# REDC

Security Gaps due to Coupling of Energy Delivery Sub-systems

# Modeling Secure Coupled Infrastructure Operations

Mahnoosh Alizadeh (UC Santa Barbara), Hoi-To Wai (ASU), Anna Scaglione (ASU), Andrea Goldsmith (Stanford), Eran Schweitzer

# GOALS

Many large infrastructure networks are **COUPLED** with power networks!



- Examples of coupled infrastructure networks
  - Gas network
  - Water Network
  - Electric vehicles (EVs)

IPSO solves economic dispatch, with

the power demand modulated by

services on infrastructure network.

- Data centers
- Goal: to investigate the way coupled infrastructure can address the issue of resilience in concert
- We start by studying congestion and possible wide area oscillations
  - In an ideal world: Maximum Social Surplus solution (or Social Optimum (SO)) finds the optimum settings across the infrastructures (most secure)
  - Can the systems operate and recover separately and still be secure?

# **BACKGROUND STUDIES / FORMULATION**

# RESEARCH RESULTS – STEADY STATE MODEL

## **EXISTENCE OF NASH EQUILIBRIUM & UNIQUENESS**

- For the special case of EV network, the multi-retailer problem is a *special case* of the competition game in network routing.
- Therefore an NE will always exist<sup>a</sup>. Furthermore, the NE is unique<sup>b</sup> if

 $s_a(\lambda_a) \propto (\lambda_a)^{\alpha}$  with  $\alpha \leq (3R-1)/(R-1)$ 

<sup>a</sup> A. Orda, R. Rom, and N. Shimkin, "Competitive routing in multiuser communication networks," IEEE ToN, 1993.
<sup>b</sup> E. Altman, T. Basar, T. Jimenez, and N. Shimkin, "Competitive routing in networks with polynomial costs," *IEEE TAC*, 2002. As number of retailers, R, increases, the NE may be non-unique for large  $\alpha$ .

# FINDING THE NE VIA BI-LEVEL OPTIMIZATION

• <u>Aim</u>: find optimal pricing for IPSO that leads to a Nash Equilibrium.

 $\begin{array}{ll} \min_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{p}} & \mathbf{1}^{T}\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{g}) \\ \text{s.t.} & \mathbf{g} \geq \mathbf{0}, \ \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{H}^{T}\boldsymbol{\mu} + \gamma \mathbf{1}, \\ & \gamma: \mathbf{1}^{T}(\mathbf{d} + \boldsymbol{\ell} - \mathbf{g}) = \mathbf{0}, \ \boldsymbol{\mu}: \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{d} + \boldsymbol{\ell} - \mathbf{g}) \leq \boldsymbol{m}, \\ & \mathbf{d} = \boldsymbol{M} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{r}, \\ & \forall \ r \in \mathcal{R}: \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{r} = \arg\min_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{r} \in \mathcal{F}^{r}} J(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{r}; \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{-r}; \mathbf{p}). \end{array} \right. \begin{array}{l} \textbf{Bi-level optimization} \\ & \text{problem} \end{array}$ 

#### MAX. SOCIAL SURPLUS SOLUTION w/ COUPLED OPTIMIZATION

• Utopia-like, when the infrastructure and IPSO are fully cooperating.

 $\min_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{e},\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \ J_{\mathsf{Power}}(\boldsymbol{g}) + J_{\mathsf{Infrast./Gas}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ 

s.t. Power system constraints:

 $\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}^{T}(\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{g}) &= 0, & \rightarrow \text{[balance]} \\ \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{g}) \preceq \mathbf{c}, & \rightarrow \text{[line flow limit]} \\ \mathbf{0} &= \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{e}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) & \rightarrow \text{[infrast. to elect. demand map]} \\ \end{aligned}$ 

# EXAMPLES OF INFRASTRUCTURE SYSTEMS



- Leader-Follower structure --- leader: IPSO, follower: retailers
- The bi-level problem can be solved as a mixed integer program.
- Invokes convex approximation to handle the non-convex constraints.



- Infrastructure: fictitious transportation network modeled after the Bay Area
- Power: modified IEEE-9 bus test case



Cost of NE vs Social Optimal solution can be bounded by the Price of Anarchy (PoA), can be calculated in closed form.

10 MWh

80 MWh

Power Generator Load Buses

• NE exists in the simulated case

85 MW

- Bi-level optimization does not find the socially optimal solution
- PoA for this case is bounded by 1.46.

## GAS PIPELINE SYSTEM COUPLED WITH POWER SYSTEM



## **MULTIPLE INFRASTRUCTURE OPERATORS**

- Assume *multiple* retailers operating the infrastructure.
- The retailers individually choose their flow on the **same** network.

 $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{r} = \arg\min_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{r} \in \mathcal{F}^{r}} J(\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{r}; \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{-r}; \mathbf{p})$ Retailer *r* has only control of its virtual flow and has its private demand to satisfy.

## **SECURITY CONCERNS:**

- Static Model Oscillations? → Any Nash Equilibrium (NE)?
- Dynamic Model? → Resonant frequencies for the pipelines!

<sup>c</sup>A. Zlotnik, L. Roald, S. Backhaus, M. Chertkov, and G. Andersson, "Coordinated scheduling for interdependent electric power and natural gas infrastructures," IEEE TPS, 2016.

- Prior study<sup>c</sup> showed that when the Max Social Surplus problem was solved separately, then system instability may occur.
- We anticipate that the situation can be exacerbated with competitive gas retailers. → Security issue!

# FUTURE WORK

- Gas network: do NE points exist?
- Looking at attacks to control system for pipelines or grid that can induce dynamic resonance for pipelines

M. Alizadeh, H.-T. Wai, A. Goldsmith, and A. Scaglione, ``Optimal Electricity Pricing for Societal Infrastructure Systems", in 50th HICSS Conference.

M. Alizadeh, H.-T. Wai, A. Goldsmith, and A. Scaglione, ``Marginal Charging Station Pricing in an Intelligent Electric Transportation System", accepted by ACC 2017.

# CYBER RESILIENT ENERGY DELIVERY CONSORTIUM | CRED-C.ORG

FUNDING SUPPORT PROVIDED BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY