

# On the Design and Tuning of Linear Model Predictive Control for Wind Turbines

Achin Jain<sup>a,\*</sup>, Georg Schildbach<sup>b</sup>, Lorenzo Fagiano<sup>c</sup>, Manfred Morari<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Mechanical and Process Engineering, ETH Zurich, Switzerland

<sup>b</sup>Model Predictive Control Laboratory, University of California Berkeley, USA

<sup>c</sup>ABB Switzerland Ltd., Corporate Research, Baden, Switzerland

<sup>d</sup>Automatic Control Laboratory, ETH Zurich, Switzerland

---

## Abstract

This paper presents a study on the design of linear model predictive control (MPC) for wind turbines, with a focus on the controller's tuning tradeoffs. A continuously linearized MPC approach is described and applied to control a 3-bladed, horizontal axis, variable speed wind turbine. The tuning involves a multiobjective cost function so that the performance can be optimized with respect to five defined measures: power variation, pitch usage, tower displacement, drivetrain twist and frequency of violating the nominal power limit. A tuning approach based on the computation of sensitivity tables is proposed and tested via numerical simulations using a nonlinear turbine model. The paper further compares the performance of the MPC controller with those of a conventional one.

*Keywords:* Wind Energy, Wind Turbines, Model Predictive Control, Sensitivity Analysis, Control System Tuning

---

## 1. Introduction

In the wake of increasing demands of wind energy, today, the focus of research lies in maximizing the power output per unit investment. This would make wind energy even more competitive with other sources of renewable energy. The production cost per unit of power decreases with an increase in size of the wind turbines, however the structure becomes more and more flexible. Thus, it is important to reduce the tower displacement and drivetrain twist in order to reduce the fatigue loads, hence eventually increasing the life span of the wind turbine. To achieve the best performance, the task of a controller becomes twofold: maximizing power output from the available wind and minimizing the fatigue of the turbine.

The classical method to control wind turbines makes use of several proportional-integral-derivative (PID) controllers. Some of them are effective in different regions of operation [1, 2] and others are used for switching between these regions [3]. The gains of these controllers must be selected by considering aspects like power output, pitch actuation effort, tower fore-aft vibration and drivetrain twist. Another recent research focuses on individual pitch control (IPC) which uses different PID controllers for each blade. With the knowledge of local asymmetrical loading on turbines, it has been shown that the loads can be significantly reduced using IPC [4, 5].

Controllers based on PID offer good performance but are not optimal. The current day research is focused more towards Gain Scheduled Linear Quadratic Regulator (LQR) [7, 6], Feedback Linearization [8, 9],  $H_2$  &  $H_\infty$  Control [10, 11, 12],  $l_1$  Control [13], Sliding Mode Control [14] and Model Predictive Control (MPC) [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24], most of which are based on optimization principles. The fundamental advantage that optimization-based strategies offer is that the problem objective can be defined explicitly by putting weights on the relevant quantities we aim to limit, for instance: loads on tower, high speed shaft twist, power output from turbine etc.

In particular, MPC is a natural choice for a control algorithm for wind turbines because it is effective at handling multivariable systems with input and state constraints. Another potential advantage that MPC offers is its ability to predict behavior in future using a plant's model. Thus, it can use feedforward information to optimize the inputs while also considering the future states. If a prediction of the disturbances (wind) is also known through an estimation model [25], it further improves the controller's ability to reject these disturbances.

Several variants of MPC have been proposed for the problem of wind turbine control. In one of the earliest studies [16], linear MPC (LMPC) was successfully implemented on an onshore and an offshore wind turbine model. To account for the nonlinearities, which [16] did not, in [17] a scheduled MPC (SMPC) is designed, where the controller switches from one linear model to another depending upon the operating point. Both SMPC and LMPC showed better speed control and load reduction in comparison to a baseline controller, at an expense of higher

---

\*Corresponding author

Email addresses: [ajain@student.ethz.ch](mailto:ajain@student.ethz.ch) (Achin Jain),  
[schildbach@berkeley.edu](mailto:schildbach@berkeley.edu) (Georg Schildbach),  
[lorenzo.fagiano@ch.abb.com](mailto:lorenzo.fagiano@ch.abb.com) (Lorenzo Fagiano),  
[morari@control.ee.ethz.ch](mailto:morari@control.ee.ethz.ch) (Manfred Morari)

pitch usage. However, SMPC could perform better over  
 60 LMPC only in speed control. In [18] it has been further  
 illustrated that the performance of LMPC, continuously  
 linearized MPC (CLMPC) and nonlinear MPC (NMPC)  
 are comparable and not much better than a well-tuned  
 PID controller. Thus, the linearized wind model very well  
 65 captures the nonlinearities in the wind turbine. It is also  
 seen that under perfect predictions of the wind speed, all  
 the variants of MPC perform very well in load mitigation  
 and speed control avoiding an increase of pitch control ac-  
 tivity when the turbine operates in the above rated region.  
 70 The results for the perfect wind speed measurement are,  
 however, not realistic. A more practical approach employs  
 LIDAR to measure wind speed before the wind actually  
 reaches the wind turbine [26]. In [19], Laks shows that  
 even with distorted measurements with LIDAR, it is possi-  
 75 ble to better off than having no preview at all. This result  
 is also validated by Soltani [20] where mean wind speed  
 estimated from LIDAR measurements is used as preview  
 with LMPC. It exhibits load reduction and lower power  
 fluctuation over a PID controller in extreme wind condi-  
 80 tions. Körber [22], Schlipf [23] and Spencer [24] have also  
 shown that, in above rated conditions, MPC with knowl-  
 edge of future wind condition helps to reduce loads signifi-  
 cantly but the effect is most prominent when the wind is  
 changing rapidly. While the literature discussed till this  
 85 point deals with loads on the tower, [21] has demonstrated  
 the use of MPC in reducing the blade fatigue loads.

