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Abstract—In this paper, we present a novel decentralized and multivariable control approach for dynamic virtual power plants (DVPPs). In particular, we consider a group of heterogeneous distributed energy resources (DERs) which collectively provide desired dynamic ancillary services such as fast frequency and voltage control. Our control approach relies on an adaptive divide-and-conquer strategy: First, we disaggregate the desired frequency and voltage control specifications of the aggregate DVPP via adaptive dynamic participation matrices (ADPMs) to obtain the desired local behavior for each device. Second, we design local linear parameter-varying (LPV) $H_\infty$ controllers to optimally match this local behaviors. In the process, the control design also incorporates the physical and engineered limits of each DVPP device. Furthermore, our adaptive control design can properly respond to fluctuating device capacities, and thus include weather-driven DERs into the DVPP setup. Finally, we demonstrate the effectiveness of our control strategy in a case study based on the IEEE nine-bus system.

Index Terms—Dynamic virtual power plant, fast ancillary services, decentralized control, matching control.

I. INTRODUCTION

FUTURE power systems will contain an increasing penetration of non-synchronous distributed energy resources (DERs). In this regard, reliable ancillary services provision, as currently ensured by conventional generators, has to be shouldered by DERs. This imposes great challenges to cope with the fluctuating nature of renewable energy sources [1], as well as their device-specific limitations.

As early as 1997, the concept of virtual power plants (VPPs) has been proposed to pave the way for future ancillary services by DERs [2]. VPPs are collections of distributed generators (all with individual device limitations), aggregated to have the same visibility, controllability and market functionality as a unique power plant [3]–[5]. Today, most commercial implementations as well as the scientific landscape are restricted to VPPs providing static ancillary services in the form of tracking set-points, see, e.g., [6].

In this work, we are interested in the vastly underexplored concept of a dynamic virtual power plant (DVPP) consisting of heterogeneous DERs, which all-together can provide desired dynamic ancillary services beyond mere set-point tracking [7]. In particular, we are interested in dynamic ancillary services on faster time scales, such as fast frequency and voltage control, which cannot be provided by existing VPP setups restricted to tracking set-points. The key to success is heterogeneity: Only a sufficiently heterogeneous group of devices (complementing each other in terms of energy/power availability, response times, and weather dependency) can reliably provide dynamic ancillary services across all power and energy levels and time scales, while none of the individual devices is able to do so.

Motivating examples of collections of heterogeneous energy sources for dynamic ancillary services provision include hydro-power with initially inverse response dynamics compensated by batteries on short time scales [8], synchronous condensers (with rotational energy) paired with converter-based generation [9], or hybrid storage pairing batteries with supercapacitors providing regulation on different frequency ranges [10]. However, the coordination of all these collections is highly customized, and not (even conceptually) extendable to other device aggregations. Further, none of these collections are controlled to match a desired aggregate dynamic behavior, therefore lacking optimal performance and reliability during ancillary services provision. In contrast, other works in [11], [12] propose more versatile DVPP approaches to achieve a desired short-term frequency response on an aggregate level. In particular, [12] relies on a coordinated control signal which is communicated to each device, but therefore subject to communication delays and single point of failure risk. As opposed to this, [11] presents a fully decentralized control strategy based on dynamic participation factors. However, both [12] and [11] are restricted to provide frequency control, do not consider device-level constraints, and are non-adaptive and thus prone to failure during temporal variability of DERs.

In this work, we present a novel decentralized and multivariable control approach for DVPPs, capable of providing multiple desired dynamic ancillary services at once. We particularly focus on fast frequency and voltage control objectives, specifying them as a desired dynamic MIMO behavior of the aggregate DVPP, given in terms of a desired transfer matrix from frequency and voltage to active and reactive power. In addition to the desired aggregate output, our DVPP control strategy also incorporates the DVPP internal constraints of the devices (e.g. speed limitations, capacities, current constraints, etc.), to ensure they are not exceeded during normal operating conditions. We pursue a fully decentralized control strategy and design local feedback controllers for each DVPP device, subject to its own limitations, but so that the aggregate behavior meets the desired MIMO specification. More specifically, our control approach relies on an adaptive divide-and-conquer strategy which is composed of two steps: First, we disaggregate the MIMO specification among the individual devices using adaptive dynamic participation matrices (ADPMs) which take the form of MIMO transfer matrices, and basically represent a multidimensional and adaptable version of the dynamic participation factors in [11]. Second, we employ local
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linear parameter-varying (LPV) $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ methods \cite{13} to optimally
match the obtained local desired behavior of each device,
while satisfying transient device-level constraints. Further, we
propose centralized and distributed update strategies to adapt
the ADPMs online towards capacity fluctuations, so that our
control design can properly respond to temporal variability of
DERs. This allows for a DVPP setup including weather-driven
DERs, which are usually treated as non-dispatchable, and,
typically not employed for fast ancillary services provision \cite{14}.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: In Section II
we introduce the decentralized DVPP control setup for fast
frequency and voltage control. We provide a simplified setup
using the formalism of linear systems, which makes it con-
venient to develop our control design. Section III presents
the divide-and-conquer strategy involving the disaggregation
via ADPMs and the local $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ control. In Section IV we
demonstrate the performance of our control design on a test
case of the IEEE nine-bus system using detailed and nonlinear
system and device models. Section V concludes the paper.

II. DECENTRALIZED DVPP CONTROL SETUP

We consider a fully decentralized DVPP control setup for a

group of heterogeneous DERs (see Fig. 1 for an illustration),
including both a collection $\mathcal{N}$ of non-controllable devices
(e.g., installed synchronous generators and condensers), as
well as a collection $\mathcal{C}$ of controllable devices (e.g., converter-
based generators). We assume that all devices of a DVPP are
connected at the same bus of the transmission grid, where they
each receive a global broadcast signal of the measured bus
frequency $\Delta f$ and voltage magnitude deviation $\Delta v$ (Fig. 1).
The active and reactive power deviation output of each device
$i$, namely $\Delta p_i$ and $\Delta q_i$, respectively (deviating from the
respective power setpoint), sum up to the global aggregate
active and reactive power deviation output of the DVPP,

namely $\Delta p_{agg}$ and $\Delta q_{agg}$, respectively, i.e.

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\Delta p_{agg} \\
\Delta q_{agg}
\end{bmatrix} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N} \cup \mathcal{C}}
\begin{bmatrix}
\Delta p_i \\
\Delta q_i
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

We assume that all non-controllable devices $i \in \mathcal{N}$ have
a pre-existing frequency and voltage control (e.g., installed
turbine and governor controls, or AVRs and PSS). Hence,
their local closed-loop transfer $2 \times 2$ matrices $T_i(s)$ (from
frequency and voltage magnitude to active and reactive power)
are considered as fixed within the DVPP setup (Fig. 1).

The local closed-loop transfer $2 \times 2$ matrices $T_i(s)$ of the
controllable devices $i \in \mathcal{C}$, in turn, can be shaped freely by
employing appropriate feedback controls (c.f. Section III-C).

Considering the local closed-loop transfer matrices $T_i$ of
both the non-controllable and controllable devices $i \in \mathcal{N} \cup \mathcal{C}$,
the aggregate DVPP behavior is given by

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\Delta p_{agg}(s) \\
\Delta q_{agg}(s)
\end{bmatrix} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N} \cup \mathcal{C}} T_i(s)
\begin{bmatrix}
\Delta f(s) \\
\Delta v(s)
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

To compensate for ancillary services conventionally pro-
vided by synchronous generators in transmission networks, we
specify a decoupled $p$-$f$ and $q$-$v$ behavior for the aggregate
DVPP as a desired MIMO transfer matrix as

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\Delta p_{des}(s) \\
\Delta q_{des}(s)
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
T^{pf}_{des}(s) & 0 \\
0 & T^{qv}_{des}(s)
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\Delta f(s) \\
\Delta v(s)
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

Since the transfer matrices $T_i$ of the non-controllable devices
$\mathcal{N}$ are fixed, the DVPP control design problem is to find
local controllers for the controllable devices $\mathcal{C}$, such that the
following aggregation condition holds:

$$
\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N} \cup \mathcal{C}} T_i(s) \approx I = T_{des}(s).
$$

Furthermore, during the control design it is important to
ensure that physical and engineered device limitations, in-
cluding bandwidth constraints as well as (potentially time-
varying) limits on power availability and current capacity, are
not exceeded during normal operating conditions.

Of course, to meet the aggregation condition \cite{14}, the power
park comprising the DVPP has to be sufficiently diverse
covering all time scales and energy/power levels. Further, the
desired behavior $T_{des}$ has to be reasonably specified so that it
is collectively achievable by the devices.

III. ADAPTIVE DIVIDE-AND-CONQUER STRATEGY

Our approach to solve the previous DVPP control design
problem is on an adaptive divide-and-conquer strategy, composed of two steps:

1) Disaggregate the desired DVPP behavior by dividing the
MIMO transfer matrix $T_{des}$ among the DVPP devices
using adaptive dynamic participation matrices (ADPMs)
to obtain local desired behaviors. The latter are defined
by the product of each ADPM and $T_{des}$, respectively.

2) Design a local feedback control for each device to opti-

cally match the local desired behavior subject to device-
level constraints. We will resort to a linear parameter-
varying (LPV) $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ method.

\footnote{Our formalism is also extendable to full MIMO specifications, potentially relevant for future ancillary services in other types of networks.}
A. Disaggregation via ADPMs

We disaggregate the desired MIMO transfer matrix to the individual devices by imposing the local matching condition

$$T_i(s) = M_i(s) \cdot T_{des}(s), \quad \forall i \in N \cup C,$$

where the $2 \times 2$ transfer matrices $M_i$ are adaptive dynamic participation matrices (ADPMs) of the form

$$M_i(s) = \begin{bmatrix} m_{i}^{pf}(s) & 0 \\ 0 & m_{i}^{qv}(s) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \forall i \in N \cup C,$$

with the diagonal elements $m_{i}^{pf}$, $m_{i}^{qv}$ being adaptive dynamic participation factors (ADPFs) for the p-f and q-v channel, respectively (see below). Using the matching condition (5), the aggregation condition (4) can be disaggregated as

$$\sum_{i \in N \cup C} T_i(s) = \sum_{i \in N \cup C} M_i(s) \cdot T_{des}(s) = T_{des}(s),$$

where $\sum_{i \in N \cup C} M_i(s) = I_2$, and $I_2$ is the identity matrix. This results in the participation condition

$$\sum_{i \in N \cup C} m_{i}^{pf}(s) = 1, \quad \sum_{i \in N \cup C} m_{i}^{qv}(s) = 1.\quad \text{(8)}$$

ADPF Selection: The ADPFs for the p-f and q-v channel are selected independently, but according to the same principle. In the following, we hence address both channels simultaneously using the variable $k \in \{\text{pf}, \text{qv}\}$. For the non-controllable devices with fixed $T_i^k$, $i \in N$, for each channel $k$, the ADPFs are obtained as

$$m_{i}^{k}(s) := \frac{T_i^k(s)}{(T_{des}(s))^{-1}}, \quad \forall i \in N, \quad k \in \{\text{pf}, \text{qv}\},\quad \text{(9)}$$

so that the matching condition (5) holds trivially. Given the fixed ADPFs in (9), the ADPFs of the controllable devices are selected such that the participation condition in (8) is satisfied, while simultaneously respecting the heterogeneous time scales of local device dynamics along with steady-state power capacity limits. Hence, for each ADPF, we envision (see case studies in Sections IV-C and IV-D for examples)

- a low-pass filter (LPF) participation factor for devices that can provide regulation on longer time scales on channel $k$ including steady-state contributions,
- a high-pass filter (HPF) participation factor for devices able to provide regulation on very short time scales on channel $k$, and
- a band-pass filter (BPF) participation factor for devices able to cover the intermediate regime.

To accomplish this, we specify the ADPFs by two parameters: a channel-specific time constant $\tau^k_i$ for the roll-off frequency to account for different time scales of local device dynamics on channel $k \in \{\text{pf}, \text{qv}\}$, and a DC-gain $m_{i}^{k}(s = 0) := \theta_{k}^{i}$ to account for device power capacity limits. In particular, the ADPFs with a BPF or HPF behavior will always have a constant zero DC-gain by definition, i.e., $m_{i}^{k}(s = 0) = 0$. In contrast, for all devices $C_{\text{pf}}^k$, $i \in C_{\text{pf}}^k$ participating as a LPF on channel $k$, the LPF DC-gains $\theta_{k}^{i}$, $i \in C_{\text{pf}}^k$ have to satisfy

$$\sum_{i \in N \cup C} m_{i}^{k}(s = 0) = 1, \quad k \in \{\text{pf}, \text{qv}\}\quad \text{(10)}$$

to meet the participation condition in (8).

Finally, for each channel $k \in \{\text{pf}, \text{qv}\}$ separately, we sort the devices in descending order w.r.t. their channel-specific time constant, and apply Algorithm 1 to compute the respective ADPFs as LPFs, BPFs and HPF according to the devices’ bandwidth and capacity limitations.

