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Executive Summary

The work package WP4 - Task T4.1 - received from WP2 a portfolio of possible scenarios and grid architectures capable of overcoming weak points and congestions of the future 2050 pan-European transmission grid. The e-Highway2050 scenarios are:

- X-5 (Large Scale RES)
- X-7 (100%RES)
- X-10 (Big & Market)
- X-13 (Fossil & Nuclear)
- X-16 (Small & Local)

Under task 4.1, two regimes are considered for each scenario:

- Winter Peak
- Summer Low

All of the analysed scenarios have been prepared with two possible grid development strategies suggested by WP2:

- Strategy 2 - which consists of grid development using HVAC overhead lines
- Strategy 3 - that uses HVDC cable lines

The set of a scenario, regime and strategy forms a configuration, which is subject to assessments.

AC power flow models of the continental European system is provided by WP2 (see deliverable 2.4). The calculated power flows, as well as the corresponding outputs from the system simulations (see deliverable 2.3) are used as inputs to the task.

To completely assess the operability of the system, different phenomena should be assessed. These phenomena are listed in Table I. To study such complex phenomena 35 years ahead is unrealistic due to the uncertainty on the detailed datasets, which influence the results significantly. However, exploratory studies can be performed on some test cases to highlight possible phenomena and anticipate the challenges and solutions. In that perspective, the following issues were considered in the task 4.1 of the e-Highway2050 project:

- Short circuit current levels
- Voltage drop
- Short-term frequency stability
- Small signal stability

Regarding short circuit currents, the maximal value appeared to be within acceptable range. However, the contribution of power electronics to short circuit currents should be further investigated and especially the impact on the minimal short circuit currents.

For voltage stability, the analyses did not show any un-manageable voltage drop in the considered configurations. Only one unstable situation was identified but it can be avoided by limiting the maximal capacity of a single line. However, some configurations could not be considered, as they were not convergent, these situations face very likely significant voltage issues. This should be further investigated with methodologies and tools suitable for the analysis of very different power flow configurations.
In all the situations analysed, the frequency was kept within acceptable range after significant disturbance. This was achieved thanks to the participation of wind farms to primary control. More-detailed studies of the behaviour of the system with significant penetration of power electronics are planned in the European Migrate project.

Regarding small signal stability, only one case showed a negative damping, but it is still on the range of power system stabilisers.

To fully assess the impacts of the current changes in the power system, further studies are required. To do so, improvements in the quality of the available data, in the modelling of new technologies and in the methods will be necessary.

### Table I. Operational validation phenomena and their consideration in the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomena considered for operational validation</th>
<th>Consideration within e-Highway2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current limits</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line loading</td>
<td>Addressed in task 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-circuit current levels</td>
<td>Addressed in task 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voltage limits</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady-state voltage levels: within limits in N situation</td>
<td>Addressed in task 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voltage stability: risk of voltage collapse</td>
<td>Addressed in task 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary voltage deviations: temporary overvoltages following an event</td>
<td>No dedicated studies as part of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency stability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term frequency stability</td>
<td>No dedicated studies as part of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term frequency stability</td>
<td>Addressed in task 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotor angle stability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small signal stability</td>
<td>Addressed in task 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient stability</td>
<td>No dedicated studies as part of the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviations

CCGT  Combined Cycle Gas Turbine
CE    Continental Europe
CIM   Common Information Model
CSP   Concentrated Solar Power
DER   Distributed Energy Resource
DFIG  Double Fed Induction Generator
DoW   Description of Work
DSR   Demand Side Response
ESS   Energy Storage System
FACTS Flexible AC Transmission Systems
FC    Full Converter connected generator
FPC   Full Power Converter
FSM   Frequency Sensitive Mode
HVDC  High Voltage Direct Current
IIDS  Improved Interface and Decision Support
LFC   Load Frequency Control
LFSM-O Limited Frequency Sensitive Mode – Over frequency
LFSM-U Limited Frequency Sensitive Mode – Under frequency
MV    Medium voltage (distribution level)
NC RfG Network Code - Requirements for Grid Connection
PMG   Permanent Magnet synchronous Generators
PSP   Pumped Storage hydro Plant
PV    Photovoltaic
RAW   abbreviation for power flow input data in PSS/E data format
RES   Renewable Energy Sources
RoR   Run of River hydro plant
SDC   System Development Committee
SMES  Superconducting Magnetic Energy Storage
SPD   System Protection & Dynamic ENTSO-E group (under regional group CE)
TES   Thermal Energy Storage
TYNDP Ten Years Network Development Plan
(U)HVAC (Ultra) High Voltage Alternating Current
UPFC  Unified Power Flow Controller
VSC   Voltage Source Converter
WP    Work Package
## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Model</td>
<td>Data set, which can be used by participants of WP4 for particular studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grid Architecture</td>
<td>Network topology including HVDC connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario</td>
<td>e-Highway2050 scenario prepared by WP1 and described in [37] is one alternative image of how the future of European Electricity Highways [37] could unfold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regime</td>
<td>A specific operational situation subject to analysis. This is either Summer Low or Winter Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>A specific way to reinforce the grid. This is either Strategy 1 (HVAC) Strategy 2 (HVAC with detour) or Strategy 3 (HVDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Configuration</td>
<td>A set of scenario, regime and strategy, which is subject to analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD Standard Model</td>
<td>Simple dynamic models for exciter and prime movers system with initial or tuned parameters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table of Contents

Document Information ........................................................................................................... ii
Executive Summary ............................................................................................................... iii
Abbreviations ........................................................................................................................ v
Glossary ................................................................................................................................. vi
Table of Contents .................................................................................................................. vii
List of Tables .......................................................................................................................... ix
List of Figures ........................................................................................................................ x
1. Introduction ....................................................................................................................... 12
   1.1. Scope ......................................................................................................................... 12
   1.2. Inputs from WP2 ....................................................................................................... 13
2. Short-Circuit Current Level Calculations ......................................................................... 15
   2.1. Tool and Models ..................................................................................................... 15
   2.2. Test Cases ............................................................................................................. 15
   2.3. Methodology ......................................................................................................... 15
   2.4. Results .................................................................................................................. 16
      2.4.1. 380, 400 and 500 kV System ......................................................................... 16
      2.4.2. 220 kV System .............................................................................................. 18
   2.5. Conclusion .............................................................................................................. 20
3. Voltage Stability ................................................................................................................ 21
   3.1. Tool and Models ..................................................................................................... 22
   3.2. Test Cases ............................................................................................................. 22
   3.3. Methodology ......................................................................................................... 22
   3.4. Results .................................................................................................................. 23
   3.5. Conclusion .............................................................................................................. 24
4. Frequency Stability Assessment ...................................................................................... 25
   4.1. Tools and Models .................................................................................................. 29
   4.2. Test Cases ............................................................................................................. 32
   4.3. Methodology ......................................................................................................... 36
   4.4. Results .................................................................................................................. 38
   4.5. Conclusion .............................................................................................................. 40
5. Small-Signal Stability Assessment .................................................................................. 41
   5.1. Test Cases ............................................................................................................. 43
   5.2. Methodology ......................................................................................................... 45
   5.3. Results .................................................................................................................. 46
      5.3.1. Mode 1 ............................................................................................................ 47
      5.3.2. Mode 2 ............................................................................................................ 48
      5.3.3. Mode 3 ............................................................................................................ 49
   5.4. Conclusion .............................................................................................................. 51
6. Conclusions ...................................................................................................................... 53
References ............................................................................................................................. 54
Appendix I: Scenarios, Models and Data ............................................................................ 64
Appendix II: Model Validation ............................................................................................ 84
Appendix III: Result Details ................................................................................................. 99
## List of Tables

**Table 1.1.** Operational validation phenomena and their consideration in the project ................................................................. 13
**Table 1.2.** Scenarios and corresponding regimes ..................................................................................................................... 14
**Table 3.1.** Maximum ICC results ....................................................................................................................................................... 16
**Table 3.2.** Maximum ICC results for 220 kV ....................................................................................................................................... 18
**Table 4.1.** Nodal configurations analysed .......................................................................................................................................... 22
**Table 4.2.** Voltage ranges for reference voltages defined by TSOs between 110 kV to 300 kV .............................................................. 23
**Table 4.3.** Voltage ranges for reference voltages defined by TSOs between 300 kV and 400 kV ............................................................. 23
**Table 4.4.** Voltage level analysis results ........................................................................................................................................... 23
**Table 2.1.** Number of objects in the full and reduced models ........................................................................................................ 30
**Table 2.2.** List of identified HVDC outside the CE ........................................................................................................................ 30
**Table 5.1.** Overview of the models ..................................................................................................................................................... 33
**Table 5.2.** Share of synchronous generation ....................................................................................................................................... 33
**Table 5.3.** Values defined in [1] and used for system operation ........................................................................................................... 37
**Table 5.4.** Frequency quality defining parameters of the synchronous areas [4] .................................................................................. 38
**Table 6.1.** Combined results for calculated eigenvalues ................................................................................................................ 46
**Table 6.2.** Contribution of synchronous generation in total generation ............................................................................................. 47

**Table B.1.** Continental Europe synchronous area .......................................................................................................................... 74
**Table B.2.** Export/import to the continental Europe synchronous area .................................................................................................. 75
**Table C.1.** Initial and tuned parameters of the SEXS model of excitation system ................................................................................ 76
**Table C.2.** Initial and tuned parameters of the TGOV1 turbine model ............................................................................................... 76
**Table C.3.** Initial and tuned parameters of simplified power system stabiliser model PSS2A ............................................................... 77
**Table C.6.** Initial and tuned parameters of synchronous generator .................................................................................................. 77
**Table D.1.** IEC synchronous machine parameters (without saturation) ............................................................................................. 78
**Table D.2.** IEC excitation system dynamics: ExcEEEDC1 ................................................................................................................ 79
**Table D.3.** IEC excitation system dynamics: ExcAVR5 ........................................................................................................................ 79
**Table D.4.** IEC turbine governor dynamics: GovHydro3 (without nonlinear flow–gate relationship) ...................................................... 80
**Table D.5.** Limits of converter .............................................................................................................................................................. 81
**Table D.6.** Voltage control parameters ................................................................................................................................................. 81
**Table D.7.** Power control parameters .................................................................................................................................................. 82
**Table D.8.** Pitch control parameters .................................................................................................................................................... 82
**Table D.9.** Turbine parameters ............................................................................................................................................................. 82
**Table D.10.** UPFC dynamic parameters ............................................................................................................................................ 82
**Table D.11.** VSC HVDC dynamic parameters ..................................................................................................................................... 83
**Table F.1.** Specification of selected ESS (according to [66]) ............................................................................................................. 90
List of Figures

Figure 3.1. Short circuit current for 380, 400 and 500 kV nodes ............................................................. 16
Figure 3.2. Short circuit histogram for 380, 400 and 500 kV nodes ............................................................. 17
Figure 3.3. Top short circuit histogram for 380, 400 and 500 kV nodes ......................................................... 18
Figure 3.4. Short circuit current for 220 kV nodes ......................................................................................... 18
Figure 3.5. Short circuit histogram for 220 kV nodes ..................................................................................... 19
Figure 3.6. Top short circuit histogram for 220 kV nodes ............................................................................. 19
Figure 3.1. Overview of the structure of the different frequency control loops [1] ............................................. 26
Figure 3.2. Time frame of each of the frequency control loops [1] ................................................................. 26
Figure 3.3. Droop characteristic of a generating unit [1] ................................................................................. 27
Figure 3.4. Load shedding recommendations as per [3] .................................................................................. 28
Figure 3.1. Scheme of CE synchronous zone with HVDC and example of reduction of CZ control area .......... 30
Figure 3.5. Overview scenario X-7, regime Summer Low .............................................................................. 34
Figure 3.6. Overview scenario X-7, regime Winter Peak ................................................................................. 34
Figure 3.7. Overview scenario X-10, regime Winter Peak .............................................................................. 35
Figure 3.8. Overview scenario X-16, regime Summer Low ............................................................................ 35
Figure 3.9: Frequency deviation waveforms for 2750 MW outage (Wind power plant in NS) in X-7 Summer Low ............................................................................................................................ 39
Figure 3.10: Frequency deviation waveforms for 4503 MW outage (HVDC GB -FR) in X-7 Winter Peak ....... 39
Figure 3.11: Frequency deviation waveforms for 6000 MW outage (HVDC GB -FR) in X-10 Winter Peak ....... 40
Figure 3.12: Frequency deviation waveforms for 1700 MW unit outage (C2) in X-16 Summer Low ............ 40
Figure 6.1. Scope of analysed configurations .................................................................................................. 44
Figure 6.2 Geographical mode shape scatter plot for Mode 1, scenario X-13, strategy 3, Winter Peak ............. 48
Figure 6.3 Geographical mode shape scatter plot for Mode 2, scenario X-10, strategy 2, Winter Peak .......... 48
Figure 6.4 Geographical mode shape scatter plot for Mode 2, scenario X-13, strategy 3, Winter Peak ........... 49
Figure 6.5 Geographical mode shape scatter plot for Mode 2, scenario X-16, strategy 3, Winter Peak .......... 49
Figure 6.6 Geographical mode shape scatter plot for Mode 3, scenario X-13, strategy 2, Winter Peak ............ 50
Figure 6.7 Geographical mode shape scatter plot for Mode 3, scenario X-13, strategy 3, Summer Low ........... 50
Figure 6.8 Geographical mode shape scatter plot for Mode 3, scenario X-16, strategy 3, Winter Peak .......... 51

Figure A.1. Overview of the generation and demand in scenario X-5 .............................................................. 64
Figure A.2. Overview of the grid architectures in scenario X-5 ........................................................................ 65
Figure A.3. Overview of the generation and demand in scenario X-7 .............................................................. 66
Figure A.4. Overview of the grid architectures in scenario X-7 ...................................................................... 67
Figure A.5. Overview of the generation and demand in scenario X-10 .......................................................... 68
Figure A.6. Overview of the grid architectures in scenario X-10 .................................................................... 69
Figure A.7. Overview of the generation and demand in scenario X-13 .......................................................... 70
Figure A.8. Overview of the grid architectures in scenario X-13 .................................................................... 71
Figure A.9. Overview of the generation and demand in scenario X-16 .......................................................... 72
Figure A.10. Overview of the grid architectures in scenario X-16 ................................................................. 73
Figure C.1. Block diagram of the SECS model of excitation system ............................................................... 76
Figure C.2. Block diagram of the TGOV1 turbine model .................................................................................. 76
Figure C.3. Block diagram of simplified power system stabiliser model PSS2A ............................................. 77
Figure D.1. IEC Excitation System Dynamics: ExciEDC1 .............................................................................. 79
Figure D.2. IEC Excitation System Dynamics: ExcAVR5 ............................................................................... 79
Figure D.3. IEC Turbine Governor Dynamics: GovHydro3 (without nonlinear flow-gate relationship) ....... 80
Figure D.4. Model of wind turbine with permanent magnet generator and full power converter ................. 81
Figure D.5. Block diagram of the voltage regulator with supplementary stabiliser signal ............................. 82
Figure D.6. Block diagram of the voltage regulator and power control with stabiliser ............................... 83
Figure E.1. Frequency waveforms for WAMS in Portugal, Switzerland, Austria and Turkey ....................... 84
Figure E.2. Frequency deviations waveforms of the MODES simulations full model .................................... 84
Figure E.3. Frequency deviations waveforms of the MODES simulations reduced model ....................... 85
Figure E.4. Frequency deviations waveforms of the PSS/E simulations on reduced model ....................... 85
Figure F.1. General block diagram of typical power electronic system (according to [42]) ......................... 86
Figure F.2. Scheme of UPFC connected between nodes I and J ................................................................. 87
D4.1 – Operational validation of the grid reinforcements by 2050

Figure F.3. One line scheme for simple test system with UPFC (test system A) ........................................ 87
Figure F.4. Results of simulations for cases without and with UPFC and for UPFC with stabiliser signal ............... 88
Figure F.5. Scheme of HVDC connected between nodes I and J and injection model ....................................... 88
Figure F.6. One line scheme for simple test system with HVDC (test system B) ............................................... 89
Figure F.7. Results of simulations for cases without and with UPFC and for UPFC with stabiliser signal ............... 89
Figure F.8. Simple test system with wind turbine and synchronous generator (test system C) .......................... 91
Figure F.9. Frequency waveforms for simulation of load step change ............................................................. 91
Figure F.10. Frequency waveforms for simulation of the wind speed .............................................................. 92
Figure F.11. Frequency waveforms for simulation of the short circuit ............................................................ 92
Figure F.12. Basic structure of PV dynamic model according to [101] .............................................................. 93
Figure F.13. One line scheme for simple test system with PV (test system D) ................................................. 94
Figure F.14. Results of simulation of short circuit near PV for Test system D .................................................. 94
Figure F.15. One line scheme for simple test system with PV and decentralised ESS (test system E) ................. 95
Figure F.16. Active powers of load and generation ......................................................................................... 95
Figure F.17. Active powers of line 2-3 and ESS ......................................................................................... 96
Figure F.18. Voltage of the node 1 .............................................................................................................. 96
Figure F.19. Basic structure of CSP with thermal energy (according to [119]) .................................................. 97
Figure G.1. Mode 1 - frequency 0.3458 Hz, damping 2.51, scenario X-10, strategy 2, Summer Low .................... 99
Figure G.2. Mode 1 - frequency 0.2935 Hz, damping 2.72, scenario X-10, strategy 3, Summer Low ................. 100
Figure G.3. Mode 1 - frequency 0.2331 Hz, damping 2.08, scenario X-10, strategy 2, Winter Peak ................. 100
Figure G.4. Mode 1 - frequency 0.1864 Hz, damping 3.28, scenario X-10, strategy 3, Winter Peak .................. 101
Figure G.5. Mode 2 - frequency 0.3764 Hz, damping 0.62, scenario X-10, strategy 2, Winter Peak .................. 101
Figure G.6. Mode 2 - frequency 0.3626 Hz, damping 1.33, scenario X-10, strategy 3, Winter Peak ................. 102
Figure G.7. Mode 3 - frequency 0.3842 Hz, damping 2.70, scenario X-10, strategy 2, Winter Peak ................. 102
Figure G.8. Mode 3 - frequency 0.3836 Hz, damping 2.67, scenario X-10, strategy 3, Winter Peak ................. 103
Figure G.9. Mode 1 - frequency 0.3187 Hz, damping 1.83, scenario X-13, strategy 2, Summer Low ................. 103
Figure G.10. Mode 1 - frequency 0.2600 Hz, damping 3.59, scenario X-13, strategy 3, Summer Low ............... 104
Figure G.11. Mode 1 - frequency 0.2147 Hz, damping 3.51, scenario X-13, strategy 2, Winter Peak .................. 104
Figure G.12. Mode 1 - frequency 0.1576 Hz, damping 5.04, scenario X-13, strategy 3, Winter Peak ................. 105
Figure G.13. Mode 2 - frequency 0.4333 Hz, damping 1.82, scenario X-13, strategy 2, Summer Low ............... 105
Figure G.14. Mode 2 - frequency 0.3628 Hz, damping 1.87, scenario X-13, strategy 3 Summer Low ............... 106
Figure G.15. Mode 2 - frequency 0.3794 Hz, damping 1.48, scenario X-13, strategy 2, Winter Peak ................. 106
Figure G.16. Mode 2 - frequency 0.3382 Hz, damping -0.50, scenario X-13, strategy 3, Winter Peak ................. 107
Figure G.17. Mode 3 - frequency 0.4665 Hz, damping 0.51, scenario X-13, strategy 3, Summer Low ............... 107
Figure G.18. Mode 3 - frequency 0.4053 Hz, damping 2.02, scenario X-13, strategy 2, Winter Peak ................. 108
Figure G.19. Mode 3 - frequency 0.3439 Hz, damping 1.91, scenario X-13, strategy 3, Winter Peak ................. 108
Figure G.20. Mode 1 - frequency 0.3648 Hz, damping 1.35, scenario X-16, strategy 2, Summer Low ............... 109
Figure G.21. Mode 1 - frequency 0.3816 Hz, damping 2.15, scenario X-16, strategy 3, Summer Low ............... 109
Figure G.22. Mode 1 - frequency 0.2026 Hz, damping 3.33, scenario X-16, strategy 2, Winter Peak ................. 110
Figure G.23. Mode 1 - frequency 0.1937 Hz, damping 3.80, scenario X-16, strategy 3, Winter Peak ................. 110
Figure G.24. Mode 2 - frequency 0.4060 Hz, damping 0.48, scenario X-16, strategy 2, Winter Peak ................. 111
Figure G.25. Mode 2 - frequency 0.3753 Hz, damping 0.63, scenario X-16, strategy 3, Winter Peak ................. 111
Figure G.26. Mode 3 - frequency 0.4325 Hz, damping 1.07, scenario X-16, strategy 3, Winter Peak ................. 112
Figure H.1. Voltage difference of the N-1 grid reinforcements for X-7 – Strategy 2 – Summer Low .................. 113
Figure H.2. Voltage difference of the N-1 grid reinforcements for X-7 – Strategy 3 – Summer Low .................. 113
Figure H.3. Voltage difference of the N-1 grid reinforcements for X-10 – Strategy 2 – Winter Peak .................. 114
Figure H.4. Voltage difference of the N-1 grid reinforcements for X-10 – Strategy 3 – Winter Peak .................. 114
Figure H.5. Voltage difference of the N-1 grid reinforcements for X-13 – Strategy 2 – Summer Low ............... 115
Figure H.6. Voltage difference of the N-1 grid reinforcements for X-13 – Strategy 2 – Winter Peak ............... 115
Figure H.7. Voltage difference of the N-1 grid reinforcements for X-13 – Strategy 3 – Summer Low ............... 116
Figure H.8. Voltage difference of the N-1 grid reinforcements for X-13 – Strategy 3 – Winter Peak ............... 116
Figure H.9. Voltage difference of the N-1 grid reinforcements for X-16 – Strategy 2 – Summer Low ............... 117
Figure H.10. Voltage difference of the N-1 grid reinforcements for X-16 – Strategy 2 – Winter Peak ............... 117
Figure H.11. Voltage difference of the N-1 grid reinforcements for X-16 – Strategy 3 – Summer Low ............... 118
Figure H.12. Voltage difference of the N-1 grid reinforcements for X-16 – Strategy 3 – Winter Peak ............... 118
1. Introduction

1.1. Scope

The significant changes in the localisation and types of generation, as well as the new grid architectures foreseen by the e-Highway2050 project can create significant challenges for the operation of the grid. The following key impacting factors can be mentioned:

- The increasing penetration of renewable energy sources
- The increasing power exchanges
- The increasing number of connections realised with HVDC

The task 2.3 of the e-Highway2050 project studied the European power flows only on a zonal level (100 clusters) with an equivalent grid model. This approach cannot identify all the overloads that could occur in the real complete network. In addition, the zonal power flows are done under the DC approximation, hiding possible voltage issues. That is why task 2.4 performed some AC power flows on a complete network model. The analysis was limited to continental Europe due to data availability. It showed that only limited overloads occur during N-1 contingencies and they could be overcome by local reinforcements. Moreover, no major voltage problem was highlighted.

To completely assess the operability of the system, even more phenomenon should be assessed, they are listed in the table below. To study such complex phenomena 35 years ahead is unrealistic due to the uncertainty on the detailed datasets, which influence the results significantly. However, exploratory studies can be performed on some test cases to highlight possible phenomena and anticipate the challenges and solutions. In that perspective, the following issues are considered in the task 4.1 of the e-Highway2050 project:

- Short circuit levels
- Voltage stability
- Short-term frequency stability
- Small signal stability

For each type of study, a theoretical background is given in this report. The assumptions and models are described and the simulation results are presented.

The general purpose of task 4.1 is not to conclude definitely on the above-mentioned phenomenon up to the year 2050, but more to pave the way for further in-depth analysis. Indeed, to consider them completely requires a dedicated project and is out of the scope of the e-Highway2050 project.
### Table 1.1. Operational validation phenomena and their consideration in the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomena considered for operational validation</th>
<th>Consideration within e-Highway2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current limits</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line loading</td>
<td>Addressed in task 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-circuit current levels</td>
<td>Addressed in task 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voltage limits</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady-state voltage levels: within limits in N and N-1 situations</td>
<td>Addressed in task 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voltage stability: risk of voltage collapse</td>
<td>Addressed in task 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary voltage deviations: temporary overvoltages following an event</td>
<td>No dedicated studies as part of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency stability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term frequency stability</td>
<td>No dedicated studies as part of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term frequency stability</td>
<td>Addressed in task 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotor angle stability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small signal stability</td>
<td>Addressed in task 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient stability</td>
<td>No dedicated studies as part of the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.2. Inputs from WP2

Five representative scenarios were selected in WP1 and quantified in WP2:

- X-5 (Large Scale RES)
- X-7 (100% RES)
- X-10 (Big & market)
- X-13 (Large Fossil Fuel & Nuclear)
- X-16 (Small and Local)

Scenario X-5 is mostly based on centralised RES, but also nuclear power plants are included. X-7 is purely based on RES, both centralised and decentralised. X-10 is based on a broad mix of generation technologies. X-13 relies mostly on conventional sources. X-16 represents a decentralised solution based on local embedded RES generation and does not require a huge transmission system development. More details on the scenarios can be found in Appendix I and [37]. The scenarios are detailed in deliverables D1.2 and D2.1 of the project.

Two operational regimes are considered (see Table 1.2)

- Winter Peak
- Summer Low
All of the four analysed scenarios have been prepared with two possible grid development strategies suggested:

- Strategy 2 - which consists of grid development using HVAC overhead lines
- Strategy 3 - that uses HVDC cable lines

The set of a scenario, regime and strategy forms a configuration, which is subject to assessments.

AC power flow models of the continental European system were created by WP2 (see deliverable 2.4). AC power flows were run within the task 2.4 of the project and serve as the basis of the work for the task 4.1 described in this report. It should be noted that for three cases: X-5 winter peak, X-5 summer low and X-7 winter peak, no convergent power flows could be created. Indeed, the flows in these situations are extremely different from the starting case (2030) and need more-advanced methods to be studied. As a result, those three cases could not be considered either during the task 4.1 (except for frequency stability, which does not require a convergent power flow).

To create the power flows, task 2.4 scaled up the generation and demand from the starting case (2030) to match the results of the system simulations performed in task 2.3. This approach was chosen due to the difficulty to localise the generation and demand in all the European substations at the 2050 horizon. The consequence is that the types of generation are not matching the results of the system simulations where the generation and demand adequacy was considered with details. This does not influence the power flow calculations but is critical for the analyses of task 4.1 when the types of generation have impact on the results. However, except for frequency stability, the generation types were not corrected in task 4.1.
2. Short-Circuit Current Level Calculations

The short-circuit current contribution provided by the new renewable sources and the HVDC network components could create challenges for the future system. Indeed, an important amount of the generation units, based on conversion through power electronics, are presently characterised by low short-circuit currents. HVDC network might connect large amounts of power to single points, with zero fault level in-feed. These new technical solutions challenge selective isolation of faults by protection systems, with potential impacts on safety, generation and network equipment damage and possible extension of incidents on wider areas.

2.1. Tool and Models

PSS/E computation software was chosen to perform the analysis.

The short circuit current depends of the amount of generation and the generation type since the contribution for the short circuit current depends of the internal impedance. Synchronous machines, asynchronous machine and full decoupled machine for wind and solar have different response.

The AC power flow models from WP2 were used as inputs of the short circuit calculation. It should be noted that the generation types in these power flows are not 100% correct (see explanations in the introduction), influencing the short circuit calculations.

Although short circuit are dynamic phenomena, they are commonly analysed with steady state tools. Their analysis requires additional data compared to a simple power flow: the reactance of the synchronous machines are required, as well as the short circuit contribution of power electronic devices (RES generation and HVDC). For task 4.1, the following assumptions were taken:

- The reactances of the synchronous machines come from the dataset provided.
- The short circuit contribution of PV and wind generations is similar has other generation. In the PSS/E model we are not able to describe the type of generation. It’s expected for 2050 that PV and Wind can provide the same amount of short circuit contribution.
- The short circuit contribution of HVDC is neglected.

2.2. Test Cases

For scenarios X-10, X-13, and X-16 the two strategies (AC or DC reinforcements) and the two regimes (Summer Low and Winter Peak) were analysed. For X-7, only the Summer Low was analysed and no situation for X-5 as the simulation requires a convergent power flow.

2.3. Methodology

As usually for this type of analysis, only 3-phase short circuits are analysed.

Short-circuit currents must not exceed the breaking capacity of all the devices installed in the respective node or designed to eliminate the fault. As a result, the maximal short circuit currents are discussed for each case.
2.4. Results

2.4.1. 380, 400 and 500 kV System

Based on the cases that converge for Continental Europe, PSS/E computation software was used to compute the total short circuit current in every Very High Voltage bus. The results for 380, 400 and 500 kV is showed in Figure 2.1.

![Figure 2.1. Short circuit current for 380, 400 and 500 kV nodes](image)

In all cases, the maximum Icc is 95 kA, with the exception of X-16 scenario were the maximum values reach 109 kA. The results are summarised in Table 2.1. The maximum Icc that the circuit breakers are able to deal is 80 kA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Regime</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Maximum Icc (kA)</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X-7</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-10</td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-13</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-16</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This Icc is the total short-circuit current at the busbar. Of course, the circuit breaker will cut its contribution to the Icc that is less than the total. The short circuit histogram is displayed in Figure 2.2.

There is no big difference of the Icc related to the scenario. To see the details of the higher values, Figure 2.3 shows the top 200 nodes in CE.
2.4.2. 220 kV System

Based on the configurations that converge for Continental Europe, PSS/E computation software was used to compute the total short circuit current in every HVH bus. The for 220 kV is showed in Figure 2.4.

Figure 2.4. Short circuit current for 220 kV nodes

In all cases, the maximum Icc is 68 kA and is observed in France. The results are summarised in Table 2.2. The normal values are in the range of 40 to 50 kA now, but in 2050 since we will have more install capacity this level of 60 to 70 kA is acceptable.

Table 2.2. Maximum Icc results for 220 kV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Regime</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Maximum Icc (kA)</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X-7</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-10</td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-13</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no big difference of results due to the scenario. The short circuit histogram is displayed in Figure 2.5.

To see the details of the higher values, Figure 2.6 shows the top 200 nodes in CE.
Figure 2.6. Top short circuit histogram for 220 kV nodes

2.5. Conclusion

The test cases analysed under T2.4 did not show any major issue regarding the maximal short circuit currents. However, the contribution of power electronics to short circuit currents should be further investigated and especially the impact on the minimal short circuit currents. Indeed, they may become even more critical due to the limited short-circuit contribution of power electronics. As a result, some faults could be missed by the protection devices.
3. Voltage Stability

One of the basis of the Network Code on Operational Security [14] is the responsibility of TSOs to keep voltages within Operational Security Limits. The origin of the requirement of keeping network voltages within a range is the limitation of operating voltage conditions of the equipment connected to the power system. This results in providing these elements with under- and over-voltage protective systems. Tripping these elements may lead to unacceptable voltage deviations and finally to cascading outages. The reasons to consider the voltage conditions for the period up to 2050 are:

- A strong development in electricity system infrastructures in the recent years, especially increasing volume of lines
- Implementation of internal electricity market. Technical functions necessary for stable system operation that today are provided by large synchronous generators will be delivered by the new players and will be significantly based on the provisions established by the Grid connection Network Codes. Market decisions leading to highly fluctuating allocation of generation will also affect regional system dynamics.
- Low carbon future of Europe, which involves increasing levels of non-synchronously connected RES while decreasing level of synchronous generators. Displacement of conventional generation in favour of non-synchronously connected RES directly affects the system in terms of all voltage limits phenomena. There is a reduction of reactive reserves from synchronous generation and a reduction in the number of voltage stabiliser devices. Emergence of converter-based generators will put emphasis on concerns related to voltage control capabilities.
- Distributed generation. The structure of generation is evolving and there will be an increase in the share of distributed generation that is usually connected to OSDs grid and on the other hand, a decrease in the share of high capacity combustion plants equipped with synchronous machines connected mostly to EHV grid.
- Long distance bulk power-flows will put emphasis on voltage stability issues and will further stress the reduction of reactive reserves from synchronous generation. The long distance bulk power flows are due to concentration of RES in areas with low power consumption and RES power needs to be transmitted to areas with high load. The connections between areas with high wind and high load (which are often very distant) usually need to be developed.
- New capabilities, devices and solutions such as Demand Side Response, FACTS and HVDC connections will provide significant changes to network performance
- As demand still grows, the voltage stability conditions are weakened unless the power network is developed.
- As RES generation level is weather (wind) determined, fast fluctuations of RES power require appropriate system response, which includes also voltage response.
- Increased use of underground cables
- Three assessments of voltage limits are usually performed: steady-state voltage levels, voltage stability and temporary voltage deviations. The first one was addressed within task 2.4 whereas task 4.1 addressed the second one.
3.1. Tool and Models

PSS/E computation software was chosen to perform the analysis.

A DC power flow model on an equivalent grid is not suitable for voltage analysis thus the AC power flow models provided by task 2.4 were directly used for the analysis. It should be noted that the mapping of generation types in the models from task 2.4 is not completely correct and thus cannot reflect with precision the real behaviour of the system in terms of voltage (provision of reactive power can depend on the type of generators).

The provision of reactive power by generators follows the 2030 model by ENTSOE. The provision of reactive power by HVDC is not considered.

3.2. Test Cases

Only converging configurations in N situation could be studied. These converging configurations are reminded in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Regime</th>
<th>Strategy 2</th>
<th>Strategy 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X-5</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>Not converged</td>
<td>Not converged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>Not converged</td>
<td>Not converged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-7</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>Converged</td>
<td>Converged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>Not converged</td>
<td>Not converged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-10</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>Not converged</td>
<td>Not converged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>Converged</td>
<td>Converged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-13</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>Converged</td>
<td>Converged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>Converged</td>
<td>Converged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-16</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>Converged</td>
<td>Converged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>Converged</td>
<td>Converged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Methodology

The objective was to perform voltage analysis of the nodal network with the reinforcements selected for the strategies 2 and 3, by comparing the voltage difference when the grid losses one of the reinforcements (N-1). It was assumed that the existing lines, cables and transformers meet the N-1 security rule.

According to Article 10 [14] Voltage control and Reactive Power management of Network Code on Operational Security, Operation Security Limits are specified in Table 3.2 and Table 3.3.
Table 3.2. Voltage ranges for reference voltages defined by TSOs between 110 kV to 300 kV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synchronous Area</th>
<th>Voltage range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continental Europe</td>
<td>0.90 pu – 1.118 pu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic</td>
<td>0.90 pu – 1.050 pu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>0.90 pu – 1.100 pu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.90 pu – 1.118 pu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland offshore</td>
<td>0.90 pu – 1.100 pu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic</td>
<td>0.90 pu – 1.120 pu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3. Voltage ranges for reference voltages defined by TSOs between 300 kV and 400 kV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synchronous Area</th>
<th>Voltage range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continental Europe</td>
<td>0.90 pu – 1.05 pu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic</td>
<td>0.90 pu – 1.05 pu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>0.90 pu – 1.05 pu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.90 pu – 1.05 pu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland offshore</td>
<td>0.90 pu – 1.10 pu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic</td>
<td>0.90 pu – 1.10 pu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within task 4.1, it was decided to classify a case as unstable if the voltage drop following an N-1 contingency was above 25%.

3.4. Results

Below are presented the results of the voltage analysis by simulating the loss of each transmission grid reinforcements, using the base case (N) voltage as the normalised voltage. Analysing the results for the 12 configurations shows that only in one there is a voltage collapse since the voltage drop is 25%. The results are displayed in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4. Voltage level analysis results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Regime</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Maximum voltage drop [pu]</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X-7</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.0307</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.0331</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-10</td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.0200</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>-0.0421</strong></td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-13</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.0191</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>-0.0456</strong></td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>-0.0961</strong></td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>-0.2525</strong></td>
<td>Not Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-16</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.0191</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.0187</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.0177</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the scenario X-13 Strategy 3 regime Winter Peak both contingency R1 and R2 that represent HVDC link to France with 6519 MW, causes a voltage drop in France. It proves that the integration of link of more than 6 GW between UK and France seems inoperable. A better solution is to consider different parallel lines to realise transmission requirements of significant power. This will prevent this type of issues.

Plots with details on the voltage level analysis can be found in Appendix H.

3.5. Conclusion

The analyses performed in task 4.1 did not show any un-manageable voltage drop in the considered configurations. Only one unstable situation was identified but it can be avoided by limiting the maximal capacity of a single line. However, some configurations could not be considered as they were not convergent, these situations face very likely significant voltage issues. This should be further investigated with methodologies and tools suitable for the analysis of very different power flow configurations.
Frequency Stability Assessment

Frequency stability deals with the ability of a power system to maintain steady frequency following a disturbance resulting in a significant imbalance between generation and load. Three main causes for frequency instability exist:

- Large generation or load outage
- Forecast errors (especially in connection with the variable RES generation)
- Separation of part of network (islanded operation)

According to ENTSO-E [2]:

“Frequency Stability means the ability of the Transmission System to maintain stable Frequency in N-Situation and after being subjected to a Disturbance.”

According to [8]:

“Frequency Stability is concerned with the ability of a power system to maintain steady frequency within a nominal range following a severe system upset resulting in a significant imbalance between generation and load. It depends on the ability to restore balance between system generation and load, with minimum loss of load. Instability that may result occurs in the form of sustained frequency swings leading to tripping of generating units and/or loads.”

In normal operation, the electric power system is characterised by the balance between the electrical power consumed by the loads and the power provided by the prime movers (turbines) of the generators. In case there is a sudden disconnection of load or generation, this balance is no longer kept, leading the system frequency to deviate from its nominal value.

In the first instants after the disturbance, the kinetic energy stored in the rotating masses of the generators is used in order to provide the energy required by the loads (in case of a generation trip). The energy consumed by the loads will therefore be supplied at the expense of reducing the system frequency. Therefore, a control system is required in order to arrest the frequency decay, keep it within acceptable values, and in the end bring it back to its nominal value. The control loop in charge of providing the initial response of the turbines required to stop the frequency decay is the Primary control. The loop responsible for bringing the frequency back to its nominal value is the secondary control. There is an additional loop, called Tertiary control, which is responsible for restoring the reserve band of the secondary control.

Figure 4.1 shows the structure of the different control loops responsible for restoring the frequency after a disturbance according to [1].
The time frame of each of the control loops is shown in Figure 4.2.

Frequency stability is sometimes also referred to as short-term adequacy.

The initial rate of change of the frequency can be calculated according to the following expression, already proposed in [6]:

\[
\frac{df}{dt} = f_{\text{base}} \cdot \frac{\Delta P_{\text{step}}}{2 \cdot H_{\text{eq}}}
\]

where \( \frac{df}{dt} \) is the derivative of the frequency in [Hz/s], \( f_{\text{base}} \) is the system base frequency in [Hz], \( \Delta P_{\text{step}} \) is the magnitude of the disturbance in [pu] and \( H_{\text{eq}} \) is the equivalent inertia constant of the system in [s]. The magnitude of the disturbance and the equivalent inertia constant are referred to the same base power. For convenience, the base power can be
chosen as the sum of the nominal powers of the generating units that remain connected. Therefore, and according to the previous equation, the main variables influencing the initial rate of decay of the system frequency are:

- Size of the disturbance: the larger the disturbance the faster the frequency will initially vary
- System inertia: the larger the inertia the slower the frequency will initially vary

With the trend of connection of RESs to the Transmission system, the conventional units will be gradually replaced by wind or solar power plants. The reduction of inertia provided by conventional generation (synchronous generators) will be significant in the future. Therefore, under scenarios with a large penetration of renewables, the inertia of the system can be significantly reduced, leading to faster and larger frequency deviations, namely:

- When a large loss of generation or load occurs the frequency will vary faster than in the current situation due to the lower inertia
- Besides, when the tripped generator is a conventional unit the inertia will be additionally reduced and the system state become even worse.

Once the frequency starts to change, the Primary Control will try to increase/decrease the power of the generating units in order to restore the balance between the generation and the load. The Primary control consists basically of a proportional control, so that when the balance is restored and a steady state is reached, there will be a frequency error. The size of the error depends on the gain of the proportional control. The inverse of this gain is called droop and defines a linear relationship on how the power of a generating unit will change depending on the frequency variations (see Figure 4.3). The Primary control response time is in the order of seconds.

![Figure 4.3. Droop characteristic of a generating unit [1]](image)

The speed at which the Primary control reacts depends very much on the type of generation unit: Hydro, Thermal, Combined Cycle, etc., some of them being very fast and the others
slower. The minimum value reached by the frequency depends on how fast the Primary control is able to restore the balance between generation and load by acting on the generators output. The slower they are the large will be the minimum value reached by the frequency. This is of crucial importance, since large frequency deviations can trigger protection schemes, which can lead to the disconnection of additional generating units, eventually leading to a system blackout. This may occur even if there is enough spinning reserve but the disturbance is so large that the Primary control cannot arrest the frequency deviation before it starts to cause additional generation trips.

The frequency deviations can be classified in two types, depending on its sign:

- Under-frequency: due mainly to the trip of generating units.
- Over-frequency: due mainly to the trip of large loads.

In order to protect the system against under-frequency situations, the power systems are equipped with additional schemes, which disconnect load when the frequency reaches predefined values. These schemes are called load shedding. As an example in Figure 4.4 are shown the ENTSO-E recommendations for such defence plans.

![Figure 4.4. Load shedding recommendations as per [3]](image)

Under large frequency deviations, the power delivered by some generating units may not remain constant and may be reduced due, for instance, to the different performance of the auxiliary services of the power plant. This means that when a large disturbance occurs, the frequency drop can be so significant to make the available spinning reserve not enough in order to arrest the frequency decay. In such circumstances, the system may experience a frequency collapse [5]. This fact can even be aggravated since the loads behave more and more like constant power loads, thus reducing the natural damping of the loads, which can be helpful during under-frequency situations.

On the other hand, in over-frequency situations there are additional phenomena that can aggravate the system state (over-frequency protection can be triggered leading to the
disconnection of conventional generators). This can produce the opposite phenomena of under-frequency [7], eventually leading to the system collapse.

After the Primary Control has acted, the Secondary Control takes over and attempts to restore the frequency to its nominal value (not only that, but also to keep the power exchanges between the different control areas to their scheduled values). The secondary control is basically an integral control, thus producing zero error when reaching the steady state. The secondary control is much slower than the primary control, and it highly depends on the generation technology. For instance, hydro power plants are much faster than typical thermal units. Typical response times of the Secondary control are in the range of minutes.

In the past, when the penetration of renewables was not relevant, it was relatively “simple” for the secondary control to restore the frequency, since there were not random factors affecting to the frequency behaviour. Nowadays, the increase number of renewables and its random characteristic makes it a challenge to operate the system when unexpected wind or sun conditions occur. In such cases, the power system should be able to control the frequency and keep it within acceptable ranges.

This might impose very demanding requirements to the secondary control. Therefore, scenarios with a large percentage of renewable generation and its random variations and its impact on the system frequency behaviour should be analysed. Moreover, the coordination between the different types of frequency control and reserves should also be investigated in order to assess possible problems derived from such scenarios.

Therefore, under scenarios with significant percentages of renewable generation, as it is foreseen in the future for the European power system, the analysis of the system frequency behaviour must be addressed by means of the adequate studies. These studies should focus on the following issues:

- Frequency deviations following generation contingencies or tripping of an HVDC connecting a different synchronous area
- Ability of the system to cope with unexpected variations of renewable power
- Ability of the system to cope with very high ramps of generation implied by RES (especially solar)

Within the task 4.1 of the e-Highway2050 project, only the issue of frequency deviation following a contingency was analysed.

### 4.1. Tools and Models

For the frequency stability, a reduced power flow data based on available TYNDP 2030 model was used. With combination of simple (initial) dynamic models the reduced model enables to carry out calculations of frequency stability.

Since the reduced model contains plugin nodes (corresponding to the switching substations of the cluster model prepared by WP2) it can be easily expanded.

Initial power flow data is based on TYNDP 2030 model. This model contains full data for continental Europe including X nodes for HVDC inside Continental Europe model – see right side of figure below.
Figure 4.5. Scheme of CE synchronous zone with HVDC and example of reduction of CZ control area

Each control area in the initial model is reduced into:

- one hub node with concentrated all generation and consumption of the control area
- all border nodes with the neighbouring control areas in order to preserve all tie lines
- internal X HVDC nodes (with HVDC terminals in CE)
- external X HVDC nodes (terminals of HVDC in GB, NO, SE and TN) – list of these HVDC is in table 4.2

An example of the reduced control area is depicted on the left side of figure 4.5.

Following table compares numbers of objects of the initial (full) and reduced model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Numbers of Nodes</th>
<th>Branches + Transformers</th>
<th>Generators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full model</td>
<td>15575</td>
<td>21426+1157</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced model</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reduced model significantly speeds up dynamic calculations. For example, one minute simulation of unit outage takes nearly 180 second for full model, but only two seconds for reduced model (using the MODES network simulator).

Table 4.2. List of identified HVDC outside the CE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HVDC Name</th>
<th>Node name (internal CE)</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Node name (external CE)</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NorNed</td>
<td>ORNED2NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>ORNED2NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XEE_FE1N</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>XEE_FE1O</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XMA_SE11</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>XSE_FR42</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KontiSkan</td>
<td>XVH_L21K</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>XVH_L11S</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XBE_GB1B</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>XBE_GB1G</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SwePol</td>
<td>XSL_SW11</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>XSL_ST1S</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XFR_GB1F</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>XFR_GB1G</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nord.Link</td>
<td>XBR_ER1D</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>XBR_ER1N</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagerrak</td>
<td>XTJ_K41K</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>XTJ_K41N</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XTJ_K23K</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>XTJ_K23N</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reduced power flow data was complemented by simple dynamic models for sub-transient round rotor generator and simpler models for excitation, PSS, turbine and governor (SEXS, PSS2A and TGOV1) with tuned parameters from Appendix C.

The validation of the reduced model can be found in Appendix II.
4.2. Test Cases

From the WP2 configurations, the following ones have been selected to capture a wide scope of possible frequency stability:

- X-7 (100% RES)
  - Summer Low
  - Reinforcement strategy 3
- X-7 (100% RES)
  - Winter Peak
  - Reinforcement strategy 3
- X-10 (Big & market)
  - Winter Peak
  - Reinforcement strategy 3
- X-16 (Small & Local)
  - Summer Low
  - Reinforcement strategy 2

As explained before, the reduced models consist of all border buses (all tie lines were observed), so called plugin nodes for clusters, X nodes to external systems (terminals of HVDC or AC connection outside continental Europe) and so called hub nodes (one hub for each control area). Initial dynamic model was created by combining this reduced power flow data with dynamic data from Appendix C (C.4 wind parks and Tab. C.1-4 for conventional units). Turkish power system was substituted by 50 GW load and generation.

The second step was adjustment of the initial dynamic model according to market model simulation. The generation was adjusted to correspond with the ANTARES results and conventional generation was replaced by appropriate dynamic models for non-synchronous generation (connected to the network through converters). An overview of the utilised models is given in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3. Overview of the models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>X-7 adjusted</th>
<th>X-10 adjusted</th>
<th>X-16 adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regime</td>
<td>Sommer Low</td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load [MW]</td>
<td>449111</td>
<td>547243</td>
<td>554705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation [MW]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synchronous</td>
<td>193871</td>
<td>326916</td>
<td>434857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumping</td>
<td>-2849</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>53732</td>
<td>106811</td>
<td>69907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>127369</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admittance</td>
<td>78180</td>
<td>111300</td>
<td>50995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inertia [GJ]</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>2071</td>
<td>2038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-factor [MW/Hz]</td>
<td>20088</td>
<td>3389</td>
<td>40944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The share of synchronous generation as part of total generation is given in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4. Share of synchronous generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Regime</th>
<th>Share of synchronous generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X-7</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-10</td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-16</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.6, Figure 4.7, Figure 4.8 and Figure 4.9 show country balances and power flows show difference between the clusters.
Figure 4.6. Overview scenario X-7, regime Summer Low

Figure 4.7. Overview scenario X-7, regime Winter Peak
The main importing countries are DE and ES with significant import from GB in X-10 Winter Peak.

Figure 4.8. Overview scenario X-10, regime Winter Peak

Figure 4.9. Overview scenario X-16, regime Summer Low
Power exchange outside continental Europe is small in X-7 Summer Low (the main export comes from IT to AT) to the contrary with X-7 Winter Peak, when exchanges are very large: imports from GB, NS, NO, SE and North Africa (DE stays very large importer, but there are large imports to IT and FR). The main importing country is AT in X-16 Summer Low, power exchange outside the continental zone is very small.

### 4.3. Methodology

The criteria for frequency stability are based on the following references:

- In case a simulation shows stable behaviour but the frequency experiences large deviations, the rejection will be based on the following:
  - ENTSO-E Policy 3 [2] and
- If a scenario shows instability during the simulations, the scenario will be rejected

Table 4.5. and Table 4.6. show frequency requirements as per [1] and [4]. The proposed criteria are based on current codes and policies, and they may of course differ from those that will be operative in 2050. Using them may lead to some conservative results, but they can be used as a starting point. Besides, the studies carried out in the scope of this project may help to identify and propose changes in the operational criteria based on the evolution of the system and the proposed architectures.
### Table 4.5. Values defined in [1] and used for system operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>dated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1-A-D1</td>
<td>Nominal Frequency</td>
<td>50 Hz</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1-A-D2.1</td>
<td>Activation of PRIMARY CONTROL RESERVES</td>
<td>±20 mHz</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1-A-D2.5</td>
<td>Full Activation of PRIMARY CONTROL RESERVES</td>
<td>±200 mHz</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1-A-D3.1</td>
<td>Reference Incident</td>
<td>3000 MW</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1-A-D4.1</td>
<td>SELF-REGULATION of Load</td>
<td>1 %/Hz</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest load in the system (from 03.12.2008)</td>
<td>412000 MW</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution by SELF-REGULATION of Load</td>
<td>4120 MW/Hz</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1-A-D4.3</td>
<td>Minimum NETWORK POWER FREQUENCY CHARACTERISTIC of PRIMARY CONTROL</td>
<td>15000 MW/Hz</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1-A-D4.4</td>
<td>Avarage NETWORK POWER FREQUENCY CHARACTERISTIC of PRIMARY CONTROL</td>
<td>19500 MW/Hz</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean generation power (in the system)</td>
<td>306000 MW</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1-A-D4.5</td>
<td>SURPLUS-CONTROL of GENERATION (50% of mean generation power in the system / 50 Hz)</td>
<td>3060 MW/Hz</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1-A-D4.6</td>
<td>Overall NETWORK POWER FREQUENCY CHARACTERISTIC</td>
<td>26680 MW/Hz</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1-A-D4.7</td>
<td>Overall PRIMARY CONTROL RESERVE</td>
<td>3000 MW</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. Results

The frequency stability was checked by power outage. Four cases were simulated:

- 2750 MW wind power plant outage in the North sea (X-7, Summer Low)
- 4503 MW HVDC outage between France and Great Britain (X-7, Winter Peak)
- 6000 MW HVDC outage between France and Great Britain (X-10, Winter Peak)
- 1700 MW unit outage in the Czech Republic (X-16, Summer Low)

Figure 4.10., Figure 4.11., Figure 4.12. and Figure 4.13. present simulation results – frequency deviations in different parts of the continental Europe synchronous zone.

### Table 4.6. Frequency Quality Defining Parameters of the Synchronous Areas [4]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>IRE</th>
<th>NE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Frequency Range</td>
<td>±50 mHz</td>
<td>±200 mHz</td>
<td>±200 mHz</td>
<td>±100 mHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Instantaneous Frequency Deviation</td>
<td>800 mHz</td>
<td>800 mHz</td>
<td>1000 mHz</td>
<td>1000 mHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Steady-state Frequency Deviation</td>
<td>200 mHz</td>
<td>500 mHz</td>
<td>500 mHz</td>
<td>500 mHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Recover Frequency</td>
<td>not used</td>
<td>1 minute</td>
<td>1 minute</td>
<td>not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency Recovery Range</td>
<td>not used</td>
<td>±500 mHz</td>
<td>±500 mHz</td>
<td>not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Restore Frequency</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency Restoration Range</td>
<td>not used</td>
<td>±1200 mHz</td>
<td>±1200 mHz</td>
<td>±100 mHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alert State Trigger Time</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.10: Frequency deviation waveforms for 2750 MW outage (Wind power plant in NS) in X-7 Summer Low

Figure 4.11: Frequency deviation waveforms for 4503 MW outage (HVDC GB -FR) in X-7 Winter Peak
Figure 4.12: Frequency deviation waveforms for 6000 MW outage (HVDC GB-FR) in X-10 Winter Peak

Figure 4.13: Frequency deviation waveforms for 1700 MW unit outage (CZ) in X-16 Summer Low

All cases are stable.

4.5. Conclusion

The reduced dynamic models were prepared for selected scenarios X-7, X-10 and X-16. Four cases of large HVDC import, wind power plant infeed and unit outages were simulated and CE interconnection stayed stable.

