Comparative Study of Robust RSC Control of Doubly Fed Induction Generator Based Wind Turbine under Grid Frequency and Voltage Variations
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Abstract
The configuration of a grid-connected doubly fed induction generator (DFIG) for wind energy generation systems consists of direct coupling of the generator stator windings with the grid and partial coupling of the rotor through power converters. This structure makes the system sensitive to the fault grid. Thus, robust control techniques are required to deal with the undesirable transient sequences in the network. In this paper, two robust controllers have integrated to regulate the stator active and reactive power of DFIG based wind turbine. Then, they have been tested and compared to verify their performances when abnormal grid networks have occurred. Firstly, we used high order sliding mode (HOSM) based Super Twisting, which keeps the same conventional sliding mode performances, such as fast dynamic response and redundancy to the extern disturbances, with a simple design and chattering reduction. Secondly, we implement the backstepping control approach which is known for its robustness in transient sequences. A number of simulations have carried out to evaluate the ride-through performance of both control strategies in case of low grid voltage dips and grid frequency variations.
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1 Introduction
The wind power plants must operate as conventional plants. Thence the electrical grid requirements applied for the existing power plants are also used for wind farms.

Grid code is a technical specification that defines requirements for power producers to be allowed to connect to an electrical network and has to satisfy and ensure the safety, security and economic functioning of the power system. Contents of this code depend on the transmission company requirement [1, 2].

The most common technical requirements for wind power generators are [3]:
- fault ride-through requirements,
- active and reactive power responses following disturbances,
- extended variation range for the voltage-frequency,
- active power control or frequency regulation support,
- reactive power control or voltage regulation capability.

Currently, most of wind energy generation systems (WEGS), producing more than 1MW, are based on a doubly fed induction generator (DFIG). The stator of such a generator is directly connected to the utility grid. The electrical rotor, equipped with windings, is connected through a set of slip rings to two back-to-back converters (rotor side converter and grid side converter) sharing the DC bus. This configuration is attractive as it allows for the power electronic converter to deal with around 30% of the generated power instead of the total power generated (Fig. 1) [4–6]. Being connected directly to the grid through a stator makes the generator very sensitive to the grid faults.

The sliding mode control technique is suitable to regulate the DFIG based wind turbine (DFIG-WT) due to its features of finite-time convergence and robustness against disturbances [7]. This robust control achieves satisfactory results. However, it is affected by the chattering...
phenomenon caused by the switching term. Many works have been conducted to improve the control algorithm to reduce this phenomenon [8–10]. Furthermore, the high order sliding mode (HOSM) control algorithm has been a good alternative to the conventional sliding mode with chattering free [11, 12]. HOSM based on super twisting is one of the popular and robust controllers with simple algorithm implementation; the idea of this technique is to let the discontinuous control act on the higher-order derivatives of the sliding variable [13–16].

Other recommended control method is backstepping, it is a recursive method of minimizing control effort, which combines a Lyapunov function with the structure of a feedback loop. The method consists in transforming intermediate state variables into virtual inputs that will control other state variables and reduce the order of complex systems into several lower-order simple systems which assure very good dynamic during a transient regime [17, 18].

In this context, the purpose of this work is to test two robust control methods under abnormal conditions of the network with no additional hardware. Firstly, the paper presents a dynamic model of DFIG used in wind generator systems, the mathematical model is developed using a field-oriented control technique this technique allows to transform the three components into two orthogonal components which can be considered as vectors [19].

Thereafter, two control techniques is developed to control the stator active and reactive powers through rotor side converter, first technique used is backstepping, and the second one is HOSM based on the super twisting algorithm. These two controllers are common robust methods used to control DFIG-WT.

At last, a test of the performances is undertaken for both controllers under low voltage dips and frequency variation.

2 DFIG dynamic modeling in the $d$-$q$ reference frame

The generator’s dynamic model is defined in the synchronous $d$-$q$ frame using Park’s transformation as detailed in [20].

The expressions of stator and rotor voltages are given as follows (Eqs. (1)–(4)):

$$v_{sd} = R_s i_{sd} + d\phi_{sd} / dt - w_r \varphi_{rq},$$

(1)

$$v_{sq} = R_s i_{sq} + d\phi_{sq} / dt + w_r \varphi_{rq},$$

(2)

$$v_{rd} = R_s i_{rd} + d\phi_{rd} / dt - w_r \varphi_{rq},$$

(3)

$$v_{rq} = R_s i_{rq} + d\phi_{rq} / dt + w_r \varphi_{rd}.$$  

(4)

where: $w_r = g w_s$.

