Next-Generation Frequency and Voltage Control using Inverter-Based Resources

John W. Simpson-Porco

https://www.control.utoronto.ca/~jwsimpson/

The Edward S. Rogers Sr. Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

EPRI
ELECTRIC POWER RESEARCH INSTITUTE

NREL Workshop on Resilient Autonomous Energy Systems

September 7, 2021

JWSP Group Research in Control and Power Systems

Control + Opt of Microgrids



Feedback-Based Optimization



Robust Methods for Power Flow Analysis



Automatic Generation Ctrl.



Motivation

Selected Trends/Challenges in Grid Modernization:

1. reliability concerns from decreased inertia & new RES, DERs
2. inadequate legacy monitoring/control architectures (e.g., SCADA)

Required Advances for Next-Grid Control:

1. use of high-bandwidth **closed-loops** (e.g. 10+ samples/sec)
2. online coordination of heterogeneous **inverter-based resources** (IBRs)
3. **distributed hierarchical controls** for (i) integration of many devices, (ii) local situational awareness, (iii) low-latency localized response

- EPRI Whitepaper: "*Next-Generation Grid Monitoring and Control: Toward a Decentralized Hierarchical Control Paradigm*"

Enabling Fast Control via Inverter-Based Resources

Objectives and design constraints

Big Picture: fully leverage IBR capabilities for freq./volt. control

1. Design Objectives
   - **Fast** and **localized** compensation of disturbances
   - Hierarchical/decentralized architecture (min. delay, **scalability**)
   - State/control variable **constraint satisfaction**
2. Design Constraints
   - Premium on **simplicity** in design and implementation
   - Integrable with **legacy controls**
   - Uses **realistically available** model info.

Enabling Fast Control via Inverter-Based Resources

Objectives and design constraints

Big Picture: fully leverage IBR capabilities for freq./volt. control

1. Design Objectives
   - **Fast** and **localized** compensation of disturbances
   - Hierarchical/decentralized architecture (min. delay, **scalability**)
   - State/control variable **constraint satisfaction**
2. Design Constraints
   - Premium on **simplicity** in design and implementation
   - Integrable with **legacy controls**
   - Uses **realistically available** model info.

Enabling Fast Control via Inverter-Based Resources

Objectives and design constraints

Big Picture: fully leverage IBR capabilities for freq./volt. control

1. Design Objectives
   - **Fast** and **localized** compensation of disturbances
   - Hierarchical/decentralized architecture (min. delay, **scalability**)
   - State/control variable **constraint satisfaction**
2. Design Constraints
   - Premium on **simplicity** in design and implementation
   - Integrable with **legacy controls**
   - Uses **realistically available** model info.

Outline of Talk

1. Frequency controller design
2. Voltage controller design
3. Joint frequency/voltage design

Review: Frequency Control in the Bulk Grid



Fundamentals of frequency control:

1. **Inertial** response: fast response of rotating machines

   Time scale: immediate

2. **Primary** control: turbine-governor control for *stabilization*

   Time scale: seconds. *Spatial scale*: local control, global response

3. **Automatic Generation Control (AGC)**: multi-area control which eliminates *generation-load mismatch* within each area

   Time scale: minutes. *Spatial scale*: area control, area response.

Review: Frequency Control in the Bulk Grid



Fundamentals of frequency control:

1. **Inertial** response: fast response of rotating machines

   Time scale: immediate

2. **Primary** control: turbine-governor control for *stabilization*

   Time scale: seconds. *Spatial scale*: local control, global response

3. **Automatic Generation Control (AGC)**: multi-area control which eliminates *generation-load mismatch* within each area

   Time scale: minutes. *Spatial scale*: area control, area response.

Review: Frequency Control in the Bulk Grid



Fundamentals of frequency control:

1. **Inertial** response: fast response of rotating machines

   Time scale: immediate

2. **Primary** control: turbine-governor control for *stabilization*

   Time scale: seconds. *Spatial scale*: local control, global response

3. **Automatic Generation Control (AGC)**: multi-area control which eliminates *generation-load mismatch* within each area

   Time scale: minutes. *Spatial scale*: area control, area response.

Review: Frequency Control in the Bulk Grid



Fundamentals of frequency control:

1. **Inertial** response: fast response of rotating machines

   Time scale: immediate

2. **Primary** control: turbine-governor control for *stabilization*

   Time scale: seconds. *Spatial scale*: local control, global response

3. **Automatic Generation Control (AGC)**: multi-area control which eliminates *generation-load mismatch* within each area

   Time scale: minutes. *Spatial scale*: area control, area response.

Overview of Proposed Frequency Controller



Bulk grid divided into small **local control areas** $\mathcal{A}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_N$ (e.g., a few substations each)

Measurements and resources locally available within each LCA

1. **Stage 1:** LCA-decentralized controllers $\mathcal{C}_k$ redispatch local IBRs
2. **Stage 2:** Centralized coordination for severe contingencies

Conceptual goal: very **fast and localized** secondary-like response

Overview of Proposed Frequency Controller



Bulk grid divided into small **local control areas** $\mathcal{A}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_N$ (e.g., a few substations each)

Measurements and resources locally available within each LCA

1. **Stage 1:** LCA-decentralized controllers $\mathcal{C}_k$ redispatch local IBRs
2. **Stage 2:** Centralized coordination for severe contingencies

Conceptual goal: very **fast and localized** secondary-like response

Overview of Proposed Frequency Controller



Bulk grid divided into small **local control areas** $\mathcal{A}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_N$ (e.g., a few substations each)

Measurements and resources locally available within each LCA

1. **Stage 1:** LCA-decentralized controllers $\mathcal{C}_k$ redispatch local IBRs
2. **Stage 2:** Centralized coordination for severe contingencies

Conceptual goal: very **fast and localized** secondary-like response

Overview of Proposed Frequency Controller



Bulk grid divided into small **local control areas** $\mathcal{A}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_N$ (e.g., a few substations each)

Measurements and resources locally available within each LCA

1. **Stage 1:** LCA-decentralized controllers $\mathcal{C}_k$ redispatch local IBRs
2. **Stage 2:** Centralized coordination for severe contingencies

Conceptual goal: very **fast and localized** secondary-like response

Stage 1: Local Control Area (LCA) Frequency Control

Philosophy: quickly estimate and compensate all local imbalance



IBRs: can have local f/P droop curve, but must **accept a provided set-point**

1. **Disturbance Estimator:** real-time estimate of gen.-load mismatch
2. **Detuning (if needed):** lower bandwidth to ensure robust stability
3. **Power Allocator:** compute (constrained) power set-points for IBRs

Stage 1: Local Control Area (LCA) Frequency Control

Philosophy: quickly estimate and compensate all local imbalance



IBRs: can have local f/P droop curve, but must **accept a provided set-point**

1. **Disturbance Estimator:** real-time estimate of gen.-load mismatch
2. **Detuning (if needed):** lower bandwidth to ensure robust stability
3. **Power Allocator:** compute (constrained) power set-points for IBRs

Stage 1: Local Control Area (LCA) Frequency Control

Philosophy: quickly estimate and compensate all local imbalance



<u>IBRs</u>: can have local f/P droop curve, but must **accept a provided set-point**

1. **Disturbance Estimator:** real-time estimate of gen.-load mismatch
2. **Detuning (if needed):** lower bandwidth to ensure robust stability
3. **Power Allocator:** compute (constrained) power set-points for IBRs

Stage 1: Local Control Area (LCA) Frequency Control

Philosophy: quickly estimate and compensate all local imbalance



IBRs: can have local f/P droop curve, but must **accept a provided set-point**

1. **Disturbance Estimator:** real-time estimate of gen.-load mismatch
2. **Detuning (if needed):** lower bandwidth to ensure robust stability
3. **Power Allocator:** compute (constrained) power set-points for IBRs

Stage 1: Design of the Disturbance Estimator

An application of classical internal model control (IMC) . . .

1. A crude/**aggregate LCA model**, e.g.,

$$2H\Delta\dot{\omega} = -(D + \tfrac{1}{R_{\rm I}})\Delta\omega + \Delta P_{\rm m} - \Delta P_{\rm u} - \Delta P_{\rm inter} + \Delta P_{\rm ibr}^{\rm c}$$
$$T_{\rm R}\Delta\dot{P}_{\rm m} = -\Delta P_{\rm m} - R_{\rm g}^{-1}(\Delta\omega + T_{\rm R}F_{\rm H}\Delta\dot{\omega}),$$

   where $\Delta x = (\Delta\omega, \Delta P_{\rm m})$ and $\Delta P_{\rm u}$ = unknown gen/load mismatch

2. **Assume:** $\Delta\omega$ measured, $\Delta P_{\rm inter}$ measured (subj. to. delays)

3. Discretize LCA model & augment with **disturbance/delay models**

$$\Delta P_{\rm u}(k+1) = \Delta P_{\rm u}(k), \qquad \Delta\omega_{\rm m}(k) = \Delta\omega(k - \tau_{\rm d}), \ldots$$

4. Design **observer** (e.g., Kalman) to estimate $\Delta\hat{x}(k)$ **and** $\Delta\hat{P}_{\rm u}(k)$)

Stage 1: Design of the Disturbance Estimator

An application of classical internal model control (IMC) . . .

1. A crude/**aggregate LCA model**, e.g.,

$$2H\Delta\dot{\omega} = -(D + \tfrac{1}{R_{\rm I}})\Delta\omega + \Delta P_{\rm m} - \Delta P_{\rm u} - \Delta P_{\rm inter} + \Delta P_{\rm ibr}^{\rm c}$$
$$T_{\rm R}\Delta\dot{P}_{\rm m} = -\Delta P_{\rm m} - R_{\rm g}^{-1}(\Delta\omega + T_{\rm R}F_{\rm H}\Delta\dot{\omega}),$$

   where $\Delta x = (\Delta\omega, \Delta P_{\rm m})$ and $\Delta P_{\rm u}$ = unknown gen/load mismatch

2. **Assume:** $\Delta\omega$ measured, $\Delta P_{\rm inter}$ measured (subj. to. delays)

3. Discretize LCA model & augment with **disturbance/delay models**

$$\Delta P_{\rm u}(k+1) = \Delta P_{\rm u}(k), \qquad \Delta\omega_{\rm m}(k) = \Delta\omega(k-\tau_{\rm d}), \ldots$$

4. Design **observer** (e.g., Kalman) to estimate $\Delta\hat{x}(k)$ **and** $\Delta\hat{P}_{\rm u}(k)$)

Stage 1: Design of the Disturbance Estimator

An application of classical internal model control (IMC) ...

1. A crude/**aggregate LCA model**, e.g.,

$$2H\Delta\dot{\omega} = -(D + \tfrac{1}{R_\mathrm{I}})\Delta\omega + \Delta P_\mathrm{m} - \Delta P_\mathrm{u} - \Delta P_\mathrm{inter} + \Delta P_\mathrm{ibr}^\mathrm{c}$$

$$T_\mathrm{R}\Delta\dot{P}_\mathrm{m} = -\Delta P_\mathrm{m} - R_\mathrm{g}^{-1}(\Delta\omega + T_\mathrm{R}F_\mathrm{H}\Delta\dot{\omega}),$$

   where $\Delta x = (\Delta\omega, \Delta P_\mathrm{m})$ and ΔP_u = unknown gen/load mismatch

2. **Assume:** $\Delta\omega$ measured, ΔP_inter measured (subj. to delays)

3. Discretize LCA model & augment with **disturbance/delay models**

$$\Delta P_\mathrm{u}(k+1) = \Delta P_\mathrm{u}(k), \qquad \Delta\omega_\mathrm{m}(k) = \Delta\omega(k - \tau_\mathrm{d}), \ldots$$

4. Design **observer** (e.g., Kalman) to estimate $\Delta\hat{x}(k)$ **and** $\Delta\hat{P}_\mathrm{u}(k)$)

Stage 1: Design of the Disturbance Estimator

An application of classical internal model control (IMC) . . .

1. A crude/**aggregate LCA model**, e.g.,

$$2H\Delta\dot{\omega} = -(D + \tfrac{1}{R_{\mathrm{I}}})\Delta\omega + \Delta P_{\mathrm{m}} - \Delta P_{\mathrm{u}} - \Delta P_{\mathrm{inter}} + \Delta P^{\mathrm{c}}_{\mathrm{ibr}}$$

$$T_{\mathrm{R}}\Delta\dot{P}_{\mathrm{m}} = -\Delta P_{\mathrm{m}} - R_{\mathrm{g}}^{-1}(\Delta\omega + T_{\mathrm{R}}F_{\mathrm{H}}\Delta\dot{\omega}),$$

   where $\Delta x = (\Delta\omega, \Delta P_{\mathrm{m}})$ and ΔP_{u} = unknown gen/load mismatch

2. **Assume:** $\Delta\omega$ measured, $\Delta P_{\mathrm{inter}}$ measured (subj. to. delays)

3. Discretize LCA model & augment with **disturbance/delay models**

$$\Delta P_{\mathrm{u}}(k+1) = \Delta P_{\mathrm{u}}(k), \qquad \Delta\omega_{\mathrm{m}}(k) = \Delta\omega(k - \tau_{\mathrm{d}}), \ldots$$

4. Design **observer** (e.g., Kalman) to estimate $\Delta\hat{x}(k)$ **and** $\Delta\hat{P}_{\mathrm{u}}(k)$)

Stage 1: Design of the Disturbance Estimator

An application of classical internal model control (IMC) ...

1. A crude/**aggregate LCA model**, e.g.,

$$2H\Delta\dot{\omega} = -(D + \tfrac{1}{R_{\rm I}})\Delta\omega + \Delta P_{\rm m} - \Delta P_{\rm u} - \Delta P_{\rm inter} + \Delta P_{\rm ibr}^{\rm c}$$
$$T_{\rm R}\Delta\dot{P}_{\rm m} = -\Delta P_{\rm m} - R_{\rm g}^{-1}(\Delta\omega + T_{\rm R}F_{\rm H}\Delta\dot{\omega}),$$

   where $\Delta x = (\Delta\omega, \Delta P_{\rm m})$ and $\Delta P_{\rm u}$ = unknown gen/load mismatch

2. **Assume:** $\Delta\omega$ measured, $\Delta P_{\rm inter}$ measured (subj. to. delays)

3. Discretize LCA model & augment with **disturbance/delay models**

$$\Delta P_{\rm u}(k+1) = \Delta P_{\rm u}(k), \qquad \Delta\omega_{\rm m}(k) = \Delta\omega(k - \tau_{\rm d}), \ldots$$

4. Design **observer** (e.g., Kalman) to estimate $\Delta\hat{x}(k)$ **and** $\Delta\hat{P}_{\rm u}(k)$)

Stage 1: Detuning and Power Allocator

An application of classical internal model control (IMC) . . .



Detuning (optional): low-pass filter

$$F(z) = \frac{1 - e^{-T/\tau}}{z - e^{-T/\tau}}$$

for lowering controller bandwidth

Power Allocator: Allocate disturbance estimate $\Delta \hat{P}_{\mathrm{u}}$ to compute IBR set-points P_{ik} within the ith LCA:

$$\underset{\varphi_i, P_{ik} \in [\underline{P}_{ik}, \overline{P}_{ik}]}{\text{minimize}} \quad f_i(\{P_{ik}\}) + \lambda_i |\varphi_i|$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{k \in I_i} (P_{ik} - P_{ik}^{\mathrm{dispatch}}) + \varphi_i = \Delta \widehat{P}_{\mathrm{u},i}$$

Stage 1: Detuning and Power Allocator

An application of classical internal model control (IMC) . . .



Detuning (optional):

low-pass filter

$$F(z) = \frac{1 - e^{-T/\tau}}{z - e^{-T/\tau}}$$

for lowering controller bandwidth

Power Allocator: Allocate disturbance estimate $\Delta \hat{P}_{\mathrm{u}}$ to compute IBR set-points P_{ik} within the ith LCA:

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\varphi_i, P_{ik} \in [\underline{P}_{ik}, \overline{P}_{ik}]}{\text{minimize}} \quad & f_i(\{P_{ik}\}) + \lambda_i |\varphi_i| \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \textstyle\sum_{k \in I_i} (P_{ik} - P_{ik}^{\mathrm{dispatch}}) + \varphi_i = \Delta \widehat{P}_{\mathrm{u},i} \end{aligned}$$

Case Study: Three-LCA System



Simplified Model Response vs. True Nonlinear Model

- LCA model parameters set via simple inertia/droop gain aggregation and using largest turbine-gov time constant (**very crude!**)
- 63 MW load increase in Area 2



Scenario: 63 MW Disturbance, Area 2



Localized Response: IBRs in Area 2 ramp quickly; IBRs in Areas 1/3 don't *need* to react, so they don't.

Stage 2: Centralized Coordinator Design

What if local IBR capacity is **insufficient** to meet the disturbance?
Then IBRs in **electrically close** areas should respond.

- mismatch variable φ_i from Stage 1 will be **non-zero**
- total IBR adjustments a_i computed as

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\{a_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{A}}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \sum_{i\in\mathcal{A}} q_i a_i^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{A}} (a_i - \varphi_i^*) \\ & 0 \le a_i \cdot \text{sign}\Big(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{A}} \varphi_i^*\Big), & i \in \mathcal{A} \\ & a_i + \sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}_i} P_{ij}^* \in [\text{lower}, \text{upper}], & i \in \mathcal{A}. \end{aligned}$$

Solution method matters! Centralized vs. privacy-preserving ADMM

Stage 2: Centralized Coordinator Design

What if local IBR capacity is **insufficient** to meet the disturbance?
Then IBRs in **electrically close** areas should respond.

- mismatch variable φ_i from Stage 1 will be **non-zero**
- total IBR adjustments a_i computed as

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\{a_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{A}}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \sum\nolimits_{i\in\mathcal{A}} q_i a_i^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 = \sum\nolimits_{i\in\mathcal{A}} (a_i - \varphi_i^*) \\ & 0 \le a_i \cdot \operatorname{sign}\Big(\sum\nolimits_{i\in\mathcal{A}} \varphi_i^*\Big), \qquad i \in \mathcal{A} \\ & a_i + \sum\nolimits_{j\in\mathcal{I}_i} P_{ij}^* \in [\text{lower}, \text{upper}], \quad i \in \mathcal{A}. \end{aligned}$$

Solution method matters! Centralized vs. privacy-preserving ADMM

Stage 2: Centralized Coordinator Design

What if local IBR capacity is **insufficient** to meet the disturbance?
Then IBRs in **electrically close** areas should respond.

- mismatch variable φ_i from Stage 1 will be **non-zero**
- total IBR adjustments a_i computed as

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\{a_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{A}}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \sum\nolimits_{i\in\mathcal{A}} q_i a_i^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 = \sum\nolimits_{i\in\mathcal{A}} (a_i - \varphi_i^*) \\ & 0 \le a_i \cdot \operatorname{sign}\Big(\sum\nolimits_{i\in\mathcal{A}} \varphi_i^*\Big), \qquad i \in \mathcal{A} \\ & a_i + \sum\nolimits_{j\in\mathcal{I}_i} P_{ij}^* \in [\text{lower}, \text{upper}], \quad i \in \mathcal{A}. \end{aligned}$$

Solution method matters! Centralized vs. privacy-preserving ADMM

Stage 2: Centralized Coordinator Design

What if local IBR capacity is **insufficient** to meet the disturbance?
Then IBRs in **electrically close** areas should respond.

- mismatch variable φ_i from Stage 1 will be **non-zero**
- total IBR adjustments a_i computed as

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\{a_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{A}}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \sum\nolimits_{i\in\mathcal{A}} q_i a_i^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 = \sum\nolimits_{i\in\mathcal{A}} (a_i - \varphi_i^*) \\ & 0 \le a_i \cdot \operatorname{sign}\Big(\sum\nolimits_{i\in\mathcal{A}} \varphi_i^*\Big), \qquad i \in \mathcal{A} \\ & a_i + \sum\nolimits_{j\in\mathcal{I}_i} P_{ij}^* \in [\text{lower}, \text{upper}], \quad i \in \mathcal{A}. \end{aligned}$$

Solution method matters! Centralized vs. privacy-preserving ADMM

Scenario: 130MW Disturbance, Area 2



IBRs in Area 2 hit limits; Stage 2 forces Area 1/3 response.

Conclusions for Frequency Control

Summary:

- Two-stage design: local area control & global coordination
- Design enables **fast frequency control** via IBRs
- Response is **localized** to the contingency
- Inherent **robustness** against model imperfections

Ongoing:

- remove even the crude model requirement via **data-driven** control
- extend to incorporate **distribution**-integrated DERs

Paper: https://www.control.utoronto.ca/~jwsimpson/

1. IEEE TPWRS: "*Hierarchical Coordinated Fast Frequency Control using Inverter-Based Resources*"

Conclusions for Frequency Control

Summary:

- Two-stage design: local area control & global coordination
- Design enables **fast frequency control** via IBRs
- Response is **localized** to the contingency
- Inherent **robustness** against model imperfections

Ongoing:

- remove even the crude model requirement via **data-driven** control
- extend to incorporate **distribution**-integrated DERs

Paper: `https://www.control.utoronto.ca/~jwsimpson/`

1. IEEE TPWRS: "*Hierarchical Coordinated Fast Frequency Control using Inverter-Based Resources*"

Conclusions for Frequency Control

Summary:

- Two-stage design: local area control & global coordination
- Design enables **fast frequency control** via IBRs
- Response is **localized** to the contingency
- Inherent **robustness** against model imperfections

Ongoing:

- remove even the crude model requirement via **data-driven** control
- extend to incorporate **distribution**-integrated DERs

Paper: `https://www.control.utoronto.ca/~jwsimpson/`

1. IEEE TPWRS: "*Hierarchical Coordinated Fast Frequency Control using Inverter-Based Resources*"

Overview of Proposed Voltage Controller (One-Area)



Control resources:

- SGs: $v_g^{\mathrm{ref}} \longrightarrow q_{\mathrm{g}}$
- SVCs: $v_s^{\mathrm{ref}} \longrightarrow q_{\mathrm{s}}$
- IBRs: $q_i^{\mathrm{ref}} \longrightarrow q_i$

Overview of Proposed Voltage Controller (One-Area)





Control resources:

- SGs: $v_g^{\mathrm{ref}} \longrightarrow q_{\mathrm{g}}$
- SVCs: $v_s^{\mathrm{ref}} \longrightarrow q_{\mathrm{s}}$
- IBRs: $q_i^{\mathrm{ref}} \longrightarrow q_i$

Overview of Proposed Voltage Controller (One-Area)





Control resources:

- SGs: $v_g^{\mathrm{ref}} \longrightarrow q_{\mathrm{g}}$
- SVCs: $v_s^{\mathrm{ref}} \longrightarrow q_{\mathrm{s}}$
- IBRs: $q_i^{\mathrm{ref}} \longrightarrow q_i$
- $u =$ vector of references
- $q =$ vector of power outputs

Overview of Proposed Voltage Controller (One-Area)





Model:

$$\dot{x} = f(x, u, w)$$
$$y = (v, q) = h(x, u, w)$$

Control resources:

- SGs: $v_g^{\mathrm{ref}} \longrightarrow q_{\mathrm{g}}$
- SVCs: $v_s^{\mathrm{ref}} \longrightarrow q_{\mathrm{s}}$
- IBRs: $q_i^{\mathrm{ref}} \longrightarrow q_i$
- u = vector of references
- q = vector of power outputs

$$\underset{u \in \{\text{Limits}\}}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(q)$$

subject to voltage limits

power limits

Steady-State Optimization Problem (One-Area)

$$\begin{aligned}
\underset{v_g^{\mathrm{ref}}, v_s^{\mathrm{ref}}, q_i^{\mathrm{ref}}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \mathsf{Priority}(q_g, q_s, q_i) + \mathsf{PenaltyFcn}(q_g, q_s, v) := F(u, y) \\
\text{subject to} \quad & y = (q_g, q_s, v) = \pi(v_g^{\mathrm{ref}}, v_s^{\mathrm{ref}}, q_i^{\mathrm{ref}}, w) = \pi(u, w) \\
& u = (v_g^{\mathrm{ref}}, v_s^{\mathrm{ref}}, q_i^{\mathrm{ref}}) \in \mathcal{U}
\end{aligned}$$



Steady-State Optimization Problem (One-Area)

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{v_g^{\text{ref}}, v_s^{\text{ref}}, q_i^{\text{ref}}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \mathsf{Priority}(q_g, q_s, q_i) + \mathsf{PenaltyFcn}(q_g, q_s, v) := F(u, y) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & y = (q_g, q_s, v) = \pi(v_g^{\text{ref}}, v_s^{\text{ref}}, q_i^{\text{ref}}, w) = \pi(u, w) \\ & u = (v_g^{\text{ref}}, v_s^{\text{ref}}, q_i^{\text{ref}}) \in \mathcal{U} \end{aligned}$$



- vector y assumed to be **measurable** in real-time
- π = steady-state grid model from power flow eqns.
- **approximate sensitivities** $\Pi \approx \frac{\partial \pi}{\partial u}$ computable via load flow model

Feedback Implementation of Voltage Controller

- approximate gradient method steps can be evaluated using **real-time system measurements** leading to a **feedback controller**

$$u_{k+1} = \mathrm{Proj}_{\mathcal{U}}\Big\{u_k - \alpha\left(\nabla_u F(u_k, y_k) + \Pi^{\mathsf{T}}\nabla_y F(u_k, y_k)\right)\Big\}$$

- nonlinear controller implemented on a nonlinear dynamic transmission system; stability analysis is non-trivial

Theorem: Assume grid is nominally "stable" and "well-behaved'. If

$$u \mapsto \nabla_u F(u, \pi(u, w)) + \Pi^{\mathsf{T}}\nabla_y F(u, \pi(u, w))$$

is a **strongly monotone** operator, then CLS is stable for all sufficiently small controller gains $\alpha > 0$.

Feedback Implementation of Voltage Controller

- approximate gradient method steps can be evaluated using **real-time system measurements** leading to a **feedback controller**

$$u_{k+1} = \mathrm{Proj}_{\mathcal{U}}\Big\{u_k - \alpha\left(\nabla_u F(u_k, y_k) + \Pi^{\mathsf{T}}\nabla_y F(u_k, y_k)\right)\Big\}$$

- nonlinear controller implemented on a nonlinear dynamic transmission system; stability analysis is non-trivial

Theorem: Assume grid is nominally "stable" and "well-behaved'. If

$$u \mapsto \nabla_u F(u, \pi(u, w)) + \Pi^{\mathsf{T}}\nabla_y F(u, \pi(u, w))$$

is a **strongly monotone** operator, then CLS is stable for all sufficiently small controller gains $\alpha > 0$.