The maximum frequency deviation should not reach value -200 mHz provided that wind power plants enable the primary frequency control (similar like conventional units with synchronous generators). It means that power system is able to withstand an outage of large source with power unbalance from 1700 to 6000 MW (depending on scenario).
5. Small-Signal Stability Assessment

Rotor angle stability deals with the ability of synchronous machines of an interconnected power system to remain in synchronism after being subjected to a disturbance. It depends on the ability to maintain/restore equilibrium between electromagnetic torque and mechanical torque of each synchronous machine in the system [16]. Rotor angle stability is one of the criteria taken into account during the assessment of power system stability. The definitions, theoretical background and recommendations presented here are based on [16], [9], [10] and [5]. It is common to divide rotor angle stability into:

- Transient stability
- Small signal stability

Within task 4.1 of the e-Highway2050 project, only small signal stability is considered.

Small signal stability deals with inter-area oscillations caused by interactions among large groups of generators and that have widespread effects. They involve oscillations of a group of generators in one area swinging against a group of generators in another area. They are characterised by small deviations between the rotor angles of generators located in different areas. Small signal stability is defined as an ability of the system to maintain stability under small disturbances [16]. If no control equipment is involved in this process, it is described as natural steady-state stability, otherwise as artificial steady-state stability [2].

Small disturbances occur continuously in the normal operation of a power system due to small variations in load and generation. A disturbance is considered to be small if the equations that describe the resulting response of the system may be linearised for the purpose of analysis [9]. Instability that may result can be of two forms:

- steady increase in generator rotor angle due to lack of synchronizing torque, or
- rotor oscillations of increasing amplitude due to lack of sufficient damping torque.

In today’s practical power systems, the small-signal stability problem is usually one of insufficient damping of system oscillations. Small signal analysis using linear techniques provides valuable information about the inherent dynamic characteristics of the power system and assists in its design.

In large power systems, small-signal stability problems may be either local or global in nature.

Local problems involve a small part of the system. They may be associated with rotor angle oscillations of a single generator, or a single plant against the rest of the power system. Such oscillations are called local plant mode oscillations. The stability problems related to such oscillations are similar to those of a single-machine infinite bus system. Most commonly encountered small-signal stability problems are of this category.

Local problems may also be associated with oscillations between the rotors of a few generators close to each other. Such oscillations are called inter-machine or inter-plant mode oscillations. Usually, the local plant mode and interplant mode oscillations have frequencies in the range of 0.7 to 2.0 Hz.
Other possible local problems include instability of modes associated with controls of equipment such as generator excitation systems, HVDC converters, and static VAR compensators. The problems associated with control modes are due to inadequate tuning of the control systems. In addition, these controls may interact with the dynamics of the turbine-generator shaft system, causing instability of torsional mode oscillations.

Analysis of local small-signal stability problems requires a detailed representation of a small portion of the complete interconnected power system. The rest of the system representation may be appropriately simplified by use of simple models and system equivalents. Usually, the complete system may be adequately represented by a model having several hundred states at most.

Global small-signal stability problems are caused by interactions among large groups of generators and have widespread effects. They involve oscillations of a group of generators in one area swinging against a group of generators in another area. Such oscillations are called inter-area mode oscillations.

Large interconnected systems usually have two distinct forms of inter-area oscillations:

- A very low frequency mode involving all the generators in the system. The system is essentially split into two parts, with generators in one part swinging against machines in the other part. The frequency of this mode of oscillation is in the order of 0.1 to 0.3 Hz.
- Higher frequency modes involving subgroups of generators swinging against each other. The frequency of these oscillations is typically in the range of 0.4 to 0.7 Hz.

The characteristics of inter-area modes of oscillation are very complex and in some respects significantly differ from the characteristics of local plant modes. Load characteristics, in particular, have a major effect on the stability of inter-area modes. The manner in which excitation systems affect inter-area oscillations depends on the types and locations of the exciters, and on the characteristics of loads.

Speed-governing systems normally do not have a very significant effect on inter-area oscillations. However, if they are not properly tuned, they may decrease damping of the oscillations slightly. In extreme situations, this may be sufficient to aggravate the situation significantly. In the absence of any other convenient means of increasing the damping, adjustment or blocking of the governors may provide some relief.

A mode of oscillation in one part of the system may interact with a mode of oscillation in a remote part due to mode coupling. This occurs when the frequencies of the two modes are nearly equal. Care should be exercised in interpreting results of analysis in such cases.

The controllability of inter-area modes with PSS is a complex function of many factors:

- Location of unit with PSS
- Characteristics and location of loads
- Types of exciters on other units

Other effective means of stabilizing inter-area modes of oscillation include modulation of HVDC converter controls and static VAR compensator controls. Analysis of inter-area oscillations requires detailed representation of the entire interconnected power system (or power system model reduced to maintain inter-area oscillations). Models for excitation
systems and loads, in particular, should be accurate, and the same level of modelling detail should be used throughout the system.

Small-signal stability problems may be either local or global in nature. Local problems are related to a small part of the system and require a detailed representation of this portion of the complete interconnected power system. On the other hand, global small-signal stability problems are caused by interactions among large groups of generators and have widespread effects. For global problems these kind of studies, transmission system model seems to be the most important part of the simulation process. It is very important to use coherent reduction methods to generate reduced order transmission system models for this type of study. Classical generator models, which assume ideal controls holding an internal voltage constant behind the transient reactance of the generator used as part of a large system model generally, give simulated oscillation frequencies close to those calculated using detailed models. Alternatively, controls with default dynamic data can also be used. All of the gathered information as well as the long term experience in preparing these kind of studies let us presume, that small signal stability studies could be prepared in detail, bearing in mind the limitations of applied simplifications and reduction methods. This does not apply to local small-signal stability problems. Structure of the model to be provided by WP2, allows making the assumption that it will not be suitable for studying local problems but will be sufficient for identification of the inter-area mode oscillations.

### 5.1. Test Cases

In order to utilise power flow models obtained from WP2 for purpose of dynamic analysis, they had to be modified. Special set of procedure (tools) which included generators aggregation and netting was prepared to prepare power flow model (from any scenario) for dynamic calculations. Moreover, installed synchronous capacity was modified in each region in order to meet results coming directly from market simulation results from WP2. Also a tool for automatic creation of dynamic model was developed.

As a result modified power flow and dynamic models for scenarios X-16, X-13 and X-10 have been prepared, where X-16 stands for Small & Local, X-13 - Fossil & Nuclear, X-10 Big & Market. All of the analysed scenarios have been prepared with 2 possible grid development strategies - strategy 2 which stands for grid development using HVAC overhead lines and strategy 3 - using HVCD cable lines. Moreover, two operational regimes have been taken into consideration:

- Winter Peak - characterised by a very high load and thus a high production in the system
- Summer Low - characterised by a high infeed of renewable energy sources and a low load
The scope of analysed configurations was presented in Figure 5.1. Scenarios X-5 and X-7 were not analysed due to lack of proper power flow model coming from WP2. Details on this can be found in deliverable 2.4.¹

¹ According to deliverable 2.4 “It is not said, that Scenarios X-5 and X-7 are not feasible for the transmission system. The implementation of such amounts of renewable production is technically feasible, but it requires new planning standards and concepts in grid development.”
5.2. Methodology

According to Operational Security Network Code (2nd edition from 24th September 2013) one of the explanations for a need for dynamic stability management are continuously increasing power flows in Transmission System due to changes in the market and the increasing amount of intermittent generation. These changes together with long distance transmission paths from generation to load centres can increase the risk of wide area oscillations or other dynamic stability problems in transmission systems.

In the foreseen 2050 scenarios, future system architecture will be not less demanding than is nowadays. For the purpose of proper evaluation of potential risk of inter-area oscillation, it is proposed to perform small signal stability analysis of power systems with comprehensive analysis function based on modal analysis calculating eigenvalues and participation factors.

For the purpose of the small signal stability evaluation, it proposed to calculate eigenvalues corresponding to the analysed power system.

\[ \lambda = \sigma \pm j \omega \]

Where:

- \( \sigma \) - real part
- \( \omega \) - imaginary part

The real component of the eigenvalues gives the damping (\( \xi \)), and the imaginary component gives the frequency of oscillation (\( f \)). A negative real part represent a damped oscillation whereas a positive real part represents oscillation of increasing amplitude.

\[ \xi = \frac{-\sigma}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 + \omega^2}} \]

\[ f = \frac{\omega}{2\pi} \]

A real eigenvalue (\( \lambda \)) corresponds to a non-oscillatory mode. A negative real eigenvalue represents a decaying mode. The larger its magnitude, the faster the decay. A positive real eigenvalue represents aperiodic instability. Complex eigenvalues occur in conjugate pairs, and each pair corresponds to an oscillatory mode.

The very useful tool of searching for power system elements (generators, devices) influencing identified inter-area oscillations the most, is calculation of so-called participation factors. This is a standard feature of programs dedicated to small signal analysis.

In analysis of low frequency (inter-area) oscillations in interconnected power systems, it is desired that modes are damped not less than 5%. Swing modes with damping lower than 3% are generally not acceptable. Those values were applied during the study Synchronisation of the Turkish Power System with the UCTE Power System [17]. The proposed approach represents a first attempt to set up criteria for the operational validation of dynamic phenomena. Future developments shall need to adapt the envisaged clusters to avoid «YES/NO» closed answers.
5.3. Results

Calculations results for all analysed scenarios are presented in Table 5.1., using eigenvalue representation based on:

- frequency of oscillation \( f \)
- damping \( \zeta \)

Presented eigenvalues are limited only to those of frequency lower than 0.5 Hz.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X-16</th>
<th></th>
<th>X-13</th>
<th></th>
<th>X-10</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy 2</td>
<td>Strategy 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy 2</td>
<td>Strategy 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f )</td>
<td>( \zeta )</td>
<td>( f )</td>
<td>( \zeta )</td>
<td>( f )</td>
<td>( \zeta )</td>
<td>( f )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2026</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.3648</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.1937</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.3816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4060</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3753</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4325</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X-13</th>
<th></th>
<th>X-10</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy 2</td>
<td>Strategy 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f )</td>
<td>( \zeta )</td>
<td>( f )</td>
<td>( \zeta )</td>
<td>( f )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2147</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.3187</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3794</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.4333</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.3382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4053</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to better understand the character and geographical structure of the identified oscillations modes, the ones with lowest frequencies are presented below on a European
map. This kind of presentation is called mode shape scatter. Each pictogram on the map represents single synchronous machine that has high participation factor in analysed mode. The individual generating units are positioned according to the representative cluster, so their location on the map is not exact, but detailed enough to see the geographical structure of the mode.

The contribution of synchronous generation to the total generation (based on results from ANTARES) in each model is presented in Table 5.2. These values help better understand why some modes vanished in Summer Low regimes (smaller amount of synchronous generation is not sufficient to excite the modes) or create more complex dependencies (greater number of generators creates more possibilities for interactions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Synchronous generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Power [GW]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-16</td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-13</td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-10</td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few representative mode shape scatter plots for modes with frequencies below 0.5Hz for the analysed configurations are presented here. The complete list of mode shape scatter plots can be found in Appendix G.

**5.3.1. Mode 1**

Mode 1, the lowest frequency mode, resembles the known east against west oscillation. It is observed in each scenario and strategy. In this mode, the Iberian Peninsula oscillates against the rest of Europe, with the border of the two areas located somewhere in France. The model in the study does not comprise Turkish power system so frequency of this oscillation is higher than it could be expected. The involvement of generators in southern France (in conjunction with the Iberian Peninsula) is higher in Strategy 2 than in Strategy 3. An example of a geographical mode shape scatter plot of Mode 1, where the border is located in southwestern France, is shown in Figure 5.2.
Figure 5.2 Geographical mode shape scatter plot for Mode 1, scenario X-13, strategy 3, Winter Peak

An example of a geographical mode shape scatter plot of Mode 1, where the border is located in north-eastern France, is shown in Figure 5.3.

Figure 5.3 Geographical mode shape scatter plot for Mode 1, scenario X-10, strategy 2, Winter Peak

5.3.2. Mode 2

Mode 2, the second lowest frequency mode, resembles a south-east and south-west against central-north oscillation. It is observed in each Winter Peak regime but only in one Summer Low regime (scenario X-13). This mode involves usually generators in Balkan countries (also in Portugal, Spain but with smaller participation factors) oscillating against generators in Belgium, Netherlands and Northern France. In some cases, the east-central-west component is more distinct, while in other cases the north-south component is dominating. Italy’s role is this mode is complex, as it sometimes is affiliated with the central area (east-west-east oscillation) and it sometimes is affiliated with the Balkan area (north-south oscillation). An
example of a geographical mode shape scatter plot of Mode 2, where the north-south component is dominant, is shown in Figure 5.4.

![Geographical mode shape scatter plot for Mode 2, scenario X-13, strategy 3, Winter Peak](image)

Figure 5.4 Geographical mode shape scatter plot for Mode 2, scenario X-13, strategy 3, Winter Peak

An example of a geographical mode shape scatter plot of Mode 2, where the east-central-west component is dominant, is shown in Figure 5.5.

![Geographical mode shape scatter plot for Mode 2, scenario X-16, strategy 3, Winter Peak](image)

Figure 5.5 Geographical mode shape scatter plot for Mode 2, scenario X-16, strategy 3, Winter Peak

5.3.3. Mode 3

Mode 3, the third lowest frequency mode, can have a variety of shapes. It is observed in each Winter Peak regime but only in one Summer Low regime (scenario X-13). This mode involves usually generators in Italy oscillating against mostly generators in Balkan countries. An example of a geographical mode shape scatter plot of Mode 3, where the constellation can be clearly observed, is shown in Figure 5.6.
Figure 5.6. Geographical mode shape scatter for Mode 3, scenario X-13, strategy 2, Winter Peak

The mode can also have a more complex shape with four distinct areas, as shown in Figure 5.7.

