Abstract—In this paper, first, the existing frequency and voltage amplitude restoration control strategies are reviewed. Moreover, the proposed second order washout filter control strategy is proposed to enhance the dynamic response under load disturbance. The physical parameter of the proposed method is derived, and system stability for the system parameter is discussed. Finally, extensive simulation results are provided to verify the effectiveness of the proposed method for UPS system.

Keywords—UPS; second order washout filter; secondary control

I. INTRODUCTION

The Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS) systems have recently experienced a large demand as the investment on the critical loads, such as: data center, financial institution, personal computers and healthcare facilities, is dramatically increased. These critical loads, which require reliable, secure and efficient power supply, are usually connected to the grid by the UPSs, since the UPSs are able to protect the critical loads from the power outages, surges and other issues from the grid [1].

According to the European Standard EN 62040-3[2], the UPS systems are categorized into on-line, off-line and line-interactive UPSs. The on-line UPS system is receiving more intention from the engineers and researchers because of its excellent capability of being immune to the grid frequency variation, voltage irregularity and other power issues.

Normally, an on-line UPS system consists of a rectifier, an inverter, a battery and a static bypass switch [3]. The rectifier is in charge of the power delivery from the utility to the DC link, and the inverter is responsible for the power transfer from the DC link to the critical load. Note that the battery is usually fully charged and operates in “standby” mode in the normal mode of operation. In case of overloading or UPS failure, the bypass switch needs to be closed and the load power is directly supplied by the utility. To achieve more reliable power supply to the sensitive loads, multiple inverters are operating together to supply the power to the critical load, as shown in Fig.1.

For the normal operation of the parallel UPS system, several control strategies have been adopted, such as the master-slave control [4], the average load sharing control [5], and the circular chain control to allow the inverter modules to share the active and reactive power of the load. However, in these methods, the intercommunication system is mandatory in the control strategy. In order to avoid the communication system, the wireless droop control [6] has been proposed to avoid the critical communication to achieve the active and reactive power sharing. However, the frequency and voltage amplitude deviation is inevitable in the steady state, and dynamic stability is poor for the power sharing. In order to deal with the above issue, the improved droop control strategy [7] have been proposed to realize the power decoupling and ensure system stability. However, the system stability model is incomplete without considering the voltage and current loop controller in the modeling.

Recently, the central or distributed secondary controller have been employed to compensate the frequency and voltage amplitude deviation [8-10]. In addition, the consensus-based secondary control strategy [11] is presented to achieve the accurate power sharing. With this control strategy, only the inverter’s own information and its neighbor’s information are needed. The multi-agent(MAS) [12], graph theory, and predictive control strategies [13] are adopted to improve the stability and accuracy of the power sharing under the complex environment. However, these methods usually adopts the low-bandwidth communication (LBC) lines, the output signals of these controller that sent to the primary control layer are always along with the time delay[14]. As a result, controller can not have fast response that degrades the system performance.

In order to overcome the time delay effect of the LBC line, several works have been presented, and among these works, a model predictive and smith predictor-based control strategy [15] is implemented to reduce the influence of delay caused by the LBC lines. In [14], the gain schedule method is implemented to minimize the delay’s effect. However, the complicated strategy decreased the reliability and stability of the system. Recently, the first order washout filter (FOWF)-based control strategy[16,17] is proposed in the primary control layer to recover the frequency and the amplitude deviation caused by the droop control strategy. This control strategy is demonstrated to be equivalent to the
Proportional-Integral (PI) controller-based secondary control strategy. However, in [16, 17], the system dynamic response under the load disturbance is still quite slow, which may not satisfy the requirement of sensitive loads in the UPS system. As the small frequency and the amplitude deviation along with the fast restoration are required for the UPS system.

In this paper, first, the equivalent model between the FOWF and the secondary control strategy is reviewed. In order to increase system dynamic response, a Second Order Washout Filter (SOWF) based control strategy will be proposed, the equivalence between the secondary control with lead filter and the SOWF-based control strategy is verified by the analysis. Furthermore, the analysis of critical parameter for the SOWF control strategy on the system stability is discussed. The feasibility and effectiveness of the proposed method are validated by the simulation.

