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Abstract—One potential future for the next generation of smart grids is the use of decentralized optimization algorithms and secured communications for coordinating renewable generation (e.g., wind/solar), dispatchable devices (e.g., coal/gas/nuclear generations), demand response, battery & storage facilities, and topology optimization. The Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM) has been widely used in the community to address such decentralized optimization problems and, in particular, the AC Optimal Power Flow (AC-OPF). This paper studies how machine learning may help in speeding up the convergence of ADMM for solving AC-OPF. It proposes a novel decentralized machine-learning approach, namely ML-ADMM, where each agent uses deep learning to learn the consensus parameters on the coupling branches. The paper also explores the idea of learning only from ADMM runs that exhibit high-quality convergence properties, and proposes filtering mechanisms to select these runs. Experimental results on test cases based on the French system demonstrate the potential of the approach in speeding up the convergence of ADMM significantly.
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I. INTRODUCTION

One potential future for the next generation of smart grids is the use of decentralized optimization algorithms and secured communications for coordinating renewable generation (e.g., wind/solar), dispatchable devices (e.g., coal/gas/nuclear generations), demand response, battery & storage facilities, and topology optimization. The alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) has been widely used in the community to address such decentralized optimization problems and, in particular, the AC Optimal Power Flow (AC-OPF). This optimization problem finds the most economical generation dispatch that meets the load, while also satisfying the physical and engineering constraints of the underlying power grid.

The non-convexity of the AC-OPF limits the solving frequency of many operational tools, in particular in decentralized settings. Moreover, the integration of renewable energy and demand response mechanisms with significant stochasticity in both load and generation makes it challenging to rely on past generation schedules: the lack of global consensus may lead to sub-optimal dispatches and, in the worst case, cause voltage, stability, and synchronization issues. As a result, balancing generation and load rapidly in a decentralized fashion without sacrificing economical efficiency is an important challenge. To cope with the AC-OPF computational complexity, system operators nowadays typically resort to OPF approximations (e.g., linearized models). While efficient decentralized linearized models (e.g., DC-OPFs with ADMM [4]) have been proposed, linear approximations may still lead to sub-optimal solutions and create potentially convergence issues [5] when converting the approximations back to AC solutions.

A recent line of research has focused on how to approximate centralize AC-OPFs using Deep Neural Networks (DNN) (e.g., [6]–[9]). Once a neural network is trained, predictions can be computed in the order of milliseconds with a single forward pass through the network. Even though power grids are large (e.g., 10,000 buses or more), they are commonly composed of different load-balancing regions/areas. AC-OPFs can then be computed in a regionally decentralized fashion [10]. Recent work [11] has also shown that deep learning can be spatially decomposed in a similar fashion.

This paper investigates the potential of machine learning in power systems in decentralized settings. In particular, it studies how machine learning may help in solving AC-OPF efficiently in a decentralized fashion, and focuses on consensus-based decentralized AC-OPFs. Instead of replacing parts of a decentralized algorithm by learning approaches & heuristics (e.g., [12]), the paper observes that, ultimately, many decentralized algorithms can be seen as iterative processes that find a set of consensus decisions on their interconnections. When the set of consensus decisions on the interconnections is known or can be predicted with high accuracy, these decentralized algorithms converge faster, reducing computing times and communication overhead. In power systems, this means that the agent for each region/zone will only perform a small number of iterations before convergence.

To realize this vision, the paper proposes a novel approach, namely ML-ADMM, that uses deep learning to learn the consensus parameters on the coupling branches. Its main contributions can be summarized as follows:

1) the paper proposes a decentralized learning scheme to learn the values of coupling branches of each region from historical data (e.g., it would learn the consensus and dual values for branches (1,2) and (3,4) in Figure 1):
2) the paper explores the idea of learning only from ADMM runs that exhibit high-quality convergence properties, and proposes filtering mechanisms to select these runs;
3) the paper performs experimental evaluations on large-scale French data sets from RTE and shows that ML-ADMM can significantly speed up of the convergence of the traditional ADMM procedure.

It is important to emphasize that the training of the machine-learning models is decentralized by nature: and each agent can
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Finally, Section VIII concludes the paper.

Section VII reports the experimental results.

Section VI introduces the Regionally Decentralized AC-OPFs and the ADMM formulations. Section V presents the related work and background material. Section IV introduces the Regionally Decentralized AC-OPFs and the ADMM formulations. Section III present the related work and background material. Section II presents the background materials for the rest of the paper. Table I presents the common notations and symbols.