Figure 5.7. Geographical mode shape scatter for Mode 3, scenario X-13, strategy 3, Summer Low
However, it is also possible that Italy and the Balkan countries are not oscillating against each other, but together against northern Europe, as shown in Figure 5.8.

Figure 5.8 Geographical mode shape scatter plot for Mode 3, scenario X-16, strategy 3, Winter Peak

5.4. Conclusion

Elaboration of a dynamic model accurately reproducing inter-area oscillations in a large power system is a rather difficult and labour intensive task. An attempt to apply for this purpose a typical dynamic model used for transient stability study gives usually very optimistic results i.e. damping of inter-area oscillations can be much better than observed in the real power system.

The dynamic model prepared for this study involves some inevitable simplifications. One of important simplifications is of course only default dynamics for the whole model. Nevertheless, there are also further, may be less obvious simplifications resulting from time and source data constraints of the Study, which influence calculated modes of inter-area oscillations. The following simplifications have influence on obtained results:

- using of uniform static load model for all loads,
- neglecting motor load dynamics,
- replacing renewable generation by negative loads,
- using default PSS structure and parameters for all generators,
- using default structure and parameters governors,
- lack of some parts of synchronous areas (e.g. Turkey).

In large area small signal stability study, especially involving analysis of some future grid scenarios it is practically impossible to calculate accurate damping of inter-area oscillations. One reason is high accuracy of wide area modelling required in such studies. The other
reason is great dependency of low frequency modes on widely understood power system conditions like power transfers, load levels, a subset of actually used generation and so on. It is only direction of changes that can be treated as credible outcome of the study. Considering the present situation in ENTSO-E CE with small damping of some low frequency oscillations any visible deterioration of damping of these modes should attract special attention.

Due to all above-mentioned facts, the results obtained should not be treated as acceptance or rejections criteria, but rather as indication of possible problems. The goal of these calculations was more to show a trend between different analysed scenarios and grid development strategies, rather than give exact frequencies and damping values for identified modes.

Nevertheless, some conclusions from obtained results can be drawn:

- The damping of all (except one) identified interarea oscillation modes is positive (above 0), which means, that there is no instability risk for all of the analysed scenarios.
- Although the damping is positive, obtained values according to operational acceptance criteria described in the report are too low. In analysis of low frequency (inter-area) oscillation in interconnected power systems, it is desired that modes are damped not less than 5%. Swing modes with damping lower than 3% are generally not acceptable. Damping of the modes identified in the study are in range 0.48 - 5.04%.
- The damping is generally better when more synchronous generation is present in the model (scenarios X-13) rather than where more dispersed RES generation is dominant in the model (scenario X-16). The same phenomenon can be observed when comparing Winter Peak and Summer Low regimes, with poorer damping in the latter. However in the case of Scenario X-10 total synchronous generation is higher than in the Scenario X-16, but damping of the lowest frequency modes in Winter Peak model is lower. This is the case when not only amount of synchronous generation is important but also its areal distribution.
- Usually the damping gets higher for strategy 3, than for strategy 2. The situation is the other way round when it comes to oscillation frequency, which gets lower for strategy 3, than for strategy 2.
- The geographical mode shape scatter picture for lowest frequency modes is close to present situation (with except lack of Turkey). Lowest frequency mode tend to actuate generators on the ends of the interconnected power systems - Portugal and Spain is oscillating against Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, however the participating units vary among scenarios, due to differences in generation pattern. Higher involvement of generators in Southern France is observed in strategy 2.
6. Conclusions

Based on the inputs delivered by the WP2, the task 4.1 of the e-Highway 2050 project studied four types operational issues:

- Short circuit current
- Voltage stability
- Frequency stability
- Small signal stability

Regarding short circuit currents, the maximal value appeared to be within acceptable range. However, the contribution of power electronics to short circuit currents should be further investigated and especially the impact on the minimal short circuit currents.

For voltage drop, the analyses did not show any un-manageable voltage deviation in the considered configurations. Only one unstable situation was identified but it can be avoided by limiting the maximal capacity of a single line. However, some configurations could not be considered as they were not convergent, these situations face very likely significant voltage issues. This should be further investigated with methodologies and tools suitable for the analysis of very different power flow configurations

In all the situations analysed, the frequency was kept within acceptable range after significant disturbance. This was achieved thanks to the participation of wind farms to primary control. More detailed studies of the behaviour of the system with significant penetration of power electronics are planned in the European Migrate project.

Regarding small signal stability, only one case showed a negative damping but is still on the range of power system stabilisers.

To fully assess the impacts of the current changes in the power system, further studies are required. To do so, improvements in the quality of the available data, in the modelling of new technologies and in the methods will be necessary.
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Appendix I: Scenarios, Models and Data

A. The Five Scenarios

A.1. Scenario X-5

Figure A.1. Overview of the generation and demand in scenario X-5
Figure A.2. Overview of the grid architectures in scenario X-5
A.2. Scenario X-7

Figure A.3. Overview of the generation and demand in scenario X-7
Figure A.4. Overview of the grid architectures in scenario X-7
A.3. Scenario X-10

Figure A.5. Overview of the generation and demand in scenario X-10
Figure A.6. Overview of the grid architectures in scenario X-10
Figure A.7. Overview of the generation and demand in scenario X-13
Figure A.8. Overview of the grid architectures in scenario X-13
A.5. Scenario X-16

Figure A.9. Overview of the generation and demand in scenario X-16
Figure A.10. Overview of the grid architectures in scenario X-16
The results in Table B.1 and Table B.2 are resulting from market simulations performed with the ANTARES software.

### Table B.1. Continental Europe synchronous area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>X-5</th>
<th>X-7</th>
<th>X-10</th>
<th>X-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
<td>Summer Low</td>
<td>Winter Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>-10461</td>
<td>-25431</td>
<td>-924</td>
<td>-4188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>-407</td>
<td>-762</td>
<td>-1358</td>
<td>1382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>-13864</td>
<td>3159</td>
<td>-16640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>-7669</td>
<td>-7693</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>-9754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>-926</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>-586</td>
<td>-418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>-9845</td>
<td>-11088</td>
<td>-2454</td>
<td>-14098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>-26270</td>
<td>-59624</td>
<td>-10031</td>
<td>-40528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>4431</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>3711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>2123</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-2513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>2299</td>
<td>4899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>-3261</td>
<td>-1369</td>
<td>-2764</td>
<td>-1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>-4602</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>-6892</td>
<td>2784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>-29971</td>
<td>-22536</td>
<td>5753</td>
<td>-26652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>-819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>-1067</td>
<td>-847</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>-941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>1273</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>2477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>-1783</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>-426</td>
<td>-568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>-59</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>-83</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>-165</td>
<td>2603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>-1618</td>
<td>-2937</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-1701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>-543</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>-812</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>-760</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-195</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>2747</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>6289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>3110</td>
<td>5912</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>4006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B.2. Export/import to the continental Europe synchronous area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Regime Area</th>
<th>X-5 Summer Low</th>
<th>X-5 Winter Peak</th>
<th>X-7 Summer Low</th>
<th>X-7 Winter Peak</th>
<th>X-10 Summer Low</th>
<th>X-10 Winter Peak</th>
<th>X-16 Summer Low</th>
<th>X-16 Winter Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td>17171</td>
<td>24153</td>
<td>5362</td>
<td>28162</td>
<td>14852</td>
<td>22494</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>11723</td>
<td>12298</td>
<td>2046</td>
<td>4541</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>17554</td>
<td>15562</td>
<td>2854</td>
<td>5901</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>1026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td>4059</td>
<td>3852</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LY</td>
<td></td>
<td>12560</td>
<td>9274</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>3955</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1772</td>
<td>3277</td>
<td>-848</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>-920</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td>340</td>
<td>17332</td>
<td>-77</td>
<td>9853</td>
<td>4585</td>
<td>24797</td>
<td>-1621</td>
<td>6947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DKE</td>
<td></td>
<td>3610</td>
<td>4692</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>6363</td>
<td>7604</td>
<td>-263</td>
<td>10456</td>
<td>4020</td>
<td>3696</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>12155</td>
<td>22505</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22493</td>
<td>5771</td>
<td>4469</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Data for Dynamic Models

Meaning of parameters is described in [40]. Tuning consist of changing of initial parameters [34] to get similar waveform of frequency deviation for large unit outage (comparing with WAMS) and stable operation for the e-Hihway2050 scenarios in the Pan European dynamic model. Following figures show block schemes of used models for excitation system and turbine.

Meaning of parameters is described in [40], [143]. Tuning consist of changing of initial parameters [34] to get similar waveform of frequency deviation for large unit outage in the Pan European dynamic model. This appendix shows block diagrams of initial models for excitation system and turbine. Tables with parameters consist of initial and tuned parameters. Tuned parameters in the tables are highlighted in red.

Figure C.1. Block diagram of the SEXS model of excitation system

Table C.1. Initial and tuned parameters of the SEXS model of excitation system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exciter</th>
<th>T_A</th>
<th>T_B</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>T_E</th>
<th>E_MIN</th>
<th>E_MAX</th>
<th>Notice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEXS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Initial values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEXSRD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tuned values for frequency stability calculations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C.2. Block diagram of the TGOV1 turbine model

Table C.2. Initial and tuned parameters of the TGOV1 turbine model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turbine</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>T_1</th>
<th>T_2</th>
<th>T_3</th>
<th>V_MIN</th>
<th>V_MAX</th>
<th>Notice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TGOV1</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initial values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGOVE</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tuned values for frequency stability calculations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure C.3. Block diagram of simplified power system stabiliser model PSS2A

Table C.3. Initial and tuned parameters of simplified power system stabiliser model PSS2A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSS</th>
<th>TW1=TW2=TW3=TW4</th>
<th>KV1</th>
<th>KV2</th>
<th>KV3</th>
<th>T9</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>VSTMAX= -VSTMin</th>
<th>Notice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSS2A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS2IB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS2CE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C.4. Initial and tuned parameters of synchronous generator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generator</th>
<th>Xl</th>
<th>Xd</th>
<th>Xd''</th>
<th>Xd''</th>
<th>Td''</th>
<th>Xq''</th>
<th>Tq''</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Notice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SubtransientRoundRotor</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E500IB</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E500FR</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E500CE</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E500E</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C.4. Initial and tuned parameters of synchronous generator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generator</th>
<th>Xl</th>
<th>Xd</th>
<th>Xq</th>
<th>Xd''</th>
<th>Xd''</th>
<th>Td''</th>
<th>Xd''</th>
<th>Xq''</th>
<th>Tq''</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Notice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SubtransientRoundRotor</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubtransientRoundRotor</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubtransientRoundRotor</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubtransientRoundRotor</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubtransientRoundRotor</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Parameters for Dynamic Models used for the benchmark test systems

IEC standard models were used if they exist.
D.1. Synchronous Generators Models

This model is according to the IEC standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name [unit]</th>
<th>Objects</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test A,B</td>
<td>TestC</td>
<td>Type of rotor on physical machine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modelType</td>
<td>Test A,B</td>
<td>Type of synchronous machine model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xd</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Direct-axis synchronous reactance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x'q</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Quadrature-axis transient reactance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xq</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Quadrature-axis synchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X''d</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Direct-axis subtransient reactance (unsaturated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'do [s]</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Direct-axis transient rotor time constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T''do [s]</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Quadrature-axis subtransient rotor time constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'qo [s]</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Quadrature-axis transient rotor time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t_c [s]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Damping time constant for “Canay” reactance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Damping torque coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H [s]</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Inertia constant of generator and mechanical load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xl</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Stator leakage reactance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td>stator Resistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D.2. Excitation System Models

This model is according to the IEC standard.

Figure D.1. IEC Excitation System Dynamics: ExcIEEEDC1

Table D.2. IEC Excitation System Dynamics: ExcIEEEDC1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name [unit]</th>
<th>Objects</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Voltage regulator gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA [s]</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Voltage regulator time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB [s]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Voltage regulator time constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC [s]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Voltage regulator time constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRMAX</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Maximum voltage regulator output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRMIN</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Minimum voltage regulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exciter constant related to self-excited field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE [s]</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>Exciter time constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KF</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Excitation control system stabiliser gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF [s]</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Excitation control system stabiliser time constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFD1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Exciter voltage at which exciter saturation is defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEFDF1</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>Exciter saturation function value at EFD1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFD2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Exciter voltage at which exciter saturation is defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEFDF2</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>Exciter saturation function value at EFD2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure D.2. IEC Excitation System Dynamics: ExcAVR5

Table D.3. IEC Excitation System Dynamics: ExcAVR5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TestC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Time constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rex</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Effective Output Resistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D.3. Prime Mover Models

This model is according to the IEC standard.

![Diagram of IEC Turbine Governor Dynamics: GovHydro3 (without nonlinear flow-gate relationship)]

**Figure D.3. IEC Turbine Governor Dynamics: GovHydro3 (without nonlinear flow-gate relationship)**

**Table D.4. IEC Turbine Governor Dynamics: GovHydro3 (without nonlinear flow-gate relationship)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name</th>
<th>mult</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TestC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWbase [MW]</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>Base for power values (MWbase) (&gt; 0). Unit = MW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pmax</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maximum gate opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pmin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Minimum gate opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cflag</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>Governor control flag true = PID control is active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rgate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Steady-state droop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relec</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Steady-state droop for electrical power feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Td [s]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Input filter time constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Washout time constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Gate servo time constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velop [1/s]</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>Maximum gate opening velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velcl [1/s]</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>Maximum gate closing velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Derivative gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gain,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ki</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>Integral gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gate servo gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Power feedback time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>db1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Intentional dead-band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eps</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Intentional dead-band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>db2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unintentional dead-band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tw [s]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Water inertia time constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Turbine gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dturb</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Turbine damping factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qnl</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>No-load turbine flow at nominal head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Turbine nominal head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D.4. Wind Turbine +PMG with FPC Models for TESTC

This model has been implemented in the MODES network simulator.

