



---

---

# European Research Infrastructure supporting Smart Grid Systems Technology Development, Validation and Roll Out

## Technical Report TA User Project **TEAM-VAR**

---

Grant Agreement No:	654113
Funding Instrument:	<b>Research and Innovation Actions (RIA) – Integrating Activity (IA)</b>
Funded under:	<b>INFRAIA-1-2014/2015: Integrating and opening existing national and regional research infrastructures of European interest</b>
Starting date of project:	<b>01.11.2015</b>
Project Duration:	<b>54 month</b>

---

Contractual delivery date:	43100.96
Actual delivery date:	43100.96
Name of lead beneficiary for this deliverable:	Saverio Bolognani / ETH Zurich
Deliverable Type:	Report (R)
Security Class:	Public (PU)
Revision / Status:	released

**Document Information**

Document Version: 1  
Revision / Status: draft

**All Authors/Partners**

Saverio Bolognani / ETH Zurich  
Adrian Hauswirth / ETH Zurich  
Ivo Caduff / ETH Zurich

**Distribution List****Document History**

Revision	Content / Changes	Resp. Partner	Date
1	First report draft	ETHZ	15.12.17

**Document Approval**

Final Approval	Name	Resp. Partner	Date
Partner Level Review	Daniel Esteban Morales Bondy	DTU	08.01.2018
WP-level review	Kai Heussen	DTU	04.02.2019

**Disclaimer**

This document contains material, which is copyrighted by certain ERIGrid consortium parties and may not be reproduced or copied without permission. The information contained in this document is the proprietary confidential information of certain ERIGrid consortium parties and may not be disclosed except in accordance with the consortium agreement.

The commercial use of any information in this document may require a licence from the proprietor of that information.

Neither the ERIGrid consortium as a whole, nor any single party within the ERIGrid consortium warrant that the information contained in this document is capable of use, nor that the use of such information is free from risk. Neither the ERIGrid consortium as a whole, nor any single party within the ERIGrid consortium accepts any liability for loss or damage suffered by any person using the information.

This document does not represent the opinion of the European Community, and the European Community is not responsible for any use that might be made of its content.

**Copyright Notice**

© The ERIGrid Consortium, 2015 – 2020

## Table of contents

Executive Summary .....	5
1 General Information of the User Project .....	6
2 Research Motivation .....	7
2.1 Objectives .....	7
2.2 Scope .....	7
3 State-of-the-Art/State-of-Technology .....	7
4 Executed Tests and Experiments.....	7
4.1 Test Plan .....	7
4.2 Standards, Procedures, and Methodology .....	7
4.3 Test Set-up(s) .....	7
4.4 Data Management and Processing .....	7
5 Results and Conclusions.....	7
6 Open Issues and Suggestions for Improvements .....	7
7 Dissemination Planning .....	7
8 References .....	7
9 Annex .....	7
9.1 List of Figures .....	7
9.2 List of Tables .....	7
9.3 Annex x.....	7
9.4 Annex y.....	7

## Abbreviations

<i>DER</i>	Distributed Energy Resource
<i>TA</i>	Trans-national Access

## Executive Summary

Future power distribution networks will be characterized by distributed and intermittent microgeneration, charging facilities for a widespread electric mobility infrastructure, and increased overall demand subject to strict reliability specifications. Grid congestion is expected to occur increasingly often, and the operational constraints of the grid (e.g. over- and under- voltage limits) will become a bottleneck to the efficient implementation of this transition.

An extremely promising avenue consists in exploiting the electronic power converters available at every micro generator as a finely distributed network of reactive power compensators. If properly controlled, these devices have the potential of regulating the feeder voltage profile, increasing grid efficiency, and ultimately extending its hosting capacity without any structural reinforcement.

Purely local real-time control strategies for these devices have been proposed and are getting incorporated in grid codes and industrial practice, given their modularity and their simple deployment. Fully centralized solutions, where a central control units has access to the entire system state and can dispatch optimal reactive power set-points to each device, are deemed as non-scalable and impractical, due to the large amount of real-time communication that they require.