Feedback Implementation of Voltage Controller

- approximate gradient method steps can be evaluated using **real-time system measurements** leading to a **feedback controller**

$$u_{k+1} = \mathrm{Proj}_{\mathcal{U}}\Big\{u_k - \alpha\left(\nabla_u F(u_k, y_k) + \Pi^{\mathsf{T}}\nabla_y F(u_k, y_k)\right)\Big\}$$

- nonlinear controller implemented on a nonlinear dynamic transmission system; stability analysis is non-trivial

Theorem: Assume grid is nominally "stable" and "well-behaved'. If

$$u \mapsto \nabla_u F(u, \pi(u, w)) + \Pi^{\mathsf{T}}\nabla_y F(u, \pi(u, w))$$

is a **strongly monotone** operator, then CLS is stable for all sufficiently small controller gains $\alpha > 0$.

Add-Ons and Extensions for Voltage Controller

The base controller is flexible and admits various modifications

$$u_{k+1} = \mathrm{Proj}_{\mathcal{U}}\left\{ u_k - \alpha \left(\nabla_u F(u_k, y_k) + \Pi^{\mathsf{T}} \nabla_y F(u_k, y_k) \right) \right\}$$

1. **Multi LCA Systems:** use one-area controller in each LCA
2. **Faster/Slower Unit Responses:** replace α with diagonal matrix $\alpha = \mathrm{blkdiag}(\alpha_{\mathrm{ibr}}, \alpha_{\mathrm{svc}}, \alpha_{\mathrm{sg}})$ and tune elements as desired
3. **Improved Recovery to Pre-Fault Operating Voltages**: integrate term proportional to $\|\Delta v_{\mathrm{sg}}\|_2^2$ into objective function
4. **Increased Transient Response:** integrate term proportional to $y_k - y_{k-1}$ into controller ("derivative" action)

Add-Ons and Extensions for Voltage Controller

The base controller is flexible and admits various modifications

$$u_{k+1} = \mathrm{Proj}_{\mathcal{U}}\left\{ u_k - \alpha \left(\nabla_u F(u_k, y_k) + \Pi^{\mathsf{T}} \nabla_y F(u_k, y_k) \right) \right\}$$

1. **Multi LCA Systems:** use one-area controller in each LCA
2. **Faster/Slower Unit Responses:** replace α with diagonal matrix $\alpha = \mathrm{blkdiag}(\alpha_{\mathrm{ibr}}, \alpha_{\mathrm{svc}}, \alpha_{\mathrm{sg}})$ and tune elements as desired
3. **Improved Recovery to Pre-Fault Operating Voltages**: integrate term proportional to $\|\Delta v_{\mathrm{sg}}\|_2^2$ into objective function
4. **Increased Transient Response:** integrate term proportional to $y_k - y_{k-1}$ into controller ("derivative" action)

Add-Ons and Extensions for Voltage Controller

The base controller is flexible and admits various modifications

$$u_{k+1} = \mathrm{Proj}_{\mathcal{U}}\left\{u_k - \alpha\left(\nabla_u F(u_k, y_k) + \Pi^{\mathsf{T}}\nabla_y F(u_k, y_k)\right)\right\}$$

1. **Multi LCA Systems:** use one-area controller in each LCA
2. **Faster/Slower Unit Responses:** replace α with diagonal matrix $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \mathrm{blkdiag}(\alpha_{\mathrm{ibr}}, \alpha_{\mathrm{svc}}, \alpha_{\mathrm{sg}})$ and tune elements as desired
3. **Improved Recovery to Pre-Fault Operating Voltages**: integrate term proportional to $\|\Delta v_{\mathrm{sg}}\|_2^2$ into objective function
4. **Increased Transient Response:** integrate term proportional to $y_k - y_{k-1}$ into controller ("derivative" action)

Add-Ons and Extensions for Voltage Controller

The base controller is flexible and admits various modifications

$$u_{k+1} = \mathrm{Proj}_{\mathcal{U}}\left\{u_k - \alpha\left(\nabla_u F(u_k, y_k) + \Pi^{\mathsf{T}} \nabla_y F(u_k, y_k)\right)\right\}$$

1. **Multi LCA Systems:** use one-area controller in each LCA
2. **Faster/Slower Unit Responses:** replace α with diagonal matrix $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \mathrm{blkdiag}(\alpha_{\mathrm{ibr}}, \alpha_{\mathrm{svc}}, \alpha_{\mathrm{sg}})$ and tune elements as desired
3. **Improved Recovery to Pre-Fault Operating Voltages**: integrate term proportional to $\|\Delta v_{\mathrm{sg}}\|_2^2$ into objective function
4. **Increased Transient Response:** integrate term proportional to $y_k - y_{k-1}$ into controller ("derivative" action)

Add-Ons and Extensions for Voltage Controller

The base controller is flexible and admits various modifications

$$u_{k+1} = \mathrm{Proj}_{\mathcal{U}}\left\{u_k - \alpha\left(\nabla_u F(u_k, y_k) + \Pi^{\mathsf{T}} \nabla_y F(u_k, y_k)\right)\right\}$$

