AC-aware Optimization Framework for Under-Frequency Load Shedding

Mazen Elsaadany, Muhammad Hamza Ali, Amritanshu Pandey, Mads R.Almassalkhi

Department of Electrical and Biomedical Engineering

University of Vermont

Burlington, Vermont

Abstract—Under-frequency load shedding (UFLS) prevents system collapse during large disturbances. Increased penetration of distributed energy resources (DERs) and reduced system inertia makes it challenging to design a static UFLS scheme, which relies on preset frequency thresholds and load shed fractions to meet design criteria across all possible operating conditions. Due to non-linearity and traceability issues, previous adaptive UFLS schemes use simplified tractable frequency models that overlook AC network effects such as voltage-dependent load/generation. This paper leverages model order reduction techniques to obtain a higher fidelity low-order model of system frequency dynamics that captures AC network effects while incorporating turbine governor action and their associated limits. The model is then used in a new AC-aware predictive optimization framework to adapt UFLS setpoints periodically based on current operating conditions while minimizing load shed. Validated on a 1,648-bus system with PSS/E simulations, the proposed method meets design criteria under various operating conditions and disturbance scenarios. Furthermore, the framework outperforms conventional static UFLS schemes and adaptive UFLS schemes based on simplified dynamic models.

Index Terms—Power system dynamics, Model Order Reduction, Under-frequency Load Shedding, Mixed Integer Program.

I. INTRODUCTION

The transition of the power grid towards renewable energy resources (RES) has significantly reshaped the operation and dynamics of modern power systems. The integration of RES technologies, such as wind and solar photovoltaic systems (PV), has displaced traditional synchronous generators, leading to a reduction in system inertia traditionally provided by synchronous generators [\[1\]](#page-10-0). Reduced inertia levels lead to larger frequency sensitivity to power imbalances, impacting grid reliability and stability. Under-frequency load shedding (UFLS) is used as the power grid's emergency brake and sheds load during large contingencies to help restore the balance between load and generation, halt frequency decline, and help prevent overall system collapse. Conventional UFLS schemes are static and rely on several UFLS relays in the network with preset frequency thresholds. The UFLS relays are designed such that when they trip a predetermined percentage of load is shed when the frequency at the relay drops below a preset threshold [\[2\]](#page-10-1). Typically, UFLS schemes consist of multiple stages each with a corresponding frequency threshold and load shed amount. The amount of load shed and the frequency thresholds are designed to meet certain performance criteria

laid out by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) for contingencies with an imbalance of up to 25% between load and generation [\[3\]](#page-10-2). However, with the increased prevalence of distributed energy resources (DERs), load patterns behind the UFLS relays have become more erratic with larger variations [\[4\]](#page-10-3). Furthermore, generation from DERs such as residential solar PV can exceed local demand leading to reversed power flow (backfeeding). Static UFLS schemes do not adapt to changing operating conditions, fluctuating load patterns, reduced system inertia, and bi-directional power flows. As a result, static UFLS schemes may fail to restore frequency to within safe limits.

Therefore, there is a need for an adaptive UFLS scheme that can respond to changing grid conditions. Previous work on adaptive UFLS schemes can be broadly classified as either response-based or prediction-based. In response-based schemes [\[5\]](#page-10-4)–[\[7\]](#page-10-5) the magnitude of the disturbance/contingency is estimated via the overall system rate of change of frequency (RoCoF) and is used to determine the amount of load to be shed. Response-based schemes use the center of inertia (CoI) frequency/RoCoF along with network and generator parameters values to estimate the magnitude of the contingency and shed load accordingly [\[5\]](#page-10-4), [\[6\]](#page-10-6). This requires measurements from all generators in the network which begets a centralized high-speed reliable communication infrastructure to estimate RoCoF in real-time [\[7\]](#page-10-5). Distributed approaches to estimate system RoCoF from local measurements have been proposed [\[8\]](#page-10-7), [\[9\]](#page-10-8). However, response-based methods are prone to error due to noise and large frequency swings associated with low inertia systems and high penetration of inverter interfaced renewable energy resources [\[10\]](#page-10-9).

In prediction-based schemes [\[11\]](#page-10-10)–[\[13\]](#page-10-11), a predictive model of the system's frequency dynamics is used to optimize UFLS setpoints. Prediction-based schemes commonly use the simplified frequency response model (SFR), presented in [\[14\]](#page-10-12), [\[15\]](#page-10-13), as a proxy for the system's frequency dynamics. This is done to facilitate analysis and/or arrive at a tractable UFLS optimization formulation [\[11\]](#page-10-10)–[\[13\]](#page-10-11). However, the SFR model is a simplified aggregated model of the system's frequency dynamics that represents the system with a single equivalent generator and in doing so ignores the AC network and the effects of voltages on frequency dynamics made more evident with the presence of voltage-dependent loads. Previous work that does consider network information has been restricted to DC power flow based models and for continuously controllable resources such as inverters providing virtual inertia and/or damping [\[16\]](#page-10-14). UFLS, on the other hand, consists of discrete load-shedding control actions. Work presented in [\[11\]](#page-10-10), [\[12\]](#page-10-15) use the SFR model to formulate a Mixed Integer Linear Program (MILP) that optimizes UFLS setpoints while ensuring that the time domain frequency response of the system meets certain design criteria. Work presented in [\[13\]](#page-10-11) presents a comprehensive optimization framework that co-optimizes UFLS setpoints along with slow and fast frequency regulation services and system inertia. The work in [\[13\]](#page-10-11) does not use a time-domain approach but uses the SFR model to formulate explicit constraints on system frequency nadir and uses that to optimize UFLS setpoints along with other frequency services. Furthermore, previous work has largely omitted turbine governor limits which greatly impact frequency response [\[17\]](#page-10-16), especially during large contingencies which is the case in UFLS applications.

Despite not suffering from the same practical implementation challenges as response-based methods, prediction-based methods have mainly utilized the SFR model as the predictive model of the system's frequency dynamics and largely ignored governor limits. Hence, this paper presents a prediction-based UFLS optimization scheme that adapts slow coherency-based reduction methods to arrive at a low-order frequency model of system frequency dynamics that is AC-aware (captures the dependency of frequency dynamics on bus voltages) [\[18\]](#page-10-17)– [\[20\]](#page-10-18). The prediction-based UFLS scheme takes in information about the network, generators, governor limits, and grid operating conditions to optimize UFLS setpoints for the largest credible contingency (25% imbalance) such that to minimize the amount of load shed and ensure satisfactory performance criteria as laid out by NERC [\[3\]](#page-10-2). Additionally, constraints are added to prevent excessive load shedding at any given UFLS stage. This is to ensure no over shedding in case of smaller disturbances.

