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Abstract — As the wind power generation develops, the Doubly Fed Induction Generator (DFIG) based wind power system may suffer Sub Synchronous Resonance (SSR) and High Frequency Resonance (HFR) in the series and parallel compensated weak network. The principle and frequency of HFR have been discussed using the Bode diagram as an analysis tool. However, the HFR can be categorized into two different types: undamped HFR (which exists in steady state) and unstable HFR (which eventually results in complete instability and divergence), both of them are not investigated before. Since both the undamped HFR and unstable HFR are critical to the output wind power quality as well as the safe and reliable operation of the DFIG system, it is meaningful to discuss them using the Nyquist Criterion from two perspectives, 1) determining either the undamped HFR or the unstable HFR happens; 2) estimating the amplitude of the undamped HFR. The influence factors, including the weak network shunt capacitance, the current PI controller parameters are discussed when estimating the amplitude of the undamped HFR. The experimental and simulation results of a 7.5 kW down-scaled DFIG setup are provided to validate the analysis on the undamped HFR and unstable HFR.

Index Terms — DFIG system impedance modeling; high frequency resonance (HFR); Nyquist Criterion; undamped HFR; unstable HFR.

I. INTRODUCTION

Doubly Fed Induction Generator (DFIG) based wind power systems are increasingly installed globally [1]-[3] to achieve a higher portion of renewable energy in the power grid. For the purpose of ensuring a safe and reliable operation of the DFIG system, several improved control strategies have been demonstrated under the condition of grid voltage three-phase long-term steady state unbalance [4]-[6] and low voltage fault [7] as well as for the frequency support by virtual inertial control [8]. When connected to a weak network where the impedance is relatively large and requires serious attention, the Sub- Synchronous Resonance (SSR) [9]-[25] and the High Frequency Resonance (HFR) [26]-[28], might appear due to the impedance interaction between the DFIG system and the weak network.

The SSR which is typically below the fundamental frequency might appear when the DFIG system is connected to the series compensated weak network [9]-[25]. The method of harmonic linearization is adopted in [9]-[11] to develop the positive and negative sequences of the DFIG system impedance, and it is demonstrated that the rotor current control and the phase locked loop control with larger control bandwidth is more likely to produce the SSR, while less possibility of the SSR seems to appear at higher rotor speeds. The impedance modeling of the entire DFIG system and the series compensated weak network are reported in [12], and it is demonstrated that the interaction between the electric network and the converter controller contributes mainly to the SSR. Instead of using the Bode diagram, Ref. [14] adopted the impedance-based Nyquist stability criterion in order to explain the SSR phenomenon, i.e., to examine whether the ratio of the grid impedance to the DFIG system impedance encircles (-1,0) or not. Besides, an eigenvalue-based analysis was conducted in [15] to investigate the impact of SSR from the perspective of the grid and the DFIG. Three different modal resonances were also analyzed in [16], i.e., induction generator effect, torsional interactions and the control interactions. The SSR was analyzed from the quantitative perspective using an aggregated RLC circuit model of the series compensated weak network in [17], however no Nyquist Curve based stability criterion method is adopted.

On the other hand, the HFR may occur when the DFIG system is connected to the parallel compensated weak network [26]-[28]. As it is discussed in [26], the HFR is a consequence of the impedance interaction between the DFIG system and the parallel compensated weak network. The frequency of HFR is estimated based on the Bode diagram of the DFIG system impedance and the parallel compensated weak network impedance in [26]. It is found that the rotor speed is not sensitive to the HFR frequency since the DFIG system impedance shape at the high frequency range remains almost the same regardless of the different rotor speed, and the PI current controller parameters are also not important to the occurrence of the HFR. Note that only the occurrence and the frequency of the undamped HFR can be theoretically analyzed and estimated using the Bode diagram method in previous works [26]-[28]. The differences between this paper and [26]-[28] include two aspects, 1) only the undamped HFR, which is one of the two different types of HFR (undamped and unstable HFR), is discussed in [26]-[28]. The main contribution of [26]-[28] is to analyze the undamped HFR which exists in the steady state performance, and to propose the active damping strategy for mitigating the undamped HFR; 2) on the other hand, both the undamped HFR and unstable HFR are investigated in this paper, and this paper focuses on explaining whether the undamped HFR or the unstable HFR will happen under certain circumstances, and what are the influencing factors. Furthermore, the amplitude of the undamped HFR is also theoretically estimated in this paper.

