



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Modulated Model Predictive Control with Branch and Band Scheme for Unbalanced Load Compensation by MMCC-STATCOM*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/183653/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Pan, X, Zhang, L, Li, Y et al. (2 more authors) (2022) Modulated Model Predictive Control with Branch and Band Scheme for Unbalanced Load Compensation by MMCC-STATCOM. IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics, 37 (8). pp. 8948-8962. ISSN 0885-8993

<https://doi.org/10.1109/TPEL.2022.3152407>

© 2022 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. Permission from IEEE must be obtained for all other uses, in any current or future media, including reprinting/republishing this material for advertising or promotional purposes, creating new collective works, for resale or redistribution to servers or lists, or reuse of any copyrighted component of this work in other works.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Modulated Model Predictive Control with Branch and Band Scheme for Unbalanced Load Compensation by MMCC-STATCOM

Xuejiao Pan, Li Zhang, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Yongfei Li, Kang Li, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Han Huang

Abstract—This paper presents a novel modulated Model-Predictive Control (MMPC) scheme for Modular Multilevel Cascaded Converter-based STATCOMs (MMCC-STATCOM) to compensate unbalanced load current and regulate reactive power flow. By adding a common mode voltage (CMV) to the phase-voltages of the star-connected MMCC current model, the method allows natural injection of a non-sinusoidal voltage to the neutral point of the converter, hence achieving inter-phase cluster voltage balance. Moreover the imposed CMV is shown to extend the operating ranges of MMCC STATCOMs when used for negative sequence current compensation. The proposed MMPC method incorporates a modified branch and bound (B&B) algorithm to optimize the per-phase switch duty ratios. It is shown to be computationally more efficient compared to model-predictive control schemes using optimal voltage level method combined with voltage sorting schemes. Experimental results with different weighting factors confirm the effectiveness of this control scheme, and compared favorably with the conventional scheme of injecting only a sinusoidal zero sequence voltage.

Index Terms—Modulated model predictive control (MMPC), Branch and bound method (B&B), Multilevel modular cascaded converter-based STATCOM (MMCC-STATCOM).

I. INTRODUCTION

INCREASING use of power electronic driven loads such as electric vehicles and electric traction, and rapid introduction of renewable energy sources in the power network, results in a growing incidence of reactive, unbalanced load current and harmonics. The voltage-source-based static synchronous compensator (STATCOM) [1]–[3] can be effective in dealing with these problems, especially the unbalanced loads. STATCOM development has been furthered in the last decade by using modular multilevel cascaded converters (MMCCs) which extend the compensation applications to the medium and high voltage power grids [4]–[6]. An MMCC-STATCOM can be scaled up to generate higher voltages without step-up transformers, and can produce voltage waveforms with good harmonic performance at lower switching frequencies and with less filtering. The key elements in an MMCC-STATCOM are its sub-modules, where the most widely used topology is the single-phase three-level H-bridge converter [7]. Other well-known topologies such as five-level flying capacitor converter (5L-FC) [8] and five-level neutral point clamped converter

[9], [10] have also been reported. Their relative merits have been investigated in terms of manufacturing cost, operational performance and footprint [11].

A critical issue in using MMCC-STATCOMs for power quality control is maintaining the balance of module capacitor voltages. Lacking common dc-links, the capacitors in the cascaded modules are isolated from each other, making it difficult to exchange power between levels in the sub-module stack [12]–[14] and between the phase arms [15]–[17]. This causes module capacitor voltages to drift away from their nominal level, disrupting normal operation or even causing device damage. This intra-cluster voltage imbalance can be counteracted within one phase arm by closed-loop average capacitor voltage control and adjustment of the PWM schemes. However when the MMCC-STATCOM compensates unbalanced loading of the utility grid, the module capacitor voltage imbalance can be worsened. This is due to STATCOM supplying negative sequence current to the grid for mitigating unbalanced loads which causes active power imbalance between its phase arms. Countermeasures have been developed where, for the star-connected MMCC-STATCOM, the approach is to introduce a sinusoidal zero sequence voltage at the neutral point, hence shifting the neutral point to a non-zero voltage level [18]–[22]. The effect of this is to eliminate the phase power differences caused by negative sequence current flowing through the phase arms, and bring about a uniform active power distribution between phases. However such a scheme is problematic since the injected zero-sequence voltage can cause the converter phase voltages to exceed their rated levels under higher load imbalance, hence operating in over-modulation mode or even becoming uncontrollable. Methods such as adding the third order harmonics can reduce the peak value of the zero sequence voltage, but with a limited effect. As shown in [23] the peak phase-voltage reduction obtained is only about 12%, this has given an increased compensation range to the maximum load imbalance ratio from about 58% up to 65%. Injecting negative sequence voltage on the converter phase reference voltages has also been suggested to realize redistribution of phase active power in MMCC-STATCOM [24]–[26], but this is mainly for dealing with the condition of grid voltage sag. A technique using both negative-sequence current and zero-sequence voltage was also proposed for MMCC-STATCOM [27]. This is specifically for operating under power grid fault conditions but cannot cope with load imbalance.

The MPC technique is well-known and has been widely applied for the control of modular multilevel converters, mostly

Xuejiao PAN, Li Zhang, Yongfei Li and Kang Li are with the School of Electrical Engineering, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK (e-mail: ml16xp@leeds.ac.uk; L.Zhang@leeds.ac.uk;elyli3@leeds.ac.uk;K.Li1@leeds.ac.uk).

Han Huang is with HVDC Center of Excellence, GE Renewable Energy, Stafford, UK(e-mail:han.huang@ge.com)

for HVDC applications. In general, this method employs a discrete-time model of the MMCC circuit to predict the output phase current. It then selects the optimal switching state which minimizes a desired cost function. The challenges of the technique can be the determination of the optimal switching state/vector from many candidates in real-time. There are various schemes reported which can be categorized into finite control set model predictive control (FCS-MPC) [28]–[33] and continuous control set model predictive control method (CCS-MPC) [34]–[38] which is also named as modulated model predictive control (MMPC). The former relies on selecting a switching state from a finite set for the corresponding converter, combined with a sorting algorithm for balancing sub-modules capacitor voltages at the next switching cycle. This method has been applied to a wide range of power converters and shown giving high dynamic performance. However its drawbacks are in giving variable switching frequency and poor steady-state performance, because only one result can be output per sampling period [39]. The CCS-MPC, on the other hand, predicts the voltage control signals which are continuous variables in one sample period and translate them into switching vectors. The method offers the benefit of causing smaller current ripples and requires less computational effort. In terms of implementing the predicted voltage, there is also the optimal voltage level-based-MPC (OVL-MPC) [29] which uses a cost function similar to that in [28], but evaluates the desired number of sub-modules to be inserted or bypassed in each phase arm. In addition, Pu Liu et al [30] proposed a combined grouping and sorting optimal MPC for MMC HVDC which divides n sub-modules in each arm into m groups. By implementing optimized MPC at group level and then sub-module level, the method can further reduce the computational burden. There is also a dual-stage based MPC [31] where the first stage aims to obtain the optimal voltage level and the second to select the switching states using another MPC without the sorting algorithm. For modulation techniques, space vector modulation scheme is utilized for MMC applications [36], [37] to enhance the steady state performance with fixed switching frequency. The optimal times for three active vectors (two active vectors and one zero vector) need to be calculated for minimizing the cost function value. Different sine-triangle-based PWM techniques are also adopted in [38] for voltage source inverters (VSIs). These give performance similar to that from the space-vector based modulation scheme, but can further simplify the computational burden. In particular the phase-shift PWM (PS-PWM) is the most popular for its advantage in maintaining SM voltage balance [35]

There are only a few MPC schemes dedicated to MMCC-STATCOMs [40]–[42], but they all concentrate on compensating reactive power under balanced grid operation; none is for compensating unbalance load current. The proposed MMPC method in this paper focuses on suppressing the grid unbalanced load current. It has two distinctive features; firstly, the three phase voltages applied to its model for current prediction are imposed with a common mode voltage (CMV). This gives the implemented phase voltages a natural zero-sequence element with harmonics for bringing symmetry to

the phase active powers, and hence eliminating drift in the phase cluster voltages. Moreover the harmonics in the imposed CMV are found to reduce the peak converter phase voltages, so extending the range of load imbalance compensation. Secondly the cost function minimisation is achieved by selecting the per phase switch duty ratio using a modified branch and bound (B&B) algorithm. This approach stems from the scheme in [40] which applies the space vector PWM concept and selects the switching vectors within each 60° sextant. The modified B&B, however, evaluates the optimal switch duty ratios in $a - b - c$ coordinate. By setting any one of them in the cost function as a branch, it solves the other two by quadratic programming. It will be shown that the method is able to mitigate unbalance load at the ratio up to 70% while still maintaining the phase DC-voltages balance.