Th main contributions of the paper are as follows:

- 1) Higher model fidelity: We leverage techniques used in slow-coherency-based model order reduction to obtain a Simplified AC-aware Frequency Response (SAFR) model of system frequency dynamics. Due to the higher model fidelity compared to the SFR model, predictive-based optimization of UFLS setpoints using the SAFR model outperforms SFR-based UFLS optimization schemes as well as static UFLS schemes.
- 2) Scalability to Larger Systems: The proposed SAFR model is a low-order dynamic model conducive to scaling the proposed prediction-based UFLS optimization for larger networks.
- 3) Empirical Validation: The performance of the optimization framework is validated against full non-linear time-domain simulations run on PSS/E on a 1648 bus system. The optimization framework is shown to meet design criteria under various operating conditions and disturbance scenarios. Furthermore, the proposed scheme outperforms static UFLS schemes (state-of-

practice) as well as SFR-based UFLS schemes.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section [II](#page-1-0) presents the full-order system model and the SFR model and highlights the pitfalls of using the SFR model. Section [III](#page-3-0) presents the slow-coherency aggregation techniques used to arrive at a low-order model of the system's frequency dynamics (SAFR) and compares the low-order SAFR model to the full-order non-linear model. Section [IV](#page-4-0) presents the MILP formulation of the UFLS setpoint optimization framework. Section [V](#page-7-0) presents the simulation results and validation of the optimization framework. Finally, Section [VI](#page-9-0) concludes the paper.

II. OVERVIEW OF SYSTEM MODELING

We consider a power system electromechanical model to capture generator frequency dynamics and bus voltage behavior. The model is then used to predict the frequency response to optimize UFLS setpoints. Typically, the tractable low-order SFR model is used [\[11\]](#page-10-10)–[\[13\]](#page-10-11). The SFR model, however, ignores AC effects (bus voltages, line flows, etc.) on the frequency dynamics. To remedy this, we adapt techniques from slow coherency model order reduction to obtain the SAFR model from the linearized full order system. A fullorder power system dynamics model is first presented and then the SFR model is given and the response of both models and the linearized dynamics to a loss of generation contingency are compared.

A. Full-order Power System Dynamics Model

Consider a power system comprised of N_g generators and N buses. Let $\mathcal{G} := \{1, \ldots, N_g\}$ denote the set of generators with rotor angle and frequency are denoted by $\delta, \omega \in \mathbb{R}^{N_g}$ and let $\mathcal{B} := \{1, \ldots, N\}$ denote the set of all buses with the bus voltage magnitudes and phase angles denoted as $V, \theta \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

1) Generator Swing Dynamics

The classical electromechanical model [\[17\]](#page-10-16), [\[21\]](#page-10-19) is considered wherein the generator i is modeled as a constant internal voltage E_i behind a transient reactance $X'_{d,i}$. The dynamics of machine $i \in \mathcal{G}$ located at bus $j \in \mathcal{B}$ is modeled as

$$
\dot{\delta}_i = \omega_i \tag{1a}
$$

$$
\frac{m_i}{\omega_0}\dot{\omega}_i = -d_i\omega_i + P_{\text{m},i} - P_{\text{e},i}
$$
 (1b)

$$
P_{\mathbf{e},i} = \frac{V_j E_i \sin(\delta_i - \theta_j)}{X'_{\mathbf{d},i}} \tag{1c}
$$

$$
Q_{e,i} = \frac{V_j E_i}{X'_{d,i}} \cos(\delta_i - \theta_j) - \frac{V_j^2}{X'_{d,i}},
$$
 (1d)

where m_i is the generator inertia constant, d_i is the generator damping coefficient, ω_0 is the nominal frequency in rad/s, $P_{m,i}$ is the mechanical power input to the generator, and $P_{e,i}$ and $Q_{e,i}$ are the real and reactive output power to the grid, and V_i and θ_i are the terminal bus voltage magnitude and phase angle of bus j.

2) Turbine-Governor Dynamics

The mechanical power input $P_{m,i}$ to machine $i \in \mathcal{G}$ is determined by the turbine governor which is modeled using a first-order low-pass filter [\[22\]](#page-10-20) as

$$
P_{\mathbf{m},i}(s) = -\frac{\omega_i - \omega_0}{R_i(T_i s + 1)} + P_{\mathbf{m},i}^{\text{ref}} \qquad \forall i \in \mathcal{G},\qquad(2)
$$

where ω_0 is the nominal frequency, $P_{m,i}^{\text{ref}}$ is the the nominal value of mechanical power input, R_i is the governor droop gain and T_i is the governor time constant. From [\(2\)](#page-2-0) the following is obtained:

$$
\dot{P}_{\mathbf{m},i} = \frac{1}{T_i} \left(-\frac{\omega_i - \omega_0}{R_i} - P_{\mathbf{m},i} + P_{\mathbf{m},i}^{\text{ref}} \right) \qquad \forall i \in \mathcal{G}. \tag{3}
$$

3) Transmission Network

The voltage phasors $V_n \angle \theta_n$ satisfy power balance equations $\forall n \in \mathcal{B}$, which is summarized with the AC power flow:

$$
P_{\text{net},n} = V_n \sum_{k=1}^{N} V_k \left[G_{nk} \cos(\theta_{nk}) + B_{nk} \sin(\theta_{nk}) \right]
$$
 (4a)

$$
Q_{\text{net},n} = V_n \sum_{k=1}^{N} V_k \left[G_{nk} \sin(\theta_{nk}) - B_{nk} \cos(\theta_{nk}) \right], \quad (4b)
$$

where G_{nk} and B_{nk} are the conductance and susceptance for line (n, k) while $\theta_{nk} := \theta_n - \theta_k$ is the phase angle difference between buses n and k . The left hand sides of [\(4\)](#page-2-1) represent the net power injection at bus n and are given by,

$$
P_{\text{net},n} := P_{g,n} - P_{d,n} \tag{5a}
$$

$$
Q_{\text{net},n} := Q_{\mathsf{g},n} - Q_{\mathsf{d},n},\tag{5b}
$$

where $P_{\text{g/d},n}$ and $Q_{\text{g/d},n}$ are active and reactive power injections/demand at buses n , respectively. The power demand $(P_{d,n}, Q_{d,n})$ are modeled as voltage-dependent ZIP loads with constant power, current, and admittance components. $P_{d,n}$ and $Q_{d,n}$ are given as follows:

$$
P_{d,n} = P_{P,n} + V_n I_{P,n} + V_n^2 Y_{P,n}
$$
 (6a)

$$
Q_{d,n} = Q_{Q,n} + V_n I_{Q,n} + V_n^2 Y_{Q,n},
$$
 (6b)

where $P_{P,n}$ and $Q_{Q,n}$ are the constant active and reactive power components of the load respectively. Similarly, $I_{P,n}$ and $I_{Q,n}$ are the constant current components of the load and $Y_{P,n}$ and $Y_{Q,n}$ are the constant admittance components of the load. Given the proportions of the constant power, current, and admittance components of the ZIP load the values of $P_{P,n}$, $I_{P,n}$ and $Y_{P,n}$ can be determined as

$$
P_{P,n} = (1 - a_n - b_n) P_{d,0,n}
$$
 (7a)

$$
I_{P,n} = a_n \frac{P_{d,0,n}}{V_{0,n}}
$$
 (7b)

$$
Y_{P,n} = b_n \frac{P_{d,0,n}}{V_{0,n}^2},\tag{7c}
$$

where $P_{d,0,n}$ and $V_{0,n}$ are the nominal power demand and voltage magnitude at bus n and can be obtained from the power flow solution. Furthermore, a_n and b_n are the constant

Fig. 1: Simplified Frequency Response (SFR) block diagram.

current and admittance fractions of the ZIP load respectively. The reactive power components $Q_{\mathbf{Q},n}$, $I_{\mathbf{Q},n}$ and $Y_{\mathbf{Q},n}$ can be determined in a similar manner.

