Al for EV Charging: Quantifying and exploiting flexibility in EV charging with data-driven modeling and reinforcement learning

Chris Develder et al.







Nasrin Manu

Johannes

Matthias







#### Chris Develder et al.







Nasrin

Johannes

Matthias





#### **SMART GRID**

UNIVERSITY



### OUTLINE

#### PART I: "Knowing" EV charging session behavior

- Quantitative analysis of real-world EV charging data
- Flexibility <u>potential</u> quantification
- Flexibility exploitation quantification

#### PART II: "Controlling" EV charging sessions

- Reinforcement learning model
- Experimental evaluation through simulations



# PART I: DATA ANALYTICS "<u>Knowing</u>" EV charging session behavior

N. Sadeghianpourhamami, N. Refa, M. Strobbe and C. Develder, **"Quantitive analysis of electric vehicle flexibility: A data-driven approach"**, Int. J. Electr. Power Energy Syst., Vol. 95, Feb. 2018, pp. 451-462.

N. Sadeghianpourhamami, D.F. Benoit, D. Deschrijver and C. Develder, **"Bayesian cylindrical data modeling using Abe-Ley mixtures"**, Appl. Math. Model, Vol. 68, Apr. 2019, pp. 629-642.

C. Develder, N. Sadeghianpourhamami, M. Strobbe and N. Refa, **"Quantifying flexibility in EV charging as DR potential: Analysis of two real-world data sets"**, in Proc. 7th IEEE Int. Conf. Smart Grid Communications (SmartGridComm 2016), Sydney, Australia, 6-9 Nov. 2016, pp. 600-605.





# Characterization of real-world EV charging sessions



# DATASETS: IMOVE (BE) AND ELAADNL

PERIOD	03/2012
# SESSIONS	8.5 k
# USERS	134
CAR TYPE	Full EV
CHARGE POINT	At home
TRIP DETAILS	Yes

012 – 03/2013 01/2012 – present > 2 M about 53 000 V Unknown mix me Public No

<u>iMove</u>: Flemish EV field trial; data from 50 EVs shared 3 x 2 months <u>ELaadNL</u>: EV innovation in NL; data from ~3000 public stations

\* : Analysis on data from 1 Jan.–31 Mar. 2015 (N = 90 562)



### TYPICAL ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE TIMES (1/2)





### **TYPICAL ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE TIMES (2/2)**





# SOJOURN AND IDLE TIMES (2/2)

UNIVERSITY



# SOJOURN AND IDLE TIMES (2/2)





# Quantifying flexibility potential



# **QUANTIFICATION OF FLEXIBILITY: CALCULATION**



 $P_{FLEX}(t, \Delta) = Maximal power that DR could either consume constantly, or not at all, in interval [t, t+<math>\Delta$ ]

• Charging session has to include [ $t, t+\Delta$ ]

[else demand is not available for DR for the whole interval ]

• Charging duration  $\geq \Delta$ 

[else we could not consume power for the full interval]

#### • Flexibility = session duration – $\Delta \ge$ charging duration

[we can also move the charging power entirely outside the interval]



### **QUANTIFICATION OF FLEXIBILITY: RESULT**

**delta** — 15 — 30 — 60 — 120 — 240 min





# Quantifying flexibility exploitation



#### **SAMPLE CASE STUDIES**





# SO ... WHAT FLEXIBILITY IS ACTUALLY USED?

Quantification of use of flexibility in relevant use cases:

$$\begin{split} \textbf{E}_{flex} &= \quad \frac{\text{Energy beyond } \textbf{t}_{\text{BAU}}}{\text{Maximal energy beyond } \textbf{t}_{\text{BAU}}} \implies 1 - \textbf{E}_{flex} = \text{fraction charged at } \textbf{t}_{\text{BAU}} \\ \textbf{T}_{flex} &= \quad \frac{\textbf{t}_{coordinated} - \textbf{t}_{\text{BAU}}}{\textbf{t}_{depart} - \textbf{t}_{\text{BAU}}} \quad = \quad \text{fraction of idle time exploited to delay} \end{split}$$

#### E.g., $E_{flex} = 0.2 \implies$ only 20% of charge volume is delayed E.g., $T_{flex} = 0.8 \implies$ end-of-charge at 80% of flexibility time window

#### CASE STUDIES: (1) Load flattening, (2) RES balancing



### SAMPLE CASE STUDIES



#### Near home:

- T<sub>flex</sub> close to 1: charging till last moment, but...
- E<sub>flex</sub> low: reasonable
  SoC at t<sub>BAU</sub>