II. REVIEW OF EXISTING METHODS

In the parallel UPS system, the secondary control strategy is adopted to restore the frequency and the voltage amplitude deviation caused by the droop control strategy. When the LC type output filter is applied in the UPS system, the \( Q - \omega \), P-E control strategy is implemented for the active and reactive power sharing and expressed as:

\[
\omega = \omega^* + D_Q (Q_{LPF} - Q^*)
\]

(1)

\[
E = E^* - D_P (P_{LPF} - P^*)
\]

(2)

where \( \omega^* \) and \( \omega \) are the UPS nominal and reference angular frequency, \( E^* \) and \( E \) are the UPS nominal and reference voltage amplitude. \( D_P \) and \( D_Q \) are the droop coefficients for regulating the UPS active power and reactive power, respectively. \( Q^* \) and \( P^* \) are the reactive and active power reference, respectively. Normally, these references are set to be zero.

A. Secondary control strategy

The droop control strategy manages to regulate the frequency and the voltage amplitude for the voltage reference to achieve the active and reactive power sharing. However, the amplitude and frequency may deviate from its nominal value when applying the droop control strategy, and these deviations may thus be harmful to the sensitive critical load. Moreover, the influence of the disturbances, such as the load connection/disconnection leads to the poor dynamic stability of active power sharing. Hence, in order to deal with the above mentioned issue in the traditional droop control strategy, a secondary control strategy has been adopted to recover the frequency and voltage amplitude of the UPS system and improve the system stability. The details of the secondary control strategy is illustrated in Fig.2, where a low bandwidth communication among the UPS modules are implemented to share frequency and voltage amplitude. In the secondary control layer, the PI controller are used to respectively recover the frequency and voltage amplitude deviation and expressed as:

\[
\omega_{sec} = G_{\omega,sec}(\omega^* - \omega)
\]

(3)

\[
E_{sec} = G_{E,sec}(E^* - E)
\]

(4)

where \( G_{\omega,sec} = k_{pwa} + \frac{k_{iwa}}{s} \), \( G_{E,sec} = k_{pE} + \frac{k_{iE}}{s} \), and \( k_{pwa} \) and \( k_{iwa} \) are the control parameters of the PI compensator in the frequency restoration. \( k_{pE} \) and \( k_{iE} \) are the control parameters of the PI compensator in the voltage amplitude restoration. The output of the PI controller \( \omega_{sec} \) and \( E_{sec} \) are sent to the droop control strategy in the primary control layer to restore the nominal voltage frequency and amplitude value. Note that the secondary control strategy requires all the UPS modules to communicate with each other. However, due to the communication lost, and delay’s effect in the low bandwidth communication system, accurate reactive power sharing and fast dynamic response of the system may be not achieved. Recently, the washout filter based control strategy is proposed for restoration of the frequency and voltage amplitude. And it shows the effective way to compensate the frequency and voltage amplitude deviation. In the next section, the washout filter based control strategy will be reviewed.

![Fig.2. Complete block diagram of the UPS system with the secondary control.](image-url)
B. Washout filter based control strategy.

In order to eliminate the delay’s effect on the low bandwidth communication system when restoring the frequency and voltage amplitude deviation, a washout filter based power sharing strategy has been proposed to share the active and reactive power sharing. The principle is illustrated as follows: by time derivative of (1) and (2), the following equations are obtained:

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \Delta \omega - D_q \frac{d}{dt} \Delta Q = 0 \tag{5}
\]

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \Delta Q + D_q \frac{d}{dt} \Delta P = 0 \tag{6}
\]

where \( \Delta \omega = \omega - \omega^* \), \( \Delta Q = Q_{LF} - Q^* \), \( \Delta E = E - E^* \), \( \Delta P = P_{LF} - P^* \).

By adding a factor of \( \Delta \omega \) in (5) and \( \Delta E \) in (6), the following equations are derived and expressed as:

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \Delta \omega - D_q \frac{d}{dt} \Delta Q + k_Q \Delta \omega = 0 \tag{7}
\]

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \Delta E + D_q \frac{d}{dt} \Delta P + k_P \Delta E = 0 \tag{8}
\]

In the steady state, the derivative terms of (7) and (8) are zero, which means \( \frac{d}{dt} \Delta \omega = 0, \frac{d}{dt} \Delta Q = 0, \frac{d}{dt} \Delta E = 0, \frac{d}{dt} \Delta P = 0 \).