4) Full-order overall System Model

The overall system is described by a set of differentialalgebraic equations (DAE), with the dynamic variables, $x :=$ $\begin{bmatrix} \delta & \omega & P_{\text{m}} \end{bmatrix}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{3N_g}$, being governed by a set of ODEs [\(1\)](#page-1-1) and [\(3\)](#page-2-2) and the algebraic variables, $y := [\theta \quad V]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2N}$, being dictated by the power flow equations [\(4\)](#page-2-1). The overall system of DAEs can be expressed (compactly) as

$$
\dot{x} = f(x, y) \tag{8a}
$$

$$
0 = g(x, y), \tag{8b}
$$

where the net power injections, $P_{\text{net},n}$ and $Q_{\text{net},n}$ are included in $g(x, y)$.

B. Simplified Frequency Response (SFR) Model

The SFR model is a simplified low-order power system dynamics model that captures the averaged frequency dynamics of the system. The model is derived by averaging the individual machine dynamics in the system to obtain a single equivalent machine [\[14\]](#page-10-12), [\[15\]](#page-10-13). The SFR model is illustrated in the block diagram in Fig [1.](#page-2-3) M_{SFR} and D_{SFR} are the aggregated weighted system inertia and damping coefficient and $\Delta P_{\text{m,SFR}}$ is the total change in mechanical power input to the system, obtained by aggregating the governors as shown in Fig [1.](#page-2-3) $\Delta P_{\rm SFR}$ is the change in total electrical power and represents the total power imbalance caused by contingencies. Note that the quantities shown in Fig [1](#page-2-3) are the changes from their respective nominal values. The SFR system frequency dynamics can be described as follows,

$$
\Delta \dot{\omega}_{\text{SFR}} = \frac{1}{M_{\text{SFR}}} \left(-D_{\text{SFR}} \Delta \omega_{\text{SFR}} + \Delta P_{\text{m,SFR}} - \Delta P_{\text{SFR}} \right). \quad (9)
$$

The SFR model is network agnostic and as such ignores voltage effects on load and the generator power injections, both of which affect the frequency. Figure [2](#page-3-1) considers a 23 bus test-case provided by PSS/E and shows the frequency response of the SFR model following a loss of generator contingency and UFLS action. The SFR model is compared against a) a full-order power system dynamics model based on DC power

Fig. 2: Comparison of frequency responses: SFR model, system response with voltage dependency, and system response without voltage dependency.

flow that does not capture voltage dependencies (as presented in [\[22\]](#page-10-20)) , b) the non-linear model in [\(8\)](#page-2-4) simulated using PSS/E , and c) a linearized version of full-order model in [\(8\)](#page-2-4). Figure [2](#page-3-1) shows that when neglecting AC effects such voltage dependencies, the SFR model is a good approximation of full system dynamics. However, when considering the AC effects, it is evident that the SFR model fails to capture the frequency dynamics. On the other hand, the linearized model, although with some error, better captures the frequency dynamics since when considering voltage dependencies. The linearized model along with techniques borrowed from slow coherency-based aggregation methods are used to obtain the SAFR model.

III. SIMPLIFIED AC-AWARE FREQUENCY RESPONSE MODEL

To obtain a reduced order model of system frequency dynamics we leverage model order reduction techniques to obtain a low-order dynamic model later used in predictive optimization of UFLS setpoints. Several model order reduction techniques can be used to obtain a reduced order power system dynamics model. Some common techniques are balanced truncation, Krylov subspace method, and slow coherencybased aggregation [\[18\]](#page-10-17), [\[20\]](#page-10-18). In this work, we borrow techniques used in slow coherency-based aggregation to obtain an aggregated model similar to the SFR model but while capturing AC effects on frequency dynamics (SAFR model) [\[18\]](#page-10-17)–[\[20\]](#page-10-18). Slow coherency aggregation takes advantage of the phenomenon that generators that are more electrically coupled (coherent generators) tend to swing together exhibiting similar frequency oscillations [\[18\]](#page-10-17). A coherent group exhibit fast intraarea oscillations within the coherent group and slower interarea oscillations between the coherent groups. Therefore, a reduced-order model can be obtained by identifying coherent frequencies and representing a coherent group with its slow inter-area dynamics while neglecting the faster intra-area dynamics.

Similar to how the SFR model aggregates the full system dynamics into an equivalent generator, our proposed SAFR model aggregates the system into a single coherent group capturing the slow modes of the system while neglecting the faster oscillatory modes of the frequency dynamics. Note that the SAFR model obtained still captures AC effects and frequency dynamics, unlike the SFR model.

Given a dynamic model described by [\(8\)](#page-2-4), the system is first linearized around the power flow equilibrium. The linearized model is given by:

$$
\Delta \dot{x} = \frac{\partial f(x, y)}{\partial x} \bigg|_{x_0, y_0} \Delta x + \frac{\partial f(x, y)}{\partial y} \bigg|_{x_0, y_0} \Delta y \qquad (10a)
$$

$$
0 = \frac{\partial g(x, y)}{\partial y} \Delta x + \frac{\partial g(x, y)}{\partial y} \bigg|_{x_0, y_0} \Delta y \qquad (10b)
$$

$$
0 = \frac{\partial g(x, y)}{\partial x}\bigg|_{x_0, y_0} \Delta x + \frac{\partial g(x, y)}{\partial y}\bigg|_{x_0, y_0} \Delta y, \quad (10b)
$$

where $\Delta x := x - x_0$ and $\Delta y := y - y_0$ are the deviations from the power flow equilibrium x_0, y_0 ^{[1](#page-3-2)}. The linearized model can be expressed compactly as

$$
\Delta \dot{x} = A_x \Delta x + A_y \Delta y \tag{11a}
$$

$$
0 = K_x \Delta x + K_y \Delta y.
$$
 (11b)

The angle and frequency states ($\Delta\delta$, $\Delta\omega$) of the linearized system in [\(11\)](#page-3-3) are transformed into aggregated variables $(\Delta \delta_{\rm r}, \Delta \omega_{\rm r})$ and difference variables by defining a state transformation based on the model-order reduction procedure presented in [\[18\]](#page-10-17)–[\[20\]](#page-10-18). The aggregated and difference variables capture the slow and fast modes of frequency oscillation respectively. The transformation matrix and its inverse are used to transform the system dynamics in terms of the aggregated and difference variables. Later on the difference variables are omitted to obtain a reduced order model that captures the slow aggregated system dynamics. The aggregated variable $\Delta \delta_r$ is obtained by taking the inertia weighted average of the rotor angles,

$$
\Delta \delta_{\rm r} := \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{G}} m_j \Delta \delta_j}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{G}} m_j},\tag{12}
$$

where $\Delta \delta_r$ is the aggregated variable that characterizes the overall trend in system frequency (i.e., the slow dynamics).

Next, we define $z \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{G}|-1}$ as the difference variable that captures the faster modes of oscillation:

$$
z_i := \Delta \delta_i - \Delta \delta_k \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{G} \backslash \{k\},\tag{13}
$$

where z_i is the relative rotor angle to a reference machine $(\Delta \delta_k)$ for any arbitrary $k \in \mathcal{G}$. That is, z captures the faster dynamics.