![Diagram of Wind Turbine with Permanent Magnet Generator and Full Power Converter](image)

**Figure D.4. Model of Wind turbine with Permanent Magnet Generator and Full Power Converter**

- $P_{WT}$, $Q_{WT}$, $P_{aero}$: terminal active and reactive power (generation sign convention), aerodynamic power ($P_n$)
- $\Theta$, $\omega_{gen}$, $\omega_{WTR}$: pitch angle (deg), generator and turbine rotational speed (rad/sec)
- $I_{p_{cmd}}$, $I_{q_{cmd}}$: active and reactive current command to generator system (gen. and cap. sign convention) ($I_n$)
- $I_{p_{max}}$, $I_{q_{max}}$: maximum active and reactive current (generation and capacitive sign convention) ($I_n$)
- $Q_{WT_{min}}$, $Q_{WT_{max}}$: minimum and maximum reactive power (capacitive sign convention) ($P_n$)
- $U_{WT}$, $I_{WT}$: terminal voltage and current phasor in power system coordinates ($U_n$, $I_n$)

**Table D.5. Limits of converter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$I_{G_{max}}$</th>
<th>$I_{P_{max}}$</th>
<th>$U_{g0}$</th>
<th>$U_{gZ}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table D.6. Voltage control parameters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$U_{zmin}$</th>
<th>$U_{zmax}$</th>
<th>$K_p$</th>
<th>$T_I(s)$</th>
<th>$v_%$/s</th>
<th>$K_{JR}$</th>
<th>$K_Q$</th>
<th>$T_Q$</th>
<th>$Q_{min}$</th>
<th>$Q_{max}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D.7. Power control parameters

| \( N_i \) | \( w_i \) | \( T_{IN} \) | \( T_W \) | \( T_N \) | \( T_D \) | \( k_{IN} \) | \( K_{IC} \) | \( K_{IC} \) | \( a \) | \( b \) | \( c \) | \( v_N \) | \( d_{P_{\text{min}}} \) | \( d_{P_{\text{max}}} \) | \( d_d \) | \( d_e \) | \( d_{f_{\text{min}}} \) | \( d_{f_{\text{max}}} \) | \( d_{P_{\text{max}}} \) |
| 1 | 1.47 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 6 | 20 | 30 | -0.75 | 1.59 | 0.63 | 0.45 | 0.21 | 0 | 0 | 0.012 | 0.03 | 0.05 |

Table D.8. Pitch control parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \beta_{\text{max}}(\circ) )</th>
<th>( K_{P2} )</th>
<th>( T_{IC}(s) )</th>
<th>( T_{I2}(s) )</th>
<th>( V_{\text{min}}(\circ/s) )</th>
<th>( V_{\text{max}}(\circ/s) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D.9. Turbine parameters

| \( k_N \) | \( T_w(s) \) | A | B | C | D | G | F | \( p(\text{kg/m}^3) \) | \( N_{\text{min}} \) | \( N_{\text{max}} \) | R(m) | \( v_E(m/s) \) | \( f_{\text{rn}}(\text{Hz}) \) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.11 | 0.3 | 80 | 0.00384 | 0.065 | 18.4 | -0.02 | -0.003 | 1.225 | 0 | 1.11 | 50 | 12.5 | 0.263 |

**D.5. UPFC Dynamic Model**

This model has been implemented in the MODES network simulator.

![Block diagram of the voltage regulator with supplementary stabiliser signal](image)

Voltage regulator is complemented by two inputs stabiliser (this stabiliser has the same purpose as the power system stabiliser in excitation control of the synchronous generators - especially damping of inter-area oscillations). Inputs are active power flows of the lines V13-102 and V13-101A in MW.

Table D.10. UPFC dynamic parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k_P )</th>
<th>( T_i(s) )</th>
<th>( T_{IC}(s) )</th>
<th>( T_{I2}(s) )</th>
<th>( k_{1} )</th>
<th>( T_I(s) )</th>
<th>( T_{2}(s) )</th>
<th>( U_{M} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D.6. VSC HVDC Dynamic Model

This model has been implemented in the MODES network simulator.

Figure D.6. Block diagram of the voltage regulator and power control with stabiliser

Transmitted power control is complemented by stabiliser. Input is active power flow of the line V13-101A in [MW].

Table D.11. VSC HVDC dynamic parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kp</th>
<th>Ti(s)</th>
<th>T2c(s)</th>
<th>TW1(s)</th>
<th>k1</th>
<th>T1(s)</th>
<th>T2(s)</th>
<th>UM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II: Model Validation

E. Validation of the Reduced Model

The reduced dynamic model was verified by simulation of an outage of a 1400 MW unit in Spain. WAMS records were compared with simulation results of:

- full and reduced models for MODES network simulator and
- reduced models for PSS/E simulator.

The following figures show simulation results (from full and reduced model) with measured frequency waveforms:

Figure E.1. Frequency waveforms for WAMS in Portugal, Switzerland, Austria and Turkey

Figure E.2. Frequency deviations waveforms of the MODES simulations full model
Mean frequency deviation for simulation corresponds to the measured data. Inter-area oscillations are more damped for the MODES simulations. Reduced CE 2030 dynamic model is able to simulate frequency stability with simplified inter-area oscillations (e.g. for inertia and load frequency shedding analysis). Moreover it enables investigation of island operation of control areas (e.g. splitting of the interconnection). Plug-in nodes and external HVDC terminal are complemented as well. Reduced CE 2030 dynamic model can be used as starting data set for frequency and small signal stability calculations.
F. Validation of Dynamic Models – Benchmark test systems

This appendix deals with dynamic models of non-standard technologies like UPFC, VSV-HVDC, RES, ESS and DSR with focus on small disturbance stability (inter area oscillations), frequency stability (primary frequency and inertia controls) and angle stability (short circuits on (U)HVAC lines). Demand Side Response possibilities are investigated as well.

Simple benchmark systems are prepared to present the dynamic performance of the new technologies. These “stand-alone” benchmark systems are used for testing in the framework of this deliverable.

The MODES network simulator was used for new technologies demonstration. It is important to mention that no mature standard dynamic models exist for the new technologies, so that available models in the different tools are somehow user-defined and more or less compatible. However, they should be tuned to provide consistent reproduction of dynamic behaviour for the simple benchmark systems.

F.1. Power Electronics Systems

Power electronic interface is widely used for distributed energy resources (DER) connection into network and from new transmission equipment. Figure F.1 shows common structure of such interface for DER.

![General block diagram of typical power electronic system](image)

Figure F.1. General block diagram of typical power electronic system (according to [42])

There are four main parts:

- Source input converter
- Inverter module
- Output interface module
- Controller module

More information on power electronics is in references [43]- [51]. This section deals with the following two power electronic systems:

- Unified Power Flow Controller - UPFC.
- VSC-HVDC.
F.1.1. Unified Power Flow Controller

The Unified Power Flow Controller (UPFC) is a member of the FACTS equipment’s, which are able to increase power system operation flexibility and controllability. Figure F.2 shows scheme for UPFC according to [52].

![Figure F.2. Scheme of UPFC connected between nodes I and J](image)

The network model is depicted in the right side of the figure. Reactive power \( Q_K \) injected into sending node controls voltage in this node (see e.g. [53]). A PI controller depicted in Figure D.2 in Appendix D can be used for this purpose. The transmitted power is controlled by inverter side of the UPFC.

Simple test system (taken over from [52]) was used to present UPFC transmission capability.

![Figure F.3. One line scheme for simple test system with UPFC (test system A)](image)

Original test system comes from [54] (Example 12.6) and it consists of two areas connecting by double 230 kV tie line with transfer more than 400 MW. UPFC is connected into one of the parallel lines.

Three cases were simulated:
- original system without UPFC,
- installed UPFC in conventional control (active power and voltage control),
installed UPFC in conventional control with additional stabilising signal (with tie line active power flows as input variables).

A 100 ms three phase short circuit in the node N3 was applied as initial disturbance. Following figure shows waveforms of difference between rotor angles of generators G1 and G3.

Figure F.4. Results of simulations for cases without and with UPFC and for UPFC with stabiliser signal

Similarly as in the reference [52] the UPFC installation (red curve) can damp system oscillations, but it increases the first swing comparing with system without UPFC (green curve). Introducing stabiliser signal improves oscillations damping significantly (blue curve), but the first swing is still greater than in the system without UPFC. The UPFC installation improves the static stability (damping of oscillations), but it worsens dynamic stability. Of course the UPFC enables power flows control and decreasing loop flows in the system.

F.1.2. VSC-HVDC

VSC-HVDC is based on fully controllable valves, which make possible the flexible control, voltages, power flows and oscillations in the power system. The injection model depicted in Figure F.5 is possible to use for simulation of electromechanical transients (see e.g. [55]).

Figure F.5. Scheme of HVDC connected between nodes I and J and injection model

VSC-HVDC controls voltage (by injection of reactive power $Q_K$) in the sending node and transferred active and reactive power $P_{REC}$ and $Q_{REC}$ in the receiving node. HVDC losses $dP_n$ is taken into account. HVDC control model is depicted in Figure D.3 in Appendix D.

Simple test system depicted in Figure F.6 was used to illustrate the HVDC capability. This test system comes from the reference [54] (page 1151).
Three cases were simulated (similar as in the reference to [54]):

- original system without HVDC,
- installed HVDC in conventional control (active power and voltage control),
- installed HVDC in conventional control with additional stabilising signal (added to the reference transferred active power).

A 100 ms three phase short circuit on line V13~101B near the node N13 was applied as initial disturbance. The fault was cleared by switching off the line. Following figure shows waveforms of difference between rotor angles of generators G1 and G3.

The system is unstable for original system without HVDC (green curve). After system reinforcement by HVDC installing, the system is stable, but oscillations are poor damped (red curve). With supplementary stabilisation signal the damping was improved (blue curve). These results are similar as in the reference [54]. The more information about VSC-HVDC models are in [56]-[55].

F.2. Energy Storage System

There is a variety of technologies for Energy Storage Systems (ESS):

- Pumped hydro-storage
- Compressed Air Energy Storage (CAES)
• Regular batteries
• Redox flow batteries
• Hydrogen storage
• Molten Salt
• Power to gas
• Pumped Heat Energy Storage
• Liquid Air Energy Storage
• Superconducting magnetic energy storage (SMES)
• Super capacitors
• Fly wheels

Energy Storage Systems (ESS) can be classified as either centralised or decentralised [65]. Some technologies are better suitable for centralised storage systems (e.g. pumped hydro) and others are better suitable for decentralised storage (e.g. SMES) An overview of performances for selected ESS is given in the following Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Storage Technology</th>
<th>Power Range (MW)</th>
<th>Response Time</th>
<th>Efficiency (%)</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Energy Storage</td>
<td>Pumped hydro-stORAGE</td>
<td>100~2000</td>
<td>4h~10h</td>
<td>60~70</td>
<td>Centralised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>100~300</td>
<td>6h~20h</td>
<td>40~50</td>
<td>Centralised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>flywheel</td>
<td>0.005~5</td>
<td>15s~15min</td>
<td>70~80</td>
<td>Decentralised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electromagnetic Energy Storage</td>
<td>SMES</td>
<td>0.01~20</td>
<td>1ms~15min</td>
<td>80~95</td>
<td>Decentralised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>super capacitors</td>
<td>0.001~0.1</td>
<td>1s~1min</td>
<td>70~80</td>
<td>Decentralised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Energy Storage</td>
<td>lead-acid battery</td>
<td>0.001~50</td>
<td>1min~3h</td>
<td>60~70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Li-ion and NaS battery</td>
<td>0.001~10</td>
<td>1min~3h</td>
<td>70~80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The simplest ESS dynamic model could be described by relation between storage energy $E_s$ and charge and discharge powers $P_C$ and $P_D$ [67]:

$$\frac{dE_s}{dt} = -\frac{P_D}{\eta_D} \quad E_s < E_{MAX} \quad P_D < P_{DMAX}$$

$$\frac{dE_s}{dt} = -\eta_C P_C \quad P_{CMIN} < P_C < P_{CMAX}$$

$P_{CMAX}$, $P_{DMAX}$, $S_{MAX}$ maximum charge and discharge powers and energy capacity, $\eta_C$, $\eta_D$ charge and discharge efficiencies.

Storage power is controlled depending on desired objective. For example: peak shaving loads, removing line overloads, frequency control and/or synthetic inertia providing. More information about ESS is in [68]-[86].

**F.3. Sustainable Energy Sources**

Wind energy has become one of the most important RES, which has the most influence on transmission system operation (large wind power plants are connected directly into
transmission network). Hence we focus on wind turbines firstly. Other important RES are solar plants. There are two main types: Concentrated solar thermal power plants (CSP) and Photovoltaics modules (PV).

**F.3.1. Wind Turbines**

A simple test system depicted on Figure F.8 was prepared for demonstration of up to date wind modules capabilities. The system was inspired by the reference [87], only instead of DFIG modules connected by one VSC-HVDC into an AC island system, permanent magnet generators (PMG) with full power converter (FPC) was used (Type 4 according to [89]). The model of PMG-FPC was complemented by additional signals to enable frequency and inertial control.