The proponent of this project has recently shown that purely local strategies are provably suboptimal: they might fail to drive these devices to reactive power set-points that guarantee satisfaction of the voltage limits, even if such feasible set-points exist. Moreover, he showed that optimality can be recovered by just adding a minimal amount of peer-to-peer communication between these power converters, without any monitoring of the load demands or of the grid state.

The proposed research aimed at giving a proof-of-concept demonstration of this fundamental result in a real test feeder, i.e., a portion of distribution grid that hosts both micro generators and fluctuating loads. Different (local / distributed / centralized) real-time reactive power compensation strategies have been tested in order to obtain an exhaustive characterization of the trade-off between communication complexity and performance.

Multiple conclusions can be drawn based on the collected data:

- even in a relatively simple and small distribution feeder, power generation from renewable sources (wind and solar) may need to be curtailed because of overvoltage contingencies, especially when the grid is not loaded;
- the fluctuating voltage at the point of connection to the MV grid introduces the need for relatively fast-tracking performance in the voltage regulation problem;
- as predicted, purely local controllers can barely mitigate this problem; the reactive power capability of the generators that experience overvoltage are generally limited and insufficient to regulate the voltage;
- model-based approaches, based on the centralized solution of an ORPF problem, has limited applicability because of the model uncertainty and measurements errors;
- networked solutions exhibit the cooperative behaviour that was expected, therefore unleashing the full potential of a distributed network of reactive power compensators;
- parameter tuning of the networked controllers proved to be more challenging than their purely local counterparts, and to be a practical impediment to a plug-and-play deployment of this control solution.

## 1 General Information of the User Project

### User Project

User Project Acronym	TEAM-VAR
User Project Title	Networked feedback control of distributed energy resources for real-time voltage regulation
ERIGRID reference	01.001-2016
TA Call no.	1
Main scientific/technical field	Distributed control
Keywords	Voltage regulation, distributed control, cyber-physical system, networked systems, distributed energy resource integration
Start date	08.10.2017
End date	05.11.2017
Number of access days	28
Number of stay days	29

### Access provider

Name	Department of Electrical Engineering Technical University of Denmark (DTU)
Installation	PowerLabDK / SYSLAB
Country	Denmark

### User group

Name	Saverio Bolognani
Position	Senior researcher
Organization	ETH Zurich
Country	Switzerland
Name	Adrian Hauswirth
Position	Ph.D. student
Organization	ETH Zurich
Country	Switzerland
Name	Ivo Caduff
Position	Master student
Organization	ETH Zurich
Country	Switzerland

## 2 Research Motivation

Future power systems will be characterized by a large penetration of renewable energy sources, typically characterized by intermittent and partially unpredictable behaviour. As an aggregate, these sources have already happened to cover three quarters (and more) of the total power demand of a regional grid. One of the main challenges connected to this shift is that the vast majority of these sources are connected to the distribution grid, rather than the transmission grid where traditional generation takes place.

Meanwhile, technological advances and policy changes driven by environmental concerns are promoting the widespread adoption of plug-in electric vehicles in the near future. The charging stations of these vehicles will introduce an unprecedented power demand on the distribution grids, because of their peak power consumption and of their unique spatial-temporal patterns.

It is believed that current power distribution networks will need a structural reinforcement in order to host these new classes of consumers while ensuring that the complex physical constraints of the grid (voltage limits, power line capacity, voltage stability) are satisfied.

This project challenges such ideas.

It contributes to the development of control strategies for the real-time actuation of the grid based on the measurements obtained from a distributed sensing infrastructure, exploiting the unused flexibility of the available power converters.