The stator and rotor fluxes are defined as (Eqs. (5)–(8)):

$$\varphi_{sd} = L_s i_{sd} + L_m i_{rd},$$

(5)

$$\varphi_{sq} = L_s i_{sq} + L_m i_{qr},$$

(6)

$$\varphi_{rd} = L_s i_{rd} + L_m i_{sd},$$

(7)

$$\varphi_{rq} = L_s i_{rq} + L_m i_{sq}. $$

(8)

The stator and rotor active and reactive power are expressed as (Eqs. (9)–(12)):

$$P_s = v_{sd} i_{sd} + v_{sq} i_{sq},$$

(9)

$$Q_s = v_{sd} i_{sq} - v_{sq} i_{sd},$$

(10)

$$P_r = v_{rd} i_{rd} + v_{rq} i_{rq},$$

(11)

$$Q_r = v_{rd} i_{rq} - v_{rq} i_{rd}.$$  

(12)

3 Controllers design

In order to control the active and reactive power of the stator, we have to decouple them first. For that we proceed to control the current space vector directly in the $d$-$q$ reference frame of the rotor by mean of field-oriented technique [21, 22]. The technique’s main principle is to orientate the stator flux on d axis as illustrated in Fig. 2.

Thus, the stator flux and voltage are expressed as follow:

$$\varphi_{sd} = \varphi_s; \ \varphi_{sq} = 0; \ v_{sq} = v_r = w_s; \ v_{sd} = 0.$$  

Then the Eqs. (5) and (6) become:

$$\varphi_r = L_s i_{rd} + L_m i_{rd};$$

(13)

$$0 = L_s i_{rd} + L_m i_{rd};$$

(14)
Let us consider the following Lyapunov function:

\[
\begin{align*}
V(e_p) &= \frac{1}{2} e_p^2, \\
V(e_q) &= \frac{1}{2} e_q^2.
\end{align*}
\]

The derivative of Lyapunov's function:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{V}(e_p) &= e_p \dot{e}_p, \\
\dot{V}(e_q) &= e_q \dot{e}_q,
\end{align*}
\]

Then we get the stabilizing control laws as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
v_q &= -L_x L_\sigma \left( P_x^\text{ref} + K_1 e_p \right) \\
&+ R_1 i_q + w_L \sigma i_\text{id} - \frac{w_L}{w_L} v_L, \\
\dot{v}_q &= -L_x L_\sigma \left( Q_x^\text{ref} + K_2 e_q \right) \\
&+ R_1 i_q - w_L \sigma i_\text{iq} - \frac{w_L}{w_L} v_L.
\end{align*}
\]

To ensure the convergence of Lyapunov’s function, we replace Eq. (29) in the derivative of Lyapunov’s function Eq. (28) respectively, we obtain:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{V}(e_p) &= -K_1 e_p^2 < 0, \\
\dot{V}(e_q) &= -K_2 e_q^2 < 0
\end{align*}
\]

where \( K_1 \) and \( K_2 \) are constant positive values.

### 3.2 High order sliding mode control design for active and reactive power

In order to optimize the active and reactive power, the sliding surfaces are given by:

\[
\begin{align*}
e_p &= P_x^\text{ref} - P_x, \\
e_q &= Q_x^\text{ref} - Q_x.
\end{align*}
\]

Then we will have:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{e}_p &= \dot{P}_x^\text{ref} + v_L \frac{d}{dt} \frac{L_m}{L_x} i_\text{id}, \\
\dot{e}_q &= \dot{Q}_x^\text{ref} + v_L \frac{d}{dt} \frac{L_m}{L_x} i_\text{iq}.
\end{align*}
\]
and:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{e}_r &= P_r^\text{ref} + \frac{v_L}{L}\begin{pmatrix}
\dot{e}_r - R_i \dot{e}_r \\
-w_L \sigma_i d
\end{pmatrix}, \\
\dot{e}_q &= Q_r^\text{ref} + \frac{v_L}{L}\begin{pmatrix}
\dot{e}_q - R_i \dot{e}_q \\
-w_L \sigma_i q
\end{pmatrix}.
\end{align*}
\]

If we define the functions \(F\) and \(G\) as follow:

\[
\begin{align*}
F &= \frac{v_L}{L}, \\
G &= \frac{v_L}{L}\begin{pmatrix}
-R_i d - w_L \sigma_i d \\
-w_L \sigma_i q
\end{pmatrix}.
\end{align*}
\]

Thus, we have: \(\dot{e} = F \ddot{e} + \dot{G}\).