The paper is structured as follows: Section II describes the configuration of the MMCC-STATCOM and prediction models for output current and per phase DC capacitor voltage. In Section III the cost function and constraints for the variables are defined. The principle of the modified branch and bound method is detailed. In Section IV the overall control scheme is presented. Section VI presents the experimental results which validate the proposed control scheme. Section VII gives conclusions.




Fig. 1. Configuration of a power system with the star-connected MMCC-STATCOM using 5-level flying capacitor converter as sub-modules

II. MODULATED MODEL PREDICTIVE CONTROL WITH COMMON VOLTAGE INJECTION

A. The Configuration of MMCC-STATCOM

The configuration of a star-connected MMCC-STATCOM is shown in Fig.1. Each of the three phase arms consists of M serially connected 5-Level flying capacitor converters as sub-modules (SM) which has two inner capacitors C_1 and C_2 and one outer floating capacitor C_3 . The SMs can equally be 2-level full-bridge converters, each with a single capacitor. Each of the flying capacitor SMs can synthesize five voltage level: $0, \pm V_{dc}/2, \pm V_{dc}$. With M SM per phase arm, there are $4M + 1$ voltage levels. The number of SMs in a phase arm depends on the line voltage rating and dc capacitor voltage per module.

The three phase arms are connected to the transmission lines through their filters with impedance $R_f + j\omega L_f$, to Bus2 which is regarded as the point of common coupling (PCC). The transmission line impedance between the supply source at Bus1 to Bus2 is $R_s + j\omega L_s$. The neutral points between the supply and converter sides are not connected [23].

At the load end, three-phase $R - L$ loads, $R_L + j\omega L_L$ is connected. Its power factor is about 80.9%. To emulate load imbalance condition, a single-phase variable resistor, R_{un} is added on the load of phase A .

B. Model for STATCOM output current

The MMCC-STATCOM is used to compensate the unbalanced load current as well as the reactive power within its rated power and voltage ratings. This has the benefit of making the current flow from PCC balanced hence eliminating the adverse effect due to load imbalance to the grid. However supplying unbalanced current by an MMCC-STATCOM causes phase power imbalance, resulting, consequently, phase cluster DC voltages drifting away from the nominal level. The existing technique is to inject a zero sequence voltage which would not affect the grid voltage but results in a power element eliminating the unbalanced power between phases, hence preventing phase voltage drift. To adapt the new approach, it is assumed a common mode voltage (CMV), equivalent to the zero sequence voltage at the fundamental frequency, is applied to the neutral point of the star-connected STATCOM. By applying the phase voltage balance expression, the rate of change of per phase current of the converter can be given as

$$\frac{dI_{cm}}{dt} = \frac{1}{L_f} \times (V_{cm} - V_{gm} + V_{n0} - R_f I_{cm}) \quad (1)$$

where V_{cm} and I_{cm} ($m = a, b, c$) are respectively the STATCOM terminal voltage and current, while V_{gm} is the grid side voltage, and V_{n0} is the CMV, which can be expressed as

$$V_{n0} = -\frac{V_{ca} + V_{cb} + V_{cc}}{3} \quad (2)$$

Assuming the sample time T_s is significantly smaller than the time constant of the converter filter, if the converter three phase-voltages and the common mode voltage at the k th sample are known. the discrete time expression of output three phase-currents at the $(k+1)$ th sample can be given as

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} I_{ca}(k+1) \\ I_{cb}(k+1) \\ I_{cc}(k+1) \end{bmatrix} &= \frac{T_s}{L_f} \begin{bmatrix} V_{ca}(k) \\ V_{cb}(k) \\ V_{cc}(k) \end{bmatrix} - \frac{T_s}{L_f} \begin{bmatrix} V_{ga}(k) \\ V_{gb}(k) \\ V_{gc}(k) \end{bmatrix} + \\ &\frac{T_s}{L_f} \begin{bmatrix} V_{no}(k) \\ V_{no}(k) \\ V_{no}(k) \end{bmatrix} + \left(1 - \frac{R_f T_s}{L_f}\right) \begin{bmatrix} I_{ca}(k) \\ I_{cb}(k) \\ I_{cc}(k) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Considering the converter phase voltage V_{cm} , its maximum value equals the sum of voltages of all SMs in a phase chain, assuming that V_m^Σ is the sum value of sub-module capacitor voltages. Applying switch duty ratio, V_{cm} relates to V_m^Σ and S_m as:

$$V_{cm} = S_m V_m^\Sigma \quad (4)$$

where S_m is the duty ratio for each phase ($m = a, b, c$) and M is the number of SM per phase arm. Since the duty ratio varies at every sample interval, the discrete time form of CMV is given as

$$V_{n0}(k) = -\frac{(S_a(k)V_a^\Sigma(k) + S_b(k)V_b^\Sigma(k) + S_c(k)V_c^\Sigma(k))}{3} \quad (5)$$

Substituting (5) into (3) the STATCOM current at $(k+1)$ th sample can be expressed as :

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} I_{ca}(k+1) \\ I_{cb}(k+1) \\ I_{cc}(k+1) \end{bmatrix} &= \frac{T_s}{L_f} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2}{3} & -\frac{1}{3} & -\frac{1}{3} \\ -\frac{1}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & -\frac{1}{3} \\ -\frac{1}{3} & -\frac{1}{3} & \frac{2}{3} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} S_a(k)V_a^\Sigma(k) \\ S_b(k)V_b^\Sigma(k) \\ S_c(k)V_c^\Sigma(k) \end{bmatrix} \\ &- \frac{T_s}{L_f} \begin{bmatrix} V_{ga}(k) \\ V_{gb}(k) \\ V_{gc}(k) \end{bmatrix} + \left(1 - \frac{R_f T_s}{L_f}\right) \begin{bmatrix} I_{ca}(k) \\ I_{cb}(k) \\ I_{cc}(k) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Assuming filter parameters, L_f and R_f , are constant and $V_m^\Sigma(k)$, $V_{gm}(k)$, $I_{cm}(k)$ ($m=a,b,c$) are measured values at the k th sample, by adequately adjusting $S_m(k)$, it is possible to obtain desired STATCOM current at the $(k+1)$ th sample.

C. Model for per phase voltage

The power flow between the grid and MMCC-STATCOM maintains SM capacitor voltages at the desired levels, hence the energy exchange per STATCOM phase arm can be given as

$$\frac{1}{2}C \begin{bmatrix} V_a^{\Sigma 2} \\ V_b^{\Sigma 2} \\ V_c^{\Sigma 2} \end{bmatrix} = \int \left(\begin{bmatrix} -V_{ca}I_{ca} \\ -V_{cb}I_{cb} \\ -V_{cc}I_{cc} \end{bmatrix} \right) dt \quad (7)$$

where C is the capacitance of the SM outer floating capacitor C_3 .

According to (4) the above can be written as

$$\frac{1}{2}C \begin{bmatrix} V_a^{\Sigma 2} \\ V_b^{\Sigma 2} \\ V_c^{\Sigma 2} \end{bmatrix} = -\int \left(\begin{bmatrix} S_a V_a^\Sigma I_{ca} \\ S_b V_b^\Sigma I_{cb} \\ S_c V_c^\Sigma I_{cc} \end{bmatrix} \right) dt \quad (8)$$

Taking derivative on both side and simplifying the resultant formula, the rate of change of per phase total capacitor voltage is given by

$$\frac{d \begin{bmatrix} V_a^\Sigma \\ V_b^\Sigma \\ V_c^\Sigma \end{bmatrix}}{dt} = -\frac{1}{C} \begin{bmatrix} S_a I_{ca} \\ S_b I_{cb} \\ S_c I_{cc} \end{bmatrix} \quad (9)$$

Expressing above in the discrete-time form, the MMCC-STATCOM phase arm total voltages at the next sample interval can be expressed as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} V_a^\Sigma(k+1) \\ V_b^\Sigma(k+1) \\ V_c^\Sigma(k+1) \end{bmatrix} = -\frac{T_s}{C} \begin{bmatrix} S_a(k)I_{ca}(k) \\ S_b(k)I_{cb}(k) \\ S_c(k)I_{cc}(k) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} V_a^\Sigma(k) \\ V_b^\Sigma(k) \\ V_c^\Sigma(k) \end{bmatrix} \quad (10)$$

It is evident from (10) that the total phase voltage of STATCOM is also adjustable by the switch duty ration of phase arm SMs.