### 2.1 Objectives

The project aims at validating a control approach that departs from both the traditional model-based optimization that is currently employed for the management of power systems, and from the simplistic, purely local, control strategies which have been recently proposed in the literature, and have even appeared in grid code drafts. It is a real-time feedback strategy, therefore robust against parametric uncertainty and unmodeled disturbances, and superior with the respect to dynamic control loop performance. Most importantly, it is a networked strategy, i.e., it enables coordination and cooperation between the different converters, in order to drive their operation to an optimal configuration in which all voltage constraints are satisfied.

The experiments proposed in this project have the potential of validating, in a proof-of-concept prototype, a two-fold fundamental claim:

1. Communication between converters is necessary for effective voltage regulation
2. Scalable distributed communication architectures are as good as centralized ones

These results have far-reaching implications, in terms of specifications for the design of smart distribution grid infrastructures. In line with ERIGRID goals, this project shows how it is possible (and necessary) to analyse and evaluate the complex interactions that emerge in these cyber-physical systems.

From a technological point of view, the results of this project will provide sound underpinnings to the engineering on the communication architecture of this new generation of distribution grids. As of today, many competing solutions are being considered, but a rigorous analysis of the implications of these choices for the overall performance, reliability, and efficiency, of these systems is often overlooked. This project shows how this analysis is possible, and how it should be performed.

Ultimately, the scientific and technological results of this project will contribute to the development of methodologies and tools for the virtual reinforcement of distribution grids, yielding larger hosting capacity via an efficient use of the available physical infrastructure, removing the bottlenecks for larger diffusion of electric mobility, higher penetration of distributed microgeneration from traditional and renewable sources, and superior grid reliability.

## 2.2 Scope

The project's scope spans different domains: the local control of power converters, the sensing infrastructure, the algorithmic aspects of a network-wide control strategy, and the communication layer that allows exchange of information between individual units.

As the experiments aims at identifying the fundamental trade-off between control performance and communication complexity, it will mostly focus on the ICT (communication and control) domain. It is assumed that local DERs can accept reactive power set-points from the control algorithm under test, and that accurate voltage measurement are available both for feedback control and for monitoring/logging purposes.

The low-level control of different devices (batteries, PV panels, converters, etc.) that allows the device to inject the commanded reactive power reference is outside the scope of the project.

State estimation is outside the scope of the project, as complete observability of the grid state is guaranteed by the redundant sensor architecture.

The communication strategy (and in particular whether communication between DERS is allowed) is within the scope of the project, while the communication protocol and implementation is not.

### 3 State-of-the-Art

Traditionally, the main task of the power distribution grid was to deliver power from the transmission grid to the consumers, in a mono-directional fashion. Proper operation of these grids has therefore been mostly a planning/design problem (*fit-and-forget*) for the distribution network operator, based on a worst-case analysis of the power demand. However, today's power distribution grid is witnessing unprecedented challenges [1][2][3] including a large penetration of distributed micro generators from renewable power sources and a larger diffusion of electric mobility.

Because of that, a fit-and-forget approach will not suffice any more. In particular, the voltage profile of low and medium voltage networks is affected by these bidirectional active power flows, and both overvoltage and under voltage conditions are expected to happen increasingly often.

An avenue that is currently being explored consists in providing micro generators with sensing and computation capabilities, and to exploit the flexibility of their power electronic interface to inject (or draw) reactive power from the grid. If properly controlled, these devices can act as a **finely distributed network of reactive power compensators**.

Because of the lack of full state monitoring of the distribution grid, most of the efforts towards reactive power control for voltage regulation have focused on **purely local feedback strategies**. According to these strategies, the reactive power injection of the power inverter is adjusted based on real time measurements that can be performed at the point of connection of the power inverter to the grid [4]. Different variations have been proposed. In most cases, the reactive power reference is computed as a static function of the measured voltage amplitude, often with a dead band and/or saturation [5]. Since the former strategies could lead to oscillatory behaviours, smoother incremental algorithms have been also proposed [6][7]. In some strategies, the static feedback is complemented by a feedforward term, function of the local active and reactive power demand [8]. In other works, the authors build a separable cost function and then perform a gradient projected descend, until they reach the equilibrium [9]. Finally, a local incremental controller has been proposed in [10]. Purely local reactive power control strategies have also been considered for inclusion in the latest revisions of some distribution grid codes [11][12].