From the above studies, it is evident that SMPC or  
 CLMPC are sufficient to capture the nonlinear behavior  
 of the wind turbine. The knowledge of future wind defini-  
 90 tely gives MPC an edge over other control strategies but  
 the accuracy with which it can be measured and the cost  
 surrounding measurement equipments remain issues that  
 must be still resolved. On the other hand, while several  
 publications indicated that MPC can be beneficial for wind  
 95 turbine control, none of them discusses its tuning proce-  
 dure. Indeed, tuning of MPC is a crucial part of the design  
 and it might be a non-trivial task when multiple compet-  
 ing objectives are present, like in wind turbine control,  
 such that a tradeoff between different performance mea-  
 100 sures has to be defined. To fill this gap in the literature,  
 this paper discusses a tuning procedure for a continuously  
 linearized model predictive controller by forming a mean-  
 ingful objective function which explicitly accounts for 5  
 different performance indices. For the reasons discussed  
 105 above, the paper primarily focuses on MPC without wind  
 preview.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, a  
 nonlinear model of the wind turbine is derived. In sec-  
 110 tion 3, the simulation environment for MPC including the  
 wind model, the performance indices and a baseline con-  
 troller for comparison is described. In the following sec-  
 tions, the formulation of the model predictive controller is  
 115 discussed together with a systematic approach to tune the  
 control parameters. In section 6, qualitative and quanti-  
 tative comparisons of MPC with a baseline controller is




Figure 1: Power Coefficient,  $C_p$




Figure 2: Thrust Coefficient,  $C_t$

presented. Finally, the paper concludes with a discussion  
 on the achieved results.

## 2. Model of the Wind Turbine

For the sake of this study, we consider a 3-blade hori-  
 zontal axis pitch-regulated wind turbine. In particular,  
 the parameters of the NREL 5 MW wind turbine [27],  
 adapted from [16], are considered (see Appendix). The  
 turbine model comprises the dynamics of 5 essential sub-  
 systems, as described in the following.

### 2.1. Aerodynamics

The momentum of the wind is transferred to the rotor  
 by means of an aerodynamic torque, given by the relation

$$T_r = \frac{P_r}{\omega_r}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\omega_r$  is the rotor speed and  $P_r$  is the equivalent power  
 generated during the interaction of wind and turbine blades.  
 $P_r$  is a function of the wind speed  $v_w$ , blade radius  $R$ , air  
 density  $\rho$ , and coefficient of performance  $C_p$ :

$$P_r = \frac{1}{2} \rho \pi R^2 v_w^3 C_p. \quad (2)$$

$C_p$  is the ratio of power extracted by the wind turbine to power carried by the wind and is a function of blade pitch angle  $\theta$  and tip speed ratio  $\lambda$ . The tip speed ratio is defined as

$$\lambda = \frac{v_w}{\omega_r R}. \quad (3)$$

The wind also exerts a thrust force  $F_t$  on the rotor and turbine which depends on the thrust coefficient  $C_t$ ,

$$F_t = \frac{1}{2} \rho \pi R^2 v_w^2 C_t. \quad (4)$$

$C_p$  and  $C_t$  are typically known from measurements. Their dependence on  $\theta$  and  $\lambda$  is shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2.

## 2.2. Rotor Mechanics

The transmission of power from rotor to generator is illustrated in Fig. 3. The wind produces an aerodynamic torque  $T_r$  on the rotor. The inertia of rotor and generator sides is represented by  $J_r$  and  $J_g$ , respectively. The low speed shaft is modeled as a flexible shaft with damping coefficient  $D_s$  and spring constant  $K_s$ . The shaft experiences twist  $\delta$  due to varying torques on both ends. The gearbox couples the two rotating masses modeled as discs.  $T_{d,r}$  and  $T_{d,g}$  are the torques across the transmission whose gear ratio is indicated by  $N_g$ . The gearbox is assumed to have perfect mechanical efficiency.  $T_g$  is the resulting generator torque:

$$T_{d,g} = \frac{T_{d,r}}{N_g}. \quad (5)$$

Applying Newton laws of mechanics yields the following equations:

$$\dot{\omega} J_r = T_r - T_{d,r}, \quad (6)$$

$$\dot{\omega} J_g = T_{d,g} - T_g. \quad (7)$$

The governing equations for the drivetrain twist are:

$$T_{d,r} = D_s \dot{\delta} + K_s \delta, \quad (8)$$

$$\delta = \Omega_r - \frac{\Omega_g}{N}, \quad (9)$$

$$\dot{\delta} = \omega_r - \frac{\omega_g}{N}. \quad (10)$$

$\Omega_r$  and  $\Omega_g$  represent angular position of the rotor and generator shaft, while  $\omega_r$  and  $\omega_g$  represent the corresponding angular velocities.