III. MMPC FOR MMCC-STATCOM

A. Cost function and Constrained Optimisation Principle

In this section, a modulated model predictive control (MMPC) method based on the $a - b - c$ framework with common mode voltage injection is given in details. The control objective is to ensure that three phase currents of the MMCC-STATCOM track as well as possible their corresponding reference values while the fluctuations on the sum of SM capacitor voltages per phase are minimized. This can be achieved by evaluating the optimal control variables, i.e. the switch duty ratio $S_m(k)$. However it is worth noting that with the current reference values defined to compensate the unbalanced load current at PCC, a CMV is imposed on each phase voltage and this may result in any one of the optimal duty ratios exceeding outside the linear modulation range, causing MMCC over-modulation. Thus a cost function combining both current and voltage objectives, with the constraints on $S_m(k)$, is defined as

$$J(k) = \sum_{m=a,b,c} \left\{ (I_{cm}(k+1) - I_{cm}^*(k+1))^2 \right\} + \lambda \sum_{m=a,b,c} \left\{ (V_m^\Sigma(k+1) - V_m^{\Sigma*}(k+1))^2 \right\} \quad (11)$$

s.t. $|S_m(k)| \leq 1$

where $I_{cm}^*(k+1)$ and $V_m^{\Sigma*}(k+1)$ are the reference values of converter current and sum of capacitor voltages per phase. λ is the weighting factor for capacitor voltage balancing. The constraints on per phase switch duty ratio ensure that the voltage variations are within the linear range.

The weighting factor λ imposes a trade off between the current tracking accuracy and balancing of three summed submodule capacitor voltages. Its value is determined by trial and error. A comparative study of using different λ in the control of the experimental rig is presented in Section V and subsequently the selection of its value is explained.

Without considering common mode voltage in the cost function, the optimization method can be very similar to that presented in [43]. However with the addition of CMV on each of the phase voltages, the expressions for the three phase currents are different as shown in (6), so minimization of cost function (11) for finding the three voltage duty ratios requires considering all three phase current simultaneously under inequality constraints. Applying the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions [44] gives a set of sufficient conditions for optimizing the cost function (11), this leads to the constraints for the three duty ratios written as

$$\textit{s.t.} \quad -1 - S_m(k) \leq 0, S_m(k) - 1 \leq 0 (m = a, b, c) \quad (12)$$

Subsequently according to KKT, the Lagrangian function of (11) combining with (12) can be shown as:

$$L(k, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5, \lambda_6) = J(k) + \lambda_1(-1 - S_a(k)) + \lambda_2(S_a(k) - 1) + \lambda_3(-1 - S_b(k)) + \lambda_4(S_b(k) - 1) + \lambda_5(-1 - S_c(k)) + \lambda_6(S_c(k) - 1) \quad (13)$$

Taking phase a as an example, the errors of both current prediction and capacitor voltage balance are simplified respectively as

$$I_{ca}(k+1) - I_{ca}^*(k+1) = a_1 S_a(k) + a_2 S_b(k) + P_{a1} \quad (14)$$

$$V_a^\Sigma(k+1) - V_a^{\Sigma*}(k+1) = a_4 S_a(k) + P_{a2}$$

where

$$a_1 = \frac{2 T_s}{3 L_f} V_a^\Sigma(k), a_2 = -\frac{1 T_s}{3 L_f} V_b^\Sigma(k),$$

$$a_3 = -\frac{1 T_s}{3 L_f} V_c^\Sigma(k), a_4 = -\frac{T_s}{C} I_{ca}(k)$$

$$P_{a1} = -\frac{T_s}{L_f} V_{ga}(k) + \left(1 - \frac{R_f T_s}{L_f}\right) I_{ca}(k) - I_{ca}^*(k+1)$$

$$P_{a2} = V_a^\Sigma(k) - V_a^{\Sigma*}(k+1)$$

Subsequently the J(k) part in Lagrangian function (3) can be rewritten as:

$$J(k) = \sum_{m=a,b,c} \left\{ (m_1 S_a(k) + m_2 S_b(k) + m_3 S_c(k) + P_{m1})^2 \right\} + \lambda \sum_{m=a,b,c} \left\{ (m_4 S_m(k) + P_{m2})^2 \right\} \quad (15)$$

Note that the parameters, m_1, m_2, m_3 , and P_{m1}, P_{m2} in (15) are given in the appendix. Hence, KKT conditions that need to be met are as follows:

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial S_a(k)} = (a_1^2 + b_1^2 + c_1^2 + \lambda a_4^2) \times S_a(k) + (a_1 a_2 + b_1 b_2 +$$

$$c_1 c_2) \times S_b(k) + (a_1 a_3 + b_1 b_3 + c_1 c_3) \times S_c(k) + (a_1 P_{a1} + b_1 P_{b1} + c_1 P_{c1} + \lambda a_4 P_{a2}) - \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial S_b(k)} = (a_1 a_2 + b_1 b_2 + c_1 c_2) \times S_a(k) + (a_2^2 + b_2^2 + c_2^2 +$$

$$\lambda b_4^2) \times S_b(k) + (a_2 a_3 + b_2 b_3 + c_2 c_3) \times S_c(k) + (a_2 P_{a1} + b_2 P_{b1} + c_2 P_{c1} + \lambda b_4 P_{b2}) - \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial S_c(k)} = (a_3 a_1 + b_3 b_1 + c_3 c_1) \times S_a(k) + (a_3 a_2 + b_3 b_2 +$$

$$c_3 c_2) \times S_b(k) + (a_3^2 + b_3^2 + c_3^2 + \lambda c_4^2) \times S_c(k) + (a_3 P_{a1} + b_3 P_{b1} + c_3 P_{c1} + \lambda c_4 P_{c2}) - \lambda_5 + \lambda_6 = 0$$

$$-1 - S_a(k) \leq 0, S_a(k) - 1 \leq 0, -1 - S_b(k) \leq 0,$$

$$S_b(k) - 1 \leq 0, -1 - S_c(k) \leq 0, S_c(k) - 1 \leq 0,$$

$$\lambda_1(-1 - S_a(k)) = 0, \lambda_2(S_a(k) - 1) = 0, \lambda_3(-1 - S_b(k)) = 0,$$

$$\lambda_4(S_b(k) - 1) = 0, \lambda_5(-1 - S_c(k)) = 0, \lambda_6(S_c(k) - 1) = 0,$$

$$\lambda_1 \geq 0, \lambda_2 \geq 0, \lambda_3 \geq 0, \lambda_4 \geq 0, \lambda_5 \geq 0, \lambda_6 \geq 0 \quad (16)$$

Solving the above equations with the set conditions leads to the derivations of the values $S_m(k)$ ($m=a,b,c$) and λ_s . If one of the λ_s is greater than 0, the corresponding phase duty ratio should be on the boundary 1 or -1. On the other hand, when λ is equal to 0, the derived duty ratio is the optimal value. Several optimization methods may be applied to solve this problem, including Interior-Point (IP) [45] and active-set [43] schemes. They all require performing multiple iterative procedures which can be computationally costly. A modified Branch and Bound (B&B) is thus proposed which can derive the optimal solution with only a finite known number of steps.

B. Modified Branch and Bound (B&B) Method

To evaluate the optimal switch duty ratios $S_m(k)$ ($m = a, b, c$) for minimizing the cost function defined by (11), a modified branch and bound method (B&B) for system represented by $a - b - c$ coordinate is proposed.

The principle of the method is as follows: By selecting any one of the three control variables, namely, one phase arm's switch duty ratio and setting it variable within the confined range imposed by the constraint in the cost function, the cost function would now have only two variables – two switch duty ratios, as the third one is bounded as a constant. This simplifies the computation process, because the order of the derived formula for cost function minimization is reduced to two other than the original three. The evaluation follows a two stage bound and branch process as follows:

Stage 1: the chosen input variable is assigned to a constant within its constraint from either the lower or upper boundary. With the cost function having now two independent variables, their optimal values can be estimated by quadratic programming.

Stage 2: the two resultant optimal values are applied to replace their originals as fixed constants in the cost function, but the first input is allowed to vary. Having only one independent variable to evaluate, the optimal cost function can be derived subsequently. This, consequently, leads to a set of three optimal inputs and completes one branch of the B&B process.

In the following branches the first input variable ascends or descends in constant steps until it reaches the upmost/lowest boundary. In each step the two-stage process described above is repeated. According to the number of steps taken by the chosen first variable, there would be multiple branches, hence multiple sets of results. These results are compared after completing the final branch evaluation and the set giving the minimum cost function value will be chosen.