### II. RELATED WORK

The application of machine learning to optimal power flows has been widely studied in recent years. Overviews on various approaches can be found in [9], [13]–[15]. For supervised learning, a wide variety of approaches have been proposed, including: learning the active set of constraints [16]–[20]; imitating the Newton-Raphson algorithm [21]; learning warm starting points for speeding-up the optimization process [22], [23]; and predicting optimal dispatch decisions [3]. Applying machine learning techniques to decentralized OPF problems has also been studied recently. Biagioni et al. [12] have proposed a recurrent neural network (RNN) for solving decentralized DC-OPF problems. Other related works explore formal guarantees for neural networks when learning OPF problems [26], [27], and extend the learning methodologies to security-constrained OPF problems [28], [29]. Reinforcement-learning approaches for OPF problems have also been proposed (e.g., [30]–[33]) and primarily focus on tackling real-time issues. This paper continues the line of work [5], [11], [33], [35] in using deep learning to predict AC-OPF solutions directly, while integrating practices/constraints found in U.S. energy markets. The work differs from existing work on decentralized OPFs (e.g., [12]) in three ways:

1) it focuses on predicting the flows and voltage on coupling branches, governed largely by transactions between regional load balancing zones/authorities (for the inter-regional exchange markets) instead of learning the decentralized algorithm itself, e.g., learning the search directions/heuristics;

2) the learning procedure is decentralized by nature and each agent can train in parallel and independently, maintaining privacy & region/agent neutrality; and

3) the predictions are not tied to any specific decentralized algorithm, and can be seen as predicting transactions in an exchange market.

### III. BACKGROUND

This section presents background materials for the rest of the paper. Table I presents the common notations and symbols.

#### A. AC Optimal Power Flow

The AC Optimal Power Flow (OPF) determines the most economical generation dispatch balancing the load and generation in a power grid. Model 1 presents an AC OPF formulation (centralized model), with variables and parameters in the complex domain for clarity and compactness. For simplicity, the presentation omits the equations for transformers, phase shifters, circuit breakers/switches, and fixed/switched bus shunts. All omitted devices are considered and implemented in the experimental evaluation. The objective function $\mathcal{O}(S^g)$ captures the cost of the generator dispatch, with $S^g$ denoting the vector of generator dispatch values ($S^g_i \mid i \in N$). Constraint (2) sets the voltage angle of the reference/slack bus $S^g_i$ to zero to eliminate numerical symmetries. Constraint (3) bounds the voltage magnitudes. Constraint (4) enforces the generator output $S^g_i$ to stay within its limits. Constraint (5) imposes the line flow limits on all the line flow variables $S_{ij}$. Constraint (6) captures Kirchhoff’s Current Law enforcing the flow balance of generations $S^g_i$, loads $S^d_i$, and branch flows $S_{ij}$ across every node. Finally, constraint (7) captures Ohm’s Law describing the AC power flow $S_{ij}$ across lines/transformers.

#### B. Alternating Direction of Multipliers Method (ADMM)

ADMM [36] is a widely used decentralized algorithm solving decentralized optimization problems with coupling
constraints. Consider an optimization problem with two agents/parties:

$$\begin{align*}
\min_{x_1, x_2} & \quad f_1(x_1) + f_2(x_2) \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad x_1 \in X_1, x_2 \in X_2, \\
& \quad Ax_1 + Bx_2 = c,
\end{align*}$$

(8)

where $X_1 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ are two disjoint feasible space for two independent local optimization problems, $x_1 \in X_1 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $x_2 \in X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ denote feasible variable vectors owned by two distinct groups of agents, and $Ax_1 + Bx_2 = c$ describes the set of $l$ coupling constraints between the two groups of agents with $A \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times m}$, and $c \in \mathbb{R}^l$. The functions $f_1$ and $f_2$ denote the objectives over $x_1$ and $x_2$, respectively. They are commonly assumed to be convex.

Problem (8) is often reformulated and simplified by introducing consensus parameters explicitly, leading to the consensus formulation [37]. Let $x^C_1, x^C_2$ to be the consensus for $x_1, x_2$. The consensus formulation of (8) for agent 1 is:

$$\begin{align*}
\min_{x_1} & \quad f_1(x_1) \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad x_1 \in X_1, Ax_1 = c - Bx_2, \\
& \quad x_2 = x^C_2,
\end{align*}$$

(9)

The consensus formulation for agent 2 is similar. The augmented Lagrange function $L^1_{\rho}(x^C_1, \lambda_2)$ of [37] for agent 1 is:

$$\begin{align*}
\min_{x_1} f_1(x_1) + \lambda_2^T x_2 + \frac{\rho}{2} \|x_2 - x^C_2\|_2^2 \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad x_1 \in X_1, Ax_1 = c - Bx_2,
\end{align*}$$