At the complete opposite of the spectrum, in terms of communication complexity, we can find **centralized solutions** which directly descend from widely adopted (and well understood) optimal power flow (OPF) techniques used by transmission grid operators. In fact, if the entire state of the distribution grid is monitored in real-time and is promptly available to a central controller, it is possible to formulate a large-scale optimization problem to compute the best set-points for the reactive power injection of each micro generator. The literature on the application of OPF tools to distribution grids is quite vast, and a recent review is available in [13][14]. OPF-based solutions can be considered as benchmark strategies, as they return – by definition – the optimal working point of the grid, at the cost of complete communication and exact knowledge of the system state.

In a very recent paper by the proponent of this project [15], it has been shown that purely local strategies are provably suboptimal. In other words, given a distribution grid, it is possible to construct practical cases in which the voltage regulation problem is feasible (i.e., there exists a solution to the OPF problem), but purely local controllers would fail to drive the grid to that solution. This result introduces a **fundamental trade-off** between communication complexity and control performance, and the aforementioned strategies lie in opposite corners, as depicted in the figure. A crucial question is therefore the following: **“How does this communication-performance trade-off look like?”**

In particular, a rigorous understanding of what performance can be achieved with a minimal, but strategic, amount of communication, is still largely missing. Networked control strategies for voltage regulation




Figure 1: Tradeoff chart in performance / communication complexity domain



have been proposed (see for example the references in [16]), but they still have not found their position in this communication-performance plane. Given the technological implications of this assessment, answering this question is a timely and relevant goal in this field.

## 4 Executed Tests and Experiments

### 4.1 Test Plan

The experiments were executed as stated in the description of the project, in order to have a structured way to approach the problem in the available time frame. The whole investigation was organized into three sub-experiments.

#### Experiment 1 – Benchmark scenario

The goal of this experiment is to identify a benchmark, i.e., a grid topology and possibly a profile for the controllable power injections (battery), so that, in the presence of typical generation and power demand patterns, and with no reactive power injection at the power inverters, under- and/or over-voltage phenomena are observed. On the other hand, for the same benchmark, there must be a profile of reactive power set-points for the power converters that yield an acceptable voltage profile.

#### Experiment 2 – Suboptimal local Volt/VAR control

A set of local reactive power control algorithms was run in Experiment 2. The goal of this experiment is to validate the fact that purely local reactive power control policies (i.e. based on local voltage and reactive power measurements, without communication) cannot regulate the feeder voltage profile to the desired level, even if the problem is feasible (that is, there exist reactive power set-points for the power converters that achieve so). In order to fairly assess the capabilities of different local controller, it is necessary to tune the parameters of each of these controllers in order to observe their expected best behaviour.

#### Experiment 3 – Networked Volt/VAR control

The goal of this experiment is to show how a networked feedback control law, in which the reactive power injection of each converter is controlled based on both local voltage measurements and information coming from other converters, can perform practically as good as the benchmark ORPF solution. The networked controller from [15] has been selected as a candidate towards this goal, although different networked controller can also be tested. Each of these controllers have to be tuned and run in voltage scenarios as similar as possible to the ones for the purely local controllers.

*Table 1: Planned and actual experiment schedule. Experiment 3 was started earlier than expected because of a nice weather window. On the contrary, it was necessary to repeat a couple of measurements of Experiment 2 at a later stage.*

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4
<b>Planned Experiment</b>	1	2	3	3
<b>Actual Experiment</b>	1	2/3	2/3	3

### 4.2 Standards, Procedures, and Methodology

Multiple tasks preceded the actual experiments. These tasks consisted of

- designing a candidate test grid topology
- implementing the desired test grid topology in the test system
- completing the software interface between the centralized MATLAB controller and the low-

- level java code which controls the components directly
- validating a grid model and programming a grid simulator in order to reproduce and compare measurements to simulations.

