Energy Conversion and Management 52 (2011) 1208-1214

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect



Energy Conversion and Management

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/enconman



Decentralized model predictive based load frequency control in an interconnected power system

T.H. Mohamed^{a,*}, H. Bevrani^b, A.A. Hassan^d, T. Hiyama^c

^a High Institute of Energy, South Valley University, Egypt

^b Dept. of Electrical Engineering & Computer Science, University of Kurdistan, Iran

^c Dept. of Electrical Engineering & Computer Science, Kumamoto University, Kumamoto, Japan

^d Faculty of Engineering, Dept. of Electrical Engineering, Minia University, Minia, Egypt

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 11 January 2010 Received in revised form 1 September 2010 Accepted 19 September 2010 Available online 16 October 2010

Keywords: Load frequency control Integral control Model predictive control Decentralized control

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a new load frequency control (LFC) design using the model predictive control (MPC) technique in a multi-area power system. The MPC technique has been designed such that the effect of the uncertainty due to governor and turbine parameters variation and load disturbance is reduced. Each local area controller is designed independently such that stability of the overall closed-loop system is guaranteed. A frequency response model of multi-area power system is introduced, and physical constraints of the governors and turbines are considered. The model was employed in the MPC structures. Digital simulations for both two and three-area power systems are provided to validate the effectiveness of the proposed scheme. The results show that, with the proposed MPC technique, the overall closed-loop system performance demonstrated robustness in the face of uncertainties due to governors and turbines parameters variation and loads disturbances. A performance comparison between the proposed MPC technique. (a classical integral control scheme is carried out confirming the superiority of the proposed MPC technique. (B 2010 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.)

1. Introduction

In LFC problem, area load change and abnormal conditions lead to mismatches in frequency and scheduled power interchanges between areas. These mismatches have to be corrected by the LFC system. LFC objectives, i.e. frequency regulation and tracking the load demands, maintaining the tie-line power interchanges to specified values in the presence of modeling uncertainties, system nonlinearities and area load disturbances, determine the LFC synthesis as a multi-objective optimization problem [1,2].

The fixed parameters controller, like an integral controller or a PI controller, is widely employed in the LFC application. Fixed parameters controllers are designed at nominal operating points and may no longer be suitable in all operating conditions. For this reason, adaptive gain scheduling approaches have been proposed for LFC synthesis [3,4].

This method could to overcome the disadvantages of the conventional PID controller like. The need of adaptation of controller parameters, but actually, it faces some difficulties, like the instability of transient response as a result of abruptness in the system parameters, in additionally, Impossibility of obtaining accurate linear time invariant models at variable operating points [3].

Recently, the model predictive control (MPC) appears to be an efficient strategy to control many applications in industry; it has many advantages such as very fast response, robustness against load disturbance and parameters uncertainty. Its straightforward design procedure is considered as a major advantage of the MPC. Given a model of the system, only an objective function incorporating the control objectives needs to be set up. Additional physical constraints can be easily dealt with by adding them as inequality constraints, whereas soft constraints can be accounted for in the objective function using large penalties. Moreover, MPC adapts well to different physical setups and allows for a unified approach [5,6].

Recently, some papers have reported the application of MPC technique on the load frequency control issue [7–9]. In [7], fast response and robustness against parameter uncertainties and load changes can be obtained using MPC controller, but, only for single area load frequency control application. In [8] the usage of MPC in multi-area power system is discussed, but, only by economic viewpoint, it presented a new model predictive load frequency control including economy logic for LFC cost reduction. In [9], Feasible Cooperation-Based MPC (FC-MPC) method is used in distributed LFC instead of Centralized MPC which is impractical for control of large-scale, geographically expansive systems, such as power systems, In spit of the good effort done in [9], the paper did not

^{*} Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: tarekhie@yahoo.com (T.H. Mohamed), bevrani@ieee.org (H. Bevrani), aahsn@yahoo.com (A.A. Hassan), hiyama@cs.kumamoto-u.ac.jp (T. Hiyama).

^{0196-8904/\$ -} see front matter \odot 2010 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. doi:10.1016/j.enconman.2010.09.016

-

_ .

deal with the problem of system's parameters mismatch, it only discussed the effect of load change, in addition, the range of load change used in the cases of study is very large and inappropriate in load frequency control issue.

This paper sheds the light on the impacts of parametric uncertainties beside the load change effect in an interconnected power system with decentralized model predictive based load frequency control. In this paper, each local area controller can be designed independently. The MPC technique law produces its optimal output derived from a quadratic cost function minimization based on the dynamic model of the specified area. The technique calculates the optimal control signal while respecting the given constraints over the output frequency deviation and the load change. The effects of the physical constraints such as generation rate constraint (GRC) and speed governor dead band [1] are considered. The power system with the proposed MPC technique has been tested through the effect of uncertainties due to governors and turbines parameters variation and load disturbances using computer simulation. A comparison has been made between the MPC and the traditional integral controller, which is widely used in practical industries, confirming the superiority of the proposed MPC technique. The simulation results proved that the proposed controller guarantees the robust performance in the presence of uncertainties due to governors and turbines parameters variation and loads disturbances.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: the description of the dynamics of the interconnected power system is given in Section 2. A general consideration about MPC and its cost function are presented in Section 3. The proposed methodology is applied to two and three-area power system as a cases study, in Section 4. Finally, the paper is concluded in Section 5.

2. System dynamics

A multi-area power system comprises areas that are interconnected by tie-lines. The trend of frequency measured in each control area is an indicator of the trend of the mismatch power in the interconnection and not in the control area alone. The LFC system in each control area of an interconnected (multi-area) power system should control the interchange power with the other control areas as well as its local frequency. Therefore, the dynamic LFC system model must take into account the tie-line power signal. For this purpose, consider Fig. 1, which shows a power system with *N*-control areas [1].