Therefore, (7) and (8) forces \( \Delta \omega \) and \( \Delta E \) to be zero in the steady state, which indicates that the voltage amplitude and the frequency restore to its nominal value. When (7) and (8) are expressed in s-domain, they are expressed as:

\[
\omega = \omega^* + D_q \frac{s}{s+s_kQ} (Q_{LF} - Q^*) \tag{9}
\]

\[
E = E^* - D_p \frac{s}{s+s_kP} (P_{LF} - P^*) \tag{10}
\]

where \( k_P \) and \( k_Q \) are the control parameters of the washout filter. By using the washout filter control strategy, secondary controller can be replaced with the washout filter to recover the frequency and voltage amplitude.

However, with the first order washout filter based control strategy, the system response under disturbance is still quite slow, which may not satisfy the requirement for sensitive loads in the UPS system that needs small frequency and amplitude deviation and fast restoration. Therefore, a SOWF-based control strategy is presented in this section to further improve the system dynamic response.

III. SECOND ORDER WASHOUT FILTER CONTROL STRATEGY

The complete control diagram of each UPS module is shown in Fig.3, where it is seen that the outer loop voltage controller is adopted for regulating the output filter’s capacitor voltage, and the current control strategy is nested inside the voltage regulation loop to directly control the inductor’s current and limit the current during the transient as a protection method. Finally, the proposed SOWF-based control strategy is implemented for voltage and frequency restoration to replace the secondary control strategy. In the following part, the SOWF strategy will be illustrated in detail.

The proposed SOWF-based control strategy is shown as:

\[
\omega = \omega^* + D_q \frac{s}{s+s_kQ} (Q_{LF} - Q^*) \tag{11}
\]

\[
E = E^* - D_p \frac{s}{s+s_kP} (P_{LF} - P^*) \tag{12}
\]

where \( D_p \) and \( D_q \) are the droop coefficient, \( A_{\omega} \), \( B_{\omega} \) and \( C_{\omega} \) are the SOWF frequency parameter, \( A_E \), \( B_E \) and \( C_E \) are the SOWF voltage amplitude parameter. By implementing the proposed control strategy, the secondary control strategy is omitted and the communication delays caused by low bandwidth communication (LBC) line is solved. The relationship between the SOWF control strategy and secondary PI control strategy will be analyzed in the following of this section.

Normally, the secondary control strategy that consists of a PI controller is derived as:

\[
\omega_{sec} = G_{\omega,sec} G_d (\omega^* - \omega) \tag{13}
\]


\[ E_{sec} = G_{E,sec}G_d(E^* - E) \]  

where \( G_{\omega,sec} = k_p + \frac{k_{ia}}{s} \), \( G_{E,sec} = k_p + \frac{k_{ie}}{s} \), \( G_d = e^{-Ts} = \frac{1}{1+T_d s} \) is defined as the LBC line delay. Moreover, the traditional droop control strategy with secondary control are expressed as:

\[ \omega = \omega^* + D_q G_{LPF}(s)q + \omega_{sec} \]  

\[ E = E^* - D_p G_{LPF}(s)p + E_{sec} \]

where \( G_{LPF} \) is the low pass filter, \( P = G_{LPF}(s)p \), \( Q = G_{LPF}(s)q \), \( p \) and \( q \) are instantaneous power. By combining (13) and (15), (14) and (16) respectively, the following expression is derived:

\[ \omega = \omega^* + D_q G_{LPF}(s) \left( \frac{1}{1+G_{E,sec}G_d} \right) q \]

\[ E = E^* - D_p G_{LPF}(s) \left( \frac{1}{1+G_{E,sec}G_d} \right) p \]

In the secondary control, in order to compensate for the delay’s effect, ideally, the lead filter \( G_d^* = 1 + T_d s \) should be adopted, which is expressed as:

\[ \omega = \omega^* + D_q G_{LPF}(s) \left( \frac{1}{1+G_{E,sec}G_d(1+T_d s)} \right) q \]

\[ E = E^* - D_p G_{LPF}(s) \left( \frac{1}{1+G_{E,sec}G_d(1+T_d s)} \right) p \]