During the three experiments, the relevant configuration (no control, local control, networked control) was implemented and executed for repeated time windows of 10 to 15 minutes. Time series of all the relevant grid quantities (voltage, active and reactive power) at all the components' connection to the grid and at every bus bar were collected in a centralized location. The controller (when present) was implemented in a centralized Matlab instance, where set points for all the reactive power compensators were computed in 2 second intervals.


In order to induce the mentioned voltage violation, the active power injection at the end of the feeder was set to a constant value depending on the grid connection voltage. Also, overvoltage bounds were redefined for every test run in order to fulfil the desired expectations.

### 4.3 Test Set-up(s)

The following is a brief overview of the grid components and the grid topology.

Component	Controllable	$P_{max}[kW]$	$lim \quad [kVAr]$ $Q$
PV 1	Yes	10	$\pm 6$
PV 2	Yes	10	$\pm 6$
PV 3	Yes	10	$\pm 6$
Vanadium redox battery	Yes	15	$\pm 10$
Gaia wind turbine	No	12	-
Grid connection	No	-	-


Using the components in Table 1 a simple linear feeder was created by using the remote tool for breaker operation. The base case in order to show the benefits of the proposed controller, consists of at least two nodes with devices that can control reactive power. In order to show the benefits of a controller with communication, only the devices at the end of the feeder should register a voltage violation and react to it whereas the voltage at the device close to the grid connection is within the bounds.



The grid topology used during the experiments is depicted above in simplified manner. At node 1 a large amount of active power is generated, which has to be evacuated via grid connection at node 3 causing a large voltage gradient along the feeder. The devices at node 2 are passive, meaning that they do not inject any active power. Since node 1 & 2 are separated by a rather long line/weak connection and the connection between 2 & 3 is short/strong, nodes 2 & 3 will be at a similar voltage, while the voltage at node 1 will be significantly higher.

This deliberately simple grid topology allows to maintain a complete understanding of the fundamental reasons that prevent local controller from being effective, and has in fact been the topology of choice also in [15], where the need for communication in voltage regulation problems was first demonstrated. To ensure consistency in the results, this grid topology and the described voltage behaviour in the grid were used to test all of the control algorithms.

MATLAB was used as a central controlling unit. All the measurements were brought in, control outputs computed and then sent to the grid devices via java interface. The whole java platform was already in place and used in many different experiments before this one, whereas the MATLAB controllers were implemented specifically for the ongoing investigation. For the purely local controllers, the controllers were run independently for every device in the grid not knowing the status of any other component. For the networked controller, neighbouring voltage conditions were considered in order to compute the new reactive power set point.



#### 4.4 Data Management and Processing


An architecture for data collection and archiving was already in place, and allowed logging of all the measurements from all components and bus bars in 1 second intervals. These measurements range from the typical grid state measurements like voltage and current to individual component measurements like wind speed for the wind turbine or SOC for the battery.

These measurements were simultaneously available for real-time control, and saved in a HDD file, facilitating post-experiment visualisation of the grid states and of the control sequences, and also enabling verification of the results against the grid simulator.

A typical data series is represented in figure.

Ultimately, the data series from each experiment (either with no control, local control, or networked control) need to be compared with the benchmark solution resulting from the solution of an offline OPF program, in order to assess the optimality gap of each strategy.

This work is still in progress, as it first requires the validation of the grid model based on the data collected on site.



## 5 Results and Conclusions

The following experiment-specific results can be reported at this time, before an accurate analysis of the recorded experiments is completed.