Algorithm 1 Sort Algorithm for Channel $k \in \{\text{pf}, \text{qv}\}$

1: // Fix ADPFs of non-controllable devices via (9)
2: // Define steady-state ADPFs as LPFs
3: $m_{i}^{k}(s) \leftarrow \theta_{k}^{i}, \quad \forall i \in C_{\text{pf}}^k$
4: // Fix intermediate ADPFs as BPFs
5: for $i = |C_{\text{pf}}^k| + 1 : n - 1$ do
6: $m_{i}^{k}(s) \leftarrow \left(\frac{1}{\tau^s_i + 1} - \sum_{i=1}^{i-1} m_{i}^{k}(s)\right)$
7: end for
8: // Fix fastest device’s ADPF as HPF
9: $m_{n}^{k}(s) \leftarrow \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} m_{i}^{k}(s)\right)$

B. Online Adaptation of LPF DC-Gains

We specify the LPF DC-gains $\theta_{k}^{i}, i \in C_{\text{pf}}^k$ in such a way that they can be adapted online, proportionally to the time-varying power capacity limits of the devices. For each channel $k \in \{\text{pf}, \text{qv}\}$, we consider the optimal quadratic allocation

$$\min_{\theta_{k}^{i}(t), \forall i \in C_{\text{pf}}^k} \sum_{i \in C_{\text{pf}}^k} y_{i}^{\max,k}(t) \left(\frac{1}{y_{i}^{\max,k}(t)} \theta_{k}^{i}(t)\right)^2$$

subject to

$$\sum_{i \in C_{\text{pf}}^k} \theta_{k}^{i}(t) + \sum_{i \in N} m_{i}^{k}(s = 0) = 1$$

$$\theta_{k}^{i}(t) \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in C_{\text{pf}}^k,$$

where the equality constraint assures the participation condition (8), and $y_{i}^{\max,k}(t) \equiv p_{i}^{\max,k}(t) \in [\bar{p}_{i}^{\max,k}, \bar{p}_{i}^{\max,k}]$, $\forall i \in C_{\text{pf}}^k$ (or $y_{i}^{\max,k}(t) \equiv q_{i}^{\max,k}(t) \in [\bar{q}_{i}^{\max,k}, \bar{q}_{i}^{\max,k}]$, $\forall i \in C_{\text{pf}}^k$) represents the time-varying active (or reactive) power capacity limit of device $i$. The LPF DC-gains are given by the optimal solution of (11), i.e., for all $i \in C_{\text{pf}}^k$ and $k \in \{\text{pf}, \text{qv}\}$, we get

$$\theta_{k}^{i}(t) = \left(1 - \sum_{j \in N} m_{j}^{k}(s = 0) \right) \frac{y_{i}^{\max,k}(t)}{\sum_{i \in C_{\text{pf}}^k} y_{i}^{\max,k}(t)},\quad \text{(12)}$$

where the quantity in the parentheses in (12) is the contribution to the DC-gain coming from the non-controllable devices. Obviously, the LPF DC-gains in (12) are bounded on an interval $[\theta_{k}^{i}, \bar{\theta}_{k}^{i}]$, where the lower and upper bounds depend on the lower and upper power capacity limits.

During power system operation, the DC-gains in (12) can be updated in a centralized way, where the DVPP operator continuously collects all $p_{i}^{\max,k}(t), \forall i \in C_{\text{pf}}^k$ and $q_{i}^{\max,k}(t), \forall i \in C_{\text{pf}}^k$, and communicates back the solution (12) for $k \in \{\text{pf}, \text{qv}\}$ to all devices. If a distributed implementation is more desired, one could alternatively use the consensus-filters (15)

$$\frac{d}{dt} \theta_{k}^{i}(t) = \sum_{i \in C_{\text{pf}}^k} \left(\frac{\theta_{k}^{i}(t) - \theta_{k}^{i}(t)}{y_{i}^{\max,k}(t)}\right) \text{ with}$$

$$\sum_{i \in C_{\text{pf}}^k} \theta_{k}^{i}(0) = \left(1 - \sum_{i \in N} m_{i}^{k}(0)\right)$$

for all $i \in C_{\text{pf}}^k$, $k \in \{\text{pf}, \text{qv}\}$ to track the allocation rule (12) via peer-to-peer communication of $\theta_{k}^{i}(t)$ and $y_{i}^{\max,k}(t)$.

Similar to the LPF DC gains, online adaptation could also be applied to all other ADPF parameters.

C. Design of Local Matching Control

Next, we need to find local feedback controls for the controllable devices $C$ to ensure their closed-loop transfer matrix $T_i$ satisfies the matching condition (5). We address these local matching control designs with a LPV $H_{\infty}$ optimal control, which is well-suited to deal with the ADPMs, being...
parameter-varying with respect to the time-varying LPF DC-gains. More specifically, the LPV $H_\infty$ control is computationally tractable and provides a suboptimality certificate for the entire parameter space of the LPF DC-gains, thereby limiting the performance degradation over all possible operating conditions. Further, we ensure transient time-domain limits of the devices are not violated during normal operating conditions.

**Tolerating Mismatch:** We first relax the restrictions on the matching control and therefore modify the participation condition in (8) by allowing a mismatch in the high frequency range of the Bode plot. In particular, since the measurement unit (e.g. a PLL) for the bus frequency and voltage measurement is limited by some bandwidth $1/\tau_c$, it suffices if the participation condition in (8) only holds for the frequency range below, i.e.,

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \mathcal{C}} m_i^k(s) = \sum_{i = 1}^{n-1} m_i^k(s), \quad k \in \{\text{pf}, \text{qv}\}. \quad (14)$$

Consequently, line 9 in Algorithm 1 is adjusted as

$$m_i^k \leftarrow \left(\frac{1}{\tau_{z+1}} - \sum_{i = 1}^{n-1} m_i^k(s)\right), \quad k \in \{\text{pf}, \text{qv}\}. \quad (15)$$

To simplify notation, we will drop the device index $i \in \mathcal{C}$ in the following, as the remainder of this subsection refers to the local matching control of one controllable device $i$.

**LPV $H_\infty$ matching control:** For each controllable device, we attempt to find a matching controller where the specification in (5) serves as a reference model to be matched. Let $y := [\Delta p, \Delta q]'$ and $w := [\Delta f, \Delta \nu]'$. The control design setup is shown in Fig. 2, where

$$\dot{x} = Ax + Bu + Ew, \quad y = Cx + Du + Fw,$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

is the linearized reduced-order system of the plant (e.g., representing the primary source technology and/or the associated grid-side converter interface, see Section IV), and

$$\dot{x}^r = A^r(\Theta(t))x^r + E^r(\Theta(t))w, \quad y^r = C^r(\Theta(t))x^r + F^r(\Theta(t))w,$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

is the LPV system representation of the local reference model $M \cdot T_{\text{des}}$, which is included into the control setup, but not a physical part of the system itself. The state-space matrices in (17) depend affinely on the time-varying vector of parameters $\Theta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, which, according to the selected ADPM of the device, is composed of the different DC-gain parameters $\theta_i^k(t), \quad i \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{pf}}, \quad k \in \{\text{pf}, \text{qv}\}$. Since the latter are varying on the interval $[\theta_i^k, \theta_i^k]$ for all $t \geq 0$ (cf. (12)), the vector $\Theta(t)$ ranges over a fixed polytope of vertices $\Theta^{(1)}, \ldots, \Theta^{(q)}$.