(10)

where $\lambda_2$ is a vector of Lagrangian multipliers for $x_2$ in the view of agent 1, with $\rho > 0$ representing the penalty parameter. Similarly, the augmented Lagrange function $L^2_{\rho}(x^C_2, \lambda_1)$ of [37] for agent 2 is:

$$\begin{align*}
\min_{x_2} f_2(x_2) + \lambda_1^T x_1 + \frac{\rho}{2} \|x_1 - x^C_1\|_2^2 \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad x_2 \in X_2, Bx_2 = c - Ax_1
\end{align*}$$

(11)

where $\lambda_1$ is a vector of Lagrangian multipliers for $x_1$ in the view of agent 2.

Given a solution tuple $(x^k_1, x^k_2)$ and the Lagrangian multipliers $(\lambda^k_1, \lambda^k_2)$ at iteration $k$, ADMM proceeds to the next iteration, $k + 1$, as follows:

$$\begin{align*}
x^{k+1}_1 &= \arg\min_{x_1} L^1_{\rho}(x^k_2, \lambda^k_2) \\
&= \arg\min_{x_1} f_1(x_1) + \lambda^k_2^T x_2 + \frac{\rho}{2} \|x_2 - x^k_2\|_2^2 \\
&\text{s.t.} \quad x_1 \in X_1, Ax_1 = c - Bx_2, \\
&\quad x_2 = x^k_2,
\end{align*}$$

(12)

The algorithm terminates when a desired condition (e.g., an iteration limit or a convergence factor) is reached. The quality of the solution at iteration $k$ can be measured by the primal infeasibility (residue) vector $[37]

$$r^k_p = Ax^k_1 + Bx^k_2 - c,$$

(13)

indicating the distance to a primal feasible solution, and the dual infeasibility (residue) vector $[37]

$$r^k_d = \rho A^T B(x^k_2 - x^{k-1}_2),$$

(14)

indicating the distance from the previous local minima. When both infeasibility vectors are zero, ADMM has converged to a (local) optimal and feasible solution.

### C. Deep Learning Neural Network (DNN)

Deep Neural Networks are a learning framework composed of a sequence of layers, with each layer typically taking as inputs the results of the previous layer (e.g., [38]). Commonly used Feed Forward Neural Networks (FNNs) are DNNs where the layers are fully connected. The function connecting the layers, from $\mathbb{R}^n$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$ is given by:

$$y = \pi(Wx + b),$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an input vector with dimension $n$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the output vector with dimension $m$, $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is a matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{N} = (N, E)$</td>
<td>Power grid</td>
<td>$j$</td>
<td>Imaginary unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>Set of buses</td>
<td>$V_i = v_i \angle \theta_i$</td>
<td>Bus voltages of bus $i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>Set of branches</td>
<td>$S_{ij}^l = p_{ij}^l + jq_{ij}^l$</td>
<td>Line power flow of branch $(i, j)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E' = {(j, i) : (i, j) \in E}$</td>
<td>Set of branches (reverse)</td>
<td>$\lambda_{ij} = g_{ij} + jb_{ij}$</td>
<td>Line Admittance of branch $(i, j)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G$</td>
<td>Set of generators</td>
<td>$S_{ij}^d = p_{ij}^d + jq_{ij}^d$</td>
<td>Generation dispatch of generator $i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D$</td>
<td>Set of load demands</td>
<td>$\lambda_i$</td>
<td>Market cost function for generator $i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s \in N$</td>
<td>Reference bus / slack bus</td>
<td>$\pi_{\mathbb{R}(\delta), \Im(x)}$</td>
<td>Upper and lower bound of quantity $x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K$</td>
<td>Set of regions ($k \in K$)</td>
<td>$\Re(x), \Im(x)$</td>
<td>Real and imaginary component of complex quantity $x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_k \subseteq E$</td>
<td>Set of local branches at region $k$</td>
<td>$x[k]$</td>
<td>Projection of quantities $x$ to region/area $k$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_k \subseteq G$</td>
<td>Set of local generators at region $k$</td>
<td>$\lambda$</td>
<td>Lagrangian multipliers (ADMM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N^B_k \subseteq N_k$</td>
<td>Set of border buses at region $k$ connecting to other regions</td>
<td>$\lambda$</td>
<td>Lagrangian multipliers (ADMM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of weights, and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is a bias vector. Both $W$ and $b$ define the trainable parameters of the network. The activation function $\pi$ is usually non-linear (e.g., a rectified linear unit (ReLU)).