## 2.3. Tower Dynamics

Due to the variability of the thrust force  $F_t$ , the tower exhibits fore and aft motion whose displacement  $\xi$  is modeled assuming a spring-mass-damper system:

$$M_t \ddot{\xi} + D_t \dot{\xi} + K_t \xi = F_t. \quad (11)$$

$M_t$ ,  $D_t$  and  $K_t$  are the mass, damping constant and spring constant of the tower, respectively. The motion of the tower changes the relative wind speed  $v_w^r$  at the rotor by the velocity of tower  $\dot{\xi}$ :

$$v_w^r = v_w - \dot{\xi}. \quad (12)$$




Figure 3: Turbine Mechanics [28]

## 2.4. Generator Dynamics

The generator is modeled as a first order system with time constant  $\tau_T$ :

$$\dot{T}_g = -\frac{1}{\tau_T} T_g + \frac{1}{\tau_T} T_{g,\text{ref}}. \quad (13)$$

Here,  $T_{g,\text{ref}}$  is the demanded torque and  $T_g$  is the output torque. The losses in transmission have been assumed to be zero. Therefore, the power output  $P_e$  is given by

$$P_e = T_g \omega_g. \quad (14)$$

## 2.5. Pitch Actuation

The pitch is controlled collectively. The pitch actuator is assumed to follow second order dynamics:

$$\ddot{\theta} + 2\zeta \omega_n \dot{\theta} + \omega_n^2 \theta = \omega_n^2 \theta_{\text{ref}}. \quad (15)$$

Here,  $\theta_{\text{ref}}$  and  $\theta$  are the demanded and actual pitch angles, respectively,  $\zeta$  denotes the damping of pitch actuator and  $\omega_n$  denotes the natural frequency of the actuator.

## 2.6. Steady State Solution

Overall, the model has eight states  $x := [\omega_r, \omega_g, \delta, x_t, \dot{x}_t, \theta, \dot{\theta}, T_g]^T$  two controllable inputs  $u := [\theta_{\text{ref}}, T_{g,\text{ref}}]^T$  and one uncontrollable input (disturbance),  $v_w$ . The state space representation of the nonlinear model is given by the following nonlinear ordinary differential equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\omega}_r &= \frac{P_r(\omega_r, \theta, v_w^r)}{\omega_r J_r} - \frac{\omega_r D_s}{J_r} + \frac{\omega_g D_s}{J_r N_g} - \frac{\delta K_s}{J_r}, \\ \dot{\omega}_g &= \frac{\omega_r D_s}{J_g N_g} - \frac{\omega_g D_s}{J_g N_g^2} + \frac{\delta K_s}{J_g N_g} - \frac{T_g}{J_g}, \\ \dot{\delta} &= \omega_r - \frac{\omega_g}{N_g}, \\ \ddot{\xi} &= -\frac{K_t}{M_t} \xi - \frac{D_t}{M_t} \dot{\xi} + \frac{1}{M_t} F_t(\omega_r, \theta, v_w^r), \\ \ddot{\theta} &= -\omega_n^2 \theta - 2\zeta \omega_n \dot{\theta} + \omega_n^2 \theta_{\text{ref}}, \\ \dot{T}_g &= -\frac{1}{\tau_T} T_g + \frac{1}{\tau_T} T_{g,\text{ref}}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$




Figure 4: Optimal trajectory under steady state conditions with  $v_w$  [m/s] on x-axis

The nonlinear model (16) can be written in a compact form as:

$$\dot{x} = f(x, u, v_w). \quad (17)$$

A steady state solution ( $\dot{x} = 0$ ) for this model can be calculated as a function of wind speed  $v_w$ ; such solutions will be used in section 4.1 to linearize the model. Fig. 4 shows the optimal trajectory (i.e. the one that maximizes the generated power) for power output, rotor speed, tower displacement and pitch angle under steady state conditions. Tower displacement velocity and pitch rate are zero under steady state operation.

As it is well-known [2], the turbine operating range is usually divided in two subregions, the so-called Region 2 and Region 3. Region 2 is characterized by low wind speeds and below rated operation (here, between cut-in speed of 3 m/s and about 11 m/s, see Fig. 4). The objective in this region is to extract as much power as possible by selecting optimal  $C_p$ . It can be seen in Fig. 4 that for a constant tip speed,  $C_p$  is maximum for  $\theta = 0$  deg. So, the optimal pitch angle  $\theta = 0$  deg is selected throughout this region, and only torque control is required. **Sometimes, Region 2 $\frac{1}{2}$  is also defined in between the Regions 2 and 3 where wind turbine achieves the rated speed but still power output is less than the rated value. From point of view of tuning MPC, we have considered it as part of Region 2 because in both the regions we have the same objective of power maximization and the same control input.**

Region 3 is characterized by high wind speeds, in this case greater than 11 m/s. Now, the operation can no longer continue at constant pitch angle, since the mechanical power needs to be limited in order not to exceed the generator's rated power. Thus, as the wind speed increases, the pitch angle must be increased so that the angle of attack, and hence the lift on the blades, decreases. The aim in this region is thus power limitation.

### 3. Performance criteria and baseline controller

#### 3.1. Wind Model

Wind speed profiles were generated using a dynamic wind simulator, based on [15]. With a specified mean wind speed, wind direction, and turbulence level, the simulator provides a statistical wind model that closely approximates the wind profiles that a rotor would experience in reality.

