Distributed algorithm for simulating dynamic interactions within a general cyber-physical system

Marija D. Ilic, Miroslav Kosanic Ilic@mit.edu, kosanic@mit.edu

11th Workshop on Modeling and Simulation of Cyber-Physical Energy Systems

San Antonio, Texas, USA

May 9, 2023





Power systems-present and future



Fig. 1. Past and the future of power systems

https://www.tva.com/energy/technology-innovation/regional-grid-transformation

Шii

State of Art Simulation of Physical Systems

- Different simulation approaches
- Centralized approach pitfalls

Electric Energy Systems Group

- Scalability issue increases with the number of areas
- Compatibility issue with different regulation authorities
- How does one differentiate between numerical and physical issue when something unexpected happens?
- Last but not least, how does one decompose hardcoupled systems, while providing feasibility conditions?



a) centralized



b) decentralized c) distributed Fig. 3. Simulation strategies of

physical system

Distributed Simulation high-level Zoom-Out Interaction...



...and Zoom-in component at lower level

Component 2 zoomed-in



One possible implementation

Summary of algorithm steps

- 1. Initialize states and port variables of each module
- 2. Compute dynamics of each module
- 3. Compute and send intVars

Electric Energy Systems Group

- 4. Receive and map intVars to conventional space
- 5. Update value of port variable and repeat step 2.

Algorithm Interactive alignment of components **i** and **j** via P and \dot{Q}

1: Initialize
$$x_i[0], r_i[0], \epsilon$$
 and $u_i[0]$ if applicable
2: $\frac{dr_i}{dt}[0] = 0$
3: $\frac{dx_i}{dt}[0] = f_i(x_i[0], r_i[0], u_i[0])$
4: $P_i^{out}[0] = r_i[0]x_i[0]$
5: $\dot{Q}_i^{out}[0] = -(r_i[0]\frac{dx_i}{dt}[0] - x_i[0]\frac{dr_i}{dt}[0])$
6: for $k = 1, 2, ..., N$ do
7: $P_i^{in}[k] = P_j^{out}[k-1]$
8: $\dot{Q}_i^{in}[k] = \dot{Q}_j^{out}[k-1]$
9: if $\mathbf{k} == 1$ then
10: $\frac{dr_i}{dt}[k] = \epsilon$
11: else if $\mathbf{k} == 2$ then
12: $r_i^*[k-1] = \frac{(Q_i[k] - \dot{Q}_i[k-1])}{\epsilon}$
13: $x_i^*[k] = \frac{P_i^{in}[k]}{x_i^*[k-1]}$
14: $r_i^*[k] = \frac{P_i^{in}[k]}{dt}$
15: $\frac{dr_i}{dt}[k] = \frac{r_i^{in}[k]}{dt}$
16: else
17: $r_i^*[k] = \frac{P_i^{in}[k]}{x_i^*[k-1]}$
18: $\frac{dr_i}{dt}[k] = f_i(x_i[k-1], r_i[k-1], u_i[k-1]))$
21: $r_i[k] = r_i[k-1] + \frac{dr_i}{dt}[k]dt$
22: $x_i[k] = x_i[k-1] + \frac{dr_i}{dt}[k]dt$
23: $P_i^{out}[k] = -r_i[k]x_i[k]$
24: $\dot{Q}_i^{out}[k] = -(r_i[k]\frac{dx_i}{dt}[k] - x_i[k]\frac{dr_i}{dt}[k])$
25: end for

RLC circuit-Simple model of a DC microgrid

- Why does this problem matter?
 - Well...CPL acts as a negative resistance
- How to approach simulation of this problem through the design of control for instability caused by CPLs in a DC microgrid?
- What we propose and we believe is needed?
 - Alignment of not only P at component interfaces, but also Q at the higher level
 (Tellegen's General Theorem-distributed), but also i and v (decentralized) so as to satisfy
 KCL and KVL





Results



i2 = 2 A, v2 = 5 V $R_2 = 0.15 Ohm, C_2 = 5 * 10^{-3} F$



i1 = -4 A, v1 = 3V, u = 6 V $R_1 = 0.4 Ohm, L_1 = 1 * 10^{-4} H$

Results



i2 = 2 A, v2 = 5 V $R_2 = 0.15 Ohm, C_2 = 5 * 10^{-3} F$





Results















Thank you!