Applying the above principle, the switch duty ratio, $S_c(k)$, in the cost function (11) may be the chosen one amongst the three to form a branch. Starting from $S_c(k) = -1$ at the lower bound, S_L , it rises at a constant step size of, say, 0.25, in each branch until reaching to the upmost bound $S_U=1$. By setting S_c as a constant in the cost function (11) in each branch, the current prediction error part is simplified as given below (taking phase a as an example).

$$I_{ca}(k+1) - I_{ca}^*(k+1) = a_1 S_a(k) + a_2 S_b(k) + n_{a1} \quad (17)$$

where

$$n_{a1} = a_3 S_c(k) - \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_{ga}(k) + \left(1 - \frac{R_f T_s}{L_f}\right) I_{ca}(k) - I_{ca}^*(k+1)$$

Likewise combining (17), the phase A voltage error can be expressed as

$$V_a^\Sigma(k+1) - V_a^{\Sigma*}(k+1) = a_4 S_a(k) + n_{a2} \quad (18)$$

where

$$n_{a2} = V_a^\Sigma(k) - V_a^{\Sigma*}(k+1)$$

Subsequently the cost function (11) can be rewritten as:

$$J(k) = \sum_{m=a,b,c} \left\{ (m_1 S_a(k) + m_2 S_b(k) + n_{m1})^2 \right\} + \lambda \sum_{m=a,b,c} \left\{ (m_4 S_m(k) + n_{m2})^2 \right\} \quad (19)$$

Note that the parameters, m_1 , m_2 , and n_{m1} , n_{m2} in the original (15) and (19) are given in the appendix. With only $S_a(k)$ and $S_b(k)$ as the input variables, the optimal values of these parameters are obtainable by minimizing the cost function $J(S_a, S_b)$ and can be estimated using the Least-Square minimization algorithm. This requires taking the first order derivatives of the cost function J with respect to the two variables respectively and setting them to zero, yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial J(k)}{\partial S_a(k)} &= (a_1^2 + b_1^2 + c_1^2 + \lambda a_4^2) \times S_a(k) \\ &\quad + (a_1 a_2 + b_1 b_2 + c_1 c_2) \times S_b(k) \\ &\quad + (a_1 n_{a1} + b_1 n_{b1} + c_1 n_{c1} + \lambda a_4 n_{a2}) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial J(k)}{\partial S_b(k)} &= (a_1 a_2 + b_1 b_2 + c_1 c_2) \times S_a(k) \\ &\quad + (a_2^2 + b_2^2 + c_2^2 + \lambda b_4^2) \times S_b(k) \\ &\quad + (a_2 n_{a1} + b_2 n_{b1} + c_2 n_{c1} + \lambda b_4 n_{b2}) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Based on the above equations the solutions for the two switching duty ratios can be obtained by the product of two 2×2 matrices as shown below

$$\begin{bmatrix} S_a(k) \\ S_b(k) \end{bmatrix} = -A_1^{-1} A_2 \quad (22)$$

where

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} a_1^2 + b_1^2 + c_1^2 + \lambda a_4^2 & a_1 a_2 + b_1 b_2 + c_1 c_2 \\ a_1 a_2 + b_1 b_2 + c_1 c_2 & a_2^2 + b_2^2 + c_2^2 + \lambda b_4^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{and } A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 n_{a1} + b_1 n_{b1} + c_1 n_{c1} + \lambda a_4 n_{a2} \\ a_2 n_{a1} + b_2 n_{b1} + c_2 n_{c1} + \lambda b_4 n_{b2} \end{bmatrix}$$

Note that either $S_a(k)$ or $S_b(k)$ estimated from (22) may violate the constraint defined in (11), and in that case, the corresponding duty ratio needs to be clamped to its nearest boundary value.

Once the optimal $S_a(k)$ and $S_b(k)$ are obtained with a fixed $S_c(k)$, the next stage is to estimate the optimal duty ratio $S_c(k)$ while $S_a(k)$ and $S_b(k)$ in (11) are fixed to their newly

evaluated values. In this case $S_c(k)$ is the only parameter to be evaluated, and this is a one-variable programming problem. The cost function (11) now become:

$$J(k) = \sum_{m=a,b,c} \left\{ (m_3 S_c(k) + n_{m3})^2 \right\} + \lambda \sum_{m=a,b,c} \left\{ (m_4 S_m(k) + n_{m2})^2 \right\} \quad (23)$$

where

$$n_{m3} = m_1 S_a(k) + m_2 S_b(k) - \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_{gm}(k) + \left(1 - \frac{R_f T_s}{L_f} \right) I_{cm}(k) - I_{cm}^*(k+1)$$

Taking derivative of $J(S_c(k))$ with respect to $S_c(k)$ and setting it to 0, $S_c(k)$ is calculated as:

$$S_c(k) = -\frac{a_3 n_{a3} + b_3 n_{b3} + c_3 n_{c3} + \lambda c_4 n_{c2}}{a_3^2 + b_3^2 + c_3^2 + \lambda c_4^2} \quad (24)$$

where $a_3, b_3, c_3, n_{a3}, n_{b3}$ and n_{c3} are also shown in the appendix.

Similar to the case with the estimated $S_a(k)$ and $S_b(k)$, the derived $S_c(k)$ value should not violate the set constraint, otherwise it must also be replaced with the nearest boundary value.

The switch duty ratio values for three phase arms estimated using the aforementioned procedure may not be the global optimum. The optimization process is repeated for the next branch in which $S_c(k)$ is fixed to a value higher or lower than its previously acquired value. With the defined constraint for the switch duty ratio and the step size setting of 0.25, there are 9 branches, resulting in 9 sets of optimal solutions. Based on their corresponding cost function values, the one producing the minimal value among the 9 sets is selected. The flowchart of this new B&B method is shown in Fig.2.

It is worth noting that the branch step size of 0.25 is set by trial and error according to the criteria of both the accuracy of the final optimal solution and computation efficiency. In general the smaller the step size, the more accurate the solution obtained according to the minimum cost function value, however the higher the number of the branches and hence the higher the computational burden. Fig.3 depicts the cost function values evaluated using the global optimal solution obtained when different step sizes are applied; i.e. 0.5(black line), 0.25(red line) and 0.1(blue line) respectively and the unbalanced load ratio is 0.28. With only 5 branches for 0.5 step size, the black line either coincides with the other two lines or is higher than them. It can be seen that when the red line is higher than the blue line, the gap between them is not very obvious. However, 21 branches with 0.1 step size results in the computational time twice of that when step size is 0.25. Thus in this work a step size of 0.25, is chosen for each branch which is a compromised choice between accuracy and computational cost.




Fig. 2. The flowchart for modified branch and bound (B&B) method




Fig. 3. Cost function value comparison using different step size when imbalance compensation ratio is 0.28.

C. Results from B&B compared with IP method

It is important to note that the proposed B&B with step size set to 0.25 does not prevent it from estimating the optimal solution values. Table I illustrates evaluated optimal results for a single instance of a real time sample. It lists the three duty

ratios at each of 9 bounds and the final chosen result (shown in bold) having the lowest cost function of all those obtained for this particular test. Clearly the evaluated three duty ratios vary over the constrained range and importantly, the final optimal solution chosen is compared with the result obtained by the Interior-Point method (IP) [46], the difference in terms of the cost functions between the two methods are about 10% and the maximum difference between the estimated three duty ratios are less than 0.02. This is deemed to be a practically acceptable result, and is obtained much more rapidly than the IP method solution.

Results from both B&B and IP methods are also shown in Table II for 4 further instances, i.e. for 4 other time instants under different operating conditions. The figures listed in Table II presents a similar pattern to those in Table I, the maximum average difference in three duty ratios identified by two methods are less than 0.05, so helping to confirm robust results in the presence of noise, and sampling errors. In fact about 100 similar instances were analysed but cannot be listed in full. All the results have been found to be acceptably close to those from the IP method. It is also worth pointing out that no instances of local minimum (i.e. in a region disjoint from the true optimum) were seen to occur.

TABLE I
PHASE DUTY RATIOS AND COST FUNCTION VALUES EVALUATED AT 9 DIFFERENT BRANCHES BY B&B METHOD AND RESULTS FROM INTERIOR-POINT METHOD

Branch	$S_a(k)$	$S_b(k)$	$S_c(k)$	Cost function value
$S_c=-1$	-0.6227	-1	-0.63434	1.329
$S_c=-0.75$	-1	-0.5085	-0.3733	0.6088
$S_c=-0.5$	-0.1240	-1	-0.3733	0.1833
$S_c=-0.25$	0.1154	-0.9964	-0.2519	0.05054
$S_c=0$	0.3748	-0.7377	-0.0022	0.05527
$S_c=0.25$	-0.4889	0.2476	0.6242	0.05828
$S_c=0.5$	0.8736	-0.2402	0.4974	0.06158
$S_c=0.75$	1	0.0856	0.6856	0.1
$S_c=1$	1	0.2573	0.8105	0.3974
Optimal value	0.1078	-1	-0.2720	0.04178

TABLE II
COMPARISON OF DUTY RATIOS AND COST FUNCTION VALUES ESTIMATED BY B&B METHOD AND INTERIOR-POINT (IP) METHOD AT FOUR DIFFERENT SAMPLES

Sample		$S_a(k)$	$S_b(k)$	$S_c(k)$	Cost function value	Cost function error
1	B&B	-0.2886	0.0816	0.7502	0.01096	0.00651
	IP	-0.2111	0.0875	0.8252	0.00445	
2	B&B	-0.5592	-0.1340	0.4999	0.02989	0.0084
	IP	-0.5026	-0.0983	0.5545	0.02149	
3	B&B	0.2926	0.2301	-0.1950	0.01831	0.00358
	IP	0.3084	0.2054	-0.2145	0.01473	
4	B&B	0.3513	-0.7843	-0.2506	0.00370	0.00255
	IP	0.2933	-0.8007	-0.2659	0.00115	
Average error		0.0482	0.0432	0.0411		0.00526

D. Evaluation and Comparison of Computational Cost

Evaluations of the computational procedures are performed on both the proposed and conventional methods. To give a

fair comparison, the MMPC method is also applied to the conventional method. The basic operations for both methods are respectively listed in Tables III and IV, including comparison, addition, multiplication and division, performed per sample interval. The operations which are common to both methods, such as DDSRF, average voltage control loop and PS-PWM are excluded. There is a column in both tables named pre-calculation; this counts for computations not performed in each sample interval. It can be seen that the count for total basic operations for the proposed method is 791 which is less than that for conventional method of 801.