Together, [\(12\)](#page-3-4) and [\(13\)](#page-3-5) define a state space transformation of the system states ($\Delta\delta$ and $\Delta\omega$) in [\(11\)](#page-3-3) to the aggregated and difference variables, $\Delta \delta_r$ and z. The transformation shown can be expressed in vector form as,

$$
\begin{bmatrix} \Delta \delta_{\rm r} \\ z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} C \\ G \end{bmatrix} \Delta \delta,\tag{14}
$$

 1 To simplify analysis, the left hand side of [\(10b\)](#page-3-6) is kept as zero indicating no contingencies/load shedding added later in Section [IV.](#page-4-0)

where $C \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times |\mathcal{G}|}$ and $G \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{G}| \times |\mathcal{G}|}$ are projection matrices that capture the transformations in [\(12\)](#page-3-4) and [\(13\)](#page-3-5). In particular, $C := M_a^{-1} \mathbf{1}^T M$, where $M \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{G}| \times |\mathcal{G}|}$ is a diagonal matrix with the machine inertia constants and $M_a \in \mathbb{R}$ is the aggregated system inertia and the transformation matrix G is given by

$$
G := \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} .
$$
 (15)

Taking the derivative of [\(14\)](#page-3-7) yields

$$
\begin{bmatrix} \Delta \omega_{\rm r} \\ \dot{z} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} C \\ G \end{bmatrix} \Delta \omega.
$$
 (16)

Next, the generator's turbine governor contributions are aggregated to obtain the aggregate governor contribution $\Delta P_{\text{mr}} \in \mathbb{R}$, and is given as

$$
\Delta P_{\rm mr} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{G}} \Delta P_{\rm m, j}.\tag{17}
$$

The equivalent aggregated governor transfer function can be found by summing the individual governor transfer functions for all generators. In this work, we assume that the governor time constants T_i are equal, simplifying the aggregation^{[2](#page-4-1)}. Applying the transformations shown in [\(14\)](#page-3-7)-[\(17\)](#page-4-2) to the system in (11) and omitting the difference variables z results in a reduced-order system of the form

$$
\Delta \dot{x}_{\rm r} = A_{\rm r,x} \Delta x_{\rm r} + A_{\rm r,y} \Delta y \tag{18a}
$$

$$
0 = K_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x}} \Delta x_{\mathbf{r}} + K_{\mathbf{y}} \Delta y,\tag{18b}
$$

where $\Delta x_{r} := [\Delta \delta_{r} \quad \Delta \omega_{r} \quad \Delta P_{mr}]^{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{3}$ is the reduced dynamic state vector of the SAFR model. To include the effect of disturbances and UFLS action, consider the net change in real and reactive power injections :

$$
\Delta u[k] := \begin{bmatrix} P_{\text{UFLS}}[k] + \Delta P[k] \\ Q_{\text{UFLS}}[k] + \Delta Q[k] \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N} \tag{19}
$$

where $\Delta P[k](\Delta Q[k])$ is the active (reactive) power imbalance caused by a disturbance and $P_{\text{UFLS}}[k](Q_{\text{UFLS}}[k])$ and is active (reactive) load shedding amounts. The values of $P_{\text{UFI},S}[k](Q_{\text{UFI},S}[k])$ are responsive to the frequency. The reduced order dynamics in [\(18\)](#page-4-3) can be re-written as follows:

$$
\Delta \dot{x}_{\rm r} = A_{\rm r,x} \Delta x_{\rm r} + A_{\rm r,y} \Delta y \tag{20a}
$$

$$
\Delta u = K_{\text{r},x} \Delta x_{\text{r}} + K_{\text{y}} \Delta y,\tag{20b}
$$

to include the change in power injections caused by UFLS action and the disturbance.

Since [\(20b\)](#page-4-4) is a linear system of equations and K_y is non-singular, the algebraic variable Δy can be eliminated by

Fig. 3: Comparison of frequency responses between the nonlinear model (implemented in PSS/E) and the SAFR model.

solving for Δy and substituting it back into [\(20a\)](#page-4-5) to obtain the following reduced-order dynamics:

$$
\Delta \dot{x}_{r} = \left[A_{r,x} - A_{r,y}K_{y}^{-1}K_{r,x}\right] \Delta x_{r} + A_{r,y}K_{y}^{-1} \Delta u, \quad (21)
$$

where $\Delta \omega_{\text{r}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \Delta x_{\text{r}}$.

To optimize UFLS setpoints we consider a discretized version of [\(21\)](#page-4-6) by using trapezoidal integration with a timestep of Δt . The discrete timestep k is related to continuous time t as $k = \lfloor \frac{t}{\Delta t} \rfloor$. The discrete-time dynamics are then used in the optimization formulation to find the optimal UFLS setpoints.

The accuracy of the SAFR model is assessed by comparing the frequency response of the reduced order model to the full order non-linear model [\(8\)](#page-2-4). Fig [3](#page-4-7) shows the frequency response of the full order model and the SAFR for 23 bus testcase provided by PSS/E for the same contingency and UFLS settings that were used in Fig [2.](#page-3-1) The SAFR model captures the frequency response of the non-linear full order model much closer with smaller error compared to the SFR model.

Next, we embed the SAFR model within a mixed-integer optimization formulation to predict the system's response to a disturbance and to determine optimal UFLS setpoints.

IV. UFLS SETPOINT OPTIMIZATION

The SAFR model presented in Section [III](#page-3-0) is used to predict the system's frequency response to a disturbance scenario with an imbalance of 25%, as defined by NERC [\[3\]](#page-10-2). The UFLS setpoints are then optimized such that to minimize the amount of load shed while ensuring the system frequency remains within acceptable limits. UFLS setpoints are defined by the load shed amounts at each load bus (usually expressed as a fraction of the present load) and the corresponding frequency threshold at which the load shed should occur ($\omega_{\rm shed}$).

Typically, a UFLS scheme is designed with multiple stages of load shedding with distinct frequency thresholds $(\omega_{\rm shed}^i)$ and load shedding amounts (P_{shed}^i) at each stage $i = 1, ..., N_{\text{UFLS}}$. NERC defines a family of Protection and Control (PRC)

 2 If governor time constants are not identical, then we can still approximate the aggregated governor transfer functions as in [\[18\]](#page-10-17).

Fig. 4: Frequency response design requirements for UFLS as outlined by NERC PRC-006-2.

regulatory standards of which PRC-006-2 is the standard for UFLS [\[3\]](#page-10-2). PRC-006-2 defines the upper and lower bounds of what is considered to be safe frequency region as illustrated in Fig [4.](#page-5-0) A UFLS scheme, as specified by NERC, needs to ensure frequency remains within the safe region following a disturbance with an imbalance of up to 25% between generation and load. Furthermore, PRC-006-2 also defines the relay operating settings that define the 'time deadband' (200ms) which is how long the frequency should be below the threshold before UFLS is triggered. The time delay between UFLS trigger and actual relay tripping is also defined (100ms). Our proposed UFLS optimization scheme as illustrated in Fig [5,](#page-5-1) uses the presented SAFR model along with network information to adapt UFLS setpoints to changing grid conditions. Our proposed methodology aims to:

- Minimize the amount of load shed while ensuring safe frequency recovery following a maximum credible contingency (25% imbalance) and while considering the specified relay settings.
- Ensure no excessive load shedding at any given stage to avoid overshedding in the case of disturbances with smaller imbalances.
- Periodically update the UFLS setpoints based on the current system operating conditions.

