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Abstract—The increasing power generation out of intermittent renewable energy sources will result in a reduction of the grid stability if no compensatory actions are taken. This issue may lead to future obligations for energy providers. This paper studies the implication of the future obligations for generators in Europe according to the recommendations of ENTSO-E, in particular the obligation for some generators to have a synthetic (or virtual) inertia and a frequency sensitive control. These obligations will be described in details in the paper, in particular their effect on the grid management and stability. The impact of this new actions on the energy production will be discussed. The continental European grid frequency is used as an example.

Keywords—Frequency Sensitive Control, Synthetic Inertia, Renewable Energy, Power Grid Vulnerability, Grid Integration

I. INTRODUCTION

The grid integration of some renewables (in particular those from intermittent primary sources) has always been a technical and political difficulty. The negative impact of renewable energy on the power grid resilience, especially from a frequency point of view, has been studied deeply [2], in particular in relative small grid (island) [3], [4].

Fig. 1. Share of wind and solar energy in the production for some ENTSO-E countries (inspired by [1])
The significant growth of these energies, in particular wind and solar (see Fig. 1), is forcing to find new solutions. Recently, special attention has been paid to the capability for renewable systems to participate in ancillary services [5]–[9].

Clearly, these studies have influenced the European Network of Transmission System Operators for Electricity (ENTSO-E) Grid code for generators connection requirements [10], specially concerning frequency regulation. The ENTSO-E represents 41 Transmission System Operators (TSOs) from 34 European countries. We will focus this paper on the description of two important part of this code: the frequency sensitive control and the synthetic inertia, in order to evaluate the implications of this grid code on the control of renewable based generators.

II. NOVEL OBLIGATIONS FOR GENERATORS

A. ENTSO-E Generators classification

ENTSO-E uses a classification of generators (A, B, C and D) according to their maximum capacity and the voltage of their connection point [10]. Typically, type A and B corresponds to small generators connected to the electric power distribution system and type C and D corresponds to large generators connected to the electric transmission system.

Each TSO must define these types according to the maximum threshold of Table I. Besides, all the generators connected at 110 kV or above are automatically of type D. The synchronous areas used in this table are illustrated in Fig. 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synchronous Area</th>
<th>Type B</th>
<th>Type C</th>
<th>Type D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continental Europe</td>
<td>1 MW</td>
<td>50 MW</td>
<td>75 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic</td>
<td>1.5 MW</td>
<td>10 MW</td>
<td>30 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>1.1 MW</td>
<td>5 MW</td>
<td>10 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.5 MW</td>
<td>10 MW</td>
<td>15 MW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Baltic            | 0.5 MW | 10 MW  | 15 MW  |

Clearly, these thresholds depend on the size in term of capacity of the synchronous area, as can be seen in Fig. 3. Since the Baltic area is synchronous connected with the IPS/UPS area (Integrated Power System/Unified Power System of Russia), the generating capacity of this area has been added to the Baltic countries. Obviously, the weaker grid is, the more generators are needed to participate to the frequency stability in these areas.

The new obligations for synthetic inertia and frequency sensitive control are just for the largest generators (type C and D) [12].
So we can rewrite (2) with this notation, and we have:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{2 H_{\text{total}}}{\omega} \frac{d\omega}{dt} &= \frac{P_g - P_l}{S_{\text{total}}} \\
\frac{2 H_{\text{total}}}{f} \frac{df}{dt} &= \frac{P_g - P_l}{S_{\text{total}}}
\end{align*}
\]  

(4)

(5)

The temporal derivative of the frequency \( \frac{df}{dt} \) is called Rate-Of-Change-Of-Frequency (RoCoF) in [Hz/s]. Some relays use this value to detect islanded operation. The typical incident case scenario corresponds to a case where a major unit of generation shut down with a low load. The relative original disbalance can have value from 1.7% (reference incident for the continental Europe) to 8% (Great Britain and Ireland). With typical value of \( H_{\text{total}} \) between 4 to 6 s \([13], [14]\), exceptional RoCoF values are between 70 mHz/s and 500 mHz/s for 50 Hz grids, depending on generators technologies and grid total capacity.

The power electronics allows static DC/AC conversion for photovoltaic power generation \([8], [15]\) and variable speed generation which is more suitable for the energy production optimization. Two architectures are mostly used: Doubly Fed Induction Generators (DFIG) \([16]\) and Fully-Fed (Induction or Synchronous) Generators (using back-to-back AC/DC/AC converters).

