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I. INTRODUCTION

The introduction of LIDAR based wind field sensing technology suitable for mounting on a turbine has prompted researchers to increase turbine controller performance beyond that provided by feedback only control. This increase in control performance translates to reduced speed variance, reduced loading and reduced actuator usage leading to reduced costs of energy. Model Predictive Control (MPC) is a candidate method to utilize future wind speed data to control for multiple control objectives [1]. The optimization can include system constraints, system nonlinearities, simultaneously control multiple actuators to achieve multiple control objectives and incorporate information about future disturbances such as that supplied by LIDAR; all of which make this control framework extremely applicable to the wind turbine application.

Recently MPC methods utilizing future disturbance information have been investigated [2]–[4], showing reductions in extreme and fatigue loading and an increase in generator speed control performance. These studies indicate promising results however they are often obtained relative to a simple baseline controller and do not test the robustness of the methods in the presence of sensor noise and delays – key concerns for commercial deployment.

In this work we present comparisons of MPC controller performance when using LIDAR feedback under realistic measurement conditions (noise and delays) and against a state-of-the-art baseline controller. Key features of this implementation are: the use of an Unscented Kalman Filter (UKF) for state estimation; short prediction horizons to reduce computational burden and loop shaping of control inputs to help tune the controller response. The performance of controllers is tested on a high fidelity Bladed model of a 7MW next generation wind turbine concept with a 160m rotor diameter, used for extensive cost of energy calculations by DNVGL [5].

Simulation results demonstrate a reduction in generator speed variance; a tower fore-aft fatigue load reduction; and a pitch actuator duty reduction in above rated wind conditions when using an MPC controller with LIDAR feedback.

II. APPROACH

A. Reduced Order Linear Parameter Varying Model

The wind turbine can be described by a reduced order nonlinear model which captures the dynamics relevant to the controller behavior:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\delta} &= \frac{Q_s}{I_s} + \frac{Q_d}{I_N} \left( \frac{c_d}{I_s} + \frac{c_d}{I_N} \right) \delta - \left( \frac{k_d}{I_s} + \frac{k_d}{I_N} \right) \delta \\
\dot{\omega}_r &= \frac{k_d}{I_s} \delta + \frac{c_d}{I_s} \delta - \frac{Q_s}{I_s} \\
\dot{x}_r &= \left( \frac{-c_d x_r - k_d x_r + F_r}{m_r} \right) \\
\dot{\delta} &= -2 \xi \omega \dot{\theta} - \epsilon \delta \theta + \omega^2 \theta_a \\
\dot{Q}_a &= -\frac{1}{\tau_s} Q_a + \frac{1}{\tau_s} Q_a^w
\end{align*}
\]  

where the \( \delta, \omega, x, \theta, \) and \( Q_a \) represent the system states: LSS torsional deflection, generator speed, tower top fore-aft position, collective blade pitch angle and generator torque respectively; \( Q_s, F_r, \theta_a, \) and \( Q_a^w \) represent system inputs: aerodynamic torque on the rotor, thrust force on the rotor, collective pitch angle demand, and generator torque demand; \( I_s \) is the rotor inertia (referenced to the LSS), \( I_N \) is the generator and drivetrain inertia (referred to the high speed shaft (HSS)), \( N \) is the gearbox ratio, \( c_d \) is the LSS torsional damping constant, \( k_d \) is the LSS torsional stiffness constant, \( c_f \) is the modal damping of the tower flexibility, \( k_f \) is the modal stiffness of the tower flexibility, \( m_t \) is the modal mass of the tower flexibility, \( \epsilon \) is the pitch actuator damping ratio, \( \omega \) is the pitch actuator frequency and \( \tau_s \) is the generator torque time constant.

The model can be further simplified to reduce computational burden for MPC by representing the system as a Linear...
Parameter Varying (LPV) model parameterized by only by $V_e$ and linearizing along the steady state operating trajectory:

$$\dot{x} = A(V_e)\Delta x + B(V_e)\Delta u$$

$$\Delta u = C(V_e)\Delta x + D(V_e)\Delta u,$$

where, $u = [V_e \quad \theta_c \quad \omega_g \quad Q_g]^T$, $y = [\omega_r \quad \dot{x}_r \quad \theta_r \quad \dot{\theta}_r \quad x_r \quad \dot{x}_r \quad Q_g]^T$, and $x = [\delta \quad \delta \quad \omega_c \quad \theta_c \quad \theta_c \quad x_c \quad \dot{x}_c \quad Q_g]^T$.

This model maintains a degree of the nonlinearity through parameter varying coefficients, but allows the MPC optimization to be performed using the same tools as a linear system, reducing computational burden.

B. Simulation Model

The Bladed model of the 7MW wind turbine includes six modes for each blade (four flapwise and two edgewise modes) and seven modes for the tower (three fore-aft, three side-side and a torsional modes). The model also includes a simulated nacelle mounted continuous wave LIDAR scanning 50 equally spaced points on the circumference of circle with radius 55m, 95m upwind of the turbine at a sample time of 20ms (1s per full scan). The LIDAR returns line-of-sight data which is processed by the controller to recreate $V_e$ over the entire prediction horizon for use by the MPC. The reconstruction of $V_e$ from scanned points is vulnerable to error due to: sampling a single point at a time, sampling only a portion of the rotor area, the need to estimate the transport model of sampled data from the measurement plane towards the rotor plane and the decorrelation of the wind as it moves from the measurement plane to the rotor plane. All sources of error except the decorrelation are present in this investigation.