Next, we present the constraints associated with load shedding and turbine governors to optimize UFLS setpoints.

A. Load Shed Constraints

For a UFLS scheme with N_{UFLS} load shedding stages, the change in power injections at timestep k caused by load shed corresponding to UFLS stage *i* is given by $P_i^{\text{sh}}[k], Q_i^{\text{sh}}[k] \in$ \mathbb{R}^N respectively. Let the fraction of load shed at each load bus in UFLS stage i and time step k be $g_i[k] \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with the

Fig. 5: Block diagram of the UFLS optimization scheme.

change in power real and reactive injections $P_i^{\text{sh}}[k]$ and $Q_i^{\text{sh}}[k]$ are definedby,

$$
P_i^{\text{sh}}[k] := g_i[k]P_{\text{d}}[k] \tag{22a}
$$

$$
Q_i^{\text{sh}}[k] := g_i[k]Q_d[k],\tag{22b}
$$

where $P_d[k]$ and $Q_d[k]$ are defined in [\(6\)](#page-2-5). The load shedding fractions, $g_i[k]$, are used to determine the fraction of load to be shed at each load bus. Due to the voltage dependency of $P_d[k]$ and $Q_d[k]$ [\(22\)](#page-5-2) are non-convex. However, since bus voltages are bounded we can envelope $P_i^{\text{sh}}[k]$ and $Q_i^{\text{sh}}[k]$ as follows:

$$
P_i^+[k] := g_i[k] \left(P_P + \overline{V}I_P + \overline{V}^2 Y_P \right) \tag{23a}
$$

$$
Q_i^+[k] := g_i[k] \left(Q_Q + \overline{V} I_Q + \overline{V}^2 Y_Q \right) \tag{23b}
$$

$$
P_i^{-}[k] := g_i[k] \left(P_P + \underline{V} I_P + \underline{V}^2 Y_P \right) \tag{23c}
$$

$$
Q_i^{-}[k] := g_i[k] \left(Q_Q + \underline{V} I_Q + \underline{V}^2 Y_Q \right), \tag{23d}
$$

where $P_i^+[k]$, $Q_i^+[k]$ and $P_i^-[k]$, $Q_i^-[k]$ are the upper and lower bounds 3 3 on $P_i^{\sh}[k], Q_i^{\sh}[k]$, respectively. Upper and lower bounds on the total UFLS load shed input to the system, $P_{\text{UFLS}}^{+}[k]$ and $P_{\text{UFLS}}^{-}[k]$, are constrained as follows:

$$
P_{\text{UFLS}}^{+}[k+d] := \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{UFLS}}} P_i^{+}[k] \tag{24a}
$$

$$
P_{\text{UFLS}}^{-}[k+d] := \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{UFLS}}} P_{i}^{-}[k], \tag{24b}
$$

where d is the time delay between the relay triggering and the actual load shedding as specified by NERC [\[3\]](#page-10-2). $P_{\text{UFLS}}^+[k]$ and $P_{\text{UFLS}}^{-}[k]$ are constrained in a similar manner. Furthermore, we define upper and lower bounds on $\Delta u[k]$ at timestep k as,

$$
\Delta u^+[k] := \begin{bmatrix} P_{\text{UFLS}}^+[k] + \Delta P \\ Q_{\text{UFLS}}^+[k] + \Delta Q \end{bmatrix}
$$
 (25a)

$$
\Delta u^{-}[k] := \begin{bmatrix} P_{\text{UFLS}}^{-}[k] + \Delta P \\ Q_{\text{UFLS}}^{-}[k] + \Delta Q \end{bmatrix}.
$$
 (25b)

Similar constraints are added for $Q^+_{\text{UFLS}}[k]$ and $Q^-_{\text{UFLS}}[k]$. Due to the linear nature of the system model, applying upper and

³Note, that [\(23\)](#page-5-4) assumes positive, inductive ZIP loads for notational convenience.

lower bounds on the true system input $\Delta u[k]$ results in $\Delta \omega_r^+$ and $\Delta \omega_r^-$ that envelope the true system dynamics and are given by,

$$
\Delta \dot{x}_r^+ = [A_{r,x} - A_{r,y} K_y^{-1} K_{r,x}] \Delta x_r^+ + A_{r,y} K_y^{-1} \Delta u^+ \quad (26a)
$$

$$
\Delta \omega_r^+ = [0 \quad I \quad 0] \Delta x_r^+ \qquad (26b)
$$

and

$$
\Delta \dot{x}_{\rm r}^- = \begin{bmatrix} A_{\rm r,x} - A_{\rm r,y} K_{\rm y}^{-1} K_{\rm r,x} \end{bmatrix} \Delta x_{\rm r}^- + A_{\rm r,y} K_{\rm y}^{-1} \Delta u^- \quad (27a)
$$

\n
$$
\Delta \omega_{\rm r}^- = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \Delta x_{\rm r}^- . \tag{27b}
$$

B. Frequency Threshold Constraints

Each stage, i , of load shed can only be triggered if the frequency is below the corresponding threshold, $\Delta \omega_{\rm shed}^i$. In other words, the fraction of load shed $g_i[k]$ should be constrained to be zero unless the frequency is below the threshold. A binary variable $\alpha_i[k] \in \mathbb{R}$ is introduced to indicate whether or not frequency has dipped below the threshold corresponding to i-th UFLS stage. The following constraints are added to the optimization problem:

$$
\alpha_i[k] \le 1 + \Delta w_{\text{shed}}^i - \Delta \omega_r^+[k] \tag{28a}
$$

$$
\alpha_i[k] \ge \Delta w_{\text{shed}}^i - \Delta \omega_r^+[k] - \sum_{n=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i[n] \tag{28b}
$$

$$
\sum_{n=1}^{K} \alpha_i[n] \le K_{\rm db} \tag{28c}
$$

$$
\alpha_i[k] \in \{0, 1\},\tag{28d}
$$

where K_{db} is the time deadband of the relay. The constraints in [\(28\)](#page-6-0) ensure that $\alpha_i[k]$ is zero if the reduced frequency is above ω_{shed}^i . Note that in [\(28\)](#page-6-0), $\Delta \omega_{\text{r}}^+[k]$ is used rather than $\Delta\omega_r^-[k]$, since $\Delta\omega_r^+[k] \geq \Delta\omega_r[k]$ $\forall k$, and when $\Delta\omega_r^+[k]$ falls below the threshold then $\Delta\omega_{\rm r}[k]$ is also below a threshold and UFLS trigger is permissible.

Then, $\alpha_i[k]$ constrains the fraction of load shed,

$$
g_i[k+1] - g_i[k] \le \alpha_i[k-z] \quad \forall z = 0 \dots K_{\text{db}} - 1 \quad (29a)
$$

$$
g_i[0] = 0, \quad (29b)
$$

which ensures that $g_i[k]$ remains zero until the frequency isbelow the frequency threshold for K_{db} consecutive time steps. Furthermore, from [\(28c\)](#page-6-1), $\alpha_i[k]$ cannot be one for more than K_{db} consecutive timesteps meaning that each element in $g_i[k]$ can only change (trigger) once throughout the entire time horizon, capturing the desired action of a UFLS relay.

