NTNU
Norwegian University of
Science and Technology

Identification of hydro power frequency containment reserves dynamics using PMUs

Sigurd Hofsmo Jakobsen

Norwegian university of technology and science Department of electri
engineering

October 22, 2018

Outline

About me

Background

Previous work using PMUs

Validation of the approach

Results

Conclusions and further work

About me

- From Sola

About me

- From Sola
- Studied and works in Trondheim

About me

- From Sola
- Studied and works in Trondheim
- Worked as a research engineer from 2013-2015 for SINTEF Energy Research

About me

- From Sola
- Studied and works in Trondheim
- Worked as a research engineer from 2013-2015 for SINTEF Energy Research
- Currently PhD student at NTNU

About me

- From Sola
- Studied and works in Trondheim
- Worked as a research engineer from 2013-2015 for SINTEF Energy Research
- Currently PhD student at NTNU
- 10% position at SINTEF Energy Research

Outline

Frequency quality in the Nordics

- From 2008 the time the frequency has been outside its allowed band has increased
- The performance of hydro turbine governors play an important role



Challenges in operation

- Towards 100% renewable electricity generation
  - Larger variability
  - More uncertainty
  - Increasing complexity



Figure: Present and future energy mix[Statnett]

Challenges in operation

- Towards 100% renewable electricity generation
  - Larger variability
  - More uncertainty
  - Increasing complexity
- More dynamics



Figure: Present and future energy mix[Statnett]

Challenges in operation

- Towards 100% renewable electricity generation
  - Larger variability
  - More uncertainty
  - Increasing complexity
- More dynamics
- Less time for actions



Figure: Present and future energy mix[Statnett]

Challenges in operation

- Towards 100% renewable electricity generation
  - Larger variability
  - More uncertainty
  - Increasing complexity
- More dynamics
- Less time for actions
- **Hydropower** is the main resource for balancing



Figure: Present and future energy mix[Statnett]

New requirements on FCR due to frequency quality

- Nordic TSOs are developing new requirements on FCR
- This includes offline testing and verification of performance



Theoretical background for new requirements

- Aggregated system model:



Theoretical background for new requirements

- Aggregated system model:
  - $G_{p_{sys}}(s)$: Aggregated model of FCR



Theoretical background for new requirements

- Aggregated system model:
  - $G_{p_{sys}}(s)$: Aggregated model of FCR
  - $G_{J_{sys}}(s)$: Aggregated model of swing dynamics



Theoretical background for new requirements

- Aggregated system model:
  - $G_{p_{sys}}(s)$: Aggregated model of FCR
  - $G_{J_{sys}}(s)$: Aggregated model of swing dynamics
  - $\Delta P_l(s)$: Aggregated load changes



Theoretical background for new requirements

- Aggregated system model:
  - $G_{p_{sys}}(s)$: Aggregated model of FCR
  - $G_{J_{sys}}(s)$: Aggregated model of swing dynamics
  - $\Delta P_l(s)$: Aggregated load changes
- Stability requirement stated in terms of the system's sensitivity function

$$S_{sys}(s) = \frac{1}{1 + G_{p_{sys}}(s)G_{J_{sys}}(s)} \tag{1}$$



Stability using Nyquist

- Stability can be checked using:

$$L_{sys}(s) = G_{p_{sys}}(s)G_{J_{sys}}(s) \qquad (2)$$



Stability using Nyquist

- Stability can be checked using:

$$L_{sys}(s) = G_{p_{sys}}(s) G_{J_{sys}}(s) \qquad (2)$$

- Stability margin given by:

$$Ms = \min |-1 - L_{sys}(j\omega)| \qquad (3)$$



Stability using Nyquist

- Stability can be checked using:

$$L_{sys}(s) = G_{p_{sys}}(s) G_{J_{sys}}(s) \qquad (2)$$

- Stability margin given by:

$$Ms = \min |-1 - L_{sys}(j\omega)| \qquad (3)$$

- Notice that

$$\min |-1 - L_{sys}(j\omega)| = \max |S_{sys}(j\omega)| \qquad (4)$$



Draft requirements for performance

- For the performance we want to limit the change in frequency.