A DNN $\mathcal{M} : R^n \rightarrow R^m$ with $i$ hidden layers $h$ can be formulated as:

\[
\begin{align*}
  h_1 &= \pi(W_1 x + b_1), \\
  h_j &= \pi(W_j h_{j-1} + b_j), \quad \forall j \in \{2, 3, ..., i\} \\
  y &= \pi(W_i h_i + b_{i+1})
\end{align*}
\]

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the input and output vectors. Learning DNN model $\mathcal{M}$ on a data set $T$ consists of finding the matrices $W_j$ and bias vectors $b_j$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, ..., i + 1\}$ to make the output predictions $\hat{y}_t$ close to the ground truth data $y_t$ for all $t \in T$, as measured by a loss function $L$:

\[
\begin{align*}
  \min_{W_j, b_j : j \in \{i, i+1\}} & \sum_{t \in T} L(y_t, \hat{y}_t), \\
  \text{where} \quad \hat{y}_t &= \mathcal{M}(x_t)
\end{align*}
\]

IV. REGIONALLY DECENTRALIZED AC-OPFS

This section presents the ADMM mechanism to solve Regionally Decentralized AC-OPFs. The presentation is largely based on [10] and describes the regional AC-OPF model for each region, followed by showing the Augmented Lagrangian formulation for the ADMM approach.

A. REGIONALLY DECENTRALIZED AC-OPF FORMULATION

Model 2 presents the regional decentralized AC-OPF model for each load balancing region/zone $k$ in $K$, based on the central Model 1. Figure 2 shows the decomposition diagram, based on the example in Figure 1. Each load balancing region only considers the grid within their boundary, plus the interconnections (coupling branches and their associated buses). The model relies on matching the consensus parameters $S^C[k]$ and $V^C[k]$ on the interconnections, by constraints (26)-(27), to synchronize with the other regions.

B. AUGMENTED LAGRANGIAN FORMULATION

Model 3 shows the Augmented Lagrangian relaxation for Model 2 with the introduction of Lagrangian dual $\lambda_S[k]$, $\lambda_V[k]$, and the $\rho$ penalty parameters for each load balancing region $k$. Model [3] will be used in the ADMM algorithm, which is presented in the appendix in details (Algorithm 1).

V. LEARNING ARCHITECTURE: ML-ADMM

The previous section presented how to utilize decentralized optimization, e.g., ADMM methods, to find flows and voltages for shared interconnections. This section presents a decentralized machine-learning approach to learn these entities. Note that the proposed learning methodology is general and does not necessarily require an augmented Lagrangian formulation and/or an ADMM approach. The paper primarily chooses ADMM method to demonstrate how to develop learning strategies for learning decentralized optimization problems in power systems.

The machine-learning approach is motivated by the recognition that, in practice, it would be costly to cold-start the ADMM instead of predictions/forecasts for the consensus variables ($S^C$, $V^C$) and their corresponding dual multipliers ($\lambda_S$, $\lambda_V$). Predictions on load demands and renewable generations are already incorporated by various ISOs in their markets (e.g., MISO [39]). ML-ADMM generalizes this practice by incorporating the predictions on the consensus variables.
Model 3 Augmented Lagrangian Regional AC-OPF: \( P_L \)

**input:**

\[
S^d[k] = (S^d_i : i \in N_k)
\]

\[
S^C[k] = (S^C_{ij} : (i,j) \in R_k \cap R_k^C)
\]

\[
\lambda_S[k] = (\lambda_{S_{ij}} : (i,j) \in R_k \cap R_k^C)
\]

\[
V^C[k] = (V^C_{ij} : (i,j) \in R_k \cap R_k^C)
\]

\[
\lambda_V[k] = (\lambda_{V_{ij}} : (i,j) \in R_k \cap R_k^C)
\]

**variables:**

\[
S^q[k] = (S^q_i : \forall i \in N_k),
\]

\[
V[k] = (V_i : \forall i \in N_k \cup N_k^N)
\]

\[
S^f[k] = (S^f_{ij} : \forall (i,j) \in E_k \cup E_k^R \cap R_k \cap R_k^R)
\]

**minimize:**

\[
\sum_{i \in N_k} M_i (R(S^q_i) +
\sum_{(i,j) \in R_k \cap R_k^R} (\lambda_{S_{ij}} \cdot S^f_{ij}) + \sum_{(i,j) \in R_k \cap R_k^R} (\lambda_{V_{ij}} \cdot V_i) + \rho \left[ \sum_{(i,j) \in R_k \cap R_k^R} \|S^f_{ij} - S^f_{ij}^{*}\|^2 + \sum_{(i,j) \in R_k \cap R_k^R} \|V_i - V_i^{*}\|^2 \right]
\]

subject to:

\[
\|S^d_i - S^d_i^{*}\|_2^2 \leq \alpha, \quad i \in N_k
\]