C. Frequency Nadir and Settling Frequency Constraints

The proposed UFLS scheme must satisfy the requirements illustrated in Fig [4.](#page-5-0) We specifically ensure that the frequency nadir is within 58 Hz which is the lowest acceptable frequency, and that the settling frequency is within 59.5 Hz and 60.7 Hz. Since $\Delta \omega_r^+$ and $\Delta \omega_r^-$ bound the reduced frequency $\Delta \omega_r$, to satisfy the aforementioned requirements on frequency nadir the following constraints are added on $\Delta \omega_r^+$ and $\Delta \omega_r^-$,

$$
\Delta \omega_{\rm r}^+[k] \le \Delta \omega_{\rm min} \quad \forall k \tag{30a}
$$

$$
\Delta \omega_{\rm r}^{-}[k] \le \Delta \omega_{\rm min} \quad \forall k,
$$
\n(30b)

Fig. 6: Illustration of Governor Limits.

where $\Delta\omega_{\text{min}}$ is the minimum allowed frequency (58 Hz). Similarly, to ensure the settling frequency requirements, the following constraints are added,

$$
\Delta\omega_{\min}^{\mathrm{ss}} \leq \Delta\omega_{\mathrm{r}}^{+}[K] \leq \Delta\omega_{\max}^{\mathrm{ss}} \tag{31a}
$$

$$
\Delta\omega_{\min}^{\mathrm{ss}} \leq \Delta\omega_{\mathrm{r}}^{-}[K] \leq \Delta\omega_{\max}^{\mathrm{ss}},\tag{31b}
$$

where K is the time horizon considered in the optimization, $\omega_{\text{max}}^{\text{ss}}$ and $\omega_{\text{min}}^{\text{ss}}$ are the upper and lower settling frequency limits (60.7 and 59.5 Hz) respectively. Note that a large enough time horizon needs to be considered to ensure frequency settles. In this work, a time horizon of $K = \lfloor \frac{15}{\Delta t} \rfloor$ was consistently sufficient for our chosen system

D. Governor Limits Constraints

Turbine governors modulate a generator's mechanical power input based on its frequency. Let the change in mechanical power for the systems shown in [\(26\)](#page-6-2) and [\(27\)](#page-6-3) be denoted by $\Delta P_{\text{mr}}^{+}[k]$ and $\Delta P_{\text{mr}}^{-}[k]$, respectively. Turbine governors can only ramp up/down the mechanical power input within certain limits as illustrated in Fig [6.](#page-6-4) The frequency dynamics in [\(26\)](#page-6-2) and [\(27\)](#page-6-3) do not yet consider the governor saturation. Let $\Delta \tilde{P}_{mr}^{+}[k], \Delta \tilde{P}_{mr}^{-}[k] \in \mathbb{R}$ denote the governor contribution after considering saturation:

$$
\Delta \tilde{P}_{\text{mr}}^+[k] = \min \left\{ \max \left\{ \Delta P_{\text{mr}}^+[k], \Delta P_{\text{mr}}^{\text{min}} \right\}, \Delta P_{\text{mr}}^{\text{max}} \right\}. \quad (32a)
$$

with similar constraints also being placed on $\Delta P_{\text{mr}}^{-}[k]$.

To engender a linear formulation of [\(32\)](#page-6-5) we introduce the binary variable $\gamma^+[k] \in \{0,1\}$ [\(32\)](#page-6-5) constrained as follows:

$$
\frac{\Delta P_{\text{mr}}^{\text{max}} - \Delta P_{\text{mr}}^+[k]}{S} \le \gamma^+[k] \le 1 + \frac{\Delta P_{\text{mr}}^{\text{max}} - \Delta P_{\text{mr}}^+[k]}{S} \tag{33}
$$

where the value of S is chosen such that the expressions on the left and right hand side of [\(33\)](#page-6-6) neither exceed one nor fall below zero, respectively. In our application, $S = 500$ was determined to be sufficiently large. $\gamma^+[k]$ is constrained by [\(33\)](#page-6-6) to be zero when governor saturates and vice versa. Therefore, $\gamma^+[k]$ is used to constrain $\Delta \tilde{P}_{mr}^+[k]$ as,

$$
\Delta \tilde{P}_{\text{mr}}^{+}[k] = \gamma^{+}[k] \Delta P_{\text{mr}}^{+}[k] + \left(1 - \gamma^{+}[k]\right) \Delta P_{\text{mr}}^{\text{max}}.
$$
 (34)

Similar constraints are introduced to capture the upper limits on $\Delta P_{\text{mr}}^{-}[k]$ using a binary variable $\gamma^{-}[k]$. The governor's lower limits can be captured similarly although for brevity, we do not include them here. However, the constraints in [\(34\)](#page-7-1) do contain bi-linear terms resulting in increased computational complexity. Therefore, the bi-linear terms in [\(34\)](#page-7-1) can be relaxed as follows:

$$
\Delta \tilde{P}_{\text{mr}}^{+}[k] = t^{+}[k] + \left(1 - \gamma^{+}[k]\right) \Delta P_{\text{mr}}^{\text{max}} \tag{35a}
$$

$$
-\gamma^+[k]S \le t^+[k] \le \gamma^+[k]S \tag{35b}
$$

$$
t^+[k] \ge -(1 - \gamma^+[k])S + \Delta P_{\text{mr}}^+[k] \tag{35c}
$$

$$
t^+[k] \le (1 - \gamma^+[k])S + \Delta P_{\rm mr}^+[k].\tag{35d}
$$

A similar relaxation is done for $\Delta P_{\text{mr}}^{-}[k]$ as well. Note that due to the binary nature $\gamma^+[k]$ and $\gamma^-[k]$ the relaxation in [\(35\)](#page-7-2) is exact. Hence, $\Delta \tilde{P}_{mr}^{+}[k]$ and $\Delta \tilde{P}_{mr}^{-}[k]$ accurately capture the governor outputs when the governor saturates.

E. Overshedding Constraints

To ensure that the UFLS scheme does not shed excessive amounts of load at any given stage, the total fraction of load shed at each stage is constrained as follows:

$$
g_i[k]^T P_{d,0} \le \overline{g} \left(1^T P_{d,0}\right) \quad \forall i,\tag{36a}
$$

where $P_{d,0}$ is the initial power demand, and \overline{g} is the maximum fraction of load that can be shed at any given stage (7.5% as specified by NERC). Furthermore, the frequency thresholds $(\Delta \omega_{\text{shed}}^i)$ are constrained as follows:

$$
\Delta \omega_{\text{shed}}^i \le \overline{\Delta \omega}_{\text{shed}} \tag{37a}
$$

$$
\Delta \omega_{\text{shed}}^{i+1} - \Delta \omega_{\text{shed}}^{i} \ge \Delta \omega_{\text{sep}},\tag{37b}
$$

where $\Delta \omega_{\rm sep}$ is the minimum separation between the frequency thresholds and $\overline{\Delta \omega}_{\text{shed}}$ the largest allowable frequency threshold. This is to ensure that, 1) frequency thresholds are not too close to the nominal frequency to avoid premature and maybe unnecessary load shedding, and 2) the frequency thresholds are spaced enough apart. Lighter disturbances that would have only needed a single stage of UFLS would trigger multiple stages of UFLS if the frequency thresholds are too close together. The values defined by NERC for $\Delta \omega_{\rm sep}$ and $\overline{\Delta \omega}_{\text{shed}}$ (i.e. 0.2Hz and 59.5Hz) are used in this work.