The behavior of the HFR may often vary in practice, to be more specific, there are two possibilities in respect to the HFR, 1) one possibility is that the undamped HFR exists in...
steady state, and the DFIG system is still able to operate with the inclusion of the HFR, unfortunately the output wind power can be distorted with a large amount of high frequency distortion in the output current and thereby jeopardizes the power quality. Besides that, the mechanical components of the DFIG system (shaft, bearing and gear-box) may experience high frequency vibrations, and even results in further mechanic damage; 2) the other possibility is that the unstable HFR may eventually result in instability, as a consequence the over voltage/current protection unit may cause a shut-down of the DFIG system and reduce the wind power output. Based on above explanations, it can be seen that the behavior of the undamped HFR and unstable HFR is critical to the output wind power quality as well as the safe and reliable operation of the DFIG system, and this topic is worthy discussing.

The Nyquist Criterion method has been adopted to analyze the occurrence of SSR in [14], and this method is implemented based on the small signal equivalent circuit of a DFIG system and a series compensated weak network, which is deduced based on the discussion of the impedance-based stability criterion for the grid-connected inverters in [29]. As it will be illustrated in this paper, the Nyquist Criterion method, compared with the conventional Bode diagram, can provide additional information about the stability of the damped HFR and the occurrence of unstable HFR.

Therefore, the HFR will be investigated using the Nyquist Criterion method from two perspectives in this paper, 1) determining whether the undamped HFR (which exists in steady state) happens and results in the deterioration of the output wind power quality; or unstable HFR (which results in instability) happens and triggers the over-voltage/current protection which shuts down the DFIG system; 2) estimating the amplitude of the undamped HFR in steady state, then the wind power quality can be evaluated.

This paper is organized as follows: the general description and the impedance modeling of the DFIG system and the parallel compensated weak network are provided in Section II as a platform for the following discussion. Then, the HFR caused by the impedance interaction between the weak network and the DFIG system is illustrated based on the conventional Bode diagram method in Section III. Thereafter, the Nyquist Criterion based method is applied in Section IV to analyze the behavior of the HFR from the two perspectives mentioned above. The influence factors, including the weak network shunt capacitance and the current PI controller parameters, are also discussed in respect to the undamped HFR and the unstable HFR. The experimental and simulation setup of 7.5 kW down-scaled DFIG system are built up in order to validate the analysis on the undamped HFR and unstable HFR in Section V. Finally, the conclusions are given in Section VI.

II. GENERAL DESCRIPTION AND IMPEDANCE MODELING OF DFIG SYSTEM

The general description of the DFIG system is necessary for the following discussion, and the impedance modeling of both the DFIG system and the parallel compensated weak network established in [26]-[28] need to be mentioned here as an analysis platform.

A. General description of the DFIG system

The diagram of the investigated DFIG system and the parallel compensated weak network is shown in Fig. 1. The RSC controls the rotor voltage to deliver the DFIG stator output active and reactive power, the GSC provides the dc-link voltage. The three-terminal step-up transformer \( T_{DFIG} \) is connected between the DFIG stator winding, the LCL output terminal and the Point of Common Coupling (PCC) for the purpose of adjusting the voltage level of the DFIG system, the detailed parameters of this transformer can be found in Table I.

The parallel compensated weak network contains the network inductance \( L_{NET} \) and the network resistance \( R_{NET} \) in series connection, and the network shunt capacitance \( C_{NET} \) is connected between the transmission cables and the ground. A two-terminal transformer \( T_{NET} \) is connected between the PCC and the high voltage transmission cable, and the parameters of this transformer can also be found in Table I.

![Diagram of the DFIG system connected to a parallel compensated weak network.](image)

**Fig. 1. Diagram of the DFIG system connected to a parallel compensated weak network.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE I. PARAMETERS OF 7.5 kW DFIG SYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DFIG Machine</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_g )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L_{dc} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L_s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_r )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LCL Filter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L_q )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_q )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voltage level and ratios in ( T_{NET} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voltage level and ratios in ( T_{NET} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_{o,NET} )</td>
<td>7.5 kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_{o,NET} )</td>
<td>0.64 Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L_{o,NET} )</td>
<td>5.16 mH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole Pairs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_r )</td>
<td>10 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_s )</td>
<td>5 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L_{q,NET} )</td>
<td>11 mH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{q,NET} )</td>
<td>6.6 uF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| $V_G$ | 400 V | $V_s$ | 400 V |
| $V_{PCC}$ | 400 V | $K_i$ | 1 |
| $K_{sw}$ | 2 | $K_{uv}$ | 5 |
| Parallel compensated weak network |
| $R_{STR}$ | 3 mΩ | $L_{STR}$ | 1.5 mH |
| $C_{STR}$ | 15,10,5,μF | $V_{PCC}$ | 400 V | $V_{PV}$ | 400 V |
| $K_i$ | 1 |