TABLE III
EXPECTED BASIC OPERATIONS OF THE PROPOSED METHOD

Basic operations	Pre-calculation	Per cycle calculation
Addition	24	23
Multiplication	38	43
Comparison	0	6
Division	0	3
Square	0	6

TABLE IV
EXPECTED BASIC OPERATIONS OF THE CONVENTIONAL METHOD

Basic operations	Pre-calculation	Outer capacitor balancing control	Per cycle calculation
Addition	16	41	19
Multiplication	30	54	39
Comparison	0	0	6
Division	0	3	3
Square	0	0	6

IV. OVERALL CONTROL SCHEME

The overall MMPC control scheme for a MMCC-SATCOM is shown in Fig.4. It has four parts: MMPC block, phase-shifted PWM block, intral-cluster voltage balancing control block, reference current and voltage generations and delay compensator. MMPC block is already described in the section III. The phase-shifted PWM (PS-PWM) block is well-reported in the literature and hence only a brief description is given here [47]. In this technique, multiple triangular carrier waves are applied to synthesize a three-phase sinusoidal reference signal. The number of triangular waves is the number of SMs (for SM being full H-bridge), in the case of 5L-FL SMs, the number is twice that of the SMs in a phase leg. Thus with the number being M , they are phase shifted by an equal angle $((180/2M)^\circ)$ to each other. By comparing these carrier waves with two anti-phased reference sine waves, desired switching signals can be generated. In the intra-cluster voltage balancing control block, the per phase SM capacitor voltage values, i.e. the intra-phase voltages, are maintained in balance by using closed loop control to their average value $v_{dc-ave}^* = v_m^*/M$ and then applying PS-PWM which has been shown in Fig.5. V_{cm1} and V_{cm2} represent the voltage values of two SM outer capacitors, C_3 , in each phase ($m = a, b, c$). The last two blocks are described in details below.




Fig. 4. The overall control scheme of MMPC for MMCC-STATCOM




Fig. 5. The diagram for intra-cluster voltage balancing control block

A. Reference Current and Voltage Generations

For MMPC+B&B scheme to eliminate the unbalance current and improve the power factor at PCC, its reference current $I_{cm}^*(k)$, is generated by extracting both the $-ve$ sequence current components, $I_{1d}^-(k)$, $I_{1q}^-(k)$, and reactive current $I_{1q}^+(k)$ from the measured load current. This can be achieved by using the Decoupled Double Synchronization Reference Frame (DDSRF) [48]. For intra-cluster voltage balancing, a $+ve$ sequence current element $I_{cv}(k)$, needs to be added to the reference current. This is evaluated using the SM average voltage control block as shown in Fig.5. Subsequently, the reference current generated consists of $I_{1d}^-(k)+I_{cv}(k)$ and $I_{1q}^-(k)$. This is transformed to the $a-b-c$ stationary reference frame through inverse Park transformation, hence given as, $I_{cm}^*(k)$.

For good performance control, the delay compensation, explained in the following sub-section, is applied. In this reference current at the $(k+2)th$ sample, $I_{cm}^*(k+2)$, is estimated by multiplying $I_{cm}^*(k)$ with $B(2\sigma)$ which is expressed in (26).

With the delay compensator inserted, the average phase arm reference voltage value for the $(k+2)th$ sample should be evaluated according to their corresponding predicted values at

the $(k+1)$ sample instant as

$$V_m^{\Sigma*}(k+2) = (V_a^\Sigma(k+1) + V_b^\Sigma(k+1) + V_c^\Sigma(k+1))/3 \quad (25)$$

B. Delay Compensator

As elaborated in the previous sub-section, the MMPC with the modified B&B algorithm predicts the converter output current and SM capacitor voltages, and estimates the optimal switching duty ratios for all three-phase arms in 9 calculation branches. The whole process is however complicated, making the time interval excessively long between the time instant taking the measured voltage and current at the kth sample and the instant of when the newly estimated switching signals are obtained. This is called the digital control delay and may cause inaccurate predictions of current and voltage hence poor control performance. In this paper, a delay compensator is implemented to tackle this problem. Its effect is analogous to inserting a “state observer” for current and SM capacitor voltages in the MMPC loop. The scheme takes the measured converter current and capacitor voltages at the kth sample and applies the switch duty ratios, $S_m(k)$, to (6) and (10), to predict $I_{cm}(k+1)$, and the sum of phase capacitor voltages, $V_m^\Sigma(k+1)$. It also estimates the $(k+1)th$ PCC voltages, $V_{gm}(k+1)$, expressed in the a-b-c coordinate as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} V_{ga}(k+1) \\ V_{gb}(k+1) \\ V_{gc}(k+1) \end{bmatrix} = B(\sigma) \begin{bmatrix} V_{ga}(k) \\ V_{gb}(k) \\ V_{gc}(k) \end{bmatrix} \quad (26)$$

where $B(\sigma)$

$$= \frac{2}{3} \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\sigma) & -\frac{1}{2}\cos(\sigma - \frac{\pi}{3}) & -\frac{1}{2}\cos(\sigma + \frac{\pi}{3}) \\ -\frac{1}{2}\cos(\sigma + \frac{\pi}{3}) & \cos(\sigma) & -\frac{1}{2}\cos(\sigma - \frac{\pi}{3}) \\ -\frac{1}{2}\cos(\sigma - \frac{\pi}{3}) & -\frac{1}{2}\cos(\sigma + \frac{\pi}{3}) & \cos(\sigma) \end{bmatrix}$$

σ is equal to ωT_s and ω is the grid angular frequency. The predicted results at $(k+1)$ sample are then used by

the MMPC+B&B algorithm to estimate the optimal switching duty ratio at the $(k + 2)$ th sample which can minimize the cost function given as below

$$J(k) = \sum_{m=a,b,c} \left\{ (I_{cm}(k+2) - I_{cm}^*(k+2))^2 \right\} + \lambda \sum_{m=a,b,c} \left\{ (V_m^\Sigma(k+2) - V_m^{\Sigma*}(k+2))^2 \right\} \quad (27)$$

s.t. $|S_m(k+1)| \leq 1$

V. EXPERIMENTAL TESTS AND RESULTS

A. Experimental Setup

To validate and demonstrate the performance of the proposed MMPC+B&B control scheme, experimental tests were conducted on an MMCC-STATCOM prototype (Fig. 5) built at the Smart Grid Laboratory of the University of Leeds. The configuration of the power network model constructed for testing the STATCOM's capability for unbalanced current cancellation is as given in Fig. 1, the PCC bus is powered by an auto transformer (3KVA,110V) through a three-phase R-L element imitating the transmission line impedance. The parameters of the main components in the experimental setup are listed in Table V.




Fig. 6. The MMCC-STATCOM prototype and other system hardware components

The experimental MMCC-STATCOM rig is comprised of six SMs, each being a full-bridge 5L-flying capacitor converter consisting of three-capacitors and 8 IGBT-Diode pairs. Two of SMs are connected in series per phase, giving 9 voltage levels. The digital device for the control unit is a combination of an ACTEL-Pro-Asic 3 FPGA module and a Texas Instrument 32-bit floating point digital-signal-processor (DSP-TMS320C6713). The DSP serves as the main control unit for processing all measured data to execute MMPC+B&B control algorithm while the FPGA implements the PS-PWM scheme. The resultant switching signals are supplied to the SMs through fibre optic transmitter and receiver circuits.

TABLE V
PARAMETERS FOR EXPERIMENTAL RIG



Rated Power P_{norm}	1.5kVA
Rated Current I_{norm}	5A
Sending end voltage V_s	80V
Line frequency f	50Hz
RL filter resistance R_f	2Ω
RL filter inductance L_f	3mH
Flying capacitor SM per per phase cluster M	2
Per Module Capacitor C_3	1120uF
Inner capacitor C_1 and C_2	560uF
Per Module voltage	60V
Switching frequency	1KHz

B. Results and Discussions

Fig. 7 and 8 show the experimental results when the proposed scheme is applied to control the experimental MMCC-STATCOM, the former has the weighting factor λ setting to 0.25 and the latter as 0.49. Fig. 9 shows the corresponding waveforms when the conventional sinusoidal zero sequence voltage injection is applied on the same experimental rig. In all the three figures, stepped lines plotted in (a) depict the levels of compensation ratio to the imbalanced load current. In this work, the unbalanced load current is fixed at $K_{ir}=I^-/I^+=0.7$. The unbalance compensation ratio is adjusted from 0% (between 0.0 s and 0.1 s) up to 70% at the step size of 14% per 0.1 sec. Thus in the initial period of 0 to 0.1 sec. the PCC current is unbalanced since there is no compensation. After 0.1 sec the degree of compensation is increased gradually. The PCC currents become more balanced until the maximum 70% compensation is applied. The unbalanced compensation ratio at 0.7 is maintained from 0.5s to 0.7s in order to observe the level of voltage oscillations away around the average sub-module capacitor voltages.

The performance of MMPC+B&B algorithm can be observed from the PCC current waveforms shown in Fig. 7(b) and 8(b). From no compensation applied (0 s to 0.1 s) to 70% of current imbalance compensation, it is evident that the degree of PCC current imbalance is reduced gradually to near complete elimination during period 0.5s to 0.7s. The three-phase current waveforms supplied by MMCC to the grid are displayed in Fig. 7(c) and 8(c), it can be seen that the degree of converter current imbalance increases with the escalation of the required level of compensation, but they are all within the rated limit. Likewise the terminal phase voltages of the MMCC are also within the rated level without over modulation. Fig. 7(e) and 8(e) display the three-phase sub-modules capacitor average voltages which are well balanced even when the compensation level is set to 56%, low voltage fluctuation with peak-peak value about 6V(10% of rated capacitor voltage) is shown before time instant 0.5s. Voltage deviations grow slightly during the final 0.2s interval when the compensation level is as high as 70%. However, the adverse effect of this condition to the control performance is minimal, the system still maintains stable operation with PCC current being well balanced.

It is worth noting that weighting factor value affects performance of compensation. When the weighting factor is 0.49,

Fig. 7. Experimental results for proposed method when $\lambda=0.25$ Fig. 8. Experimental results for proposed method when $\lambda=0.49$

the degree of capacitor voltages deviation is lower than that when the value is 0.25. However, for the reduced weighting factor, the performance in unbalanced current compensation is better. When weighting factor is 0.49, the maximum difference between the peak values of the three PCC phase currents is about 0.5A, higher than that with the weighting factor being 0.25 which is 0.3A, This means that the unbalanced ratio after compensation is higher than its counterpart when the weighting factor is 0.49. In terms of common mode voltage (zero sequence voltage), as shown in Fig. 7(f) and 8(f), the peak values for both cases are always around 60V, so none

presents the over-modulation problem.

The above results are compared with those shown in Fig. 9 where the conventional method using zero sequence voltage injection for inter-cluster voltage balance is applied. In this case to extend the MMCC STATCOM voltage range the zero sequence voltage injected is composed of a sinusoidal fundamental element plus two third harmonics; one has the magnitude of 1/6 of its main fundamental component and the other's magnitude is 1/6 of the positive sequence component of the converter terminal voltage.

As can be seen the waveforms up to $t=0.5s$ when the




Fig. 9. Experimental results for conventional zero sequence voltage injection method

compensation ratio is 0.56 (see Figures 7, 8 and 9) are stable for both methods. However as load imbalance compensation ratio is increased to a higher level of 0.7, the performance of the controlled PCC current waveforms from the conventional method deteriorates as shown in Fig. 9(b). This is due to increasing the negative sequence current for mitigating load imbalance, adversely increases phase active power imbalance. However the zero sequence voltage injected is insufficient to eliminate the phase power differences even though the magnitude of its fundamental element has increased significantly (Fig. 9(f)). Consequently the phase voltages drift away from their nominal levels as seen in Fig. 9(e), resulting in system becomes uncontrollable. In contrast, the results from the proposed control scheme, depicting in Fig. 7 and 8, show that the common mode voltage magnitude does not show noticeable increment but its spectra changes significantly for eliminating phase power imbalance. This in turn prevents the phase voltages drifting apart hence enables effective cancellation of the unbalanced load current. Thus the proposed MMPC has shown that it allows the STATCOM compensating higher level of load unbalance compared to the conventional method.

To explore the advantage of the MMPC+B&B algorithm, the frequency spectra of the common mode voltages derived by FFT analysis are compared as shown in Fig. 10 and 11 when unbalanced ratio is set to 0.42. It can be seen clearly from Fig. 10(a) and (b) that the odd harmonics dominate the other frequency components. In particular the magnitude of the third harmonic exceeds that of the fundamental element, and other odd harmonics, for example, when $\lambda = 0.25$, 5th and 7th order harmonics are about 40% and 75% of the fundamental respectively. For $\lambda = 0.49$ there are about 35% of 5th and 70% of 7th harmonics existing in common mode voltage waveform. In contrast, the dominate components in the zero sequence voltage obtained from the conventional method




Fig. 10. Frequency spectra of common mode voltage when unbalanced ratio is 0.42 for (a) proposed method with $\lambda = 0.25$ (b) proposed method with $\lambda = 0.49$




Fig. 11. Frequency spectra of common mode voltage when unbalanced ratio is 0.42 for conventional method

(Fig. 11) are only the fundamental and 3rd harmonic elements, with the magnitude of the 3rd harmonic being below 40% of the fundamental frequency. This confirms that the proposed method is capable of making use of the harmonic components for power balance between phases hence achieving a superior performance for unbalanced current mitigation. Furthermore the peak amplitude of the fundamental element in CMV for the period between 0.3s to 0.4s is as low as 27.42V when $\lambda = 0.25$ and that for $\lambda = 0.49$ is 29.34V, whereas for the conventional method, the magnitude is a lot higher reaching 40.35V, hence the proposed method offers a higher level of unbalanced current compensation without pushing the MMCC terminal voltages into over modulation range.

C. Weighting Factor Selection

As stated the weighting factor, λ , is determined by trial and error depending on the requirements to converter current control accuracy, according to the PCC current THD factor, the levels of the three-phase capacitor voltage deviations, and the voltage ripple percentages. It is clear that setting a higher weighting factor imposes a tighter limit on voltage deviation levels while compromising the PCC current control performance, hence resulting in its THD value being increased. Conversely, a lower weighting factor would result in better current control, and hence lower PCC phase current THD values, but the constraints on phase voltage deviations are weakened. With high phase voltage deviations reaching the extent that one phase voltage drifts away, the system will become uncontrollable.

To demonstrate clearly the effect of λ on the control of PCC current and sub-module capacitor voltage balance, a test was performed on the MPC control scheme, for the STATCOM operating under the unbalanced PCC current condition. λ varies from low at 0.016 to high at 0.81 with step size 0.1. Table VI lists the corresponding PCC current THD values, the maximum voltage ripple percentages, and the differences between the summed sub-module capacitor voltages per phase.

Clearly at high λ (0.81), the PCC current THD value is higher at 3.57% while the sub-module capacitor voltage ripple is the lowest at 7.7% and the voltage deviation is

low (0.74 V). As λ decreases, control on the PCC current improves with steadily reducing THD values. However the sub-module capacitor voltage balance control is weakened, causing increases in both the sub-module capacitor percentage voltage ripples and phase voltage deviations. As λ is reduced further to 0.16, the three phase capacitor voltages cannot be maintained at the balanced levels. As shown in Fig.12, the three phase voltages drift continuously in different directions, so that one phase voltage pushes the MMC STATCOM into the over-modulation range. This is referred to as “out of range” in Table VI since the sum of the capacitor voltages in one phase leg becomes higher than the maximum allowed value (80V).

Fig.13(a) and (b) show the variations of the sums of sub-module capacitor voltages with $\lambda=0.25$ and 0.49 respectively. For both cases the compensation ratio is 70% and the time of test is from 0 sec to 0.9sec. It can be seen clearly that there is no occurrence of uncontrolled phase voltage drift in either cases. However with the λ value of 0.25, the differences of the summed phase capacitor voltages differences are larger, which implies a weaker voltage balance control performance. After repeated tests the proposed λ value = 0.49 is chosen as a good compromise between maintaining balance of the summed sub-module capacitor voltages and giving good current control performance with a low enough THD value.

TABLE VI
RESULTS FOR DIFFERENT WEIGHTING FACTORS

Weighting factor	PCC current THD	Sub-module capacitor voltage ripple percentage	Sub-module capacitor voltage deviation
0.81	3.57%	7.7%	0.74V
0.64	3.52%	8%	1.11V
0.49	3.48%	8.4%	1.66V
0.36	3.31%	9.3%	3.23V
0.25	3.2%	9.5%	5.26V
0.16	3.14%	10.2%	Out of Range
0.09	3.08%	10.5%	Out of Range




Fig. 12. Variations of the sum of sub-modules capacitor voltages with $\lambda=0.16$ and compensation ratio 70%

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This paper presented a new modulated model-predictive control scheme for an MMCC-STATCOM, shunt connected to the PCC bus of a power grid, to eliminate the unbalanced current and improve the power factor. The proposed method employs a modified Branch and Bound algorithm to select the optimal switch duty ratios for the converter. The current and capacitor voltage prediction models are presented together with the cost function and constraint. The procedures for B&B algorithm implementation were described in detail.




Fig. 13. Variations of the sum of sub-modules capacitor voltages with (a) $\lambda=0.25$ and (b) $\lambda=0.49$ when the compensation ratio is 70%

Experimental validations of the proposed control scheme were performed. The results obtained demonstrated superior performance as compared to the traditional sinusoidal zero sequence waveform injection method. The distinctive features of this new method can be summarized as follows:

(1) Injecting a CMV in the phase voltages of a STAR-connected MMCC reduces the peak phase voltages, hence extends the unbalanced load current compensation range up to 70%, whereas the conventional method can only reach 60%.

(2) The proposed method is experimentally verified that good performance in unbalanced current and reactive current cancellation with the compensation current below the rated limit.

(3) The SM capacitor voltages can be well balanced, achieving significant reduction of the capacitor voltage ripples down to 8.0% compared to 10% for the conventional scheme under the same operation conditions.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Eremia, C.-C. Liu, and A.-A. Edris, *Advanced solutions in power systems: HVDC, FACTS, and Artificial Intelligence*. John Wiley & Sons, 2016.
- [2] L. Wang, C.-S. Lam, and M.-C. Wong, "A hybrid-statcom with wide compensation range and low dc-link voltage," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 63, no. 6, pp. 3333–3343, 2016.
- [3] K. Mahapatra, A. Ghosh, and S. Doradla, "Simplified model for control design of statcom using three-level inverter," in *Proceedings of IEEE TENCON'98. IEEE Region 10 International Conference on Global Connectivity in Energy, Computer, Communication and Control (Cat. No. 98CH36229)*, vol. 2. IEEE, 1998, pp. 536–539.
- [4] M. Hagiwara and H. Akagi, "Control and experiment of pulsewidth-modulated modular multilevel converters," *IEEE transactions on power electronics*, vol. 24, no. 7, pp. 1737–1746, 2009.
- [5] S. Debnath, J. Qin, B. Bahrani, M. Saedifard, and P. Barbosa, "Operation, control, and applications of the modular multilevel converter: A review," *IEEE transactions on power electronics*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 37–53, 2014.
- [6] H. Akagi, "Classification, terminology, and application of the modular multilevel cascade converter (mmcc)," *IEEE Transactions on power electronics*, vol. 26, no. 11, pp. 3119–3130, 2011.
- [7] Y. Yu, G. Konstantinou, B. Hredzak, and V. G. Agelidis, "Power balance of cascaded h-bridge multilevel converters for large-scale photovoltaic integration," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 292–303, 2015.
- [8] A. Stillwell, E. Candan, and R. C. Pilawa-Podgurski, "Active voltage balancing in flying capacitor multi-level converters with valley current detection and constant effective duty cycle control," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 34, no. 11, pp. 11 429–11 441, 2019.
- [9] X. Xing, X. Li, F. Gao, C. Qin, and C. Zhang, "Improved space vector modulation technique for neutral-point voltage oscillation and common-mode voltage reduction in three-level inverter," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 34, no. 9, pp. 8697–8714, 2018.
- [10] X. Xing, Z. Zhang, C. Zhang, J. He, and A. Chen, "Space vector modulation for circulating current suppression using deadbeat control strategy in parallel three-level neutral-clamped inverters," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 977–987, 2016.
- [11] S. Kouro, M. Malinowski, K. Gopakumar, J. Pou, L. G. Franquelo, B. Wu, J. Rodriguez, M. A. Pérez, and J. I. Leon, "Recent advances and industrial applications of multilevel converters," *IEEE Transactions on industrial electronics*, vol. 57, no. 8, pp. 2553–2580, 2010.
- [12] Y. Li and B. Wu, "A novel dc voltage detection technique in the chb inverter-based statcom," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 1613–1619, 2008.
- [13] J. A. Barrena, L. Marroyo, M. Á. R. Vidal, and J. R. T. Apraiz, "Individual voltage balancing strategy for pwm cascaded h-bridge converter-based statcom," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 21–29, 2008.
- [14] Z. Liu, B. Liu, S. Duan, and Y. Kang, "A novel dc capacitor voltage balance control method for cascade multilevel statcom," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 14–27, 2010.
- [15] H. Akagi, S. Inoue, and T. Yoshii, "Control and performance of a transformerless cascade pwm statcom with star configuration," *IEEE Transactions on Industry Applications*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 1041–1049, 2007.
- [16] C. Han, A. Q. Huang, Y. Liu, and B. Chen, "A generalized control strategy of per-phase dc voltage balancing for cascaded multilevel converter-based statcom," in *2007 IEEE Power Electronics Specialists Conference*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 1746–1752.
- [17] L. Maharjan, S. Inoue, and H. Akagi, "A transformerless energy storage system based on a cascade multilevel pwm converter with star configuration," *IEEE Transactions on Industry Applications*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 1621–1630, 2008.
- [18] R. Betz, T. Summers, and T. Furney, "Symmetry compensation using a h-bridge multilevel statcom with zero sequence injection," in *Conference Record of the 2006 IEEE Industry Applications Conference Forty-First IAS Annual Meeting*, vol. 4. IEEE, 2006, pp. 1724–1731.
- [19] Q. Song and W. Liu, "Control of a cascade statcom with star configuration under unbalanced conditions," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 45–58, 2009.
- [20] L. Maharjan, S. Inoue, H. Akagi, and J. Asakura, "State-of-charge (soc)-balancing control of a battery energy storage system based on a cascade pwm converter," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 1628–1636, 2009.
- [21] J. I. Y. Ota, Y. Shibano, N. Niimura, and H. Akagi, "A phase-shifted-pwm d-statcom using a modular multilevel cascade converter (ssbc)—part i: Modeling, analysis, and design of current control," *IEEE Transactions on Industry Applications*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 279–288, 2014.
- [22] J. I. Y. Ota, Y. Shibano, and H. Akagi, "A phase-shifted pwm d-statcom using a modular multilevel cascade converter (ssbc)—part ii: Zero-voltage-ride-through capability," *IEEE Transactions on Industry Applications*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 289–296, 2014.
- [23] O. J. Oghorada and L. Zhang, "Unbalanced and reactive load compensation using mmcc-based statcoms with third-harmonic injection," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 2891–2902, 2018.
- [24] S.-F. Chou, B.-S. Wang, S.-W. Chen, C.-T. Lee, P.-T. Cheng, H. Akagi, and P. Barbosa, "Average power balancing control of a statcom based on the cascaded h-bridge pwm converter with star configuration," in *2013 IEEE Energy Conversion Congress and Exposition*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 970–977.
- [25] L. Zhao, S. Yan-jun, D. Shan-xu, K. Yong, and C. Tian-jin, "The research of dc capacitance voltages balancing strategy based on cascade statcom using individual phase instantaneous current tracking," in *2009 IEEE 6th International Power Electronics and Motion Control Conference*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 1136–1140.
- [26] R. E. Betz, T. J. Summers, and B. J. Cook, "Outline of the control design for a cascaded h-bridge statcom," in *2008 IEEE Industry Applications Society Annual Meeting*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 1–8.
- [27] N. Hatano and T. Ise, "Control scheme of cascaded h-bridge statcom using zero-sequence voltage and negative-sequence current," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 543–550, 2010.
- [28] J. Qin and M. Saedifard, "Predictive control of a modular multilevel converter for a back-to-back hvdc system," *IEEE Transactions on Power delivery*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 1538–1547, 2012.