F. Overall Formulation

The overall UFLS optimization formulation can be summarized as follows:

minimize
$$
g_i[k]^T P_{d,0}
$$

\n**P1:**
$$
\omega_{\text{shed}}^i g_i[k] \qquad (38)
$$
\nsubject to $(23) - (33)$ and $(35) - (37)$.

The implementation is summarized in Algorithm [1.](#page-7-4) It begins by linearizing the non-linear system model and deriving the SAFR model. For every p hours, the algorithm solves the optimization problem to calculate the UFLS setpoints, adapting to changing grid conditions.

Algorithm 1: UFLS Setpoint Optimization

⁶ while *True* do Solve: P1

$$
\begin{array}{c}\n\cdot & \text{source 11} \\
\cdot & \cdot \\
\hline\nn & \leftarrow n+1\n\end{array}
$$

Goto: Step 1

$$
10 \quad end
$$

Fig. 7: Frequency responses of all buses to 25% imbalance with SAFR-based UFLS setpoints.

V. SIMULATION RESULTS

The proposed UFLS scheme is validated on the 1648-bus test case provided by PSS/E [\[23\]](#page-10-21). The UFLS setpoints were optimized for a disturbance scenario with an imbalance of 25% caused by generator tripping. A timestep (Δt) of 0.01s is considered, along with a governor droop gain (R_i) of 0.05 and a governor time constant (T_i) of 0.1s. The governor's limits were assigned assuming generators have 15% reserves. The UFLS setpoints were then obtained by solving [\(38\)](#page-7-5) and were then implemented on the full non-linear system using PSS/E. The optimization was conducted using MacBook Pro, M-1 Pro chip, with Gurobi as the MILP solver. The response of the system is shown in Fig [7.](#page-7-6) The response shown in Fig [7,](#page-7-6) and satisfies the performance criteria laid out by NERC.

However, with the ongoing evolution of grid conditions towards reduced inertia and increased DER penetration, it is important to evaluate and compare the robustness and adaptability of various UFLS schemes under diverse operating scenarios. To this end, the performance of the proposed SAFRbased UFLS scheme is assessed against a conventional static UFLS scheme and an SFR-based UFLS scheme. To determine conventional static UFLS setpoints, UFLS relays are added to various load buses until the load-shedding requirement specified by NERC is met [\[3\]](#page-10-2). The setpoints are then tested by simulating a 25% imbalance disturbance and ensuring the frequency response satisfies specified requirements. Note that UFLS relays come with additional logic that stops relay tripping in case of net-generation behind the relay (netgen blocking). This is to avoid a counter-productive loss of generation during an under-frequency event. Therefore, the implemented conventional UFLS scheme has the net-gen blocking logic embedded. A 1648-bus test case, provided by PSS/E, is considered. The test case consists of 1648 buses with 285 generators. The performance of the UFLS schemes are evaluated on the test case under three different scenarios: a base case, a reduced inertia case, and high DER penetration, reflecting the different power systems operating conditions.

A. Base Case

In this scenario, the network operates under normal loading conditions. The largest credible contingency with 25% imbalance is introduced by simulating the loss of generators. This disturbance is applied at $t = 1$ s to evaluate the performance of the proposed SAFR scheme in comparison to conventional and SFR-based UFLS schemes. The SAFR model captures ACnetwork effects and accounts for changes in load caused by voltage variations. The higher accuracy yields UFLS set points that reflect these effects, offering greater accuracy compared to the SFR model, which neglects voltage dependency. The results as illustrated in Fig. [8](#page-8-0) demonstrate that the SFRbased UFLS approach under-estimates the required amount of load shed needed to halt frequency decline. Consequently, the method failed to stabilize the frequency under this scenario. In contrast, both the proposed SAFR and conventional approach shed appropriate amounts of load and stabilized frequency within safe limits. However, the settling frequency achieved by the conventional scheme was higher than that of the SAFRbased approach. This indicates that the conventional scheme sheds more load than necessary to stabilize the system as shown in Table [I.](#page-8-1) The solve times needed to obtain the SAFR and SFR-based UFLS setpoints are also shown in Table [I.](#page-8-1) The optimization formulation presented in [\(38\)](#page-7-5) is larger than the SFR-based UFLS optimization due to the additional variables introduced to envelop the system dynamics and capture governor saturation. As such the solve time needed to obtain the UFLS setpoints using the SAFR model is larger. However, the solve times are still within 5 minutes for the 1649 bus test-case. Note, for clearer illustration, only a subset of the bus frequencies is plotted.

B. Reduced Inertia System

To conduct a more comprehensive performance comparison of the different UFLS schemes, the system parameters were modified to represent a reduced inertia scenario. In this setup, the inertia of each synchronous generator is reduced to half of its original value. The performance of the UFLS schemes under the reduced inertia system is illustrated in Fig [8.](#page-8-0)

Fig. 8: Comparison of simulation results for the base case scenario using SAFR, SFR, and the conventional method.

TABLE I: Comparison of UFLS Schemes: Base Case

Model	Solver	Nadir	Settling	Load
	Time	Frequency	Frequency	Shed
	(s)	(Hz)	(Hz)	$(\%)$
SAFR	251.71	58.75	59.79	16.79
SFR	0.15	-	-	15.58
CONV	٠	58.65	59.97	21.92

Similar to the base case, the SFR-based UFLS approach failed to stabilize the system. Meanwhile, the conventional UFLS scheme stabilizes the system but at the cost of shedding approximately 10% more load than the proposed SAFR-based UFLS scheme, as recorded in Table [II.](#page-9-1) Notably, the proposed SAFR scheme outperformed the conventional approach by maintaining the system frequency within the safe operating range while minimizing load shedding, thereby demonstrating its superior efficiency and adaptability.

Fig. 9: Comparison of simulation results for the reduced inertia scenario using SAFR, SFR, and the conventional method.

TABLE II: Comparison of UFLS Schemes: Reduced Inertia

Fig. 10: Simulation results for high DER penetration.

C. Penetration of DER

We modified the network further to evaluate the performance of UFLS schemes in systems with high DER penetration and reduced inertia. This modification involved incorporating DERs to account for 20% of the total load while keeping the 50% reduction in system inertia. The results for this scenario are presented in Fig [10.](#page-9-2) From Fig [10,](#page-9-2) it is evident that both the SFR-based and conventional UFLS schemes failed to shed the necessary amount of load required to stabilize the system under these conditions. However, the proposed UFLS setpoints from the SAFR-based UFLS scheme successfully stabilized the frequency of the system within safe limits. Table [III](#page-9-3) summarizes the % load shed, frequency nadir and settling frequency under the different UFLS schemes.