### Experiment 1

- A suitable scenario (i.e. grid topology, power generation set points, loading) capable of inducing overvoltage contingencies (and therefore, indirectly, curtailment of renewable generation) was identified. A deliberately simple grid configuration was selected in order to highlight the complete generality of this phenomenon, and to provide a benchmark for the rest of the experiments. This benchmark is also valuable *per se*, as an example of distribution grid *congestion* to be made publicly available.
- Parametric uncertainty for individual devices and measurement errors at the sensors made the calibration of a grid simulator more challenging than expected. This observation implies that the use of accurate grid models for model-based real-time operation of the grid should be considered impractical in most application cases.
- The grid at each bus in the network was equally affected by the local power flows (and therefore loading and generation in the feeder) and by the fluctuating voltage at the point of grid connection. Preliminary data analysis confirmed that this voltage fluctuation is exogenous, and therefore to be considered as an external disturbance that makes the voltage regulation problem a tracking problem.

### Experiment 2

- Local controllers were generally simple to tune, but most of the time ineffective. As predicted in the preparation of the experiments, the reactive power capability of individual devices is often insufficient to regulate its voltage, and therefore the control action will often saturate at the maximum allowed set point. Integral and proportional-integral strategies didn't exhibit any relevant difference in performance.

### Experiment 3

- Two networked algorithms have been tested: the one proposed in [15] and the Method of

Multipliers. The computational complexity of both methods was minimal, and compatible with the available communication infrastructure and time sampling.

- Networked solutions exhibit the cooperative behaviour that was expected, therefore unleashing the full potential of a distributed network of reactive power compensators; DERs which were not experiencing overvoltage were commanded to inject power based on the information shared by other devices which could observe a voltage contingency (but were not able to counteract it).
- Parameter tuning of both networked controllers proved to be more challenging than their purely local counterparts. This has to be interpreted as a complexity dimension that was not fully predicted in the preparation of the experiments, but clearly affect the practicality of networked solutions. This observation suggests that the design of plug-and-play (self-tuning) strategies should be prioritized in order to enable the deployment of these solutions.

## 6 Open Issues and Suggestions for Improvements

A few unanticipated issues appeared in the implementation of Experiments 2 and 3, leaving some open questions to be addressed in the near future.

- Tuning the parameters of local and networked control strategies proved to be harder than expected, and definitely more complicated than what most of the current literature suggests. The level of complexity required in the deployment of these controllers is a further dimension in the trade-off chart that motivated this project.
- The validation of the proposed algorithms and the assessment of the optimality gap of each of them requires to be able to compute, offline, the benchmark optimal solution based on a high-fidelity model of the grid. This simulative model is current being validated based on the collected data, but its accuracy is expected to be lower than expected. On one hand, this suggests that model-based solutions are inherently fragile (which is an interesting contribution *per se*), but on the other hand this makes a rigorous comparison of different approaches more challenging.

The following natural follow-up experiment is anticipated.

- The implementation of the distributed/networked control strategies was done at a central location, and therefore simulated. This architectural solution had the obvious advantage of allowing quick debugging and testing, complete monitoring, and fast prototyping. On the other hand, the complexity coming from a true distributed implementation (peer-to-peer communication, among others) is hidden. A full analysis of this aspect is only possible by implementing a true distributed control strategy, where each agent (DER) runs independent pieces of code locally, and communicate in a peer-to-peer fashion to the other DERs. A central local shall only be used for monitoring and logging purposes.

## 7 Dissemination Planning

Following the completion of the analysis of the collected data, the following dissemination activities are planned.

- **Technical report** – A technical report containing the documentation of the experiments and the results, complete with a data repository, will be made available in an open-access self-archiving platform.
- **Scientific publications** – We expect to publish the results of these experiment in the following ways:
  - as a contribution to a journal paper currently under preparation, where the mathematical aspect of the problem under study is presented and analysed
  - as a conference contribution where the key finding of the experiment are presented and discussed
  - based on the quality of the collected data, and ideally via a follow-up experiment that could resolve the aforementioned open issues, as a journal article.
- **Benchmark** – The scenario that we identified in the experiment will be shared in order to provide the research and industrial community with a simple tractable example where purely local control strategies are provably suboptimal and ineffective.
- **Grid simulator** – The grid simulator for SYSLAB will be made available to the research infrastructure, and made public to those researchers that want to replicate the proposed benchmark scenario and validate their own Volt-VAR controllers.