We combine (16) and (17), and add an integral state $\hat{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon$ of the matching error $\varepsilon := y - y^r$ as a feedback signal to robustify the matching design against model uncertainties. This yields the augmented LPV system used for control design

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{x}^r \\ \dot{\varepsilon} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & O & O \\ O & A^r(\Theta(t)) & O \\ C & -C^r(\Theta(t)) & O \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ x^r \\ \sigma \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} B & O & E^r(\Theta(t)) \\ O & D & F^r(\Theta(t)) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u \\ w \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{z} \\ \dot{x} \\ \dot{\varepsilon} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} C & -C^r(\Theta(t)) & O \\ O & C^r(\Theta(t)) & O \\ \bar{D} & \bar{D}(\Theta(t)) & \bar{E}(\Theta(t)) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z \\ x^r \\ \sigma \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \bar{D}(\Theta(t)) & \bar{D}(\Theta(t)) & \bar{E}(\Theta(t)) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u \\ w \end{bmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

where $O$ is the zero matrix with appropriate dimension. The associated static control law is given by $u(t) = K(\Theta(t))\hat{\varepsilon}(t)$, where the state-feedback gain $K(\Theta(t))$ is parameter-dependent, and the resulting (open-circuit) closed-loop system is given as

$$\dot{\varepsilon} = (A(\Theta) + B(\Theta)K(\Theta))\varepsilon + \mathcal{E}(\Theta)w,$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

Under the configuration in Fig. 2 the parameter-dependent state-feedback gain $K(\Theta(t)) = \bar{K}(\Theta(t))$ is obtained by minimizing the matching error $\varepsilon(s) = N(s)w(s)$ in the $H_\infty$-norm as

$$\min_{K(\Theta)} \gamma$$  \hspace{1cm} (20a)

subject to $\|N(s)\|_\infty < \gamma$,  \hspace{1cm} (20b)

where $N(s)$ is the transfer function obtained from (19). As a common practice in $H_\infty$ control, the $H_\infty$-bound in (20b) can be reformulated in terms of a linear matrix inequality (LMI) to obtain a tractable convex optimization problem that can be solved efficiently. Namely, by virtue of the Bounded Real Lemma (BRL) [16], the $H_\infty$ bound in (20b) is equivalent to the LMI (indicates symmetric blocks)

$$\begin{bmatrix} Q\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}_1}(\Theta) + \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}_1}(\Theta)Q & * & * \\ \mathcal{E}(\Theta)' & -\gamma I & * \\ \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{C}_1}(\Theta)Q & \mathcal{F}(\Theta) & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

ensuring (open-circuit) closed-loop stability of the system in (19), if there exists a symmetric positive definite solution $Q = Q' > 0$ for all admissible values of $\Theta(t)$ [13], [17].

**Parametric State-Feedback Gain:** The key challenge of (21) is the infinite number of constraints it imposes, as we consider the entire polytope of possible parameter values of $\Theta(t)$. For polytopic LPV systems, however, (21) can be reduced to a finite set of constraints [13], [17]. In particular, since the state-space matrices in (18) depend affinely on $\Theta(t)$, and $\Theta(t)$ varies in a polytope of vertices $\Theta^{(1)}, \ldots, \Theta^{(q)}$, the state-space matrices are constrained on the polytope with vertices

$$\left(A^{(l)}, B^{(l)}, \mathcal{E}^{(l)}, C^{(l)}, D^{(l)}, \mathcal{F}^{(l)}\right) := (A, B, \mathcal{E}, C, D, \mathcal{F})\left(\Theta^{(l)}\right), \quad (22)$$
for $l = 1, \ldots, q$. Given the latter, it can be shown that (21) will hold for all $\Theta(t)$ if there exist symmetric positive definite matrix $Q$ and matrices $\gamma^{(l)}$ for $l = 1, \ldots, q$, such that the vertex

LMIs in (25) are satisfied [13]. In this regard, we can transform

the LMIs, which can immediately be included into the problem

is based on the reformulation of these constraints in terms of

input constraints, but rather provide a tool, which, after tuning

state and input constraints of the system in (18) into control

in our applications, i.e. simplices and parallelotopes, there

In particular, for the parameter polytopes we are considering

where, for a given online measurement of $z(t)$ during power

system operation, the coefficients $\lambda^{(l)}(\Theta)$ of the convex

combination of the vertices are computed such that [13]

\[ \sum_{l=1}^{q} \lambda^{(l)}(\Theta) \Theta^{(l)} = \Theta(t), \quad \lambda^{(l)}(\Theta) \geq 0, \quad \sum_{l=1}^{q} \lambda^{(l)}(\Theta) = 1. \] (24)

where, for a given online measurement of $\Theta(t)$ during control

design, to do so, we employ an idealized method for design

purposes, i.e., we do not aim to represent actual state and input constraints, but rather provide a tool, which, after tuning

parameters, can lead to these constraints being satisfied.

The tuning method for state and input constraint satisfaction is based on the reformulation of these constraints in terms of

LMIs, which can immediately be included into the problem

in (23). Namely, as derived in [20], [21], for $w$ limited in energy and $z(0) = 0$, the input and state constraints

max_{t \geq 0} \|u(t)\| \leq \mu$ and max_{t \geq 0} $|\zeta(t)| \leq \zeta$, for the states

$\gamma \leq 0$, if $Q$ and $\gamma^{(l)}$ satisfy

\[ \begin{bmatrix} Q & \gamma^{(l)} \\ \gamma^{(l)} & \alpha \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad l = 1, \ldots, q, \] (26a)

\[ \begin{bmatrix} Q \gamma^{(l)} & Z \gamma^{(l)} \\ Z \gamma^{(l)} & Q \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad j \in \{1, \ldots, v\}, \] (26b)

where $Z$ is a diagonal matrix with ones at positions $j$, $|| \cdot ||$ is the Euclidean norm, and $\mu, \zeta_j, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ are tuning parameters

to handle several performance requirements (see [20], [21] for details). In this regard, we also implicitly tune the integral gain of the controller by adjusting the bound $\zeta_j$ for the state $\sigma$.

We include the LMIs in (26) into the problem in (23) and arrive at the final $H_\infty$ model-matching problem

\[ \begin{bmatrix} Q & \gamma^{(l)} \\ \gamma^{(l)} & \alpha \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad l = 1, \ldots, q, \] (27a)

\[ \begin{bmatrix} Q \gamma^{(l)} & Z \gamma^{(l)} \\ Z \gamma^{(l)} & Q \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad j \in \{1, \ldots, v\}, \] (27b)

where the resulting vertex controllers $K^{(l)}$, $l = 1, \ldots, q$, are used to compute the LPV feedback gain $K(\Theta(t))$ online via (24).

IV. TEST CASE

To verify our DVPP controls, we use Simscape Electrical to perform an electromagnetic transients (EMT) simulation based on the IEEE nine-bus system. In a first case study, we start with a tutorial example of a DVPP composed of only weather-independent DERs, specified to improve the fast frequency response of the initial system in [19] in a non-adaptive fashion. In a second case study, we investigate a multivariable DVPP setup replacing the fast frequency and voltage control of a thermal-based generator, while additionally including online-adaptation of the ADPMs to handle temporal variability of weather-dependent DERs. The MATLAB/Simulink implementation of the models and controls is available online [22], and the parameter values are given in Table I.

A. System Model

As in the nine-bus system in [19], we consider two conventional thermal-based power plants and one hydro power plant for our initial test case (Fig. 4). The implementation is based on the system model in [23], where the transmission lines are modelled via nominal $\pi$ sections, and the transformers via three phase linear transformer models. The loads are modelled as constant power loads. We adopt an 8th-order model for the synchronous machines equipped with a ST1A excitation system with built-in automatic voltage regulator (AVR) and a power system stabilizer. The governors are modelled as a proportional speed-droop control with first-order delay, and the hydro and steam turbine parameters are taken from [24].
B. Grid-Side Converter Model and Control Architecture

Both DVPP case studies include (among others) converter-based generators which are interfaced to the grid via individual power converters, and thus considered as controllable (∈ C) within their respective DVPP control setup. The proposed grid-side converter model used for dynamic simulation represents an aggregation of multiple commercial converter modules, and is based on a state-of-the-art converter control scheme [25], into which we have incorporated the $H_\infty$ matching control (Fig. 5). Namely, we employ a grid-supporting control scheme that is synchronized with the grid voltage and contributes to the regulation of the grid frequency and voltage according to the local desired DVPP specifications $M_i \cdot T_{des}$, respectively.

Similar to [23], we assume that the dc current $i_{dc}$ is supplied by a controllable dc current source (Fig. 5), e.g. representing the machine-side converter of a wind power plant, a PV system, or an energy storage. In particular, we use a coarse-grain model of the underlying primary source technology and model its control behavior by a first-order delay with a time constant $T_{del}$ [23], e.g. representing the resource associated dynamics, communication delays and/or actuation delays.

The grid-side converter control is separated into two control loops for the dc and the ac side (Fig. 5). The dc-side control regulates the dc voltage through the dc current source and a proportional controller. The ac-side control is used to control the network current magnitudes. It is implemented in a dq-coordinate frame oriented via a phase locked loop (PLL) which tracks the system frequency after the $RL$-branch, keeping the converter synchronized with the grid voltage [25]. The ac-side control is composed of a cascaded control loop, where the outer loop, containing the $H_\infty$ matching control, provides the ac current reference $i_{dq}^*$ to the inner current control loop.

C. Case Study I: Supplementing Hydro in Frequency Response

The initial system (Fig. 4) is characterized by a poor short-term frequency response, caused by the transient droop compensation and the non-minimum phase zero of the hydro turbine [24]. As proposed in [8], [26], this poor response behavior can be compensated by a battery energy storage system (BESS) connected to the same bus. In addition, we complement the hydro turbine and BESS by a supercapacitor (sc) for fast frequency response, as in hybrid energy storage systems [10]. This gives us a DVPP at bus 1 (Fig. 6a), for which we specify an aggregate frequency response behavior identical to a proportional p-f droop control, i.e.

$$\Delta p(s) = T_{des}(s) \Delta f(s), \quad T_{des}(s) = \frac{D}{s + 1},$$

where $D$ is the desired droop coefficient, and the denominator with $\tau$ is included to filter out high frequency dynamics. The voltage control at bus 1 is fully provided by the installed AVR of the hydro plant, therefore not part of the DVPP control. Thus, (28) represents a one-dimensional version of the aggregate specification in [3].

To provide each DVPP device with the DVPP broadcast signal, given by the bus frequency deviation at bus 1, we use individual bus measurements of the devices (instead of one common bus measurement), assuming that independent measurements are sufficiently similar.

**ADPF Selection:** Since the aggregate specification of DVPP 1 in (28) is a one-dimensional transfer function, the ADPFs of the devices reduce to the ADPFs for p-f control, respectively, i.e., $M_i(s) = M_i^{pf}(s)$, $i \in \{\text{hydro}, \text{bess}, \text{sc}\}$.

A small-signal model of the hydro governor and turbine dynamics with input being the bus frequency and output being the mechanical active power is given by [24]

$$T_{hydro}(s) = \frac{-1/R_h}{s + \tau} \frac{\tau + 1}{(\tau/R_s) + 1} \frac{1}{s + \tau_w} \frac{1}{s + \tau_{bess}},$$

where the last term accounts for the delay between the bus frequency $\Delta f_b$ and the rotor frequency $\Delta f_r$ of the hydro generator. Since (29) describes a pre-installed setup of the hydro unit at bus 1, it is considered as fixed ($\in \mathbb{C}$) within the DVPP setup for p-f control. In particular, for a choice of $1/D = R_g$ and $\tau = \tau_{bess}$ in (29), the hydro ADPF is given as

$$m_{hydro}^{pf}(s) = T_{des}(s)^{-1} T_{hydro}(s) = \frac{\tau_{s+1}}{(\tau/R_s) + 1} \frac{1}{s + \tau_w} \frac{1}{s + \tau_{bess}},$$

i.e., by our design choice of (28), the hydro unit establishes the full DC gain of DVPP 1, so that $T_{hydro}(0) = T_{des}(0)$.

The converter-based BESS and supercapacitor are controllable ($\in C$) and used to complement the hydro response on faster time scales, therefore participating in the specified p-f control in (28) as BPF and HPF, respectively. Their ADPFs are selected by Algorithm 1, i.e.

$$m_{bess}^{pf}(s) = \frac{1}{\tau_{s+1}} - m_{hydro}^{pf}(s)$$

$$m_{sc}^{pf}(s) = \frac{1}{\tau_{s+1}} - m_{bess}^{pf}(s) - m_{hydro}^{pf}(s).$$
where the magnitude Bode plots are shown in Fig. 6b. The time-constant $\tau_{\text{bess}}$ corresponds to the dc time-constant in the associated converter model in Fig. 5, representing actuation delays of the BESS technology. In contrast to the hydro unit, the frequency measurements for the BESS and the supercapacitor are given by their respective PLL. Therefore, the HPF ADPF of the supercapacitor is cut at the PLL-bandwidth $1/\tau_c < 1/\tau_{\text{PLL}}$ according to the relaxation in (15).

Since $m^{\text{PLL}}_{\text{hydro}}$ is non-adaptive by definition and establishes the full DC gain of DVPP 1, all our ADPFs in (30) to (32) are free of any adaptive DC-gain parameters, which is in accordance with the weather-independence of all three devices.

**Local matching control:** To match the local closed-loop dynamics of the converter-based BESS and supercapacitor with their local reference model $M_s \cdot T_{\text{des}}$, $i \in \{\text{bess, sc}\}$, respectively, we employ the previously introduced $H_{\infty}$ matching control in the outer control loop of their respective grid-side converter (Fig. 5). As shown in Fig. 7, the matching control is defined by the local reference model $M_s \cdot T_{\text{des}}$, $i \in \{\text{bess, sc}\}$ and the associated state-feedback gain $K_i$. In particular, since the ADPFs of the BESS and the supercapacitor are fixed transfer functions (and with that their reference models $M_s \cdot T_{\text{des}}$), the matching control design simplifies in such a way, that the respective optimization problem in (27) has to be solved for a parameter polytope consisting of one vertex only. Consequently, each matching controller $K_{\text{bess}}(\Theta_{\text{bess}}(s)) = K_{\text{ac}}$ and $K_{\text{ac}}(\Theta_{\text{ac}}(s)) = K_{\text{sc}}$ is parameter-independent, and directly obtained as the solution of (27), respectively.

Beyond that, we consider a one-dimensional DVPP specification for the $p$-$f$ control of DVPP 1 (c.f. (28)), and therefore employ the matching control only in the converter’s “active power path” to control the $d$-component $i_d^\star$ (Fig. 7).

**Simplified Converter Model for Control Design:** According to Section III-C, a linearized representation of the converter model in Fig. 5 is required to design the feedback gain $K_i$ in Fig. 7. While linearizing the converter model, we proceed by making a reasonable model reduction, which supports the optimization problem in (27) in computation and scope.

Firstly, we disregard the dc side of the converter by assuming $v_{\text{dc}} \approx v_{\text{dc}}^\star$ and only consider the ac-side dynamics for control design. In particular, since the ADPFs $m^{\text{PLL}}_i$, $i \in \{\text{bess, sc}\}$ include the time-constants $\tau_{\text{bess}}$ and $\tau_{\text{sc}} > \tau_{\text{ac}}$ of the converter’s primary source (c.f. (31) and (32)), the regulation of active power on the ac side, imposed by the local reference model $M_s \cdot T_{\text{des}}$, will be slower or equal than the dc-side control.

Considering the ac-side dynamics, we extract the PLL from the model, as it provides the DVPP broadcast signal in terms of the frequency deviation $\Delta f_{\text{PLL}}$. Therefore, the remaining system for control design consists of the $RL$-branch dynamics, the current loop, and the power computation, given as

$$\begin{align}
\frac{\dot{v}_{\text{dc}}}{\omega} &= -Z_i i_{\text{dc}} + v_{\text{c,dc}} - v_{\text{dc}} \\
\dot{x}_{i,\text{dc}} &= i_{\text{dc}} - i_{\text{dq}} \\
v_{\text{c,dc}} &= Z_i i_{\text{dc}} + k_p (i_{\text{dc}}^\star - i_{\text{dc}}) + k_i x_{i,\text{dc}} \\
p &= v_i d_l + v_i q_l, \quad q = v_q d_l - v_q i_l.
\end{align}$$

We proceed by approximating $v_i \approx v^\star$ and $v_q \approx 0$ as constants, such that the active and reactive power expressions become decoupled, i.e. $p \approx v^\star d_l$ and $q \approx -v^\star q_l$, assuming to stay close to the nominal operating point. In particular, since we include the reference model $M_s \cdot T_{\text{des}}$ into the matching control, we can compensate for the mismatch between the desired active power injection and the latter approximation.

Moreover, since $v_{\text{dc}} \approx v_{\text{dc}}^\star$, we can assume $v_{\text{c,dc}} \approx v_{\text{c,dc}}^\star$ and therefore reduce (33c) and (33a) to

$$\begin{align}
\frac{\dot{i}_{\text{dc}}}{\omega} &= k_p (i_{\text{dc}}^\star - i_{\text{dc}}) + k_i x_{i,\text{dc}}.
\end{align}$$

By linearizing about the nominal operating point, we obtain

$$\begin{align}
\frac{\dot{\Delta i}_{\text{dc}}}{\omega} &= k_p (\Delta i_{\text{dc}}^\star - \Delta i_{\text{dc}}) + k_i \Delta x_{i,\text{dc}} \\
\Delta \dot{x}_{i,\text{dc}} &= \Delta i_{\text{dq}} - \Delta i_{\text{dc}} \\
\Delta p &= v^\star \Delta i_{\text{dc}}, \quad \Delta q = -v^\star \Delta i_{q}.
\end{align}$$

where all variables represent deviations from their respective equilibrium point, i.e. $\Delta i_{\text{dc}} = i_{\text{dc}} - i_{\text{dc},0}$, $\Delta i_{\text{dq}} = i_{\text{dq}} - i_{\text{dq},0}$, $\Delta x_{i,\text{dc}} = x_{i,\text{dc}} - x_{i,\text{dc},0}$, $\Delta p = p - p_0$ and $\Delta q = q - q_0$.

Since we are only interested in controlling $i_d^\star$ to regulate the active power, the decoupled system in (35) can be reduced to only considering the $d$-states and the active power output, i.e.,

$$\begin{align}
\frac{\dot{\Delta i}_{\text{d}}}{\omega} &= k_p (\Delta i_{\text{d}}^\star - \Delta i_{\text{d}}) + k_i \Delta x_{i,\text{d}} \\
\Delta \dot{x}_{i,\text{d}} &= \Delta v^\star - \Delta i_{\text{d}} \\
\Delta p &= v^\star \Delta i_{\text{d}}.
\end{align}$$

Finally, the system in (36) serves as linearized plant model for the design of the BESS and supercapacitor matching controllers (c.f. Fig. 2), where the PLL frequency deviation $\Delta f_{\text{PLL}}$ is an input to only the device’s local reference model $M_s \cdot T_{\text{des}}$ (i.e., $E = 0$ in (16)). In this regard, the augmented system in (18), required to solve the optimization problem in (27) is established by (36) and the individual reference model $M_i \cdot T_{\text{des}}$, $i \in \{\text{bess, sc}\}$, respectively, where $T_{\text{des}}$ is given in (28). The tuning parameters in (26) limit to transients of the converter currents as $||\Delta i_{\text{d}}^\star|| \leq \mu_{\text{bess}}$ and $||\Delta i_{\text{d}}|| \leq \mu_{\text{ac}}$, as well as to shape the integral gain of the controllers as $[\sigma_p] \leq \mu_{\text{bess}_{\mu_{\text{p}}}}$ and $[\sigma_p] \leq \mu_{\text{ac}_{\mu_{\text{p}}}}$, are given in Table 1.