These architectures decouple the mechanical and electrical systems, thus preventing the generator from responding to system frequency changes like a traditional synchronous generator. Controls that allow inertia-like response have several name in the literature: synchronised WindINERTIA \([21]\) and ENERCON Inertia Emulation \([20]\) and for photovoltaic power generation \([8], [15]\) and Synthetic inertia. Such permanent reserve would result in a significant loss on energy production. So this reserve should be used only in some rare cases, only at the time the grid is the weaker (typically during low consumption periods).

\( C. \text{ Frequency Sensitive Control} \)

The frequency sensitive mode describes in the ENTSO-E code is a classical primary frequency control or frequency containment control. The control of this reserve \( \Delta P_c \) is proportional to the frequency deviation with a saturation effect:

\[
\Delta P_c = -P_{\text{max}} \text{sgn}(f - f_n) \min\left(\frac{|f - f_n|}{D \cdot f_n}, R_c\right)
\]  

\( (8) \)

with \( D \) the droop, \( R_c \) the containment reserve. All grid codes allow a deadband \( (db) \). If the deviation is inside this deadband, no power response is required. The recommended range for \( R_c \), \( D \) and \( db \) are given in Table II. The response time asked for this reserve is much less than for the inertia reserve: the maximum admissible initial delay is 2 s and the maximum admissible delay for full activation is 30 s.

\[ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Parameters} & \text{ENTSO-E} & \text{France} & \text{Great Britain} \\
\hline
\text{Reserve } R_c & 1.5-10\% & \geq 2.5\% & \geq 10\% \\
\text{Droop } D & 2-12\% & 3-16\% & 3-5\% \\
\text{Deadband } db & \pm 10-30 \text{mHz} & \pm 10 \text{mHz} & \pm 15 \text{mHz} \\
\hline
\end{array} \]
The actual French remuneration for the containment reserve is 9.16 €/MW/(1/2h): it is the availability of the reserve that is remunerated ($R_c$ at a half hour time step) [7]. Deload operation in order to provide reserve is economically interesting for a generator if the reserve remuneration is superior to the feed-in tariff. But official feed-in tariff for ocean energy in France for example (wave and tidal) is 150 €/MWh (more than 8 times superior than the reserve price). This raises the question of distinguishing ancillary services market and grid code requirement.

The actual Great Britain code proposes a non-symmetric frequency sensitive mode control, as can be seen in Fig. 4. Indeed, when no permanent deload is required by the TSO, the frequency containment service is used only in case of over-frequency.

![Figure 4](image-url)

**Fig. 4.** Two full load and two deload (or generation shedding) scenarios in the Great Britain grid code (inspired by [25])

### III. Studies

#### A. Test case of a major loss of production

The test case presented here is inspired by those presented for example in the following papers [7], [8], [26]. The main characteristics of this test case are presented in Table III. Such major frequency deviations come from a sudden imbalance, due to the loss of a large producer or a major line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial RoCoF</td>
<td>49.3 Hz/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency nadir (lowest frequency)</td>
<td>49.6 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady state frequency deviation</td>
<td>49.87 Hz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The architecture of the control is shown in Fig. 5. The blue part represents the synthetic inertia and the green part the sensitive frequency control (or containment control). The output is a power set-point which has to be added to the power output. The inertia synthesis has a 20 ms time constant with an inertia constant of 5 s and the containment control has a time constant of 3 s, a droop of 5% and a dead-band of ±10 mHz. Both are limited by a reserve of 10%, but this limit is not reached during our test case. These values are considered here as a typical example.

![Figure 5](image-url)

**Fig. 5.** Structure of the two controls (inertia and containment): example of an individual tidal turbine with a back-to-back AC/DC/AC converter

On this test case, we can see the complementary between the inertia response and the frequency sensitive response in Fig 6. Indeed, the inertia synthesis is very rapid and can help to limit the RoCoF value and the frequency nadir (lowest frequency). The containment control is much more slow, but helps to limit the frequency nadir and the steady-state frequency deviation.

It is also noticeable that the power fluctuations of each control can partially be compensated when added (fluctuations of the total curve compared to the inertia and containment curves).