Draft requirements for performance

- For the performance we want to limit the change in frequency.
- The change in frequency is given by:

$$\Delta f_{sys}(s) = -2\pi G_{J_{sys}}(s) S_{sys}(s) d(s) = 2\pi G_{1_{sys}}(s) d(s) \qquad (5)$$



Draft requirements for performance

- For the performance we want to limit the change in frequency.
- The change in frequency is given by:

$$\Delta f_{sys}(s) = -2\pi G_{J_{sys}}(s) S_{sys}(s) d(s) = 2\pi G_{1_{sys}}(s) d(s) \tag{5}$$

- We can use this for defining the performance requirements:

$$|2\pi G_{1_{sys}}(j\omega)|^2 \phi_d(\omega) < \phi_{\Delta f}(\omega) = 0.1 \tag{6}$$



Draft requirements for power plant

1. Measure a plant's response to ten sine injections

Draft requirements for power plant

1. Measure a plant's response to ten sine injections
2. Estimate $G_p^{(p.u.)}(s)$ for the plant based on the sine injections

Draft requirements for power plant

1. Measure a plant's response to ten sine injections
2. Estimate $G_p^{(p.u.)}(s)$ for the plant based on the sine injections
3. Use $G_p^{(p.u.)}(s)$ together with $G_{J_{sys}}^{(p.u.)}(s)$ to check.

$$|S(j\omega)| < \frac{1}{M_s} \tag{7}$$

and

$$|2\pi G_1(j\omega)|^2 \phi_d(\omega) < 0.1 \tag{8}$$

Drawbacks with the draft requirements

- One has to disconnect the plant to inject the sine waves.
- Injecting 10 sine waves take a lot of time.
- They assume the same swing dynamics for all plants.

Research question

- Can the draft requirements be tested using PMU measurements from normal operation?



Outline

About me

Background

Previous work using PMUs

Validation of the approach

Results

Conclusions and further work

Previous work at NTNU

- A transfer function was identified from the electrical frequency to the electrical power under normal operation using the ARX model structure.



Previous work at NTNU

- A transfer function was identified from the electrical frequency to the electrical power under normal operation using the ARX model structure.
- A transfer function was identified from the electrical frequency to the electrical power under normal operation using vector fitting.



Previous work at NTNU

- A transfer function was identified from the electrical frequency to the electrical power under normal operation using the ARX model structure.
- A transfer function was identified from the electrical frequency to the electrical power under normal operation using vector fitting.
- There are also other papers in the literature using other methods for online identification, however, mostly relying on data from disturbance recordings.



Outline

System identification basic

- Assume that a data set $Z^N = \{u[n], y[n] | n = 1 \ldots N\}$ has been collected.
- The dataset Z^N is assumed generated by

$$\mathcal{S} : y[n] = G_1(z, \theta_1) u[n] + H_1(z, \theta_1) e[n] \quad (9)$$



- Using the data set Z^N we want to find the parameter vector θ^N minimizing

$$\hat{\theta}_N = \arg\min_{\theta} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \epsilon^2(n, \theta) \quad (10)$$

Modeling used for the validation

- The system we want to identify



Modeling used for the validation

- The system we want to identify
- We use a small power system



Modeling used for the validation

- The system we want to identify
- We use a small power system
- We use a dc power flow



Modeling used for the validation

- The system we want to identify
- We use a small power system
- We use a dc power flow
- This results in the following block diagram



Conclusion from the identification analysis

- We can identify a consistent estimate of $G_1(s)$



Conclusion from the identification analysis

- We can identify a consistent estimate of $G_1(s)$
  - If $v_{l5}(s)$ excites the system sufficiently,



Conclusion from the identification analysis

- We can identify a consistent estimate of $G_1(s)$
  - If $v_{l5}(s)$ excites the system sufficiently,
  - and there is a delay in either $G_1(s)$ of the transfer function from $\Delta\omega_1(s)$ to $\Delta P_{e1}(s)$.



Outline

About me

Background

Previous work using PMUs

Validation of the approach

Results

Conclusions and further work

Example of identifying $G_1(s)$ in Simulink

- The simple power system presented was implemented in Simulink.



The identification experiment in the draft requirements

- In the draft requirements they require the power plant owners to replace the input to the governor with their own signal.

The identification experiment in the draft requirements

- In the draft requirements they require the power plant owners to replace the input to the governor with their own signal.
- They then identify the transfer function from the input to the governor to the electrical power of the generator.

$$G_{req}(s) = -\frac{G_p(s)G_J(s)T(s)}{1 + G_J(s)T(s)} \tag{11}$$

The identification experiment in the draft requirements

- In the draft requirements they require the power plant owners to replace the input to the governor with their own signal.
- They then identify the transfer function from the input to the governor to the electrical power of the generator.

$$G_{req}(s) = -\frac{G_p(s)G_J(s)T(s)}{1 + G_J(s)T(s)} \tag{11}$$

- This is not $G_p(s)$

Example of identifying $G_{req}(s)$ in Simulink

- The simple power system presented was implemented in Simulink.



Outline

About me

Background

Previous work using PMUs

Validation of the approach

Results

Conclusions and further work

Conclusions and further work

- It is indeed possible to identify the turbine dynamics(closed loop with electromechanical dynamics) using PMU measurements.
- The results from real life measurements seem reasonable and have low variance, however, they should be further validated.
- The assumptions should be further investigated

Thanks for your attention.