**B. Impedance modeling of the DFIG system**

The grid part of the DFIG system contains the GSC and the LCL filter, its impedance modeling [26]-[28] in the stationary frame is presented in Fig. 2. Then, the impedance of the DFIG grid side in the stationary frame can be obtained as,

$$Z_G = K_i Z_{CL}(L_{CL} + Z_{GSC}) + Z_{ls} (L_{CL} + Z_{GSC}) + Z_{Cf} Z_{ls}$$

$$Z_{CL} + (Z_{ls} + Z_{GSC})$$

(1)

where, $Z_{CL} = 1/(sC_f)$, $Z_{ls} = sL_s$, $Z_{ls} = sL_s$, $C_f$ is the LCL-filter capacitance, $L_s$ is the converter side inductance, and $L_g$ is the LCL grid side inductance. $K_i$ is the voltage ratio between $V_G$ and $V_{PCC}$ defined as $K_i = V_{PCC}/V_G$. $Z_{GSC} = G_s(s-jω_o)G_m(s-jω_o)$, $G_s(s-jω_o)$ is the PI current controller containing the proportional part $K_{pgsc}$ and the integral part $K_{igsc}(s-jω_o)$, the parameters of $K_{pgsc}$ and $K_{igsc}$ can also be found in Table I. $G_m(s-jω_o)$ is the digital control delay of 1.5 sample period due to the delay of sampling and PWM update [26]-[28]. It needs to be pointed out that $ω_o$ is the grid fundamental component angular speed of 100π rad/s. The introduction of $ω_o$ is due to the reference frame rotation from the stationary frame to the synchronous frame, where the PI closed-loop current control is implemented. The control loop of the dc-link voltage and the grid synchronization in the GSC are neglected due to the slower dynamic response [26]-[28].

On the other hand, the impedance of the RSC and DFIG machine [26]-[28] in the stationary frame can be obtained in Fig. 3 as,

$$Z_{sys} = K_i Z_{im} H + (R_i + Z_{LS}) H + Z_{LS} (R_i + Z_{LS})$$

(2)

where $H = Z_{im} + (R_i + Z_{RSC})/slip$, $Z_{RSC} = G_s(s-jω_o)G_m(s-jω_o)$,

$$Z_{im} = sL_m, Z_{LS} = sL_m, Z_{LS} = sL_m, R_i is the rotor resistance, L_m is the mutual inductance, L_{ov} is the rotor leakage inductance, and L_{ov} is the stator leakage inductance. $K_i$ is the voltage ratio between $V_S$ and $V_{PCC}$ as defined $K_i = V_{PCC}/V_S$. Since the rotor current control is implemented in the synchronous reference frame, it needs to be transformed into the rotor side frame using the slip angular speed expressed as [26]-[28],

$$slip = (s - jω_o)/s$$

(3)

Therefore, since the RSC and DFIG machine $Z_{SR}$ and the GSC and LCL-filter $Z_G$ are connected in parallel, then the DFIG system impedance $Z_{SYS}$ can be obtained based on (1) and (2) as,

$$Z_{SYS} = Z_G/Z_{SR}$$

(4)

**C. Impedance modeling of the parallel compensated weak network**

According to Fig. 1, the impedance modeling of the parallel compensated weak network [26]-[28] can be deduced as,

$$Z_{NET} = \frac{1}{K_i} \left(\frac{sL_{NET} + R_{NET}}{sC_{NET}}\right)$$

(5)

where, $K_i = V_{PV}/V_{PCC}$ is the voltage ratio between the high voltage $V_{PV}$ in the long distance transmission cable and the PCC voltage $V_{PCC}$. $R_{NET}$. $L_{NET}$ and $C_{NET}$ are the network resistance, inducance and capacitance.

**III. CONVENTIONAL ANALYSIS ON THE FREQUENCY OF HFR USING BODE DIAGRAM**

In the previous works in [26]-[28], the Bode diagram method is adopted to discuss the frequency of the HFR. The method is first to plot the Bode diagram curves of the DFIG system impedance and the parallel compensated weak network impedance, then to examine if the phase difference at the magnitude intersection point between the DFIG system and the weak network is equal or larger than 180° [26]-[28]. In order to better explain the HFR, the conventional analysis on the undamped HFR frequency using the Bode diagram method [26]-[28] is still mentioned here. The Bode diagram method and the proposed Nyquist Criterion method will also be compared and summarized in the following discussion.