C. Baseline Controller

The state-of-the-art classically designed baseline controller used for this investigation has been heavily optimized to achieve significant reductions in cost of energy[5]. A schematic of the complete baseline control architecture can be seen in Fig 1.

D. Model Predictive Control

MPC controllers determine control inputs by optimizing a cost function of the system online. In this study an approximation of a quadratic infinite horizon cost function is used for optimizations[7]:

$$J = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \Delta x_i^T Q \Delta x_i + \Delta u_i^T R \Delta u_i + \Delta x_i^T S \Delta x_i + \Delta x_{i,n,p}^T P \Delta x_{i,n,p},$$

where $Q$ is the state deviation penalty, $R$ is the input deviation penalty, $S$ is the cross deviation penalty and $P$ is the terminal cost weighting. The cross term, $S$, allows additional tuning outputs to the control model leading to greater flexibility in loop shaping. The minimization of $J$ can be reduced to a quadratic program (QP) by using a discrete version of (2)[2]. In the implementation used for this work we have used the ‘closed-loop paradigm’ [8] method for numerical stability and predictability.

We assume for this study that only typical, noisy turbine measurements are available to the controller, requiring state estimation. Noise and delay characteristics of the turbine IO are summarized in Table 1. (\(\omega_g\), \(T_x\), \(Q_g\), \(\theta_c\), and \(Q_g\)). We use a Square Root Unscented Kalman Filter (UKF) to construct state estimates from measurements[9]. The UKF is particularly suited to the turbine estimation problem as it allows for stable estimation of nonlinear systems and it provides accurate estimation of mean and covariance data for nonlinear systems in contrast to the more commonly used Extended Kalman Filter. A schematic of the complete MPC control architecture is shown in Fig. 2.
III. RESULTS

Initially four controllers have been compared in a 600s turbulent wind simulation: MPC without LIDAR based measurements (MPC); MPC with LIDAR based measurements (MPC+LIDAR); MPC with ideal \( V_r \) measurements (MPC+Ideal LIDAR) and the baseline controller. The MPC with ideal \( V_r \) allows quantification of performance loss through errors in reconstructing \( V_r \) from realistic LIDAR measurements.

The simulations have been run with 3D turbulent full field wind with a mean speed of 16ms\(^{-1}\), created according to IEC61400-3 design standards for normal turbulence[10]. Hard constraints are placed on the inputs:

\[
0^\circ < \theta_{cd} < 90^\circ , \\
-8.5\text{ s}^{-1} < \dot{\theta}_{cd} < 8.5\text{ s}^{-1} , \\
-15\text{ s}^{-2} < \ddot{\theta}_{cd} < 15\text{ s}^{-2} \text{ and} \\
0\text{Nm} < Q_{cd} < 195140\text{Nm}
\]

All controllers used a sample time of 0.02s and the MPC controllers used a prediction horizon of 30 steps (0.6s), just above the minimum necessary to guarantee a feasible optimization in light of the pitch input position and acceleration constraints (0.57s).

To enable a fair comparison, an MPC controller with no LIDAR input is tuned to perform as closely to the baseline as possible. The same controller was then given LIDAR based reconstructions of \( V_r \) over the entire prediction horizon (MPC+LIDAR) and perfect knowledge of \( V_r \) over the prediction horizon (MPC+Ideal LIDAR).

The results for all controllers relative to the baseline are summarized in Table 2. The MPC+Ideal LIDAR case shows the most significant performance increases with a reduction from 142% to 69% in generator speed standard deviation, a reduction from 91% to 85% in total pitch travel and a reduction from 104% to 90% in total pitch travel and a reduction from 104% to 90% in total pitch travel and a reduction from 104% to 90% in tower base fore-aft fatigue DELs relative to a state-of-the-art feedback only baseline controller on an next generation 7MW wind turbine concept.

As the rotor speed objective is often binary, a greater reduction in loading for the same speed control performance is preferred. In the presented paper we will include results comparing MPC controllers with LIDAR feedback detuned to have similar speed control to the baseline case to investigate the resulting load reduction.

IV. CONCLUSION

An MPC controller has been shown to reduce rotor speed variance and tower fore-aft fatigue DELs relative to a state-of-the-art feedback only baseline controller on a next generation 7MW wind turbine concept.

The investigation shows that the method is robust to practical implementation issues such as noisy and delayed IO, realistic LIDAR measurements, short prediction horizons, reduced order LPV models and relying on state estimation.

V. LEARNING OBJECTIVES

The following learning objectives are intended for conference attendees:

- Become familiar with LIDAR technologies;
- Become familiar with MPC for wind turbines;
- Understand the practical challenges for implementing MPC for wind turbines; and
- Understand the potential benefits of adopting LIDAR assisted MPC for wind turbine control commercially.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controller</th>
<th>MPC</th>
<th>MPC + LIDAR</th>
<th>MPC + Ideal LIDAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gen. Speed</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev. Gen. Speed</td>
<td>142%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pitch Travel</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Base Fore-Aft DEL</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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