract values.

For our 200 prosumers, we suppose that the grid fixes a reliability $\phi = 0.1$ (meaning that coalitions should produce more than their contract values at least 90% of the time). We also fix the number of coalitions to 10 and have a look at how these coalitions evolve as the grid changes the P_ϕ^{MIN} requirement. As a comparison, we use a completely random algorithm that only asks for a number of coalitions and partitions the agents in a random fashion. Figure 3 shows this evolution for our algorithm (blue dots) and for the random process (red dots). The diameter of a dot is proportional to the number of agents in the coalition and the higher the dot is, the higher its utility. The P_ϕ^{MIN} values of the x axis are expressed in tenth of MW for readability and the hatched zone corresponds to the "under-requirement space", meaning that whenever a coalition is in this zone, it has a null utility.

Looking at figure 3, we can see first that our algorithm seems to make generally a better job at finding high valued coalitions, but also that the results seem far more robust against how the grid positions its requirements. The blue dots allowed to enter the market seem indeed to outnumber the red dots, especially when the grid requirements are neither too low or too high ($P_\phi^{MIN} = 5$ in figure 3).

In more details, figure 4a presents the evolution of social welfare as the number of coalitions increases (all other parameters are kept constant) for both random (red curve) and clique percolation (blue curve). As for the right plot, it shows the percentage of coalitions able to enter the market for different values of P_ϕ^{MIN}. For consistency, we average the results of both plots of the random procedure over 100 realizations (5 realizations for clique percolation, but the results are relatively stable), and the errorbars in the plots stands for the standard deviations of the results.

When the grid requirements are constant (figure 4b), and the

Figure 3: Evolution of the coalitions for different values of P_ϕ^{MIN} for clique percolation (blue dots) and random process (red dots). The diameters of the dots are proportional to the corresponding coalition sizes.

(a) Social Welfare (b) Market entering percentage

Figure 4: Evolution of the social welfare (fig 4a) and the percentage of coalitions able to enter the market (fig 4b) for different values of P_{MIN}. Blue curves represent clique percolation and the red ones, the random process.

number of desired coalitions is low, clique percolation generally performs only a little better than random. Nevertheless, when N_{COAL} gets bigger, the performance of a random split tumble down rapidly while clique percolation social welfare decreases slowly.

When the grid requirements vary, for very low P_ϕ^{MIN}, all coalitions for both algorithms are able to enter the market, yielding an acceptance percentage of 100%. But as P_ϕ^{MIN} increases, we see the percentage of the random procedure quickly dropping while it stays constant for our algorithm. For $P_\phi^{MIN} = 4$, we see that only a little more than half of the coalitions for the random case are able to enter while all of them enters for the clique percolation algorithm. Finally, when the grid requirement becomes too high, the acceptance percentage of our algorithm tends slowly to zero (only partly shown in this plot for readability).

VI. CONCLUSION

We believe that the originality of this paper lies in its willingness to exploit the de-correlation of prosumer profiles in order to build stable coalitions. In this direction, we presented a model based on meteorological traces, that captures the complex "*energetic mix/climate vectors*" combination and generates realistic production and consumption patterns. We then built a framework that enables the grid to specify stability and minimum production requirements for filtering the coalitions. On this basis, we proposed a simple algorithm that seeks for uncorrelated prosumer patterns as potential seeds and expand them in coalitions able to rise above the grid requirements.

The algorithm is validated against a random process, where we show that it performs better (coalitions are more stable and the overall production is more important) and that it exhibits a higher robustness/flexibility against grid requirements changes.

Interresting leads for future works would be the use of correlated clusters to reduce the number of entities the algorithm has to deal with, or the introduction of a payoff allocation towards the prosumers such that the stability against player defection could be analysed through game theory. Showing that maintaining the coalitions formed with our algorithm necessitates less communication and less storage capacity

could also conduct to a stimulating project. Besides, we believe that not restricting the algorithm to non overlapping coalitions and studying the strategies and weights of nodes with multiple options could lead to interesting works.

REFERENCES

[1] S. D. Ramchurn, P. Vytelingum, A. Rogers, and N. R. Jennings, "Putting the 'smarts' into the smart grid: A grand challenge for artificial intelligence," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 86–97, Apr. 2012.
[2] C. Wu, A.-H. Mohsenian-Rad, and J. Huang, *Smart Grid Communications and Networking*, E. Hossain, Z. Han, and V. Poor, Eds. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
[3] A. J. D. Rathnayaka, V. Potdar, and M. H. Ou, "Prosumer management in socio-technical smart grid," in *Proceedings of the CUBE International Information Technology Conference*, 2012, pp. 483–489.
[4] S. Pahwa, C. Scoglio, and N. Schulz, "Topological Analysis and Mitigation Strategies for Cascading Failures in Power Grid Networks."
[5] M. Braun, "Virtual Power Plants in Real Applications Pilot Demonstrations in Spain and England as part of the European project FENIX."
[6] R. Mantegna, "Hierarchical structure in financial markets," *The European Physical Journal B*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 193–197, 1999.
[7] W. Saad, Z. Han, M. Debbah, and A. Hjorungnes, "A distributed coalition formation framework for fair user cooperation in wireless networks," *Wireless Communications, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 8, no. 9, pp. 4580–4593, September 2009.
[8] X. Luan, J. Wu, S. Ren, and H. Xiang, "Cooperative power consumption in the smart grid based on coalition formation game," in *Advanced Communication Technology (ICACT)*, Feb 2014, pp. 640–644.
[9] D. Europe, "Integrating Wind."
[10] G. Chalkiadakis, V. Robu, R. Kota, A. Rogers, and N. R. Jennings, "Cooperatives of distributed energy resources for efficient virtual power plants," in *The 10th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, 2011, pp. 787–794.
[11] A. Garas, P. Argyrakis, and S. Havlin, "The structural role of weak and strong links in a financial market network," *The European Physical Journal B*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 265–271, 2008.
[12] J.-P. Onnela, K. Kaski, and J. Kertész, "Clustering and information in correlation based financial networks," *The European Physical Journal B - Condensed Matter and Complex Systems*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 353–362, 2004.
[13] M. E. J. Newman, "Modularity and community structure in networks," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 103, no. 23, pp. 8577–8582, 2006.
[14] M. Girvan and M. E. J. Newman, "Community structure in social and biological networks," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 99, no. 12, pp. 7821–7826, 2002.
[15] M. E. J. Newman, "Finding community structure in networks using the eigenvectors of matrices," *Phys. Rev. E*, vol. 74, p. 036104, Sep 2006.
[16] A. Lancichinetti, S. Fortunato, and J. Kertész, "Detecting the overlapping and hierarchical community structure in complex networks," *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 11, no. 3, p. 033015, 2009.
[17] [Online]. Available: http://www.infoclimat.fr
[18] [Online]. Available: http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/
[19] [Online]. Available: http://www.wind-power-program.com