The conventional analysis on the undamped HFR frequency is conducted based on the 7.5 kW DFIG system as shown in Fig. 4. As it can be seen, the impedance curves of the DFIG system and the parallel compensated weak networks have the magnitude intersection point at 1316 Hz when $C_{NET} = 15 \mu F$, 1575 Hz when $C_{NET} = 10 \mu F$, 2195 Hz
when $C_{NET} = 5 \mu F$, 2820 Hz when $C_{NET} = 3 \mu F$. The phase differences at these frequencies are all 180° and it will result in the occurrence of the HFR. This analysis method has been proved to be accurate and effective in [26]-[28], however only the frequency of the HFR can be identified using the Bode diagram method, while the resonance amplitude cannot be directly observed based on the Bode diagram in Fig. 4.

As discussed in Section IV. B and the experimental results, the amplitude of the undamped HFR is determined by the equivalent resistance is subject to several influencing factors, including the DFIG machine parameters, LCL filter parameter, RSC and GSC controller parameters, transformer parameters, parallel compensated weak network parameters. Thus, it can be found out that discussing the amplitude of the undamped HFR quantitatively with the consideration of all these above parameters are too complicated and difficult to understand in this paper. Instead, it is assumed that the network inductance $L_{NET}$ remains constant for the weak network, while the shunt capacitance $C_{NET}$ may vary under different conditions due to reactive power compensation and connection / disconnection of sources and loads [26]-[28].

On the other hand, for the DFIG system, the only variables current may vary according to output power. Thus, from the perspective of the equivalent circuit seen from the PCC, it is more appropriate to model the small signal equivalent circuit of the DFIG system as a current source $I_{SYS}$ and its parallel impedance $Z_{SYS}$ [29]. On the other hand, the weak network is normally modelled as the voltage source $V_{NET}$ and its series impedance $Z_{NET}$ [29].

Based on the above explanation, the overall small signal equivalent circuit of the investigated DFIG system connected to a weak network is shown in Fig. 5, where $Z_{SYS}$ is the DFIG system impedance in (4), $Z_{NET}$ is the weak network impedance in (5), the $V_{NET}$ is the voltage source of the weak network, and $I_{SYS}$ is the current source presenting the DFIG system.

Then, according to Fig. 5, the output current $I_o$ of the DFIG system at PCC can be presented as,

$$I_o = \frac{I_{SYS} Z_{SYS} - V_{NET}}{Z_{SYS} + Z_{NET}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

As illustrated in [29], since the DFIG system is normally able to work stable when the network impedance $Z_{NET}$ is zero (indicating ideal stiff grid), thus the DFIG system, including the variables of $I_{SYS}$ and $Z_{SYS}$, can be assumed stable. Besides, the network voltage $V_{NET}$ is also normally stable. Based on this description, (6) can be rewritten as,

$$I_o = \left( I_{SYS} - \frac{V_{NET}}{Z_{SYS}} \right) \frac{1}{1 + Z_{NET}/Z_{SYS}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

Note that the first item of (7) is normally stable as described above and the stability of the overall DFIG system connected to the weak network is determined by the second item of (7), that is, whether the ratio of the network impedance to the DFIG system $Z_{NET}/Z_{SYS}$ satisfies the Nyquist Criterion or not [14], [29].

As discussed in Section IV. B and the experimental results, the amplitude of the undamped HFR is determined by the equivalent resistance of the total impedance including both the DFIG system and the weak network. Note that this equivalent resistance is subject to several influencing factors, including the DFIG machine parameters, LCL filter parameter, RSC and GSC controller parameters, transformer parameters, parallel compensated weak network parameters. Thus, it can be found out that discussing the amplitude of the undamped HFR quantitatively with the consideration of all these above parameters are too complicated and difficult to understand in this paper. Instead, it is assumed that the network inductance $L_{NET}$ remains constant for the weak network, while the shunt capacitance $C_{NET}$ may vary under different conditions due to reactive power compensation and connection / disconnection of sources and loads [26]-[28].
are the current controller parameters in the RSC and GSC. Therefore, the following stability analysis on the amplitude of undamped HFR using the Nyquist Criterion method will be conducted with different network shunt capacitances and RSC/GSC current controller parameters.

B. Stability analysis using Nyquist Criterion with different network shunt capacitance

![Nyquist Curve](image)

Fig. 6. Nyquist curve of the \( Z_{NET}/Z_{SYS} \) under four different network shunt capacitances \( C_{NET} = 15, 10, 5, 3 \mu F \), the other parameters are available in Table I. Three conclusions can be drawn from Fig. 6.

1) For all four cases of different network shunt capacitances \( C_{NET} \), their Nyquist curves are very close to the point of (-1,0), indicating that the stability margin is so small that the DFIG system might suffer the HFR at 1320 Hz for \( C_{NET} = 15 \mu F \); 1580 Hz for \( C_{NET} = 10 \mu F \); 2200 Hz for \( C_{NET} = 5 \mu F \); 2820 Hz for \( C_{NET} = 3 \mu F \). This analysis result matches well with the Bode diagram method results in Fig. 4.

2) For the three cases of \( C_{NET} = 15, 10 \) and 5 \( \mu F \), their Nyquist curves do not encircle the (-1,0), therefore the undamped HFR will exist in steady state. On the contrary, the Nyquist curve with \( C_{NET} = 3 \mu F \) encircles the (-1,0) and the unstable HFR will become divergently instability as a consequence.

This result can also be explained from the perspective of total impedances including both the DFIG system \( Z_{SYS} \) and the weak network impedance \( Z_{NET} \). For the cases of \( C_{NET} = 15, 10 \) and 5 \( \mu F \), the \( Z_{NET}/Z_{SYS} \) has a negative imaginary part and the total impedance \( Z_{NET} + Z_{SYS} \) contains a small positive resistance \( Z_{SYS} \) * (-jX), where X is a small positive value of imaginary part as shown in Fig. 6. \( Z_{SYS} \) is the pure inductance as shown in Fig. 4. This equivalent small positive resistance causes the undamped HFR in the DFIG system, and at the same time ensures that the undamped HFR exists in steady state.

On the other hand, for the case of \( C_{NET} = 3 \mu F \), the \( Z_{NET}/Z_{SYS} \) has a positive imaginary part, indicating that the \( Z_{NET} + Z_{SYS} \) contains a small negative resistance \( Z_{SYS} \) * (j0.00141). This equivalent small negative resistance results in the unstable HFR (which eventually results in instability) in the DFIG system.

3) For the three cases of undamped HFR in steady state with \( C_{NET} = 15, 10 \) and 5 \( \mu F \), the value of the equivalent small positive resistance becomes smaller as the \( C_{NET} \) becomes smaller, as a consequence the amplitude of the undamped HFR will become larger.

All three conclusions will be validated by the following simulation and experimental results. Based on above explanations, it can be seen that the value of the shunt capacitance \( C_{NET} \) in the parallel compensated weak network is 1) very important to the amplitude of the undamped HFR; 2) determining whether the undamped HFR will exist in steady state or enters into unstable HFR and eventually complete instability.

C. Stability analysis using Nyquist Criterion under different current controller parameters

The PI current controller parameters in RSC and GSC are likely to be adjusted in order better to track the rotor current and grid side current, hence it is meaningful to discuss the influence of the PI controller parameters on the amplitude of the undamped HFR. Note that the proportional parameter, but not the integral parameter, is investigated since the proportional parameter has a comparatively larger influence than the integral parameters on the DFIG system impedance in the high frequency range. The PI controller in the RSC is discussed as an example, while the PI controller in the GSC is neglected for the sake of simplicity.

As shown in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3, the PI controllers in the RSC and the GSC are subject to the digital control delay. As a consequence, from the perspective of equivalent impedance, the proportional parameters will behave as the combination of Positive Capacitance (PC) and Positive Resistance (PR) or Negative Resistance (NR) as shown in Fig. 7.
control delay is considered.

On the other hand, when the digital control delay $T_d = 150 \mu s$ is included and the HFR resonance frequency is lower than 1666 Hz as shown in Fig. 7(b), the phase delay angle is between -90° and 0°, indicating the PI controller can be equivalently regarded as the combination of the Positive Capacitance (PC) and Positive Resistance (PR).

Moreover, when the digital control delay $T_d = 150 \mu s$ is included and the HFR resonance frequency is higher than 1666 Hz as shown in Fig. 7(c), the delay phase angle is between -180° and -90°, indicating the PI controller can be equivalently regarded as the combination of the PC and Negative Resistance (NR).

Based on above explanations, Fig. 8 shows that the increase of the proportional parameter will lead to different DFIG system impedance changing. For the HFR frequency lower than 1666 Hz, the increase of the proportional parameter $K_p$ will result in a phase response decrease of the DFIG system below 90° as shown in Fig. 8(a). In contrast, for the HFR frequency higher than 1666 Hz, the increase of the proportional parameter $K_p$ will result in a phase response increase of the DFIG system larger than 90° as shown in Fig. 8(b).

Then, based on the analysis conducted in Fig. 7 and Fig. 8, when the proportional parameters change, the amplitude of the undamped HFR can be analyzed using the Nyquist Criterion method as shown in Fig. 9.

As shown in Fig. 9(a), for the case of HFR frequency = 1320 Hz when $C_{NET} = 15 \mu F$, the increase of $K_{prsc} = 2, 4, 8$ helps to move the Nyquist curve away from the (-1,0) and increase the stability margin. Besides, the equivalent positive resistance of the total impedances (including the DFIG system and the weak network) will also increase and the amplitude of the undamped HFR can be suppressed. Thus, it can be verified that the increase of the proportional parameters help to mitigate the amplitude of the undamped HFR when its frequency is below the critical frequency of 1666 Hz.

On the other hand, as shown in Fig. 9(b), for the case of HFR frequency = 2220 Hz when $C_{NET} = 5 \mu F$, the increase of $K_{prsc}$ from 2 to 4 and 8 causes the DFIG system to change from the undamped HFR in steady state to the unstable HFR since the Nyquist curves encircle the (-1,0). This change can also be explained from the perspective of the equivalent impedance of the entire system. The equivalent total impedance is small positive resistance for the case of $K_{prsc} = 2$; however, for the case of $K_{prsc} = 4$ and 8, the equivalent total impedance is small negative resistance, and as a consequence the unstable HFR will appear and eventually results in instability.

Based on the above discussions, it can be found that the proportional parameters are important to the behavior of HFR by either changing the amplitude of the undamped HFR or causing a complete unstable HFR.

![Nyquist curve of different Z_{NET/ZSYS}, K_{prsc} = 2, 4, 8, K_{prsc} = 5, K_{prsc} = 2 and K_{prsc} = 5. (a) when C_{NET} = 15 \mu F, HFR frequency = 1320 Hz; (b) when C_{NET} = 5 \mu F, HFR frequency = 2220 Hz.](image-url)
weak network can be presented as,
\[ Z_{NET} + Z_{SYS} = -jX \ast Z_{SYS} = -jX \ast jS = X \ast S \quad (8b) \]
where, the \( Z_{SYS} \) can be regarded as \( jS \) (\( S \) is also a very small positive value) since the DFIG system behaves as positive inductive with phase response = 90 degree in the HFR frequency range as shown in Fig. 4.

Thus, it can be seen that the total impedance has positive resistance in this case, and the undamped HFR will occur in steady state.

2) In contrary, when the intersection point (black dots in Fig. 6 and Fig. 9) between the Nyquist Curve \( Z_{NET}/Z_{SYS} \) and the unit circle is above imaginary axis, indicating a positive imaginary part,
\[ Z_{NET}/Z_{SYS} = -1 + jX \]
Then, the total impedance of the DFIG system and the weak network can be presented as,
\[ Z_{NET} + Z_{SYS} = jX \ast Z_{SYS} = jX \ast jS = -X \ast S \quad (9b) \]
Thus, it can be seen that the total impedance has negative resistance in this case, and the unstable HFR will occur to divergence.

3) Therefore, it can be concluded that whether the intersection point (black dots in Fig. 6 and Fig. 9) between the Nyquist Curve \( Z_{NET}/Z_{SYS} \) and the unit circle located below or above the imaginary axis is the boundary of the undamped HFR and unstable HFR, i.e., the undamped HFR happens if the intersection point is below the imaginary axis which indicates a positive resistance of the total impedance; or the unstable HFR happens if the intersection point is above the imaginary axis which indicates a negative resistance of the total impedance.

V. SIMULATION AND EXPERIMENTAL VALIDATION

In order to validate the analysis on the undamped HFR and unstable HFR using the proposed Nyquist Criterion based method, the experimental and simulation validation on a small scale DFIG system is provided. For the steady state undamped HFR performance, the experimental results are given, and the undamped HFR with different frequency and amplitude can be observed. However, the unstable HFR may trigger the over current and over voltage protection, and may even cause damage to the DFIG system experimental hardware. Therefore, instead, the simulation results of the unstable HFR which results in instability are provided in MATLAB Simulink.

A. Control diagram

Fig. 10 shows the control diagram of the DFIG system and its parameters can be found in Table I. An enhanced Phase Locked Loop (PLL) is employed to provide the grid voltage fundamental synchronous angular speed \( \omega_1 \) and angle \( \theta_1 \), while an encoder gives out the DFIG rotor position \( \theta_r \) and speed \( \omega_r \).

The rotor current \( I_{rd} \) is first sampled and then controlled based on the reference value \( I_{rd}^{*} \) with a PI controller to output the harvested wind energy. The output of the rotor current PI closed-loop control \( V_{idr} \) and a decoupling compensation are added, giving out the rotor control voltage \( V_{idr}^{*} \), which is then transformed to the rotor stationary frame and delivered as the input to the Space Vector Pulse Width Modulation (SVPWM).

As for the GSC control, the dc-link voltage \( V_{dc} \) is regulated by a PI controller, and its output is delivered as the converter side inductance filter current reference \( I_{i}^{*} \), which is used to regulate the converter side inductance filter current \( I_{r}^{*} \) by a PI controller. Similarly, the GSC control voltage \( V_{idr} \) can be obtained by a PI current controller output and the decoupling compensation unit.