**Simulation Results:** We compare the frequency response of the hydro unit at bus 1 in the initial system in Fig. 4 with the response of DVPP 1 in Fig. 6a in detailed simulations based on nonlinear system and device models. In both scenarios, the hydro unit is assigned 60% of the baseload, while the thermal-based power plants at buses 2 and 3 provide the remaining 40%. Since we focus on time scales of minutes to seconds or faster, the impact of the state of charge of the BESS and the supercapacitor are neglected. From the simulation results of the nine-bus system in Fig. 8, we can observe that the frequency response of the stand-alone hydro unit to a 30 MW load step at bus 6 is quite poor in terms of both settling time.
super-DVPP 3, which, thanks to our adaptive control approach can be exploited to compensate each other's fluctuations [27].

Case study II: SG Replacement by Adaptive DVPP Control

While keeping DVPP 1 at bus 1, we replace the thermal-based power plant at bus 3 by another DVPP, consisting of a wind power plant, a PV system and a STATCOM with battery (Fig. 9a). We want to substitute the services of the thermal-based power plant, and specify a p-f and q-v control as

\[ \Delta p(s) = T_{\text{des}}(s) \left[ \frac{\Delta f(s)}{\Delta \nu(s)} \right], \quad T_{\text{des}}(s):= \begin{bmatrix} -D_q - H_p s \tau_p + 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -D_q \tau_p + 1 \end{bmatrix}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (37)

where \( H_p, D_q \) are the virtual inertia and droop coefficients for the p-f control, \( D_q \) is a high gain droop for the q-v control, and the denominators with \( \tau_p \) and \( \tau_q \) are included to filter out high-frequency dynamics.

Due to their volatile availability, neither PV nor wind are typically solely installed for frequency and voltage control. However, the complementary nature of wind and solar energy can be exploited to compensate each other’s fluctuations [27].

D. Case Study II: SG Replacement by Adaptive DVPP Control

Fig. 8: Frequency and active power of the hydro unit at bus 1 in the initial system (Fig. 4) compared with DVPP 1 in Case Study I (Fig. 6a). The dashed lines indicate the desired active power injection of the DVPP devices.

and frequency nadir. In contrast, the DVPP highly improves the frequency response of the hydro plant, and the BESS and the supercapacitor match their desired power injection (dashed lines) very well. We also observed that the transient actuation constraints, i.e., converter current constraints, are not encountered during the load step (not shown).

\[ m_{\text{inj}}(s) = \frac{\theta_{\text{inj}}}{\tau_{\text{inj}}} + 1, \quad m_{\text{inj}}(s) = \frac{q_{\text{inj}}}{q_{\text{inj}}} + 1, \quad m_{\text{inj}}(s) = \frac{\theta_{\text{inj}}}{\tau_{\text{inj}}} + 1, \]

where \( \tau_{\text{wind}}, \tau_{\text{pv}} \) are the dc time-constants employed in the associated converter model in Fig. 5. The adaptive DC-gains \( \theta_{\text{inj}}(t) \) and \( \theta_{\text{inj}}(t) \) are defined as in [12], i.e.,

\[ \theta_{\text{wind}}(t) = \frac{p_{\text{inj}}}{p_{\text{inj}}} + 1, \quad m_{\text{inj}}(s) = \frac{q_{\text{inj}}}{q_{\text{inj}}} + 1, \]

where the active power capacity limits vary in the interval \( \max(p_{\text{inj}}(t) \in [\max(p_{\text{inj}}), \max(p_{\text{inj}})]) \) and \( \max(q_{\text{inj}}(t) \in [\max(q_{\text{inj}}), \max(q_{\text{inj}})]) \), respectively. The ADPF of the p-f channel for the STATCOM with battery is obtained via Algorithm 1 as

\[ \eta_{\text{inj}}(s) = \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{inj}}} + m_{\text{inj}}(s) - m_{\text{inj}}(s), \]

where \( 1/\tau_{\text{inj}} \) is the PLL bandwidth. Note that \( \eta_{\text{inj}} \) depends on the adaptive DC-gains \( \theta_{\text{inj}} \) and \( \theta_{\text{inj}} \) of wind and PV.

Since the reactive power capability of the converters is independent of the dc source technology in our test case, we select the ADPFs of the q-v channel for all three devices as

\[ m_{\text{inj}}(s) = \frac{q_{\text{inj}}}{q_{\text{inj}}} + 1, \quad m_{\text{inj}}(s) = \frac{q_{\text{inj}}}{q_{\text{inj}}} + 1, \quad m_{\text{inj}}(s) = \frac{q_{\text{inj}}}{q_{\text{inj}}} + 1, \]

The adaptive DC-gains are defined as in [12], i.e.,

\[ \theta_{\text{wind}}(t) = \frac{p_{\text{inj}}}{p_{\text{inj}}} + 1, \quad \theta_{\text{wind}}(t) = \frac{q_{\text{inj}}}{q_{\text{inj}}} + 1, \quad \theta_{\text{wind}}(t) = \frac{q_{\text{inj}}}{q_{\text{inj}}} + 1, \]

where the reactive power capacity limit \( q_{\text{inj}} \) is related to the active power capacity limit \( p_{\text{inj}} \), \( i \in \{\text{wind}, \text{pv}, \text{st}\} \) via the PQ-capability curve of the power converter [28]. Namely, for \( v_{\text{dc}} \) sufficiently large, the ac voltage converter limit can be disregarded, and, under the assumption of a constant voltage magnitude, the current converter limit \( |i_{\text{dc}}| \) is 1 pu relates the active and reactive power limits in per unit as

\[ q_{\text{inj}}(t) = \sqrt{\left(|i_{\text{dc}}| \right)^2 - p_{\text{inj}}(t)^2} = \sqrt{1 - p_{\text{inj}}(t)^2}. \]

Finally, the magnitude Bode plots of all ADPFs during nominal capacity conditions are shown in Fig. 9b.