A. The Machine-Learning Models

ML-ADMM aims at learning two sets of parameters: the consensus variables \( S^C, V^C \) and their corresponding dual multipliers \( \lambda_S, \lambda_V \), based on the current load forecast \( S^d \). Since these parameters are complex quantities, ML-ADMM first splits each quantity into its individual components as follows:

\[
S^d \to p^d + iq^d,
\]

\[
S^C \to p^C + iq^C, \quad V^C \to v^C \angle \theta^C,
\]

\[
\lambda_S \to \lambda_p + i\lambda_q, \quad \lambda_V \to \lambda_\theta.
\]

Let \( x \) be the flattened input vector \((p^d, q^d)\), and \( y[k] \) to be the target prediction quantities, i.e., \( p^C[k], q^C[k], v^C[k], \theta^C[k], \lambda_p[k], \lambda_q[k], \lambda_\theta[k], \lambda_\theta[k], \lambda_\theta[k] \) for each load balancing zone/region \( k \). Each region \( k \) can be seen as learning \( y[k] \) for an input vector \( S^d \). To do so, ML-ADMM constructs DNNs \( \mathbb{M}_y[k] \) of the form:

\[
\mathbb{M}_y[k](x) : y[k] = \pi(W_2 h + b_2), \quad \text{with} \quad h = \pi(W_1 x + b_1)
\]

where \( h \) is the hidden layer with a dimension set to twice the dimension of the output vector \( y[k] \). Figure 3 illustrates the four types of DNNs constructed by ML-ADMM for predicting the coupling parameters and the associated dual multipliers for each region \( k \).

B. Decentralized Training

ML-ADMM trains the models \( \mathbb{M}_y[k] \) of each load balancing zone/region \( k \) in a decentralized fashion using a data set \( T[k] \) for each region \( k \). Moreover, the training can also proceed in parallel for each target prediction quantity — \( p^C[k], q^C[k], v^C[k], \theta^C[k], \lambda_p[k], \lambda_q[k], \lambda_\theta[k], \lambda_\theta[k] \). In real time, the ML-ADMM framework uses the predicted quantities from the machine-learning models to seed/initiate the ADMM process for each of the regional decentralized AC-OPF optimizations. Observe that both the training and the optimization proceeds in a fully decentralized fashion. Moreover, during training, the region do not interact with each other.

VI. Filtering the Training Data

ADMM runs may exhibit significant convergence properties, even for closely related inputs. The section investigates a novel idea: only using historical ADMM runs with high-quality convergence properties in the training set. The motivation here is not to imitate the behavior of all ADMM runs: rather it is to find initial values for the consensus parameters that will enable strong convergence of the optimization model.

a) ADMM Behavior: The filtering idea is motivated by the fact that ADMM runs for specific inputs may not be optimal, unique, or may not have converged when reaching their termination condition. For instance, Figures 4 and 5 display the active power and voltage magnitude, together with their corresponding dual multipliers, for a specific coupling branch and one of its associated buses. The results are for ADMM runs with 3,000 iterations over a variety of instances of the France_EHV test case. Each dot in the figures is an instance and the figures report correlations between the primal & dual infeasibility residues on the one hand and the active power and voltage magnitude (and their duals) on the other hand. As can be observed, there are strong correlations between these quantities and the convergence measures (i.e., primal and dual infeasibility residues) and also natural breakpoints that separates the runs with good convergence properties from the more problematic runs. Learning from instances with poor convergence qualities is not desirable and hence ML-ADMM utilizes two set of filters to select the training data.

b) Convergence Filter: The convergence filter \( c(\alpha) \) returns a subset of the data set \( T[k] \) by filtering instances whose primal or dual infeasibility residues are higher than a threshold specified by \( \alpha \). In other words, the convergence filter excludes data sets by splitting the x-axis of Figures 4 and 5. Let \( r_p(t) \) and \( r_d(t) \) to be the primal and dual infeasibility residue for instance \( t \), and \( A_{r_p} \) and \( A_{r_d} \) to be two arrays storing, in ascending order, the primal and dual infeasibility residues for all instances in \( T[k] \). Let \( A_{r_p}[i]/A_{r_d}[i] \) to be the \( i^{th} \) element
of the array $A_{p_d}/A_{d_d}$. The threshold $r^\text{thres}_p/r^\text{thres}_d$ for primal and dual infeasibility residues are given by:

$$r^\text{thres}_p = A_{p_d} \left[ \frac{\alpha \times |T|}{p} \right]$$

$$r^\text{thres}_d = A_{d_d} \left[ \frac{\alpha \times |T|}{d} \right]$$

where $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. The data set returned by filter $c(\alpha)$ for region/zones $k \in K$ is thus

$$\{t \in T[k] \mid r_p(t) \leq r^\text{thres}_p \land r_d(t) \leq r^\text{thres}_d \}.$$

c) Standard Deviation Filter: The standard deviation filter $s(\beta)$ returns a subset of the data set $T[k]$ by filtering instances whose consensus/dual multiplier values are outliers. In other words, the filter excludes instances by splitting the $y$-axis of Figures 4 and 5. Let $y[k](t)$ to be the target prediction quantity (either $p^C[k], q^C[k], v^C[k], \theta^C[k], \lambda_p[k], \lambda_q[k], \lambda_d[k], \lambda_v[k], \lambda_a[k]$) for instance $t \in T[k]$. Let $m(y[k])$ and $\sigma(y[k])$ be the mean and standard deviation vector of $y[k]$ across the data set $t \in T[k]$, i.e., the mean and standard deviation for the set $\{y[k](t) : t \in T[k]\}$. The data set returned by filter $s(\beta)$ for region/zones $k \in K$ is:

$$\{t \in T[k] \mid |y[k](t) - m(y[k])| \leq \beta \sigma(y[k])\},$$

for all $y[k] \in \{p^C[k], q^C[k], v^C[k], \theta^C[k], \lambda_p[k], \lambda_q[k], \lambda_d[k], \lambda_v[k], \lambda_a[k]\}$, where $\leq$ generalizes $\leq$ for vectors.

VII. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATIONS

This section presents the data-generation process, the implementation and training details, the prediction accuracy, and convergence results of the learning-boosted ADMM with respect to the original ADMM and the AC-OPF solution.

A. Experimental Setup

a) Benchmarks: The experiments were performed on three networks: France_EHV, LYON, and France. All of them were extracted and modified from parts of the French Transmission Grid. They are partitioned geographically into 12 French regions, composed by 1700 to 6700 buses, and contain between 140 and 320 coupling branches. Detailed network parameters can be found in [11].

b) Implementation Details: The ADMM and AC-OPF solving routines were implemented in Julia 1.6.1, with Ipopt 3.12.13 (w/ HSL MA57) as the nonlinear solver. The learning models were implemented in PyTorch [40] and run with Python 3.6, with the Mean Squared Error (MSE) as the loss function. The training was performed in parallel on Intel CPU cores at 2.1GHz, one core for each region. The training used Averaged Stochastic Gradient Descent (ASGD), with 64 minibatches, 1000 epochs, and 0.001 learning rate.

c) Data Generation: The training data sets were generated by varying the load profiles of each test network from 80% to 122% of their original (complex) load values, with a step size of 0.01%, giving a maximum of 4200 test cases for every benchmark network. For each test case, to create enough diversity, every load is perturbed with random noise from the polar Laplace distribution whose parameter $\lambda$ is set to 1% of the apparent power. Test cases with no feasible AC solutions were removed from the data set. The outputs of each test case is obtained by running the implemented ADMM routine for 3000 iterations with $\rho$ set to 10. Results from the ADMM routine were recorded as the ground truth, and split with 80%-20% ratio for training and testing purposes.

d) Evaluation Details: The evaluation aims at determining whether machine learning can speed up the convergence of the ADMM. It compares the learning-boosted ML-ADMM with three key baselines:

1) Nominal initialization [N-ADMM] — the ADMM initialized with nominal consensus and zero dual values and run for 500 iterations;
2) Ground Truth Data [P-DATA] — the ADMM initialized with nominal consensus and zero dual values and run for 3000 iterations.
The Prediction Errors in Percentage for Various Filters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Filter</th>
<th>$\psi^C$</th>
<th>$\sigma^C$</th>
<th>$\psi^C$</th>
<th>$\theta^C$</th>
<th>$\lambda_p$</th>
<th>$\lambda_q$</th>
<th>$\lambda_s$</th>
<th>$\lambda_{p}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>11.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>21.19</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>60.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>s(2.0)</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>21.34</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>60.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>s(3.0)</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>21.34</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>60.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>s(4.0)</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>21.34</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>60.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>s(5.0)</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>21.34</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>60.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that ADMM solutions are difficult to learn and generalize. The errors without filters can be as large as 24% for primal variables and close to 68% for dual multipliers. The filters significantly reduce predictor errors, producing data sets that are easier to learn. In particular, the accuracy for primal solutions (LYON-$q^C$) and dual solutions (LYON-$\lambda_{p}$) improve almost 12% and 54% when using specific filters.