## 8 References

- [1] Clement-Nyns, Haesen, and Driesen, "The impact of charging plug-in hybrid electric vehicles on a residential distribution grid," *IEEE Trans. on Power Systems*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2010.
- [2] Lopes, Soares, and Almeida, "Integration of electric vehicles in the electric power system," *Proc. of the IEEE*, vol. 99, no. 1, 2011.
- [3] Tonkoski, Lopes, and El-Fouly, "Coordinated active power curtailment of grid connected PV inverters for overvoltage prevention," *IEEE Trans. on Sustainable Energy*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2010.
- [4] K. Turitsyn, P. Šulc, S. Backhaus, and M. Chertkov, "Options for control of reactive power by distributed photovoltaic generators," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 99, no. 6, Jun. 2011.
- [5] P. Jahangiri and D. C. Aliprantis, "Distributed Volt/VAr control by PV inverters," *IEEE Trans. on Power Systems*, vol. 28, no. 3, Aug. 2013.
- [6] G. Cavraro and R. Carli, "Algorithms for voltage control in distribution networks," in *Smart-GridComm*, 2015.
- [7] M. Farivar, X. Zhou, and L. Chen, "Local voltage control in distribution systems: An incremental control algorithm," in *SmartGridComm*, 2015.
- [8] H.-G. Yeh, D. F. Gayme, and S. H. Low, "Adaptive VAR control for distribution circuits with photovoltaic generators," *IEEE Trans. On Power Systems*, vol. 27, no. 3, Aug. 2012.
- [9] V. Kekatos, L. Zhang, G. B. Giannakis, and R. Baldick, "Fast localized voltage regulation in single-phase distribution grids," in *SmartGridComm*, 2015.
- [10] N. Li, G. Qu, and M. Dahleh, "Real-time decentralized voltage control in distribution networks," in *Proc. Allerton Conference*, 2014.
- [11] ENTSO-E Standard Draft, "Draft network code for requirements for grid connection applicable to all generators," *Tech. Rep.*, 2012.
- [12] IEEE P1547.8/D8, "IEEE draft recommended practice for establishing methods and procedures that provide supplemental support for implementation strategies for expanded use of IEEE standard 1547," *Tech. Rep.*, 2014.
- [13] E. Dall'Anese, H. Zhu, and G.B. Giannakis, "Distributed Optimal Power Flow for Smart Microgrids," *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, vol. 4, no. 3, Sept. 2014.
- [14] S. Bruno, S. Lamonaca, G. Rotondo, U. Stecchi, and M. La Scala, "Unbalanced Three-Phase Optimal Power Flow for Smart Grids," *IEEE Trans. on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 58, no. 10, Oct. 2011.
- [15] G. Cavraro, S. Bolognani, R. Carli, S. Zampieri, "The value of communication in the voltage regulation problem," in *Proc. IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2016.
- [16] S. Bolognani, R. Carli, G. Cavraro, S. Zampieri, "Distributed reactive power feedback control for voltage regulation and loss minimization," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 4, 2015.



## 9 Annex

### 9.1 List of Figures

Figure 1: Tradeoff chart in performance / communication complexity domain .....	9
Figure 2: The grid topology adopted as a benchmark for the experiment.....	11
Figure 3: Schematic illustration of the controller architecture.....	12
Figure 4: Typical time series as it is automatically recorded during an experiment.....	13

### 9.2 List of Tables

Table 1: Planned and actual experiment schedule. Experiment 3 was started earlier than expected because of a nice weather window. On the contrary, it was necessary to repeat a couple of measurements of Experiment 2 at a later stage.....	10
--	----