1. **Multi LCA Systems:** use one-area controller in each LCA
2. **Faster/Slower Unit Responses:** replace α with diagonal matrix $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \mathrm{blkdiag}(\alpha_{\mathrm{ibr}}, \alpha_{\mathrm{svc}}, \alpha_{\mathrm{sg}})$ and tune elements as desired
3. **Improved Recovery to Pre-Fault Operating Voltages**: integrate term proportional to $\|\Delta v_{\mathrm{sg}}\|_2^2$ into objective function
4. **Increased Transient Response:** integrate term proportional to $y_k - y_{k-1}$ into controller ("derivative" action)

Scenario: 120 MVAR Disturbance (SG Priority)

solid: with proposed controller dotted: without



Scenario: 180 MVAR Disturbance (G2/IBR Priority)

solid: with proposed controller dotted: **ignore**



Scenario: 180 MVAR Disturbance (IBR Priority)

solid: with proposed controller dotted: **ignore**



Conclusions for Voltage Control

Summary:

- Local area control based on local model/meas.
- Flexible design allows operator to set device priority
- Bus voltage and device output constraint satisfaction
- More scenarios: line trips, 3ϕ-fault, multi-areas, etc. ...

Ongoing:

- combine with online least-squares sensitivity estimation (model-free)
- integration with frequency controller

Paper: `https://www.control.utoronto.ca/~jwsimpson/`

1. IEEE TPWRS: "*Measurement-Based Fast Coordinated Voltage Control for Transmission Grids*"

Conclusions for Voltage Control

Summary:

- Local area control based on local model/meas.
- Flexible design allows operator to set device priority
- Bus voltage and device output constraint satisfaction
- More scenarios: line trips, 3ϕ-fault, multi-areas, etc. ...

Ongoing:

- combine with online least-squares sensitivity estimation (model-free)
- integration with frequency controller

Paper: `https://www.control.utoronto.ca/~jwsimpson/`

1. IEEE TPWRS: "*Measurement-Based Fast Coordinated Voltage Control for Transmission Grids*"

Conclusions for Voltage Control

Summary:

- Local area control based on local model/meas.
- Flexible design allows operator to set device priority
- Bus voltage and device output constraint satisfaction
- More scenarios: line trips, 3ϕ-fault, multi-areas, etc. ...

Ongoing:

- combine with online least-squares sensitivity estimation (model-free)
- integration with frequency controller

Paper: `https://www.control.utoronto.ca/~jwsimpson/`

1. IEEE TPWRS: "*Measurement-Based Fast Coordinated Voltage Control for Transmission Grids*"

Integration of Freq. and Volt. Controllers

The two controllers can operate simultaneously.

1. Allocate IBR capacity priority



2. Dynamic cross-couplings between controllers:
   - **voltage-sensitivity** of (e.g., impedance) loads
   - **PSS** and VC both operate through SG AVR systems

Scenario: 150MW/80MVAR Disturbance (FC Priority)

solid: with proposed controller dotted: without





Scenario: 150MW/80MVAR Disturbance (FC Priority)

solid: with proposed controller   dotted: without



Collaborators

UWaterloo: Etinosa Ekomwenrenren (PhD), Zhiyuan Tang (PDF), JWSP



EPRI: Evangelos Farantatos, Mahendra Patel, Hossein Hooshyar, Aboutaleb Haddadi

Questions

The Edward S. Rogers Sr. Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

EPRI
ELECTRIC POWER RESEARCH INSTITUTE

https://www.control.utoronto.ca/~jwsimpson/
jwsimpson@ece.utoronto.ca

Comparison with Traditional Frequency Control

Traditional frequency control:

1. **very fast** inertial response of machines limits ROCOF
2. primary layer (droop) provides **"fast" & global** stabilizing response
3. secondary layer (AGC) provides **slow & "localized"** response

Traditional frequency control + next-gen IBR controller:

1. **very fast** inertial response of machines limits ROCOF
2. Stage 1 (local IBR redispatch) provides **fast & localized** response

   Ideally, **minimal activation** of SG turbine-govs

3. Stage 2 (global IBR redispatch) provides **fast & semi-local** response
4. AGC cleans up any remaining mismatch on minutes time-scale

Frequency Scenario: Robustness Test

- Introduce large (50%–100%) errors in parameters (H, T, R, . . .) used for LCA disturbance estimator designs



Scenario: 150MW/80MVAR Disturbance (VC Priority)



Scenario: 150MW/80MVAR Disturbance (VC Priority)