

EPRI Update on Latest Research and Testing of Control Systems



Dr. Arindam Maitra, Technical Executive, EPRI

Microgrid & DER Controller Symposium MIT Samberg Conference Center, Cambridge, MA Feb 16th, 2017

A Practical Microgrid Goal by 2020...

Maximize project lifecycle value for economic and technically feasible opportunities in our evolving grid environment

- Creating a microgrid is complicated
 - Involves multiple power, operations management and control system components from diverse vendors that must be integrated and optimized for interoperability and security
 - Integrated controls, communication & coordination, and new protection approaches are needed
 - Assets within the microgrid must comply with the distribution system operator's interconnection requirements





Key Parameters Impacting Microgrid Operations and Cost



A variety of factors, many interconnected, impact the overall design and cost of a microgrid. Certain factors are considered fixed inputs (i.e. assumptions) while other factors are varied to in order to evaluate the sensitivity of their impact on overall cost.



Microgrid Business Models Can Impact Controller Operation

THIRD-PARTY MODEL

- End user(s) or 3rd party own and finance microgrid
- End user(s) or 3rd party determine economic dispatch (potentially with utility guidance)
- Utility, end user(s) or 3rd party agree on appropriate islanding conditions
- End user(s) see net change in bills

UNBUNDLED MODEL

- Utility or 3rd party owns and finances microgrid on behalf of end user(s)
- Utility or 3rd party dispatches DER assets on behalf of customer(s)
- Utility and end user(s) agree on appropriate islanding conditions
- End user(s) pays utility for grid assets, pay implementer (utility/3rd party) for microgrid assets, receives credit from DER

INTEGRATED UTILITY MODEL

- Utility owns and finances microgrid
- Utility dispatches DER assets based on system economics
- Utility and end user(s) agree on appropriate islanding conditions
- End user(s) pays utility for resiliency/premium power service



For more information – "Microgrids: Expanding Applications, Implementations, and Business Structures". EPRI/SEPA whitepaper.



Transitions and Impact of Controls





Develop Consistent Approaches to Evaluate Microgrid Adoption: *Evaluation, Design, Testing & Demo*





EPRI Microgrid Feasibility and Design Projects





List of Current Microgrid Controller Projects

DOE Microgrid Projects

- FOA 997 Controller (End Date May 2017) Spirae Controller
- DMS Structuring Project Phase 1/2 (October 2015 November 2017) Schneider & GE Controller
- ADMS Test bed (November 2016 November 2019) Schneider & GE Controller
- ARPA E with UTK TI Controller

DoD Microgrid Projects

- Transportable Microgrid (Dec 2016-Dec 2018). SEL Controller
- Fort Hunter Liggett (Sep 2016 Dec 2017). LBNL Controller

NYSERDA Microgrid Projects

Phase 2 BNMC NYSERDA Spirae/OpusOne Controller

• Utility Funded Demonstrations

• NCEMC, Xcel, HydroOne, Central Hudson



Microgrid Controller Test Options – Which is Better?



Pure simulation

Abstract or realtime

Need to integrate MGC



<u>CHIL</u>

Interface real controller *Real-time simulation*



CHIL & PHIL

Interface real controller and assets *Power interface, more complex*



Power

Real controller and assets Simple EPS model

CHIL = Controller Hardware-in-the-Loop; PHIL = Power Hardware-in-the-Loop

MGC = Microgrid controller; DER = Distributed Energy Resource; G = Generator; EPS = Electric Power System



Need IEEE 2030.8 to Define Microgrid Controller Testing Procedures and Evaluations

Test case:	Met Requirement?
A.1.1: DER available (renewables only); Wave offline.	\checkmark
A.2.1: System importing power at PCC	\checkmark
A.2.2: System importing power at PCC (loss of one generator)	✓
A.3.1: System exporting power at PCC	\checkmark
A.3.2: System exporting power at PCC (loss of one generator)	\checkmark
A.4.1: System net-zero power at PCC	\checkmark
A.4.2: System net-zero power at PCC (loss of one generator)	\checkmark
A.4.3: System net-zero power at PCC (loss of communications MG/Wave)	\checkmark
B.1.1a: Planned disconnection using microgrid controller interface	\checkmark
B.1.1b: Planned disconnection (high renewable penetration)	\checkmark
B.1.2: Planned disconnection (loss of one generator)	\checkmark
B.2.1: Unplanned disconnection via manual breaker trip	\checkmark
B.2.2: Unplanned disconnection via manual breaker trip (loss one generator)	\checkmark
B.2.3: Unplanned disconnection via protective relay trip	✓



Need for an Uniform Way to Evaluate Multiple Vendor Control Systems

- Single product compliance
 - Does it meet IEEE 2030.7 core level functions?
 - Does it meet additional customer requirements?
- Product comparison
 - How do these controllers compare?
- Requires testing in the context of a microgrid system
- Site-specific compliance
 - Is it capable of managing *this* microgrid's assets in order to meet *these* interconnection requirements?





Function currently supported Function partially supported

CHIL & PHIL for Site-Specific Evaluation

- Model of site EPS
- Actual or representative DER
 - reduce modeling inaccuracies
 - proprietary controls





Verify Controller Functions and Capabilities







CHIL/PHIL Test @NREL

PHIL & CHIL evaluation of microgrid controller for Buffalo Niagra Medical Campus (BNMC) site





Figure 3. Relationship between transition and dispatch functions.





Establish End-to-End Connectivity



 DER Device Functions

 Status Monitoring

 Output Forecasting

 Fixed PF

 Volt-VAR

 Volt-Watt

 ...



DER Group Functions and Messages





Microgrid Controller Testing @ EDF Concept Grid



Benefits of Testing at EDF's Concept Grid:

- Verify capabilities of Wave controller in an environment not limited by the scale or capacity of the power system it is
- Verify communication latency issues

Equipement type	symbo I	Equipment details
Air conditioner	A/C 1	Mitsubishi 1 kVA
	A/C 2	Mitsubishi 1.4 kVA
	A/C 3	Daikin 3.5 kVA
	A/C 4	Daikin 3.5 kVA
inverter	=\~ 1	SMA STP 15000TL-10
	=\~ 2	Fronius IGplus 150V-3
	=\~ 3	SMA Sunny island SI6.0H-11
Washing Machine	WM 1	Electrolux 2.2 kVA
	WM 2	Electrolux 2.2 kVA
	WM 3	Boch 2.4 kVA
served		