Consequently, we consider the following high order sliding mode controller based on the super twisting algorithm:

\[
\begin{align*}
v_y &= y_1 - B_1 \left| \dot{e}_r \right|^{0.5} \text{sign}(e_r), \\
y_2 &= -B_2 \text{sign}(e_r), \\
v_3 &= y_1 - B_3 \left| \dot{e}_q \right|^{0.5} \text{sign}(e_q), \\
y_4 &= -B_4 \text{sign}(e_q),
\end{align*}
\]

where the gains:

\[
B_{1,2} > \frac{1}{\Gamma_{mi}}, i = 1, 2,
\]

\[
B_{1,2} > \frac{1}{\Gamma_{mi}} \frac{4\phi_i \Gamma_{16}}{\Gamma_{mi}} (B_{2,4} + \phi_i),
\]

\[|\dot{G}| < \phi_i,
\]

\[0 < \Gamma_{mi} \leq F_l \leq \Gamma_{16}.
\]

\(\Gamma_{mi}, \Gamma_{16}\) and \(\phi_i\) are positive constants.

### 4 Simulation and results

Simulations to show the performances of two robust controllers under grid dips and frequency variation is carried out; the HOSM and backstepping regulators are respectively implemented to control the active and reactive stator powers. Fig. 3 shows the schematic diagram of the studied system. The nominal parameters of the DFIG and wind turbine system are listed in Appendix.

The wind turbine blades are commonly designed to operate the DFIG near the synchronous speed. We consider the speed of wind is 8 m/s to have a realistic performance analysis.

Fault ride through is wind power generator capability to stay connected in voltage or frequency variations. To evaluate the performance of the previous controllers, we have considered several grid faults that might affect the presented power system.

The voltage dips usually occurred in the grid is divided into symmetrical and unsymmetrical faults. The symmetrical faults are extremely severe [23].

The faults simulated are:

1. A three-phase voltage dip of 50% during 0.2 s;
2. A two-phase voltage dip of 50% during 0.2 s (phase a and b);
3. A single-phase voltage dip of 50% during 0.2 s (phase a);
4. Frequency variation from 50 Hz to 47.5 Hz for 150 ms.

**Case 1:** Three-phase faults: Figs. 4–7 show the system response to a 50% grid voltage dip between 8 s and 8.2 s for the controllers (HOSM and backstepping control). Both controllers show good results of time recovering after the voltage dip. The overshoot of rotor speed with the HOSM controller is smaller compared to the backstepping controller. The same remark is observed for electromagnetic torque, stator active and reactive powers.

The range currents are acceptable for both controllers during the voltage dip even though we did not regulate...
the rotor currents as usually recommended. The HOSM controller recovers directly after the voltage dip. However, undesirable chattering appears.

Despite that the grid side converter is regulated by conventional PI in both systems, we notice that the DC-link voltage response of the system regulated by the HOSM technique is low sensitive to the transient regime than the other controlled system.

**Case 2:** Two-phase faults: Figs. 8–11 reveal the system response to 50% depth of grid voltage at phases "a" and "b" between 8 s and 8.2 s for both controllers. The HOSM still maintain a low overshoot than backstepping for rotor speed, electromagnetic torque, stator reactive and active power. Compared to the first case the HOSM is low effective in unbalanced voltage dip.

Upon evaluating the system’s performance under both control techniques, it was found that the current responses
Fig. 9 Results of Case 2; (a) Reactive stator power response of HOSM controller (VAR); (b) Reactive stator power response of Backstepping controller (VAR); (c) Active stator power response of HOSM controller (W); (d) Active stator power response of backstepping controller (W).

Fig. 10 Results of Case 2; (a) Stator current of HOSM controller (A); (b) Stator current of Backstepping controller; (c) Rotor current of HOSM controller (A); (d) Rotor current of Backstepping controller.

Fig. 11 DC-link voltage for HOSM and backstepping control (V) (Case 2).