We used the simulator to generate several cases with different mean wind speeds perpendicular to the face of rotor, both in Regions 2 and 3 for tuning our MPC control parameters. **In practice, the wind speed can be estimated from available measurements using model-based algorithms. A comprehensive review on wind speed estimation can be found in [25].**

#### 3.2. Performance Criteria

We consider five indices to evaluate the performance of the controller:

##### 3.2.1. Average Power Output/ Power Variation (W)

For Region 2, an important performance criterion is the mean power output over a given time interval  $T$ ,

$$AP = \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{P_e(t)}{T}. \quad (18)$$

The higher the value of  $AP$ , the better the controller's performance.

In Region 3, the performance criterion of interest is the root mean square value of the deviation of the generated power from the rated power output

$$PV = \left( \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T (P_e(t) - P_{e,nom})^2}{T} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (19)$$

The lower the value of  $PV$ , the better the controller's performance.

### 3.2.2. Tower Displacement (m)

It is desirable to minimize the displacements of the tower from its steady state position due to a changing wind speed. This quantity is taken as a measure of the tower fatigue caused by changing loads:

$$TD = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T |\xi(t+1) - \tilde{\xi}(t)|}{T}. \quad (20)$$

### 3.2.3. Pitch Usage (deg/s)

Rapid changes in pitch are undesirable, since they cause fatigue in the pitch actuator. Also, higher pitch activity can provoke vibrations in the structure if the resonance frequencies of the tower are excited [7]. Hence, the average pitch angle deviation during the considered time is computed:

$$PU = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T |\theta_{\text{ref}}(t+1) - \theta_{\text{ref}}(t)|}{T}. \quad (21)$$

The lower  $PU$ , the better the controller's performance. This applies only to Region 3, since in Region 2 the pitch is always fixed.

### 3.2.4. Drivetrain Twist Rate (rad/s)

As another measure of loads, the following criterion is considered to account for the fatigue on the drivetrain shaft:

$$DT = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T |\delta(t+1) - \delta(t)|}{T}. \quad (22)$$

This is also equivalent to considering the variability of the generator's torque, since the latter is closely related to drivetrain twist, see (8).

### 3.2.5. Frequency of Power Exceeding Nominal

Only meaningful in Region 3, this criterion quantifies how many times the power exceeds the rated value:

$$PEN = \sum_{t=1}^T \chi(t), \quad (23)$$

$$\chi(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } P_e(t) > P_{e,\text{nom}}, \\ 0, & \text{if } P_e(t) \leq P_{e,\text{nom}}. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Clearly, it is not possible to obtain the best of every criterion, since for example a lower power variation usually implies a higher pitch usage. There is always a compromise which can be set by tuning the controller. The choice of the control approach influences what are the achievable tradeoffs (within the limits of what is physically possible) and how easy it is to tune the control law.

## 3.3. Baseline Controller

To have a term of comparison for the MPC controller, a baseline controller is considered. The latter is a discrete-time controller with sampling time  $T_s$ , which is the same as that used by the MPC law. In particular,  $T_s$  is chosen such

that the sampling frequency is greater than the frequency of the fastest pole of the linearized model (eigenvalue  $\lambda_{\text{max}}$  of  $A$  in (29)), in the considered case 14.15 rad/s. Thus,  $T_s = 0.1$  s has been chosen here.

### 3.3.1. Region 2

The conventional controller used in Region 2 is torque-based control which tries to always operate the turbine at the most efficient power coefficient,  $C_p^*$ .  $\lambda^*$  is the corresponding tip speed ratio [2]:

$$T_{g,\text{ref}} = \frac{0.5\rho\pi R^5 \lambda^{*3} C_p^* \omega_r^2}{N_g}, \quad \theta_{\text{ref}} = 0. \quad (25)$$

### 3.3.2. Region 3

In Region 3, a PID controller is used. The pitch angle is controlled using proportional-integral-derivative action on error in rotor speed tracking:

$$\theta_{\text{ref}}(t) = K_p \omega_e(t) + K_i \int_0^t \omega_e(\tau) d\tau + K_d \frac{d\omega_e(t)}{dt}, \quad (26)$$

$$\omega_e(t) = \omega_r(t) - \omega_{r,\text{nom}}. \quad (27)$$

The parameters  $K_p$ ,  $K_i$  and  $K_d$  are designed using a similar methodology as in [29]. The generator torque is controlled by a feedback of the generator speed:

$$T_{g,\text{ref}}(t) = \frac{P_{e,\text{nom}}}{\omega_g(t)}. \quad (28)$$

The control signals of the PID controller are limited according to the input constraints that are present (discussed in section 4.3).

Equations (26)-(28) form the controller's structure. The values of  $K_p$ ,  $K_i$  and  $K_d$  depend on the wind speed and can be designed by evaluating performance given by the five criteria introduced above, for a wide range of gains. For a particular wind scenario with mean wind speed of 15 m/s, Fig. 5 shows the dependence of performance on  $K_p$  and  $K_d$ . As a matter of fact, the integral gain does not have much influence on the performance, so that the value  $K_i = 1$  was chosen such that the controller stabilizes the system for a wide range of  $K_p$  and  $K_d$ . The values for the latter have been selected (marked by \* in Fig. 5) to achieve similarly good performance across all measures with slightly higher weight on power variation.

## 4. Design and tuning of Linear Model Predictive Control

The central idea behind using MPC [30] is to solve a finite time horizon optimal control problem in discrete time. The ability of MPC to handle actuator and state constraints, especially in MIMO systems, provides a potential advantage over traditional PID controllers. In this section, a linear MPC formulation for a wind turbine is derived, by defining the model, the cost function and the constraints.