TABLE III: Comparison of UFLS Schemes: DER Penetration

Model	Solver Time (s)	Nadir Frequency (Hz)	Settling Frequency (Hz)	Load Shed $(\%)$
SAFR	13.29	58.46	59.95	18.96
SFR	0.12	-	٠	15.66
CONV	-	-	-	14.06

D. Multiple disturbance scenarios

To further demonstrate the efficacy of the proposed SAFRbased approach, simulations were conducted under various disturbance scenarios to highlight the robustness of the proposed methodology in handling diverse disturbances. These

Fig. 11: Simulation results for different scenarios.

scenarios involve the application of various disturbance scenarios with imbalances ranging from 5% to 25%. For this analysis, 100 distinct disturbances were identified. For all 100 disturbance scenarios, the UFLS setpoints obtained from the proposed SAFR-based approach were implemented, and the resulting frequency nadir and settling frequency are illustrated in Fig. [11.](#page-9-4) The results, presented in Fig. [11,](#page-9-4) illustrate the system's performance under three distinct operating scenarios and various disturbance magnitudes. These results confirm that the proposed SAFR approach successfully stabilizes the system while adhering to NERC's operational guidelines.

VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this study, slow coherency aggregation techniques are leveraged to obtain an SAFR model of frequency dynamics used to optimize UFLS setpoints. Previous methods have relied on the SFR model to predict system frequency response; however, the SFR model is agnostic to the dependency of load and generator injections on voltage, which significantly affects system behavior during under-frequency events. Unlike the SFR model, the SAFR model is a predictive model that incorporates AC network effects such as voltage dependencies, providing a more accurate representation of the system's dynamic response. Furthermore, unlike prior work that neglected governor limits, we included these constraints in our modeling. UFLS applications involve scenarios with large contingencies that can cause governors to saturate, and failure to account for these limits can lead to substantial inaccuracies in predicting frequency response.

The performance of our SAFR-based UFLS setpoints under the largest credible contingency scenario was verified using PSS/E. The SAFR-based UFLS setpoints were also compared to setpoints derived from the SFR model and conventional static UFLS setpoints. Our results demonstrated that the proposed UFLS setpoints successfully restored system frequency to safe levels with minimal load shedding. In contrast, the SFR-based setpoints significantly underestimated the required load shedding, failing to halt the frequency decline. While the conventional setpoints performed adequately under the base case, they were ineffective in situations with reduced inertia and high penetration of DERs, where the static setpoints failed to arrest the frequency decline.

Future work will incorporate higher-order generator models and exciters to further enhance the fidelity of the system representation. Furthermore, the effect of uncertainty in available load behind load buses would be incorporated to obtain UFLS setpoints that are robust against said uncertainty.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. J. B. Kabeyi and O. A. Olanrewaju, "Sustainable Energy Transition for Renewable and Low Carbon Grid Electricity Generation and Supply," *Frontiers in Energy research*, vol. 9, p. 743114, 2022.
- [2] H. H. Alhelou, M. E. H. Golshan, T. C. Njenda, and N. D. Hatziargyriou, "An Overview of UFLS in Conventional, Modern, and Future Smart Power systems: Challenges and opportunities," *Electric Power Systems Research*, vol. 179, p. 106054, 2020.
- [3] "PRC-006-NPCC-2 – Automatic Underfrequency Load
Shedding." https://www.nerc.com/pa/Stand/Reliability%20Standards/ https://www.nerc.com/pa/Stand/Reliability%20Standards/ [PRC-006-NPCC-2.pdf.](https://www.nerc.com/pa/Stand/Reliability%20Standards/PRC-006-NPCC-2.pdf) [Accessed 27-11-2024].
- [4] R. Frost, L. Zieland, D. Sharafi, and J. Susanto, "Impact of Reverse Power Flow in Distribution Feeders on Under-Frequency Load Shedding Schemes," in *2020 International Conference on Smart Grids and Energy Systems (SGES)*, pp. 100–104, 2020.
- [5] H. Golpîra, H. Bevrani, A. R. Messina, and B. Francois, "A Datadriven Under Frequency Load Shedding Scheme in Power Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 1138–1150, 2022.
- [6] P. He, B. Wen, and H. Wang, "Decentralized Adaptive Under Frequency Load Shedding Scheme Based on Load Information," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 52007–52014, 2019.
- [7] U. Rudez and R. Mihalic, "WAMS-based Underfrequency Load Shedding with Short-term Frequency Prediction," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 1912–1920, 2015.
- [8] F. Milano, "Rotor Speed-Free Estimation of the Frequency of the Center of Inertia," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 1153– 1155, Jan. 2018.
- [9] Y. Zuo, G. Frigo, A. Derviskadic, and M. Paolone, "Impact of Synchrophasor Estimation Algorithms in ROCOF-Based Under-Frequency Load-Shedding," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 1305–1316, Mar. 2020.
- [10] H. Haes Alhelou, M. E. Hamedani Golshan, T. C. Njenda, and N. D. Hatziargyriou, "An Overview of UFLS in Conventional, Modern, and Future Smart Power Systems: Challenges and Opportunities," *Electric Power Systems Research*, vol. 179, p. 106054, Feb. 2020.
- [11] F. Ceja-Gomez, S. S. Qadri, and F. D. Galiana, "Under-Frequency Load Shedding Via Integer Programming," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 27, pp. 1387–1394, Aug. 2012. Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Power Systems.
- [12] T. Amraee, M. G. Darebaghi, A. Soroudi, and A. Keane, "Probabilistic Under Frequency Load Shedding Considering RoCoF Relays of Distributed Generators," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 3587–3598, 2017.
- [13] C. O'Malley, L. Badesa, F. Teng, and G. Strbac, "Probabilistic Scheduling of UFLS to Secure Credible Contingencies in Low Inertia Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 2693–2703, 2021.
- [14] P. M. Anderson and M. Mirheydar, "A Low-order System Frequency Response Model," *IEEE transactions on power systems*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 720–729, 1990.
- [15] D. L. H. Aik, "A General-order System Frequency Response Model Incorporating Load Shedding: Analytic Modeling and Applications," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 709–717, 2006.
- [16] B. K. Poolla, S. Bolognani, and F. Dörfler, "Optimal Placement of Virtual Inertia in Power Grids," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 12, pp. 6209–6220, 2017.
- [17] P. W. Sauer and M. A. Pai, *Power System Dynamics and Stability*. Prentice Hall, 1998.
- [18] J. H. Chow, ed., *Power System Coherency and Model Reduction*, vol. 94 of *Power Electronics and Power Systems*. New York, NY: Springer New York, 2013.
- [19] D. Romeres, F. Dörfler, and F. Bullo, "Novel Results on Slow Coherency in Consensus and Power Networks," in *2013 European Control Conference (ECC)*, pp. 742–747, July 2013.
- [20] I. Tyuryukanov, M. Popov, M. A. M. M. van der Meijden, and V. Terzija, "Slow Coherency Identification and Power System Dynamic Model Reduction by Using Orthogonal Structure of Electromechanical Eigenvectors," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 36, pp. 1482–1492, Mar. 2021. Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Power Systems.
- [21] P. Kundur, N. Balu, and M. Lauby, *Power System Stability and Control*. EPRI power system engineering series, McGraw-Hill, 1994.
- [22] B. K. Poolla, D. Groß, T. Borsche, S. Bolognani, and F. Dörfler, "Virtual Inertia Placement in Electric Power Grids," in *Energy Markets and Responsive Grids* (S. Meyn, T. Samad, I. Hiskens, and J. Stoustrup, eds.), vol. 162, pp. 281–305, New York, NY: Springer New York, 2018. Series Title: The IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications.
- [23] Siemens Power Technologies International, "The 1648 bus system provided by pss/e software," September 9 2018.