#### B. Continental Europe frequency analysis

RTE published freely the frequency in the continental area with a time-step of 10 s since the 1st October 2014 [27]. We can see for example the frequency measured by RTE for three different days in Fig. 7.

So, we now can study one year of frequency deviation, from the 1st October 2014 to the 30th September
To the best of our knowledge, such big frequency data were not freely accessible so far, which prevented some work on the frequency control. This signal is shown in Fig. 8.

The tendency to have similar frequency deviations at the same hour appears to be very important. The autocorrelation study (Fig. 9) confirms this with a more important correlation for a day lag than for an hour lag. This hour periodicity is linked with the way the production is scheduled (at a one-hour time-step). Seasonal effects can also be seen, specially during the early morning (between 4 am and 6 am) and the evening (between 4 pm and 8 pm).

The analysis of the distribution shows a good fitting
Part of the production will be lost compared to the maximum power production. It depends on the use of the containment reserve during the considered period, so the expected value of the asymmetric use of the containment reserve during the considered period, so the expected value of the asymmetric use of the containment power will be used (\( E(\Delta P_c^+) \), with \( \Delta P_c^- \), the negative part of the containment reserve \( \Delta P_c \), described in (8)). The expected value of the symmetric and asymmetric use of the containment reserve is shown in Fig. 12.

The optimistic hypothesis is made that a non-symmetric reserve will be paid two times less than a symmetric reserve \((1/2 \times c_{fi})\). It will be noted that we consider a case where only the reserve availability is remunerated regardless of the dynamic or the droop. Part of the production will be lost compared to the maximum power production. It depends on the use of the containment reserve during the considered period, so the expected value of the asymmetric containment power will be used (\( E(\Delta P_c^+) \), with \( \Delta P_c^- \), the negative part of the containment reserve \( \Delta P_c \), described in (8)). The expected value of the symmetric and asymmetric use of the containment reserve is shown in Fig. 12.

Finally, the expected value of the income \( E(Inc) \), considering both reserve remuneration and energy loss,
is computed from this formulation:

\[ E(\text{Inc}) = \frac{1}{2} r c_{fi} P_{\text{max}} R_c + c_{fi} E(\Delta P_c^-(R_c, D)) \]  

The expected value in this case comes from the frequency data history.

This result can be normalized by \( c_{fi} P_{\text{max}} \):

\[ E \left( \frac{\text{Inc}}{c_{fi} P_{\text{max}}} \right) = \frac{1}{2} r R_c + E \left( \frac{\Delta P_c^-(R_c, D)}{P_{\text{max}}} \right) \]  

The result is shown in Fig. 13 for different values of \( D, R_c \) and \( r \).

\[ E \left( \frac{\text{Inc}}{c_{fi} P_{\text{max}}} \right) \approx (r - 1) R_c \]  

Indeed, the expected value of the containment reserve use in the symmetric case is near zero regardless the reserve size, the droop or the dynamic (see Fig. 12). Thus, the income of such symmetric reserve would be around -0.88%/% in the first case and -0.33%/% in the second case. This formula confirms that such symmetric reserve is economically interesting for an intermittent renewable generator only if the reserve tariff is superior to the feed-in tariff \( (r > 1) \).

**IV. CONCLUSION**

The future grid code for generators concerning the frequency control in the ENTSO-E area have been detailed and explained: from a certain capacity threshold (dependent of the synchronous area), generators must emulate a synthetic inertia and participate to the frequency containment control (called frequency sensitive control).

The control laws used to participate to the grid resilience have been detailed with typical value and some techno-economic comments. In particular, the capabilities of different intermittent energy technologies concerning inertia synthesis (including tidal energy) must be assessed in future works, similarly to what have been done for wind turbines [19], [29].

The complementary of these two controls is tested on a test case in order to verify the different dynamics and steady-state response.

At the end of the paper, we analyze one year of frequency data in order to assess the potential income of a asymmetric frequency containment control participation (on the understanding that classical symmetric containment control cannot be economically interesting if the reserve price is less than feed-in tariff). Within the hypotheses taken here, this seems to be economically interesting in lots of cases to participate to this reserve.

The frequency data used in this study concern only the Continental Europe, that is only one part of the ENTSO-E area. It could be interesting to use this method in the other synchronous area.

The comparison with the use of an energy storage system can also be interesting. Indeed, the decreasing
cost of Energy Storage Systems may lead to a more economical way to increase grid resilience compared to generation shedding.
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