However, in reality, the actual delay is unknown, but from a practical view of point, the delay is ranged from hundreds of millisecond to second. Therefore, \( T_d \) is usually chosen as 0.1–1. Finally, as the SOWF is implemented in primary control, the unknown delay \( G_d \) is neglected and expressed as \( G_d = 1 \). Therefore, the second-order washout filter is derived as:

\[ \omega = \omega^* + D_q G_{LPF}(s) \left( \frac{1}{1+k_p s + \frac{k_{ia}}{s}(1+T_d s)} \right) q \]

\[ E = E^* - D_p G_{LPF}(s) \left( \frac{1}{1+k_p s + \frac{k_{ie}}{s}(1+T_d s)} \right) p \]

where \( A_\omega = k_p T_d \), \( B_\omega = 1 + k_p + k_p T_d \), \( C_\omega = k_{ia} \)

IV. STABILITY OF THE PROPOSED METHOD

In this section, the system stability is analyzed with the proposed SOWF-based control strategy. In the following section, the washout parameter will be explored to see the frequency restoration process and voltage amplitude restoration process.

For the SOWF frequency droop control strategy, the dynamic model between \( \omega \) and reactive power \( Q \) is expressed as:

\[ \frac{Q}{\omega} = D_q \left( \frac{1}{1+k_p s + \frac{k_{ia}}{s}(1+T_d s)} \right) \]

The pole-zero map under the different control parameter is presented in Fig.4. As is seen from Fig.4 (a), when the \( k_p \) increases from 0.1 to 4, one dominant pole moves to the right but converges into a stable point that still have distance from the imaginary axis. Another pole moves to the right as well. As this pole is quite far from the imaginary axis, its influence on the stability of the system is neglected. Meanwhile, \( k_{ia} \) increases from 0.1 to 4. One pole moves into the left-infinity, the other dominant pole move towards to the left as well but converges into a stable point (see Fig.4 (b)). Finally, the parameter \( T_d \) varies from 0.1 to 2, as is seen from Fig.4 (c), both of these two poles move to a stable point. From above analysis, it is found that in order to have a good performance for SOWF controller, \( k_p \) should be chosen between 0.2–0.5, \( k_{ia} \) is chosen greater than 4. And \( T_d \) is chosen to be less than 0.5.
In this section, the dynamic response for the SOWF based control strategy will be compared with the secondary controller with LBC delay, and FOWF based control strategy that was proposed in [16].

The system parameters are shown in Table I. It is noted that parameter of $k_{PE}$, $k_{IE}$, $k_{pu}$, and $k_{iu}$ are chosen the same parameter for these three methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE I. SYSTEM PARAMETERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System Parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter Inductor $L_f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESR of Inductor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter Capacitor $C_f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droop Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency droop $D_f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voltage droop $D_v$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voltage Control Parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportional gain $K_{pe}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resonant gain $K_{ri}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current controller Parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportional $K_{pu,i}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resonant gain $K_{iu}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The performance of the secondary control strategy that is applied to the UPS system is shown in Fig.5. In this control strategy, two sample delay is applied for the secondary control. Initially, the two UPS modules are providing the active power ($6.5\text{kW}$) and reactive power ($10\text{kVar}$) to the load 1. As is seen from Fig.5 (c) and (d), at $0.3\text{s}$ when the Load 2 is connected with Load 1, it takes over $1.5\text{s}$ for the frequency recovery during the transient time. Moreover, the frequency deviate from $314.16$ rad/s to $314.18$ rad/s during the transient time. Meanwhile, the voltage amplitude recovery time takes around $0.7\text{s}$, and voltage amplitude drops $0.5\text{V}$ from the nominal value during the transient process.
When the SOWF is applied for frequency and voltage amplitude restoration, as is shown in Fig. 7, at 3s, the restoration time for frequency is greatly reduced from around 0.7s to less than 0.1s. Moreover, the frequency fluctuation is further dropped to 0.005Hz as well (Fig. 7 (c) and (d)). In addition, the voltage amplitude recovery time is less than 0.1s and amplitude deviation is less than 0.1V (Fig. 7 (e) and (f)) that is in contrast with the previous two methods. Finally, it is noted that due to the immunity of LBC delay, FOWF and SOWF can both achieve frequency and voltage amplitude restoration without communication lines. However, the dynamic response is significantly improved for SOWF.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, the second order washout filter based strategy is proposed to increase the dynamic response under load disturbance. Compared with the existing method, the SOWF control strategy by adding a lead filter dramatically enhance the dynamic response under load. Simulation results validate the effectiveness of the proposed methods.
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