Figure 5: Performance of a conventional PID controller in Region 3 as a function of  $K_p$  and  $K_d$  for  $K_i = 1$

Once these ingredients have been set, the MPC law is implemented through a receding horizon strategy, where at the current time step only the first term of the solution sequence is applied to the plant, and at the next time step the whole optimal control problem is solved again, once the updated state variables have been measured.

#### 4.1. Linearization

The turbine model (16) is continuously linearized at the current estimated wind speed  $\tilde{v}_w$  to account for the non-linear system behavior. The linearization makes LMPC computationally more tractable than NMPC.  $\tilde{x}$  and  $\tilde{u}$  represent corresponding steady state and steady input, respectively. Linearization of (17) can be expressed as

$$\dot{\hat{x}} = A(\tilde{v}_w)\hat{x} + B(\tilde{v}_w)\hat{u} + B_d(\tilde{v}_w)\hat{v}_w. \quad (29)$$

where,

$$\hat{x} = x - \tilde{x}, \quad \hat{u} = u - \tilde{u}, \quad \hat{v}_w = v_w - \tilde{v}_w, \quad (30)$$

$$A(\tilde{v}_w) = \left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right|_{(\tilde{x}, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}_w)}, \quad B(\tilde{v}_w) = \left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial u} \right|_{(\tilde{x}, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}_w)}, \quad (31)$$

$$B_d(\tilde{v}_w) = \left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial v_w} \right|_{(\tilde{x}, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}_w)}.$$

The linear model is then discretized with sampling time  $T_s$  by an explicit Euler method.

#### 4.2. Cost Function

The optimization is carried out with a quadratic cost function which is optimized at each time step:

$$J = \min_u \hat{x}_N^T P \hat{x}_N + \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} \hat{x}_t^T Q \hat{x}_t + \hat{u}_t^T R \hat{u}_t. \quad (32)$$

$Q$  and  $R$  are diagonal, positive definite weight matrices that penalize the deviations from the steady state  $\tilde{x}_t$  and steady input  $\tilde{u}_t$ , respectively, over a horizon length  $N$  which can be tuned for desired performance. For a finite horizon problem, a terminal cost  $\hat{x}_N^T P \hat{x}_N$ ,  $P \succ 0$  can be chosen such that feasibility is ensured at all times [30].

#### 4.3. Constraints

The optimization is subject to constraints concerning both the states and the inputs. In particular, input constraints arise from actuator limitations: there is a limit on how much and how fast the blades can pitch. Similarly, the generator has a limitation on the maximum and minimum torque it can provide:

$$\theta_{\min} \leq \theta \leq \theta_{\max}, \quad (33)$$

$$\dot{\theta}_{\min} \leq \dot{\theta} \leq \dot{\theta}_{\max}, \quad (34)$$

$$T_{g,\min} \leq T_g \leq T_{g,\max}. \quad (35)$$

The strength of rotor assembly dictates the maximum rotational speed it can bear, and the minimum speed is dic-




Figure 6: Linearized power constraint with region of feasibility

tated by the generator:

$$\omega_r \leq \omega_{r,\max}, \quad (36)$$

$$\omega_g \geq \omega_{g,\min}. \quad (37)$$

The input and state constraints mentioned above are hard constraints on the turbine operation. They must be followed strictly to avoid any damage to the wind turbine system. There are also soft constraints. For instance, when operating in Region 3, power should not vary much above the nominal power  $P_{e,\text{nom}}$  because overcurrents/overvoltages can lead to thermal stresses [28]. So, imposing a power constraint is a reasonable approach to the problem:

$$\omega_g T_g \leq P_{e,\text{nom}}. \quad (38)$$

This constraint is a bilinear relation between two of the states which cannot be implemented as such in a linear optimization problem. So, the power constraint was linearized according to Fig. 6. This linearization is chosen such that it is tangent to the constant nominal power curve at nominal set point  $(\omega_{g,\text{nom}}, T_{g,\text{nom}})$ , which is a slightly conservative approximation. The area marked by dashed lines denotes the feasible region. The linear approximation (solid gray line in Fig. 6) is

$$\omega_{g,\text{nom}}^2 T_g + P_{e,\text{nom}} \omega_g \leq 2P_{e,\text{nom}} \omega_{g,\text{nom}}. \quad (39)$$

While in Region 3, (39) plays an important role; in Region 2 it always remains inactive.

## 5. Tuning Procedure

The typical way to design the objective function is to look for the weights  $Q$  and  $R$  on states and inputs, respectively, that achieve a satisfactory performance, via a trial-and-error procedure. Such a procedure can be time-consuming and non-trivial, especially when many different

aspects have to be balanced. We propose here a systematic approach to tune the MPC law, such that the procedure is easier and the interpretation of weights becomes more meaningful. This is done in two steps:

1) *Modifying the cost function to account explicitly for power maximization, and setting zero-terms in the weight matrix*

In Region 2, the aim is power maximization and in Region 3, power limitation. So, maximizing power in both regions superimposed with the power constraint (39) is an approach suitable for both regions. In lieu of above argument, the objective function can be augmented with a power maximization term,  $x_t^T S x_t$  (compare equation (32)):

$$J = \min_u \hat{x}_N^T P \hat{x}_N + \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} \hat{x}_t^T Q \hat{x}_t + \hat{u}_t^T R \hat{u}_t - x_t^T S x_t. \quad (40)$$

where  $S$  is a positive semi-definite matrix, nonzero only for the terms corresponding to the product of  $\omega_g$  and  $T_g$  in the state vector. This new term has a negative sign since the aim is to maximize power; moreover, since the generated power is a concave function of the state, the cost function  $J$  (40) is still convex. To this end, note that the new term accounts for the whole state  $x$  (and not only its deviation  $\hat{x}$  from the linearization point  $\tilde{x}$ ).

