A Hybrid Reinforcement Learning-MPC Approach for Distribution System Critical Load Restoration

Abinet Tesfaye Eseye, Xiangyu Zhang, Bernard Knueven, Matthew Reynolds, Weijia Liu, and Wesley Jones National Renewable Energy Laboratory

Motivation & Introduction

MINREL

- Utilizing generation from variable and uncertain renewable energy resources could enhance distribution system resilience in the event of a transmission system outage
- The Critical Load Restoration Problem (CLRP) is that of scheduling available distribution system resources to maintain as much load as possible during transmission system outage
- Optimization-based Model Predictive Control (MPC) is a common approach for CLRP, while Reinforcement Learning (RL) is an emerging approach for this problem
- **We propose a hybrid RL-MPC approach through an operational energy reserve to characterize renewable generation uncertainty**

Fig 1. Hybrid RL-MPC controller learning framework

Hybrid Control Design

- RL determines an energy reserve policy: the amount of energy to have available at the end for the MPC time-horizon
- State is determined by wind and solar forecasts, current power output, current restored load, and energy available as fuel and in batteries
- The action is the final end-state battery energy and fuel energy available
- Reward function is identical to MPC objective: **maximize restored load whilst not shedding previously restored load**
- Maximize the cumulative expected reward utilizing Proximal Policy Optimization
- MPC-based Optimal Scheduling and Restoration (OSR), including
- Prioritized Loads (real & reactive)
- Linearized distribution power flow with voltage constraints
- Microturbine dispatch (real & reactive) with fuel constraints
- Battery charging/discharging with state-of-charge management
- Renewable power generation/curtailment with limited reactive power dispatch
- Enforcing RL-based reserve policy for end-state battery state-of-charge and fuel availability

Case Study

- Method is applied to a modified IEEE 13-bus distribution test system containing wind, solar, microturbine, and battery (see Figure 2)
- Performance of RL-MPC dynamic energy reserve policy (RP1) is compared against four MPCbased fixed energy reserve policies (RP2, RP3, RP4, & RP5) on 20 outage scenarios

Fig 2. Modified IEEE 13-bus feeder Fig 3. Total reward across 20 scenarios for RP1 – RP5

Simulation Results

- The RL-MPC approach (RP1) has several distinguishing characteristics over the fixed energy reserve policies – it has the highest median reward, best worst-case performance, and lowest sample variance, as shown in Figure 3
- As shown in the example in Figure 4, the RL-MPC controller manages the DERs interactively to monotonically increase the total restored load with a dynamic energy reserve policy

Fig 4. Single scenario example. Upper: sample power dispatch and restored *load. Lower: RL-based dynamic energy reserve policy.*

Conclusions

- The RL-MPC hybrid controller utilized RL to learn MPC parameters while the MPC included sophisticated operational constraints (e.g., voltage limits) which could be difficult to enforce with RL alone.
- This hybrid approach out-performed the MPC-based alternatives

This work was authored by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, operated by Alliance for Sustainable Energy, LLC, for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) under Contract No. DE-AC36-08GO28308. Funding provided by the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Electricity (OE) Advanced Grid Modeling (AGM) Program. The views expressed in the article do not necessarily represent the views of the DOE or the U.S. Government. The U.S. .
Government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, worldwide license to publish or reproduce the published *of this work, or allow others to do so, for U.S. Government purposes.*