In this section, a frequency response model for any area-*i* of *N* power system control areas with an aggregated generator unit in each area is described [1].

The overall generator-load dynamic relationship between the incremental mismatch power $(\Delta P_{mi} - \Delta P_{Li})$ and the frequency deviation (Δf_i) can be express

$$\Delta \dot{f}_{i} = \left(\frac{1}{2H_{i}}\right) \cdot \Delta P_{mi} - \left(\frac{1}{2H_{i}}\right) \cdot \Delta P_{Li} - \left(\frac{D_{i}}{2H_{i}}\right) \cdot \Delta f_{i} - \left(\frac{1}{2H_{i}}\right) \cdot \Delta P_{tie,i}$$
(1)

the dynamic of the governor can be expressed as:

$$\Delta \dot{P}_{mi} = \left(\frac{1}{T_{ti}}\right) \Delta P_{gi} - \left(\frac{1}{T_{ti}}\right) \Delta P_{mi} \tag{2}$$

the dynamic of the turbine can be expressed as:

$$\Delta \dot{P}_{gi} = \left(\frac{1}{T_{gi}}\right) \Delta P_{ci} - \left(\frac{1}{R_i T_{gi}}\right) \Delta f_i - \left(\frac{1}{T_{gi}}\right) \Delta P_{gi} \tag{3}$$

the total tie-line power change between area-*i* and the other areas can be calculated as:

$$\Delta \dot{P}_{tie,i} = 2\pi \cdot \left[\sum_{\substack{j=1\\j \neq i}}^{N} T_{ij} \Delta f_i - \sum_{\substack{j=1\\j \neq i}}^{N} T_{ij} \Delta f_j \right]$$
(4)

7

In a multi-area power system, in addition to regulating area frequency, the supplementary control should maintain the net interchange power with neighbouring areas at scheduled values. This is generally accomplished by adding a tie-line flow deviation to the frequency deviation in the supplementary feedback loop. A suitable linear combination of frequency and tie-line power changes for area *i*, is known as the area control error (ACE),

$$ACE_i = \Delta P_{tie,i} + B_i \Delta f_i \tag{5}$$

Eqs. (1) to (4) represent the frequency response model for N power system control areas with one generator unit in each area and can be combined in the following state space model:

$$\begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta \dot{P}_{gi} \\ \Delta \dot{P}_{mi} \\ \Delta \dot{f}_{i} \\ \Delta \dot{P}_{tie,i} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{T_{gi}} & 0 & -\frac{1}{R_{i}T_{gi}} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{T_{ti}} & -\frac{1}{T_{ti}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2H_{i}} & -\frac{D_{i}}{2H_{i}} & -\frac{1}{2H_{i}} \\ 0 & 0 & 2\pi \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{N} T_{ij}\Delta f & 0 \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta P_{gi} \\ \Delta P_{mi} \\ \Delta f_{i} \\ \Delta P_{tie,i} \end{bmatrix} \\ + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2H_{i}} & 0 \\ 0 & -2\pi \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta P_{Li} \\ \Delta \nu_{i} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{T_{gi}} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \Delta P_{ci} \\ y = ACE_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & B_{i} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta P_{gi} \\ \Delta P_{mi} \\ \Delta P_{mi} \\ \Delta f_{i} \\ \Delta P_{tie,i} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$(6)$$

where ΔP_{gi} is the governor output change of area *i*; ΔP_{mi} the mechanical power change of area *i*; Δf_i the frequency deviation of area *i*; ΔP_{Li} the load change of area *i*; ΔP_{ci} the supplementary control action of area *i*; y_i the system output of area *i*; H_i the equivalent inertia constant of area *i*; D_i the equivalent damping coefficient of area *i*; R_i the speed droop characteristic of area *i*; T_{gi} , T_{ti} the governor and turbine time constants of area *i*; ACE_i the control error of area *i*; B_i the frequency bias factor of area *i*; T_{ij} the tie-line synchronizing coefficient with area *j*; $\Delta P_{tie,i}$ the total tie-line power change between area *i* and the other areas; and ΔV_i is the control area interface, $\Delta V_i = \sum_{\substack{j=1 \ i \neq i}}^{N} T_{ij} \Delta f_j$.

3. Model predictive control

The MPC has proved to efficiently control a wide range of applications in industry such as chemical process, petrol industry, electromechanical systems and many other applications. The MPC scheme is based on an explicit use of a prediction model of the system response to obtain the control actions by minimizing an objective function. Optimization objectives include minimization of the difference between the predicted and reference response, and the control effort subjected to prescribed constraints. The effectiveness of the MPC is demonstrated to be equivalent to the optimal control. It displays its main strength in its computational expediency, realtime applications, intrinsic compensation for time delays, treatment of constraints, and potential for future extensions of the methodology. At each control interval, the first input in the optimal sequence is sent into the plant, and the entire calculation is repeated at subsequent control intervals. The purpose of taking new measurements at each time step is to compensate for unmeasured disturbances and model inaccuracy, both of which cause the

دريافت فورى 🛶 متن كامل مقاله

- امکان دانلود نسخه تمام متن مقالات انگلیسی
 امکان دانلود نسخه ترجمه شده مقالات
 پذیرش سفارش ترجمه تخصصی
 امکان جستجو در آرشیو جامعی از صدها موضوع و هزاران مقاله
 امکان دانلود رایگان ۲ صفحه اول هر مقاله
 امکان پرداخت اینترنتی با کلیه کارت های عضو شتاب
 دانلود فوری مقاله پس از پرداخت آنلاین
 پشتیبانی کامل خرید با بهره مندی از سیستم هوشمند رهگیری سفارشات
- ISIArticles مرجع مقالات تخصصی ایران