### 5.1. Region 3

Table 1 presents the sensitivity of the four performance measures for a wind profile in Region 3, if the objective function is based on (32). Unlike all the performance criteria listed in Table 1, the frequency of power exceeding the nominal value shows bidirectional behavior, in the sense that if it increases with increase in some weight, it might decrease when the same weight is further increased. So, it has been excluded in evaluating the sensitivity table. Nevertheless, this indicator provides useful insight while comparing PID with MPC. All the cost weights in (32) were initially set to  $\frac{1}{\tilde{x}^2}$  or  $\frac{1}{\tilde{u}^2}$  to normalize the contribution of each state and input to the cost function. This choice is referred to as “base weights” here. The weights were then increased ( $\uparrow$ ) or decreased ( $\downarrow$ ) by a factor  $\alpha$  (10 in this case) one at a time, and Table 1 shows how much a performance measure changed when a specific weight was modified with respect to the base value. As a matter of fact, changing the weights on  $\omega_r$ ,  $\omega_g$ ,  $\dot{x}_t$  and  $T_g$  did not change the performance significantly in any of the criteria. So, these terms are excluded from the cost function. The effect of input weights is not shown in the table for space limitations but the same behavior as the corresponding states has been observed. Excluding the redundant states from the cost function, (40) can be redefined with 4 states, 2 inputs and 1 power maximization term:

$$Q = \text{diag}(0, 0, q_\delta, q_\xi, 0, q_\theta, q_{\dot{\theta}}, 0), \quad (41)$$

$$R = \text{diag}(r_{\theta_{\text{ref}}}, r_{T_{g,\text{ref}}}). \quad (42)$$

Table 1: Sensitivity of performance measures on state weights with J(32) and base at steady state in Region 3

Criteria	$\omega_r$		$\omega_g$		$\delta$		$\xi$		$\dot{\xi}$		$\theta$		$\dot{\theta}$		$T_g$	
	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓
PV	5.26	0.00	5.05	0.00	1.06	0.25	22.22	0.00	1.95	-0.01	2.54	0.03	0.49	3.42	1.63	0.15
PU	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.00	22.38	-0.25	4.17	-0.04	13.82	-0.17	-0.98	3.20	0.05	0.00
TD	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.00	-0.07	0.00	-0.48	0.02	-0.03	0.00	-0.46	0.01	0.04	-0.41	0.03	0.00
DT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.04	0.01	2.24	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	0.00

The sensitivity analysis with this objective function is shown in Table 2. The weights which are the most favorable for performance are highlighted in **bold** and the most unfavorable in *italic*.

Table 2: Sensitivity of performance measures on state weights with J(40) and base at steady state in Region 3

Criteria	$P_e$		$\delta$		$\xi$		$\theta$		$\dot{\theta}$	
	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓
PV	-0.02	0.00	0.04	0.00	-0.25	0.04	<b>-0.42</b>	0.68	<i>0.82</i>	<b>-0.43</b>
PU	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.59	-0.06	0.26	-0.10	<b>-0.21</b>	<i>0.39</i>
TD	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.07	0.01	<b>-0.09</b>	<i>0.09</i>	<i>0.11</i>	<b>-0.11</b>
DT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

2) Finding appropriate weights for non-zero terms in the cost function

Once all the nonzero weight terms are identified, the next step is iterating between sensitivity tables defined at new set points, in order to find suitable values for such weights. For instance, Table 2 is calculated with respect to the base values. To reduce the pitch usage, the weight on  $\dot{\theta}$  may be increased or  $\theta$  may be decreased by  $\alpha$ . This forms a new base and a new sensitivity table can be calculated for it by again increasing and decreasing each weight by new  $\alpha$ . The local validity of the sensitivity table makes it necessary to recompute it again after a change has been made.

Table 2 also illustrates the trade-off between different performance measures. If the weight on the pitch rate is increased, pitch usage is reduced but power variation and tower displacement both increase. This effect can be explained by the fact that higher pitch rate weight restricts the actuator from quickly adjusting the pitch with the changing wind speed.

Table 2 has been calculated for mean wind speed of 15 m/s. Next, we analyze the correlation of this sensitivity table with another one calculated for different mean wind speed (18 m/s) in Table 3. A correlation matrix was calculated by dividing the corresponding sensitivity values from the two tables. The sensitivity values are very highly correlated for all the performance measures across all the weights. A negative correlation is observed only when the corresponding sensitivity values are very small low, which is irrelevant anyways.