![Control diagram of the DFIG system including the parallel compensated weak network](image)

B. Experimental setup

A 7.5 kW test rig is built up for the purpose of experimental validation and shown in Fig. 11, and the DFIG system parameters can be found in Table I.

The main differences between the commercial DFIG system discussed in Fig. 10 and the experimental DFIG system in Fig. 11 are, 1) the three-terminal transformer and the two-terminal transformer in the commercial DFIG do not exist in the experimental DFIG; 2) in order to prevent the grid connection inrush and the inner system current circulation, a transformer is connected between the DFIG stator winding and the PCC in the experimental DFIG system in Fig. 11, but it does not change the voltage level
between the primary and secondary sides.

The DFIG is externally driven by a prime motor, and two 5.5-kW Danfoss motor drives are used for the GSC and the RSC, both of which are controlled with dSPACE 1006 control system. The rotor speed is set to 1200 rpm (0.8 pu), with the synchronous speed of 1500 rpm (1.0 pu). The dc-link voltage is 650 V. The DFIG stator output active and reactive power is 5 kW and 0 Var. The AD sampling frequency and switching frequency of both converters are 10 kHz and 5 kHz respectively.

![Diagram of DFIG system](image)

**Fig. 1.** Setup of a 7.5 kW experimental DFIG system test rig

### C. Experimental result of the undamped HFR in steady state

Fig. 12 shows the experimental result of no HFR in the DFIG system when no shunt capacitor in the weak grid network, $R_{NET} = 3 \text{ mΩ}$, $L_{NET} = 1.5 \text{ mH}$, rotor speed = 1200 rpm (sub-synchronous speed). No HFR will occur in this case due to the inductive character of both the DFIG system and the weak network at the high frequency range.

Fig. 13 to Fig. 15 show the experimental results of the undamped HFR in the DFIG system when the shunt capacitor $C_{NET} = 15, 10, 5 \mu F$, $R_{NET} = 3 \text{ mΩ}$, $L_{NET} = 1.5 \text{ mH}$, rotor speed = 1200 rpm (sub-synchronous speed). By comparing the experimental results at different network shunt capacitances $C_{NET}$, it can be seen that the amplitude of the undamped HFR becomes increasingly larger when the $C_{NET}$ becomes smaller as shown in Table II. This result matches well with the theoretical analysis in Fig. 6.

On the other hand, Fig. 16 to Fig. 18 show the experimental results of the undamped HFR in the DFIG system when the shunt capacitor $C_{NET} = 15, 10, 5 \mu F$, $R_{NET} = 3 \text{ mΩ}$, $L_{NET} = 1.5 \text{ mH}$, rotor speed = 1700 rpm (super-synchronous speed). Similar results as the case at sub-synchronous speed can be obtained as shown in Table II, i.e., smaller network shunt capacitance $C_{NET}$ leads to larger amplitude of the undamped HFR. Thus, these results at super-synchronous speed also help to validate the analysis in further research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$C_{NET}$</th>
<th>Theoretical Analysis</th>
<th>Sub-synchronous speed 1200 rpm</th>
<th>Super-synchronous speed 1700 rpm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 μF</td>
<td>1316 Hz</td>
<td>1475 Hz: 5.2%</td>
<td>1470 Hz: 5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 μF</td>
<td>1575 Hz</td>
<td>1600 Hz: 32%</td>
<td>1600 Hz: 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 μF</td>
<td>2195 Hz</td>
<td>2250 Hz: 47%</td>
<td>2125 Hz: 42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, by comparing the experimental results with same network shunt capacitance $C_{NET}$, but at different rotor speeds, i.e., Fig. 13 and Fig. 16 with the same $C_{NET} = 15 \mu F$ but with different rotor speed = 1200 rpm and 1700 rpm; Fig. 14 and Fig. 17 with the same $C_{NET} = 10 \mu F$ but with different rotor speed = 1200 rpm and 1700 rpm; Fig. 15 and Fig. 18 with the same $C_{NET} = 5 \mu F$ but with different rotor speed = 1200 rpm and 1700 rpm. It can be found that the amplitude of the undamped HFR is almost constant regardless of the different rotor speeds as shown in Table II. These experimental results help to validate that the rotor speed is not important to the amplitude of the undamped HFR.
Fig. 13. Experimental result of the undamped HFR in the DFIG system when shunt capacitance $C_{SET} = 15$ μF in the weak grid network, $R_{SET} = 3$ mΩ, $L_{SET} = 1.5$ mH, rotor speed = 1200 rpm (sub- synchronous speed)

Fig. 14. Experimental result of the undamped HFR in the DFIG system when shunt capacitance $C_{SET} = 10$ μF in the weak grid network, $R_{SET} = 3$ mΩ, $L_{SET} = 1.5$ mH, rotor speed = 1200 rpm (sub- synchronous speed)