Local matching control: Similar as in case study I, we employ the \( H_{\infty} \) matching control in the outer control loop of each grid-side converter to match the local closed-loop dynamics of the DVPP 3 devices with their local reference model \( M_i, T_{\text{des}}, i \in \{\text{wind}, \text{pv}, \text{st}\} \) (Fig. 10). However, in contrast to the DVPP 1 converters, we now aim to regulate the entire reference current \( i_{\text{des}} \) to participate in the desired p-f and q-v control of DVPP 3 in [37]. In this regard, we consider the previous linearized converter model in [35] with

Fig. 9: System model and ADPFs of case study II.
both the $d$- and the $q$-states, as well as the active and reactive power outputs as our plant model for control design.

Furthermore, the ADPFs of the DVPP 3 devices (and with that their local reference models $M_i \cdot T_{des, i}$, $i \in \{\text{wind, pv, st}\}$) rely on the adaptive DC-gains introduced in \cite{40} and \cite{43} so that the associated state-feedback gains $K_i(\Theta)$ are parameter-dependent now. More precisely, the parameter vector $\Theta_i(t)$ of each device’s augmented LPV system in \cite{18} is given by the DC-gains appearing in the individual ADPM in \cite{38}, i.e.,

$$
\Theta_{\text{wind}}(t) = [p_{\text{wind}}^\text{pv}(t), \theta_{\text{wind}}^\text{pv}(t)],
\Theta_{\text{pv}}(t) = [p_{\text{pv}}^\text{pv}(t), \theta_{\text{pv}}^\text{pv}(t)],
\Theta_{\text{st}}(t) = [p_{\text{st}}^\text{pv}(t), \theta_{\text{st}}^\text{pv}(t) ].
$$

(45)

Hence, for each device, the optimization problem in \cite{27} is solved for the respective set of vertices $\Theta_{\text{wind}}^{(1)}, \ldots, \Theta_{\text{wind}}^{(q)}$, $\Theta_{\text{pv}}^{(1)}, \ldots, \Theta_{\text{pv}}^{(q)}$ and $\Theta_{\text{st}}^{(1)}, \ldots, \Theta_{\text{st}}^{(q)}$, to compute the associated vertex controllers, respectively. The tuning parameters in \cite{26} to limit transients of the converter currents as $||\Delta i_{\text{dc}}^i|| \leq \mu_1$, as well as to shape the integral gains of the controllers as $|\sigma_p| \leq \hat{\sigma}_p$, and $|\sigma_q| \leq \hat{\sigma}_q$, $i \in \{\text{wind, pv, st}\}$, are given in \cite{Table 1}.

Finally, during online operation, we compute the state-feedback controllers $K_{\text{wind}}(\Theta_{\text{wind}}(t))$, $K_{\text{pv}}(\Theta_{\text{pv}}(t))$ and $K_{\text{st}}(\Theta_{\text{st}}(t))$ as the convex combination of the respective vertex controllers (c.f. \cite{24}), where the convex combination coefficients are obtained via closed-form expressions derived in \cite{18}, based on the instantaneous values of the vectors $\Theta_i(t), i \in \{\text{wind, pv, st}\}$.

**Simulation Results:** While keeping DVPP 1 at bus 1, we replace the synchronous generator (SG) at bus 3 by DVPP 3 as in \cite{Fig 9a} and investigate its frequency and voltage response behavior in detailed simulations using nonlinear system and device models. We adopt the same baseload supply for DVPP 3 as for the prior SG, provided by the wind power plant and the PV system. The latter are operated under delineated conditions with respect to their maximum power point tracking, allowing them to participate in frequency and voltage regulation \cite{29}.

The DC-gains of the ADPFs are adapted by the DVPP operator and communicated to all DVPP devices. The impact of communication delays is neglected, not being relevant for the time-scales considered in this case study.

We first consider nominal generation capacities of the DVPP devices, i.e. the ADPFs are given as in \cite{Fig 9b}. During the simulation at $t = 5\text{ s}$, we impose a 18.7 MW load step at bus 3. From the results in \cite{Fig 11} it becomes apparent how all DVPP devices accomplish an accurate matching of their desired active and reactive power injection (dashed lines), such that their specified $p$-$I$ and $q$-$V$ controls establish an adequate replacement of the prior SG services. In particular, due to our design choice of $T_{des}$ in \cite{37}, the aggregate DVPP behavior even outperforms the frequency and voltage responses of SG 3 (c.f. red curves in \cite{Fig 11} from a separate simulation). Moreover, we also observed that the transient actuation constraints, i.e. converter reference current constraints, are not encountered during the load step (not shown).

To examine the DVPP control during time-varying limits on generation capacity, we induce a step decrease of the PV active power capacity limit $p_{\text{pv}}^{\text{max}}(t)$ at $t = 5\text{ s}$ (e.g. caused by a cloud), resulting in an overall generation loss of 18.7 MW at bus 3 (\cite{Fig 12}). This causes the ADPFs of all DVPP devices to automatically adapt in response to the PV loss, such that the respective LPV controllers $K_{\text{wind}}(\Theta_{\text{wind}}(t))$, $K_{\text{pv}}(\Theta_{\text{pv}}(t))$ and $K_{\text{st}}(\Theta_{\text{st}}(t))$ are recomputed online. In particular, as we can see by comparing the aggregate DVPP response during the PV generation loss (\cite{Fig 12}) and during the load step of equal size (\cite{Fig 11}), the overall DVPP behavior in \cite{37} remains nearly unaffected, since the wind and STATCOM ADPFs are adapted to compensate for the missing PV generation (see \cite{Fig 13} in comparison to \cite{Fig 9b}). Note that if we would stick to a non-adaptive controller implementation without adapting the ADPFs online, one would observe similar transient behavior as in \cite{Fig 12}, however, a larger steady-state deviation in frequency due to the absent DC-gain contribution of PV.
V. CONCLUSION

We have proposed a novel decentralized and multivariable control approach to DVPPs, with the objective to provide desired dynamic ancillary services in the form of fast frequency and voltage control. We employ an adaptive control strategy that takes into account the DVPP internal constraints of the devices, and can additionally handle temporal variability of weather-driven DER in a robust way. Our numerical case study in the IEEE nine-bus system shows the successful performance of our controls, and, in particular demonstrates how DVPPs can be used to improve the fast frequency response of the initial system, and to facilitate the dynamic ancillary services provision by DERs in future power systems.

Ongoing research includes the incorporation of grid-forming converter controls into our DVPP setup, as well as the extension of the DVPP setup to a geographically distributed scenario, where the DVPP devices are located at different geographical regions within the power system.

TABLE I: Model and control parameters for nine-bus system test case. Further parameters of the test case can be found in [22].
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