5.2. Region 2

In Region 2, only 3 performance measures are relevant:  $PA$ ,  $TD$  and  $DT$  because power output is always below

Table 3: Correlation of sensitivity between different wind scenarios, mean speed of 15 (m/s) and 18 (m/s)

Criteria	$P_e$		$\delta$		$\xi$		$\theta$		$\dot{\theta}$	
	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓
PV	0.58	0.59	0.52	0.50	0.99	1.07	0.75	0.35	0.39	0.81
PU	1.42	1.41	24.33	14.58	1.86	1.88	0.77	0.71	1.16	1.31
TD	-2.52	-2.34	-3.12	-4.25	1.72	1.42	0.63	0.06	0.19	0.98
DT	0.20	-0.13	1.21	1.18	1.88	1.76	-0.36	-0.87	1.00	1.03

nominal limit and the pitch is always fixed. A similar analysis (Table 4) in this region reveals that the sensitivity of these three measures on the weights is very low as compared to Region 3. Now, the contribution of tower displacement and tower velocity to performance becomes insignificant and therefore,  $\xi$  and  $\dot{\xi}$  can be removed from the objective function. The weights on  $\omega_r$  and  $\omega_g$  have similar effects and can be assigned an equal weight. Again, after removing the redundant terms from the cost function, the  $Q$  and  $R$  matrices can be rewritten as:

$$Q = \text{diag}(q_\omega, q_\omega, q_\delta, 0, 0, 0, 0, q_{T_g}), \quad (43)$$

$$R = \text{diag}(0, r_{T_g, \text{ref}}). \quad (44)$$

As seen before, the inclusion of the generated power in the cost function helps to increase the power output. This is taken into account for further computations in section 6.

6. Results

In order to evaluate the performance of the MPC law tuned with the described approach, two simulation scenarios have been considered. The first one has mean wind speed of 8 m/s and turbulence of 7% which lies completely in Region 2 and the other one, lying in Region 3, has mean wind speed of 15 m/s and turbulence of 3%. The direction of the wind in both the scenarios is perpendicular to the surface of the rotor. Both the cases were simulated for 600s with a time horizon of 2s in MPC. **This length of prediction horizon is sufficiently long when wind preview is not considered in the control problem.** The convex optimization problem was solved using Gurobi [31]. **In practice, MPC with quadratic cost function and affine constraints, as in this case, can be implemented real-time reliably, either by optimizing online [32] or by computing offline the corresponding explicit controller [33].**

Table 4: Sensitivity of performance measures on state weights with J(32) and base at steady state in Region 2

Criteria	$\omega_r$		$\omega_g$		$\delta$		$\xi$		$\dot{\xi}$		$T_g$	
	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓
AP	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
TD	-0.009	0.001	-0.009	0.001	-0.003	0.001	-0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.004	-0.002
DT	-0.022	0.002	-0.022	0.002	0.074	-0.021	-0.003	0.000	0.002	0.000	0.042	-0.021

6.1. Region 2

The comparison of performance between MPC and that of the torque-based control in Table 5 shows that it is indeed difficult to outperform the latter, especially without preview. This result is also supported by [23, 24]. This can be attributed to the fact that all the constraints in below rated conditions are inactive, and it is only in the presence of constraints that MPC is most effective. For MPC, the data in Table 5 (and 6) represent the absolute values of the performance indices calculated with base values and with tuned values for the cost weights, the latter obtained after several iterations of the procedure described in section 5. With initial tuning, the baseline controller performs better in all the considered criteria. The final, tuned weights are such that a reasonable comparison can be made with the baseline controller, but there always exists a room for trade off between different performance measures.

Table 5: Performance comparison of MPC and PID in Region 2

	AP [kW]	TD [m]	DT [rad/s]
Torque based	1763.8	0.0041	2.1e-5
MPC (Initial)	1719.8	0.0194	1.8e-4
MPC (Final)	1763.4	0.0040	1.7e-4

The comparison was done for mean wind speed of 8 m/s. Quantitatively, both power output and tower displacement are more or less the same but the drivetrain twist rate is much larger with MPC (with tuned weights). Sensitivity on weights for the final tuning parameters can be used to further investigate the possibility of finding a different trade-off with MPC.

6.2. Region 3

Table 6 compares the performance of MPC against a PID controller which was tuned for a particular wind profile with mean wind speed of 15 m/s. With the base weight values, MPC performed worse in 4 out of 5 criteria. **Table 2 is used to tune MPC with the objective of reducing power variation. The sensitivities of increasing the pitch angle and decreasing the pitch rate are the most negative with respect to power variation. We chose to increase the weight on pitch angle because its sensitivity with respect to pitch usage is lower. Also, increasing the weight on power term doesn't have influence on any other performance**

**criteria, so it can be increased as well.** In subsequent steps, weights on power term and pitch were increased to reach the final tuning where MPC performs better in 3 out of 5 criteria. The comparison shows that MPC performs much better in reducing the power variation and limiting the frequency of exceeding nominal power with final tuning. MPC can achieve almost half power variation while exceeding the nominal power only two-third times of PID (total simulation time steps are  $600s/T_s$ ). Tower displacement in both the cases is very much comparable. The benefits with MPC come at an expense of higher pitch usage. Drivetrain displacement is very small in both cases but nonetheless, the PID controller performs slightly better in this criterion.

Table 6: Performance comparison of MPC and PID in Region 3

	PV [W]	PU [deg/s]	TD [m]	DT [rad/s]	PEN [-]
PID	1407	0.53	0.0067	7.95e-5	2976
MPC (init.)	1863	1.07	0.0082	8.14e-5	958
MPC (final)	735	1.35	0.0066	8.14e-5	1936

Table 7 shows the sensitivity of changing the weights for the final tuning. It suggests that a decrease in the pitch usage is possible by decreasing the weight on pitch angle or increasing the weight on pitch rate, but both of these would have an adverse effect on power variation as well as tower displacement. Also, Fig. 5-(a) suggests that the power variation that MPC is able to achieve seems unattainable with PID for any combination of gains. This shows the trade-off between different measures and is an indication of the fact that MPC cannot outperform PID in all the measures simultaneously. However, the pitch usage with MPC is still much lower than the limits imposed by the pitch actuator.