Fig. 12 Results of Case 3; (a) Single-phase voltage dips (50% faults) (V), (b) Rotor speed (rad/s); (c) Electromagnetic torque of HOSM controller (N m); (d) Electromagnetic torque of backstepping controller (N m).

Fig. 13 Results of Case 3; (a) Reactive stator power response of HOSM controller (VAR); (b) Reactive stator power response of backstepping controller (VAR); (c) Active stator power response of HOSM controller (W); (d) Active stator power response of Backstepping controller (W).

Fig. 14 Results of Case 3; (a) Stator current of HOSM controller (A); (b) Stator current of Backstepping controller; (c) Rotor current of HOSM controller (A); (d) Rotor current of Backstepping controller.
fell within acceptable ranges. Notably, when comparing the backstepping technique to the HOSM technique in this specific scenario, it became evident that the former exhibited a lower overshoot in the DC-link voltage response.

Case 3: Single-phase faults: Figs. 12–15 present the system response to a 50% grid voltage dip of phase "a" between 8 s and 8.2 s for the controllers (HOSM control and backstepping control). The HOSM controller still guarantees better performance than backstepping in terms of overshooting and time recovery.

Case 4: Frequency variation: wind power generators have to be dimensioned to generate continuous power within the typical grid frequency variations range [24].

The two control methods are tested regarding a frequency variation. The frequency falls from 50 Hz to 47.5 Hz from 8 s to 8.15 s [16].

Figs. 16–19 show the system response to frequency faults of grid voltage between 8 s and 8.2 s for the controllers (HOSM control and backstepping control).

Both controllers did not show satisfactory results. The responses to the tracking references of electromagnetic torque, stator active and reactive power have big overshooting. In terms of time recovery, the backstepping controller recovers more rapidly than HOSM. Moreover, the current ranges are deemed unacceptable.

5 Conclusion

Stator active and reactive powers of DFIG-WT are directly controlled by two robust controllers.

These two controllers are studied under grid fault conditions. The first control technique is HOSM based on the Super twisting algorithm, and the second is the backstepping method. We have provided 4 cases to compare the performances of the controllers. Both control methods show favourable results in the case of a low voltage grid. Furthermore, the controllers’ effectiveness is more sensitive to the unbalanced voltage faults. However, we notice that the HOSM have better performance in the senses of time recovery and overshooting. In addition, the HOSM is simple to implement and do not need system parameter values. The only inconvenience is the chattering phenomenon, which affects the robustness of the controller after the recovery time.

The performance of controllers under the unbalanced fault grid can be enhanced by introducing the controller to sequence decomposition.

For the security of the converter, we recommend adding a crowbar in the event of a frequency variation grid.
Fig. 18 Results of Case 4; (a) Stator current of HOSM controller (A); (b) Stator current of Backstepping controller, (c) Rotor current of HOSM controller (A), (d) Rotor current of Backstepping controller

Fig. 19 DC-link voltage for HOSM and backstepping control (V) (Case 4)

Nomenclature

\( w_s, w_r \)  
Synchronous and rotor angular frequencies (rad/s)

\( g \)  
Slip (%)

\( L_s, L_r, L_m \)  
Stator, rotor and mutual inductances (H)

\( R_s, R_r \)  
Stator and rotor resistances (Ω)

\( \sigma \)  
Leakage coefficient

\( v_{sd}, v_{sq}, v_{rd}, v_{rq} \)  
Stator and rotor \( d-q \) frame voltages (V)

\( i_{sd}, i_{sq}, i_{rd}, i_{rq} \)  
Stator and rotor \( d-q \) frame currents (A)

\( \varphi_{sd}, \varphi_{sq}, \varphi_{rd}, \varphi_{rq} \)  
Stator and rotor \( d-q \) frame fluxes (A)

\( P_s \)  
Stator active power (W)

\( Q_s \)  
Stator reactive power (VAR)

\( u \)  
Stator/rotor turns ratio
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Appendix

DFIG parameters of 2MW wind turbine:

\[
L_s = 0.0026 \text{ H},\quad L_r = 0.0026 \text{ H},\quad L_m = 0.0025 \text{ H},
\]

\[
R_s = 0.0026 \Omega,\quad R_r = 0.0029 \Omega.
\]

Other parameters are as follows:

\[
v_s = 690 \text{ V},\quad f = 50 \text{ Hz},\quad w_s = 2 \pi f,\quad u = 1/3.
\]