

Hydro-economic optimization under inflow uncertainty using the SDP_GAMS generalized optimization tool

Hector Macian-Sorribes and Manuel Pulido-Velazquez

Research Institute of Water and Environmental Engineering (IIAMA). Universitat Politècnica de València. Email: hecmasor@upv.es

Bologna IAHS 2014 6th IAHS-EGU International Symposium on Integrated Water Resources Management Bologna 4-6 June 2014

River Reno close to Bologna Source: Panoramio

1. Introduction

2. The SDP_GAMS tool

3. Case study: Mijares River Basin (Jucar RBD)

4. Conclusions

The SDP approach INTRODUCTION

Main advantages:

Able to handle non-linearities

 \Box Takes into account inflow uncertainty

 \Box Decision-making process treated sequentially

Main disadvantages:

Requires uncertainty descriptor (Markov Chain)

 The computational burden increases exponentially with the system size: **curse of dimensionality**

The curse of dimensionality has been worked out by:

 \Box Simplifying the system (decomposition techniques)

- \Box Using interpolation techniques
- \Box Employing alternative approaches (RL, SSDP, SDDP, etc.)

The SDP approach INTRODUCTION

Stochastic dynamic programming developments in multireservoir systems based on *ad-hoc* codes

Goal: develop a general-purpose DSS code to solve the SDP algorithm in any multipurpose multireservoir system

Approach: use GAMS supported by GAMS – MS Excel links

Outline and Flowchart THE SDP_GAMS TOOL

Data entry module THE SDP_GAMS TOOL

Calls from Excel to GAMS to introduce:

- **□** System features (physical, economic and environmental)
- Discrete variables and Markov Chain
- Reoptimization data
- Convergence control parameters

MODEL GENERAL FEATURES

Optimization module THE SDP_GAMS TOOL

GAMS solver (CONOPT, CPLEX) -> optimal immediate benefits associated to each possible combination between discrete state variables

Longest computational time

For reservoirs in series, a "quick mode" can be activated to save computation time

Recursion module THE SDP_GAMS TOOL

Solves backwards the Bellman recursive equation using the optimization results

$$
F_t(S_t, Q_t) = \max_{D_t} \left(\underbrace{B(S_t, Q_t, D_t)}_{\text{Optimization}} + \sum_{q} \underbrace{P_{p,q}}_{\text{Markov}} \cdot F_{t+1}(S_{t+1}, Q_{t+1}) \right)
$$

Features:

- **□** Two convergence criteria: steady benefits (primary) and steady policies (secondary)
- \Box Each iteration corresponds to a year
- **Q** Results: steady-state optimal policies (D_t) and steady-state benefit-to-go values (F_{t+1}) for all the discrete states (S_t)

Recursion module THE SDP_GAMS TOOL

Reoptimization module THE SDP_GAMS TOOL

GAMS solver (CONOPT, CPLEX) to solve forward the Bellman recursive equation using the benefit-to-go function values obtained in the recursion module

$$
F_t(S_t, Q_t) = \max_{D_t} \left[B(S_t, Q_t, D_t) + \sum_q P_{p,q} \cdot \underbrace{(F_{t+1}(S_{t+1}, Q_{t+1}))}_{\text{Recursion}} \right]
$$

module results

Results: time series of

 \Box Storages

Demand deliveries

 \Box Flows in the system

- **Q** Benefits obtained
- **O** Marginal water values

Results retrieval module THE SDP_GAMS TOOL

Call-back from GAMS to Excel to show:

- Recursion module results
- Reoptimization module results

Recursion status report

Recursion optimal benefits

t1 2.00 3.00 9.60 1.00 4.47 50.06 54.54

General view CASE STUDY: MIJARES RIVER

Units in Mm3

Sichar

Arenós

Source: CEDEX

Purpose: test the performance of the tool in the Mijares river

Approach: to build the following models:

- A hydro-economic SDP model
- **A hydro-economic deterministic optimization model**
- **□** A simulation model

And compare their economic performance

Model features CASE STUDY: MIJARES RIVER

Historical data records for the 1940-2010 period

System features included:

- **O** Physical: connectivity matrices, sub-basins, storage features, stream features, demand features, etc.
- \Box Economic: demand curves, network costs, etc.
- \Box Environmental: minimum flows and storages

State variables discretization:

- \Box Storage: 91-point discrete grid
- \Box Inflows: 16-point discrete grid
- **□ Lag-1 Markov Chain**

Results CASE STUDY: MIJARES RIVER

Comparison for the 1940-2010 period

All demands are fully met except during large droughts (steady inflows)

SDP performance between simulation (non-optimal policies) and deterministic optimization (with perfect foresight). It covers 60% of the gap

Comparison for the 1977-1986 period (the worst drought)

Results CASE STUDY: MIJARES RIVER

SDP covers 62% of the gap (similar than the whole period)

Economic differences between alternatives grow: optimal

Advantages / disadvantages

Advantages of SDP_GAMS

- \Box Friendly user interface
- General-purpose
- **□ GAMS skills are not required**
- **□ Modular structure saves time**

Disadvantages of SDP_GAMS

- \Box Curse of dimensionality
- \Box Hard constraints (inflows & storages)

CONCLUSIONS

- \Box Demand curves as polynomials
- \Box No aquifers

Further developments

- Improve the interface (GUI)
- \Box Overcome the curse of dimensionality (switching from SDP to SDDP)

CONCLUSIONS

- Include aquifer and stream-aquifer interactions (embedded multireservoir or eigenvalue models)
- Adaptation of the tool to explore climate change effects
- \Box Coupled quantity-quality analysis
- Etc.

Hydro-economic optimization THANK WOLUTFOR *the SDP_GAMS generalized optimization tool* YOUR ATTENTION

Hector Macian-Sorribes and Manuel Pulido-Velazquez

Research Institute of Water and Environmental Engineering (IIAMA). Universitat Politècnica de València. Email: hecmasor@upv.es

Bologna IAHS 2014 6th IAHS-EGU International Symposium on Integrated Water Resources Management Bologna 4-6 June 2014

River Reno close to Bologna Source: Panoramio