The convergence filters almost always provide higher accuracy than the standard deviation filters. This may be explained by the fact that the convergence variations are not necessarily Gaussian and hence the standard deviation filters are potentially biased against instances with high infeasibility residues that occur frequently.

### C. Performance of ML-ADMM Against the Ground-Truth

This section presents the performance results of ML-ADMM over all testing instances, including those instances with high infeasibility residues. Table [V] presents the average objective gap of ML-ADMM (over all test cases and regions $k \in K$) against the ground truth P-DATA when ML-ADMM is run for a number of iterations ranging from 5 to 500 ADMM. The average objective gaps of N-ADMM are also included for comparison purposes. Let $\hat{O}$ to be the objective value from P-DATA and let $\hat{O}$ be the objective value returned by a run of ML-ADMM. The objective gap is defined as

$$100 \times \frac{\hat{O} - O^*}{O^*}$$

In addition, Tables [V] and [VI] also report average results for the primal and dual residues $r_p$ and $r_d$.

The results show that ML-ADMM provides orders of magnitude improvements in objective gap, primal residue, and dual residue over ADMM for small numbers of iterations. Within 500 iterations, the ML-ADMM variants recover almost the same solution quality as P-DATA ($< 0.3\%$ objective difference). Interestingly, within 5 iterations, the ML-ADMM variants differ only by at most 3% from the ground truth. On the contrary N-ADMM exhibits objective gaps of $-3.44\%$, $-10.44\%$, and $-24.21\%$, demonstrating the value of learning for fast convergence. The primal and dual residue of the ML-ADMM variants are of high quality, often improving those of P-ADMM, the ADMM procedure initialized with the ground-truth consensus and dual values. This contrast with the results of N-ADMM which are often an order magnitude larger than those of the ML-ADMM variants.

B. Learning Accuracy

Let $T[k]$ to be the collection of the data set obtained by applying filters to the testing data sets for region $k \in K$. Let $x^T(t)$ to be the tensor of ground truths for data set $t \in T[k]$, and $\hat{x}(t)$ to be predicted tensor. The mean prediction error (in % metric) for $\hat{x}$ is given by:

$$100 \times \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{k \in K} \frac{1}{|T[k]|} \sum_{t \in T[k]} \frac{\|x^T(t) - \hat{x}(t)\|_1}{\|x^T(t)\|_1}.$$
TABLE IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Filter</th>
<th>ADMM Iterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50 100 150 200 250 300 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>-6.17</td>
<td>-6.09 -6.05 -6.02 -6.02 -6.02 -6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr(0%)</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-0.45 -0.27 -0.19 -0.14 -0.09 -0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr(50%)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.18 0.14 0.09 0.06 0.04 0.02 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr(100%)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.73 0.50 0.37 0.25 0.17 0.10 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s(40%)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.37 0.21 0.15 0.09 0.04 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s(60%)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.34 0.18 0.04 -0.03 -0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s(20%)</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.11 -0.02 -0.01 0.01 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-ADMM</td>
<td>-54.32</td>
<td>-54.08 -53.99 -54.37 -59.09 -59.64 -51.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYN</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>-1.01 -0.88 -0.63 -0.50 -0.33 -0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr(0%)</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.64 -0.50 -0.40 -0.33 -0.26 -0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr(50%)</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>-1.18 -0.91 -0.72 -0.53 -0.48 -0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr(100%)</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>-1.04 -0.83 -0.64 -0.54 -0.45 -0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s(40%)</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>-0.90 -0.69 -0.43 -0.31 -0.26 -0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s(60%)</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>-0.94 -0.73 -0.50 -0.46 -0.37 -0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s(20%)</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>-0.64 -0.46 -0.30 -0.24 -0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-ADMM</td>
<td>-50.42</td>
<td>-50.04 -49.27 -47.73 -33.84 -25.90 -20.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
<td>-1.64 -1.30 -1.03 -0.82 -0.67 -0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr(0%)</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
<td>-1.89 -1.54 -1.06 -0.85 -0.69 -0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr(50%)</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>-1.40 -1.08 -0.87 -0.70 -0.57 -0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr(100%)</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>-1.01 -0.80 -0.63 -0.50 -0.40 -0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s(40%)</td>
<td>-2.12</td>
<td>-1.65 -1.31 -1.04 -0.83 -0.68 -0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s(60%)</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>-1.36 -1.07 -0.84 -0.67 -0.53 -0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s(20%)</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
<td>-1.30 -1.02 -0.81 -0.63 -0.49 -0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Performance of ML-ADMM Against Centralized AC-OPF

Since not all the test cases from P-DATA converged with the same level of infeasibility, the comparison against the ground-truths may not always be ideal: indeed, ML-ADMM may obtain solutions with potentially better objectives, but these would be reported as errors in Table IV. This section further evaluates the learning routines against solutions obtained by a centralized AC-OPF procedure, which almost always produces better objective values.