Fig. 15. Experimental result of the undamped HFR in the DFIG system when shunt capacitance $C_{SET} = 5$ μF in the weak grid network, $R_{SET} = 3$ mΩ, $L_{SET} = 1.5$ mH, rotor speed = 1200 rpm (sub- synchronous speed)

Fig. 16. Experimental result of the undamped HFR in the DFIG system when shunt capacitance $C_{SET} = 15$ μF in the weak grid network, $R_{SET} = 3$ mΩ, $L_{SET} = 1.5$ mH, rotor speed = 1700 rpm (super- synchronous speed)

Fig. 17. Experimental result of the undamped HFR in the DFIG system when shunt capacitance $C_{SET} = 10$ μF in the weak grid network, $R_{SET} = 3$ mΩ, $L_{SET} = 1.5$ mH, rotor speed = 1700 rpm (super- synchronous speed)
D. Simulation result of the unstable HFR

Simulations are done for the validation of the unstable HFR (which results in instability). The parameters of the simulated DFIG system are the same as the experimental one.

Before showing the simulation results of the unstable HFR, the results of the undamped HFR need to be shown in order to prove that the simulation model is identical with the experimental setup. Note that in order to save space in this paper, only the simulation results of the stator voltage and its FFT analysis will be provided with the network shunt capacitance $C_{NET} = 15, 10, 5 \, \mu F$ at sub- synchronous speed as shown in Fig. 19.

As it can be seen, the simulation results of stator voltage with different network shunt capacitance $C_{NET} = 15, 10, 5 \, \mu F$ contain the undamped HFR with different frequency and amplitude, i.e., the undamped HFR = 1410 Hz of 5.5% for the case of $C_{NET} = 15 \, \mu F$; the undamped HFR = 1610 Hz of 31.5% for the case of $C_{NET} = 10 \, \mu F$; the undamped HFR = 2215 Hz of 38.1% for the case of $C_{NET} = 5 \, \mu F$. By comparing the simulation results in Fig. 19 and the experimental results in Fig. 13 to Fig. 15 and Table II, it can be found out that the simulation results match well with the experimental results, thus it can be concluded that the simulation model of the DFIG system is identical to the experimental setup, thereby the simulation model can be adopted to validate the unstable HFR performance in the DFIG system when the small network shunt capacitance $C_{NET} = 3 \, \mu F$ is applied. This unstable HFR simulation results are shown in Fig. 20.

![Stator voltage FFT analysis when undamped HFR appears and $C_{NET} = 15 \, \mu F$](image1.png)

![Stator voltage FFT analysis when undamped HFR appears and $C_{NET} = 10 \, \mu F$](image2.png)

![Stator voltage FFT analysis when undamped HFR appears and $C_{NET} = 5 \, \mu F$](image3.png)

Fig. 18. Experimental result of the undamped HFR in the DFIG system when shunt capacitance $C_{NET} = 5 \, \mu F$ in the weak grid network, $R_{NET} = 3 \, m\Omega$, $L_{NET} = 1.5 \, mH$, rotor speed = 1700 rpm (super- synchronous speed)

Fig. 19. Simulation results of undamped HFR when shunt capacitance $C_{NET} = 15, 10, 5 \, \mu F$, $R_{NET} = 3 \, m\Omega$, $L_{NET} = 1.5 \, mH$ in the weak grid network, rotor speed = 1200 rpm (sub- synchronous speed) (a) stator voltage; (b) FFT analysis of the stator voltage.
This paper has investigated the amplitude of the undamped HFR (which exists in steady state) as well as the unstable HFR (which eventually results in instability) in the DFIG system under the parallel compensated weak network using the Nyquist Criterion method. Several conclusions can be obtained:

1) Compared with the conventional Bode diagram based analysis method, the proposed Nyquist Criterion analysis method can identify the HFR frequency and estimate the amplitude of the undamped HFR at the same time; moreover, it can also identify the occurrence of the unstable HFR.

2) The smaller network shunt capacitance $C_{\text{NET}}$ in the parallel compensated weak network results in a larger amplitude and higher frequency of the undamped HFR. In extreme cases, a smaller $C_{\text{NET}}$ may even cause the unstable HFR by encircling the (-1,0) with the Nyquist curve of $Z_{\text{NET}}/Z_{\text{SYS}}$.

3) The proportional parameters in the PI current controller in the RSC and GSC are relatively important to the amplitude of the undamped HFR, but not sensitive to the HFR frequency.

4) The rotor speed is not sensitive to the amplitude and frequency of the undamped HFR.

VI. CONCLUSION
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