#### Near work:

- Higher T<sub>flex</sub> in weekend
- Reasonable SoC at t<sub>BAU</sub>

#### Park-to-charge:

- T<sub>flex</sub> close to 1
- Peaked E<sub>flex</sub> during daytime



### **SUMMARY OF PART I**

- Real world data set
- Three major types of charging sessions
- Statistical models of user behavior
- Methodology to quantify flexibility potential
- Metrics to evaluate exploitation of flexibility

**Application?** 

E.g., extrapolation of iMove data to 3% of Flemish fleet by 2020:

- ~100k cars out of ~3.2M
- E.g., noon in weekend  $\Rightarrow$  can have ~7MW extra for 2h



# PART II: "<u>Controlling</u>" EV charging sessions

N. Sadeghianpourhamami, J. Deleu and C. Develder, **"Definition and evaluation of model-free** coordination of electrical vehicle charging with reinforcement learning", IEEE Trans. Smart Grid, 2019, pp. 1-12. (In Press)

M. Lahariya, N. Sadeghianpourhamami and C. Develder, "Reduced state space and cost function in reinforcement learning for demand response control of multiple EV charging stations", in Proc. 6th ACM Int. Conf. Sys. for Energy-Effic. Build., Cities and Transp. (BuildSys 2019), New York, NY, USA, 13-14 Nov. 2019.



# **CONTROLLING EV CHARGING? Possible objectives**

Possible objectives:

- Flatten load: peak shaving & valley filling
- **Balance** renewable sources
- Avoid voltage violations

250

200

150

100

50

0

Total load (kWh)





# CONTROLLING EV CHARGING? Problem statement



input: arrival & departure times, charging needs
 output: which EVs to charge now?





# **Reinforcement learning model**



# REINFORCEMENT LEARNING MODEL State space

- Characterization of EVs in the system:
  - Time of arrival
  - Time till departure
  - Required charging & charging rate
- Aggregated state representation: Bin cars with similar (1) time till departure, (2) requested charging

$$\operatorname{car} c_{1} : (\Delta t_{1}^{\text{depart}}, \Delta t_{1}^{\text{charge}}) = (3, 2) \\ \operatorname{car} c_{2} : (\Delta t_{2}^{\text{depart}}, \Delta t_{2}^{\text{charge}}) = (2, 1) \\ \operatorname{charging} \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & c_{1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c_{1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c_{1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c_{1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c_{1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c_{1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & c_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{requested}}$$

 $\mathcal{V}_t = \{ (\Delta t_1^{\text{depart}}, \Delta t_1^{\text{charge}}), \dots \}$ 

 $\dots, (\Delta t_{N_a}^{\text{depart}}, \Delta t_{N_a}^{\text{charge}})\}$ 



# REINFORCEMENT LEARNING MODEL Making charging decisions





# Simulation results



## EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION Experiment settings and dataset

- Arrival data from ElaadNL data, top-10 or top-50 stations from 2015
- Control/decision granularity of 2h (to compute fast)
- Set maximum connection time to 24h
- Ensure empty system in between consecutive days
- "Cost" = squared power per timeslot, summed over all timeslots
- We plot costs relative to optimal, all-knowing oracle decision



# **EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION** Q1: Appropriate training data settings?

 Training period of 3 months suffices



 Sampling 5k trajectories per day suffices





## EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION Q2: RL performance compared to oracle benchmark?

- Relative cost saving compared to business-as-usual scenario (= immediate charging) of the order of 39% or 30% for 10 or 50 EV stations
- Relative difference compared to all-knowing optimal charging strategy (with perfect knowledge of future arrivals) of the order of 13% to 15.6% for 10 or 50 EV stations



### EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION Q3: Variance of RL performance over time (a year)?

- Flexibility varies: higher cost difference between BAU and optimal
- RL policy exploits flexibility to varying degree



### EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

# Q4: Generalization to different number of stations?

- Experiment: scale up car arrivals (and # EV stations) by factor up to 10x
  ... but follow policy from original system size
- Result: RL policy still achieves largely same cost reduction





### **SUMMARY OF PART II**

- Challenge: coordinate EV charging (for peak shaving & valley filling, for balancing renewable energy sources) of an EV fleet
- **Reality check**: real-world charging behavior shows flexibility potential
- Reinforcement learning looks like a viable approach to solve the challenge with consistent performance over time & when upscaling system
  - ↔ MPC: RL is purely data-driven
  - ↔ SotA: Our RL solution = <u>single-step</u> decision for <u>aggregate</u> of EVs
- What's next?
  - Effective exploration of vast state-action space
  - More advanced neural net architectures for Q-function approximation



Thank you. Any questions?

chris.develder@ugent.be http://users.ugent.be/~cdvelder