Table VII reports the average optimality gap over all the testing instances. Again, the ML-ADMM variants provide orders of magnitude improvements in optimality gaps over N-ADMM. Moreover, the ML-ADMM variants recover almost the same optimality gap as P-ADMM and deliver a smaller optimality gap for the France_EHV benchmark. Again, filters further improve the benefits of learning. As indicated in Table IV and VII, P-ADMM, seeded with P-DATA, have almost no improvements.

Figure C further shows the optimality gap statistics (summarized by two box-(and-whisker) plots) for all the testing instances for the largest French benchmark. The box-plots indicate that ML-ADMM is essentially similar to P-ADMM, which is initialized with the ground truth, and produces orders of magnitude improvements compared to the traditional ADMM. The box-plots indicate tighter filtering parameters would generally result in slightly better skew/median optimality gaps, and with largely similar spread and variance.
VIII. CONCLUSION

This paper proposed ML-ADMM, a decentralized machine-learning framework to accelerate the convergence of an ADMM algorithm for solving the AC-OPF problem. The framework learns the coupling parameters of the regionally decentralized AC-OPF formulation, which can be used to hot-start the ADMM algorithm when new instances arrived. The paper has also explored the benefits of learning filters — filters that prevent machine learning being trained on instances with bad convergence properties. Experimental results on data sets from the French networks have showed that ML-ADMM produces solutions of similar quality than the traditional ADMM algorithm within a fraction (1/6) of iterations (500 versus 3,000). Moreover, ML-ADMM can produce solutions of similar quality as the ADMM algorithm hot-started with the ground truths for the consensus and dual multipliers. Filtering the datasets to learn from “good” runs also generally provides some additional benefits. These results indicate that machine learning could be a valuable tool for future smart grids operated with distributed optimization algorithms similar to ADMM.
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Algorithm 1: ADMM: Main routine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\rho \leftarrow \rho_0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$S^C \leftarrow S^C_0$, $V^C \leftarrow V^C_0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>for $k \in K$ do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$\lambda_S[k] \leftarrow (\lambda_S^i)_{ij} \leftarrow 0 : (i, j) \in R_k \cup R^R_k$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$\lambda_V[k] \leftarrow (\lambda_V^i)_{ij} \leftarrow 0 : (i, j) \in R_k \cup R^R_k$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>for $t = 1, 2, \ldots, t_{max}$ do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>for $k \in K$ do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Regional AC-OPF: $P_L(S^d \in R_k \cup R^R_k)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$S^d_{ij} = V_i : (i, j) \in R_k \cup R^R_k$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lagrange multiplier update: $\lambda_S[k] \leftarrow (\lambda_S^i)<em>{ij} \leftarrow (\lambda_S^i)</em>{ij} + (S^C_0)^i_{ij} - S^C_{ij} \in R_k \cup R^R_k)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$\lambda_V[k] \leftarrow (\lambda_V^i)<em>{ij} \leftarrow (\lambda_V^i)</em>{ij} + (V_i - V^C_i) : (i, j) \in R_k \cup R^R_k)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Consensus update: $S^C_{ij} \leftarrow (S^C_0^i + S^C_{ij}) / 2 : \forall (i, j) \in R_k \cup R^R_k$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$V^C_i \leftarrow (V^C_i + V_i) / 2 : \forall (i, j) \in R_k \cup R^R_k$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Penalty $\rho$ update (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$\rho \leftarrow \text{update}_\rho()$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX: ADMM ALGORITHM

The ADMM algorithm starts by receiving network topology $\mathcal{N}$ and load information $S^d$, predictions on the interconnection/coupling branch flows $S^C_0$ and voltage $V^C_0$, and the search parameters $\rho_0$ and $t_{max}$.

Line 1 initializes the penalty parameter, consensus variables, and the Lagrangian duals for each of the regions. Line 2 iterates the main search procedure $t_{max}$ times. Line 3 shows the search procedure for each region $k$. Line 4 executes Model 3 for each region. Line 5 updates the Lagrangian multipliers for each of the region. Finally, line 6 exports the consensus parameters.