![Figure F.8. Simple test system with wind turbine and synchronous generator (test system C)](image)

Three cases were simulated for different disturbances:
- 10% step increasing of load connected to node B2,
- increasing of wind speed,
- short circuit in the node B2.

The following figure shows results of the first simulation cases for 10% step load change.

![Figure F.9. Frequency waveforms for simulation of load step change](image)
Four different control modes were tested:

- conventional wind power plant control without additional controls,
- simple frequency modulation of turbine power to enable the Frequency Sensitive Mode (FSM) according to prepared NC RfG [88] (wind turbine operates with a primary control reserve to provide response to network frequency deviations by pitch angle control),
- extended FPC grid side inverter control for frequency control and
- inertial control to enable so called Synthetic Inertia according to [88].

Figure F.9 shows significant improving of the frequency response for combination of turbine pitch angle control and extended inverter controls.

The following figure shows results of the second simulation case for the wind speed changes with conventional wind power plant control and with additional frequency control (all (b), (c), (d) control modes activated):

![Figure F.10. Frequency waveforms for simulation of the wind speed](image)

Additional frequency control of wind power plant module can improve frequency stability especially in the power system island operation.

The following figure shows results of the third simulation case for the short circuit.

![Figure F.11. Frequency waveforms for simulation of the short circuit](image)

Additional frequency control of wind power plant can improve frequency stability after short circuit as well. References [90]-[100] deal with wind modules modelling in more details.
F.3.2. Photovoltaic Modules

PV model for system stability studies are described in [101]. Basically this model contains two main parts: Electric control and Converter models – see Figure F.12.

![Diagram of PV dynamic model](image)

Figure F.12. Basic structure of PV dynamic model according to [101]

Electric control model should contain some important parts like Reactive Power Control and Limited Over-frequency Sensitive Mode. Converter model should contain at least Low Voltage Power Logic and it provides interface between PV and the network (usually implemented by a controlled current source injected into the network. Trip signal is controlled by a switched and reconnection logic, which is based on frequency and voltage relays. Solar power model may contain a dependency of PV power on solar irradiation (see reference [102]). This irradiation may be either constant or variable in dependency on daytime (see reference [103]).

A simple test system depicted on was prepared for demonstration of up to date PV modules capabilities. The system was inspired by the reference [104] and data description is in [105].
100 ms three phase short circuit at node 3 was applied as initial disturbance. The fault was cleared, but at t=0.9 s occurred again as permanent. PV was disconnected by under voltage protection at t=1.013 s. Following figure shows waveforms of PV current I (violet curve) and active power P (red curve).

The active power P decreased to zero due to a low voltage power logic during the short circuit and it is restored to the initial value after short circuit clearing. Current I increased to 110 % of nominal value (defined short term overloading value). P and I decreased to zero after disconnection.

References [106]-[118] deal with wind modules modelling in more details.

Additional benchmark system was developed to test PV and decentralised ESS (batteries). This system comes from [105] and one line diagram is shown in the following figure:
Whole day simulation was carried to present performance of the ESS. Load was changed according to daily load profiles from [105], production of PVs was changed according Direct normal insolation curve (model is described in [103]) and wind speed was changed as well.

Three cases were simulated:
- without RES and ESS
- with RES
- with RES and ESS

Figure F.16 shows simulated time profiles of active powers of PV (yellow curve), wind turbine (blue curve), residential and commercial loads (red and brown curves).

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PV1</th>
<th>PV2</th>
<th>PV3</th>
<th>PV4</th>
<th>PV5</th>
<th>PV6</th>
<th>PV7</th>
<th>PV8</th>
<th>PV9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS1</th>
<th>ESS2</th>
<th>WT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Figure F.17 shows active powers of the line 2-3 for three cases (blue curve for the first case without RES and ESS, green curve for the second case without RES, brown curve for the third
case with RES and ESS). ESS power (in [MW]) and stored energy (in per unit [ ] ) are depicted by dashed and dotted lines.

![Figure F.17. Active powers of line 2-3 and ESS](image)

The batteries charging/discharging were adjusted to maintain the line 2-3 power flow to 2.5±0.2 MW (for the third case with RES and ESS). When the power flow of the line 2-3 is smaller than setup value 2.5 MW, the batteries were charged (P_{ESS} is negative and stored energy increased) and reversely. Figure F.18 shows voltages waveforms:

![Figure F.18. Voltage of the node 1](image)

Installation of RES can significantly improve voltage deviations during the day (of course RES modules have to be able to control voltage). ESS Installation can smooth out power flows from sub-transmission network (load peak shaving).

**F.3.3. Concentrated Solar Thermal Power Plants**

Concentrated solar thermal power plants (CSP) produce electricity with conventional synchronous generators combined with steam turbines, but they use solar radiation as energy source instead of fossil fuel. This means the solar field is the heat source instead of boiler. A basic model for CSP with Thermal Energy Storage (TES) is depicted in Figure F.19.
The simplest solar field and TES dynamic model could be described by relation between heat transfer fluid temperatures $T_{SF}$ and $T_{TES}$ charge and thermal powers (see reference [119]):

$$C_{SF} \frac{dT_{SF}}{dt} = -P_{SF-PB} - P_{SF-TE} + P_{Sun}$$

$$C_{TES} \frac{dT_{TES}}{dt} = +P_{SF-TE} - P_{TES-PB}$$  \(2\)

$C_{SF}$, $C_{TES}$ are thermal capacities and $T_{SF}$, $T_{TES}$ are per unit temperatures. Thermal losses are neglected. More detailed model was published in [120].

Thermal input power to the power block model $P_{PB}$ can be changed into turbine mechanical power with efficiency $\eta_{PB}$:

$$\eta_{PB} = a_1 + a_2 e^{\frac{P_{PB}}{a_3}}$$  \(3\)

According to [120] the parameters for 50 MW CSP are $a_1 = 0.397$, $a_2 = -0.243$ and $a_3 = 28.23$ MW$^{-1}$.

**F.4. Demand Side Response**

Deliverable 3.1 [140] defines three the most impacting demand-side technologies: heat pumps, electric vehicles and LED/OLED lightning. The heat pumps as typical representatives of the temperature-controlled devices are interesting from the dynamic analysis point of view.

One form of Demand Side Response (DSR) specified in the Network Code on Demand Connections [141] is a System Frequency Control (SFC) with decreasing or increasing set temperature proportionately to frequency deviation. Temperature controlled devices are for example fridges, freezers, heat pumps, water heaters, air conditioning and electric heating. Appropriate dynamic model was published e.g. in [142].

**F.5. Summary**

Features of the possible new technologies are demonstrated on the simple benchmarks test systems:

- Test system A with UPFC
- Test system B with HVDC
- Test system C with wind power plant
- Test system D with PV modules
• Test system E with PV and decentralised ESS.

Namely, UPFC, VSC-HVDC and Wind and PV modules were investigated. The test cases were focused mainly on small disturbance and frequency stability.

Since no consolidated standard dynamic models exist for these new technologies, these benchmark test systems for all potentially used SW tools (Powerfactory, PSS/E and DSA). These benchmark test system calculations may help to prepare suitable models, align dynamic responses, provide reliable and consistent results and facilitate future implementing of these models into the European grid architecture model.

Examples of the dynamic input data were introduced in Appendix D.

Different simple benchmark systems have been developed where these new features have been modelled. Their impact on the system Operational Security has been investigated by means of dynamic simulations.

The described test systems:

• provide suitable models to test grid and generation technologies for future European power system
• allow the comparison and benchmark of the dynamic response of different available tools and
• provide reliable and consistent results to facilitate future implementation of these models into pan-European grid architecture model.
Appendix III: Result Details

G. Geographical Mode Shape Scatter Plots

The geographical mode shape scatter plots are displayed. The modes are numbered starting at the lowest frequency mode. Only the lowest three frequency modes are displayed.

G.1. Scenario X-10

G.1.1. Mode 1

Figure G.1. Mode 1 - frequency 0.3458 Hz, damping 2.51, scenario X-10, strategy 2, Summer Low
Figure G.2. Mode 1 - frequency 0.2935 Hz, damping 2.72, scenario X-10, strategy 3, Summer Low

Figure G.3. Mode 1 - frequency 0.2331 Hz, damping 2.08, scenario X-10, strategy 2, Winter Peak
G.1.2. **Mode 2**

Figure G.4. Mode 1 - frequency 0.1864 Hz, damping 3.28, scenario X-10, strategy 3, Winter Peak

Figure G.5. Mode 2 - frequency 0.3764 Hz, damping 0.62, scenario X-10, strategy 2, Winter Peak
Figure G.6. Mode 2 - frequency 0.3626 Hz, damping 1.33, scenario X-10, strategy 3, Winter Peak

G.1.3. Mode 3

Figure G.7. Mode 3 - frequency 0.3842 Hz, damping 2.70, scenario X-10, strategy 2, Winter Peak
G.2. Scenario X-13

G.2.1. Mode 1

Figure G.8. Mode 3 - frequency 0.3836 Hz, damping 2.67, scenario X-10, strategy 3, Winter Peak

Figure G.9. Mode 1 - frequency 0.3187 Hz, damping 1.83, scenario X-13, strategy 2, Summer Low
Figure G.10. Mode 1 - frequency 0.2600 Hz, damping 3.59, scenario X-13, strategy 3, Summer Low

Figure G.11. Mode 1 - frequency 0.2147 Hz, damping 3.51, scenario X-13, strategy 2, Winter Peak
Figure G.12. Mode 1 - frequency 0.1576 Hz, damping 5.04, scenario X-13, strategy 3, Winter Peak

G.2.2. Mode 2

Figure G.13. Mode 2 - frequency 0.4333 Hz, damping 1.82, scenario X-13, strategy 2, Summer Low
Figure G.14. Mode 2 - frequency 0.3628 Hz, damping 1.87, scenario X-13, strategy 3 Summer Low

Figure G.15. Mode 2 - frequency 0.3794 Hz, damping 1.48, scenario X-13, strategy 2, Winter Peak
4.1 – Operational validation of the grid reinforcements by 2050

Figure G.16. Mode 2 - frequency 0.3382 Hz, damping 0.50, scenario X-13, strategy 3, Winter Peak

G.2.3. Mode 3

Figure G.17. Mode 3 - frequency 0.4665 Hz, damping 0.51, scenario X-13, strategy 3, Summer Low
Figure G.18. Mode 3 - frequency 0.4053 Hz, damping 2.02, scenario X-13, strategy 2, Winter Peak

Figure G.19. Mode 3 - frequency 0.3439 Hz, damping 1.91, scenario X-13, strategy 3, Winter Peak
G.3. Scenario X-16

G.3.1. Mode 1

Figure G.20. Mode 1 - frequency 0.3648 Hz, damping 1.35, scenario X-16, strategy 2, Summer Low

Figure G.21. Mode 1 - frequency 0.3816 Hz, damping 2.15, scenario X-16, strategy 3, Summer Low
Figure G.22. Mode 1 - frequency 0.2026 Hz, damping 3.33, scenario X-16, strategy 2, Winter Peak

Figure G.23. Mode 1 - frequency 0.1937 Hz, damping 3.80, scenario X-16, strategy 3, Winter Peak
G.3.2. Mode 2

Figure G.24. Mode 2 - frequency 0.4060 Hz, damping 0.48, scenario X-16, strategy 2, Winter Peak

Figure G.25. Mode 2 - frequency 0.3753 Hz, damping 0.63, scenario X-16, strategy 3, Winter Peak
G.3.3. Mode 3

Figure G.26. Mode 3 - frequency 0.4325 Hz, damping 1.07, scenario X-16, strategy 3, Winter Peak
H. Detailed Voltage Analysis Plots

Voltage analysis has been performed by simulating the loss of every transmission grid reinforcement, using the base case (N) voltage as the normalised voltage. The horizontal axis is the Very High Voltage bus number for continental Europe. In the figures in this appendix, X7 refers to X-7, X10 to X-10, X13 to X-13 and X16 to X-16. S2 refers to Strategy 2 and S3 to Strategy 3. SL refers to Summer Low and WP to Winter Peak. This is not to be confused with WP as Work Package.

H.1. Scenario X-7

![Figure H.1. Voltage difference of the n-1 grid reinforcements for X-7 – Strategy 2 – Summer Low](#)

![Figure H.2. Voltage difference of the n-1 grid reinforcements for X-7 – Strategy 3 – Summer Low](#)
H.2. Scenario X-10

Figure H.3. Voltage difference of the n-1 grid reinforcements for X-10 – Strategy 2 – Winter Peak

Figure H.4. Voltage difference of the n-1 grid reinforcements for X-10 – Strategy 3 – Winter Peak
H.3. Scenario X-13

Figure H.5. Voltage difference of the n-1 grid reinforcements for X-13 – Strategy 2 – Summer Low

Figure H.6. Voltage difference of the n-1 grid reinforcements for X-13 – Strategy 2 – Winter Peak
Figure H.7. Voltage difference of the n-1 grid reinforcements for X-13 – Strategy 3 – Summer Low

Figure H.8. Voltage difference of the n-1 grid reinforcements for X-13 – Strategy 3 – Winter Peak
H.4. Scenario X-16

Figure H.9. Voltage difference of the n-1 grid reinforcements for X-16 – Strategy 2 – Summer Low

Figure H.10. Voltage difference of the n-1 grid reinforcements for X-16 – Strategy 2 – Winter Peak
Figure H.11. Voltage difference of the n-1 grid reinforcements for X-16 – Strategy 3 – Summer Low

Figure H.12. Voltage difference of the n-1 grid reinforcements for X-16 – Strategy 3 – Winter Peak