- [29] M. Vatani, B. Bahrani, M. Saeedifard, and M. Hovd, "Indirect finite control set model predictive control of modular multilevel converters," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 1520–1529, 2014.
- [30] P. Liu, Y. Wang, W. Cong, and W. Lei, "Grouping-sorting-optimized model predictive control for modular multilevel converter with reduced computational load," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 1896–1907, 2015.
- [31] A. Dekka, B. Wu, V. Yaramasu, and N. R. Zargari, "Dual-stage model predictive control with improved harmonic performance for modular multilevel converter," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 63, no. 10, pp. 6010–6019, 2016.
- [32] J.-W. Moon, J.-S. Gwon, J.-W. Park, D.-W. Kang, and J.-M. Kim, "Model predictive control with a reduced number of considered states in a modular multilevel converter for hvdc system," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 608–617, 2014.
- [33] A. Dekka, B. Wu, V. Yaramasu, and N. R. Zargari, "Model predictive control with common-mode voltage injection for modular multilevel converter," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 1767–1778, 2016.
- [34] Z. He, P. Guo, Z. Shuai, Q. Xu, A. Luo, and J. M. Guerrero, "Modulated model predictive control for modular multilevel ac/ac converter," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 34, no. 10, pp. 10359–10372, 2019.
- [35] D. Zhou, S. Yang, and Y. Tang, "Model-predictive current control of modular multilevel converters with phase-shifted pulsewidth modulation," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 66, no. 6, pp. 4368–4378, 2018.
- [36] Z. Gong, X. Wu, P. Dai, and R. Zhu, "Modulated model predictive control for mmc-based active front-end rectifiers under unbalanced grid conditions," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 2398–2409, 2018.
- [37] E. Fuentes, C. A. Silva, and R. M. Kennel, "Mpc implementation of a quasi-time-optimal speed control for a pmsm drive, with inner modulated-fs-mpc torque control," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 63, no. 6, pp. 3897–3905, 2016.
- [38] J. Xu, T. B. Soeiro, F. Gao, L. Chen, H.-J. Tang, P. Bauer, and T. Dragicevic, "Carrier-based modulated model predictive control strategy for three-phase two-level vsis," *IEEE Transactions on Energy Conversion*, 2021.
- [39] J. Wang, X. Liu, Q. Xiao, D. Zhou, H. Qiu, and Y. Tang, "Modulated model predictive control for modular multilevel converters with easy implementation and enhanced steady-state performance," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 35, no. 9, pp. 9107–9118, 2020.
- [40] Y. Zhang, X. Wu, and X. Yuan, "A simplified branch and bound approach for model predictive control of multilevel cascaded h-bridge statcom," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 64, no. 10, pp. 7634–7644, 2017.
- [41] Y. Zhang, X. Yuan, X. Wu, Y. Yuan, and J. Zhou, "Parallel implementation of model predictive control for multilevel cascaded h-bridge statcom with linear complexity," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 832–841, 2019.
- [42] Y. Zhang, X. Wu, X. Yuan, Y. Wang, and P. Dai, "Fast model predictive control for multilevel cascaded h-bridge statcom with polynomial computation time," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 63, no. 8, pp. 5231–5243, 2016.
- [43] J. Yin, J. I. Leon, M. A. Perez, L. G. Franquelo, A. Marquez, and S. Vazquez, "Model predictive control of modular multilevel converters using quadratic programming," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 7012–7025, 2020.
- [44] R. K. Sundaram, "Inequality constraints and the theorem of kuhn and tucker," in *A First Course in Optimization Theory*. Cambridge University Press New York, 1996, pp. 145–171.
- [45] A. Shustrova, *Primal-Dual Interior Methods for Quadratic Programming*. University of California, San Diego, 2015.
- [46] J. A. Momoh, S. Guo, E. Ogbuobiri, and R. Adapa, "The quadratic interior point method solving power system optimization problems," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 1327–1336, 1994.
- [47] C. Feng, J. Liang, and V. G. Agelidis, "Modified phase-shifted pwm control for flying capacitor multilevel converters," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 178–185, 2007.
- [48] P. Rodríguez, J. Pou, J. Bergas, J. I. Candela, R. P. Burgos, and D. Boroyevich, "Decoupled double synchronous reference frame pll for power converters control," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 584–592, 2007.

APPENDIX

$$c_2 = -\frac{1}{3} \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_b^\Sigma(k)$$

$$b_1 = c_1 = -\frac{1}{3} \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_a^\Sigma(k), b_2 = \frac{2}{3} \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_b^\Sigma(k)$$

$$b_3 = -\frac{1}{3} \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_c^\Sigma(k), c_3 = \frac{2}{3} \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_c^\Sigma(k)$$

$$b_4 = -\frac{T_s}{C} I_{cb}(k), c_4 = -\frac{T_s}{C} I_{cc}(k)$$

$$n_{b1} = -\frac{1}{3} \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_c^\Sigma(k) S_c(k) - \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_{gb}(k) + \left(1 - \frac{R_f T_s}{L_f}\right) I_{cb}(k) - I_{cb}^*(k+1)$$

$$n_{c1} = -\frac{1}{3} \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_c^\Sigma(k) S_c(k) - \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_{gc}(k) + \left(1 - \frac{R_f T_s}{L_f}\right) I_{cc}(k) - I_{cc}^*(k+1)$$

$$n_{b2} = P_{b2} = V_b^\Sigma(k) - V_b^{\Sigma*}(k+1)$$

$$n_{c2} = P_{c2} = V_c^\Sigma(k) - V_c^{\Sigma*}(k+1)$$

$$P_{b1} = -\frac{T_s}{L_f} V_{gb}(k) + \left(1 - \frac{R_f T_s}{L_f}\right) I_{cb}(k) - I_{cb}^*(k+1)$$

$$P_{c1} = -\frac{T_s}{L_f} V_{gc}(k) + \left(1 - \frac{R_f T_s}{L_f}\right) I_{cc}(k) - I_{cc}^*(k+1)$$

$$n_{a3} = \frac{2}{3} \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_a^\Sigma(k) S_a(k) - \frac{1}{3} \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_b^\Sigma(k) S_b(k) - \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_{ga}(k) + \left(1 - \frac{R_f T_s}{L_f}\right) I_{ca}(k) - I_{ca}^*(k+1)$$

$$n_{b3} = -\frac{1}{3} \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_a^\Sigma(k) S_a(k) + \frac{2}{3} \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_b^\Sigma(k) S_b(k) - \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_{gb}(k) + \left(1 - \frac{R_f T_s}{L_f}\right) I_{cb}(k) - I_{cb}^*(k+1)$$

$$n_{c3} = -\frac{1}{3} \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_a^\Sigma(k) S_a(k) - \frac{1}{3} \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_b^\Sigma(k) S_b(k) - \frac{T_s}{L_f} V_{gc}(k) + \left(1 - \frac{R_f T_s}{L_f}\right) I_{cc}(k) - I_{cc}^*(k+1)$$

Xuejiao Pan was born in Wuxi, Jiangsu, China in 1994 and received B.Eng. degree in Electrical Engineering from Nantong University, Nantong, Jiangsu, China in 2016. He received M.Sc. degrees in Electronic/Electrical Engineering from University of Leeds, United Kingdom in 2018.

He is currently studying Phd degree at the Electronic/Electrical Engineering from University of Leeds, United Kingdom. His research interests include modulation and control of power converters, multilevel converters, modular multilevel converters,

FACTS devices, Harmonic cancellation methods.





Li Zhang (M'03-SM'10) received the PhD degree and was a research fellow in Oxford University, UK. She was then a lecturer at the University of Bradford and is currently a senior lecturer in the School of Electronic and Electrical Engineering at the University of Leeds, UK. Dr Li Zhang is an adjunct professor in Chongqing University, China from 2006 till now and Joint Grant holder of China State Natural Science Foundation Fund (60712, 2014 01-2017 12) entitled: Analysis and research on the hot spot effect and it's control method of photovoltaic

system. She is an associate editor for IEEE, Transaction on Power Electronics and has also been the associate editor of IET proceedings on Power Electronics between 2014 to 2017. She has authored and co-authored three books on power converter circuits and wind power electricity generation. She has authored and co-authored more than 130 technical papers in the fields of power electronics, renewable power generation system and wind generator control.



Yongfei Li was born in Henan, China, in 1995. He received the B.Eng. degree in electrical engineering from Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin, China, in 2016. He is currently working toward the Ph. D.degree with the Department of electrical engineering, Harbin Institute of Technology. His research interests include PMSMs, special motors and motor control.



Kang Li (M'05-SM'11) received the B.Sc. degree in Industrial Automation from Xiangtan University, Hunan, China, in 1989, the M.Sc. degree in Control Theory and Applications from Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin, China, in 1992, and the Ph.D. degree in Control Theory and Applications from Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai, China, in 1995. He also received D.Sc. degree in Engineering from Queen's University Belfast, UK, in 2015.

Between 1995 and 2002, he worked at Shanghai Jiaotong University, Delft University of Technology and Queen's University Belfast as a research fellow. Between 2002 and 2018, he was a Lecturer (2002), a Senior Lecturer (2007), a Reader (2009) and a Chair Professor (2011) with the School of Electronics, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, U.K. He currently holds the Chair of Smart Energy Systems at the University of Leeds, UK. His research interests cover nonlinear system modelling, identification, and control, and machine learning, with substantial applications to energy and power systems, smart grid, transport decarbonization, and energy management in energy intensive manufacturing processes. He has authored/co-authored over 200 journal publications and edited/co-edited 18 conference proceedings, winning over 20 prizes and awards, including a recent Springer Nature 'China New Development Award' in 2019 in recognition of the 'exceptional contributions to the delivery of the UN Sustainable Development Goals'.

Dr Li was the Chair of the IEEE UKRI Control and Communication Ireland chapter, the Secretary of the IEEE UK & Ireland Section. He is also a visiting professor of Shanghai Jiaotong University, Southeast University, Tianjin University, Shanghai University and Xiangtan University



Han Huang (S'17-M'19) received the Ph.D. degree in Electronic and Electrical Engineering from University of Leeds, Leeds, U.K., in 2019.

He worked as a Postdoctoral Researcher with the Energy Safety Research Institute, Swansea University, Swansea, U.K. In 2021, he joined the HVDC Centre of Excellence, GE's Grid Solutions, Stafford, U.K., as a Lead Electrical Engineer.

His research interests include modular multilevel converter control, HVDC system design, FACTS and integration of renewable energies into the power

grid.