Table 7: Sensitivity of performance measures on state weights with base at final tuning in Region 3

Criteria	$P_e$		$\delta$		$\xi$		$\theta$		$\dot{\theta}$	
	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓
PV	-0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	-0.37	0.06	-0.61	0.68	0.86	-0.63
PU	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.55	-0.06	0.26	-0.11	-0.22	0.39
TD	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-0.13	0.02	-0.20	0.11	0.15	-0.22
DT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

## 570 7. Conclusions

The paper presented an approach for designing and tuning linear MPC for wind turbines. The performance of MPC can be very sensitive to cost weights which were selected by trading off five underlying criteria: Power Output/Power Variation, Tower Displacement, Pitch Usage, Drivetrain Twist Rate and Frequency of violating nominal power limit. These factors are very much related and there is always a compromise between them. It has been observed that even without preview, a well-tuned MPC, by means of multiobjective optimization, can outperform a conventional controller like PID in above rated conditions. However, in below rated conditions, MPC doesn't prove to be beneficial over the baseline torque-based control. Overall, the presented study indicates that a relatively systematic procedure can be set-up to properly tune the MPC controller, and that MPC can yield a higher flexibility than conventional controllers when the power output needs to be limited to a certain value. Considering the trend of modulating and controlling the power output of wind farms in order to meet grid stability requirements, this feature may prove to be crucially important in the next future.

### Appendix: Model Parameters

$\rho = 1.225$	[kg/m <sup>3</sup> ]
$P_{e,nom} = 5e6$	[W]
$N_g = 97$	[-]
$\omega_{r,nom} = 1.26$	[rad/s]
$\omega_{g,nom} = 122.91$	[rad/s]
$\omega_{g,min} = 70.16$	[rad/s]
$J_r = 5.9154e7$	[kgm <sup>2</sup> ]
$J_g = 500$	[kgm <sup>2</sup> ]
$K_s = 8.7354e8$	[Nm/rad]
$D_s = 8.3478e7$	[kgm <sup>2</sup> /rad/s]
$R = 63$	[m]
$H = 90$	[m]
$M_t = 4.2278e5$	[kg]
$K_t = 1.6547e6$	[Nm/rad]
$D_t = 2.0213e3$	[kgm <sup>2</sup> /rad/s]
$\omega_n = 0.88$	[rad/s]
$\zeta = 0.9$	[-]
$\tau_T = 0.1$	[s]
$\theta_{min} = 0$	[deg]
$\theta_{max} = 25$	[deg]
$\dot{\theta}_{min} = -8$	[deg/s]
$\dot{\theta}_{max} = 8$	[deg/s]

## Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank Dr. Vedrana Spudić, Visiting Researcher at ETH Zurich for providing us with wind simulator for generating effective wind speed.

## References

- [1] F. D. Bianchi, H. De Battista, R. J. Mantz, Wind turbine control systems: principles, modelling and gain scheduling design, Springer, 2006.
- [2] L. Y. Pao, K. E. Johnson, Control of wind turbines, Control Systems, IEEE 31 (2) (2011) 44–62.
- [3] L. J. Fingersh, K. E. Johnson, Baseline results and future plans for the nrel controls advanced research turbine, in: Proc. 23rd ASME Wind Energy Symposium, Citeseer, 2004, pp. 87–93.
- [4] E. Bossanyi, Further load reductions with individual pitch control, Wind energy 8 (4) (2005) 481–485.
- [5] E. A. Bossanyi, P. A. Fleming, A. D. Wright, Validation of individual pitch control by field tests on two-and three-bladed wind turbines, Control Systems Technology, IEEE Transactions on 21 (4) (2013) 1067–1078.
- [6] B. Boukhezzar, L. Lupu, H. Siguerdidjane, M. Hand, Multi-variable control strategy for variable speed, variable pitch wind turbines, Renewable Energy 32 (8) (2007) 1273–1287.
- [7] E. Bossanyi, Wind turbine control for load reduction, Wind Energy 6 (3) (2003) 229–244.
- [8] R. Burkart, K. Margellos, J. Lygeros, Nonlinear control of wind turbines: An approach based on switched linear systems and feedback linearization, in: Decision and Control and European Control Conference (CDC-ECC), 2011 50th IEEE Conference on, IEEE, 2011, pp. 5485–5490.
- [9] A. Kumar, K. Stol, Simulating feedback linearization control of wind turbines using high-order models, Wind Energy 13 (5) (2010) 419–432.
- [10] R. Rocha, L. Martins Filho, M. Bortolus, Optimal multivariable control for wind energy conversion system a comparison between h2 and h controllers, in: Proceedings of the 44th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, and the European Control Conference, 2005, pp. 7906–7911.
- [11] M. Kristalny, D. Madjidian, T. Knudsen, On using wind speed preview to reduce wind turbine tower oscillations, Control Systems Technology, IEEE Transactions on 21 (4) (2013) 1191–1198.
- [12] A. A. Ozdemir, P. Seiler, G. J. Balas, Design tradeoffs of wind turbine preview control, Control Systems Technology, IEEE Transactions on 21 (4) (2013) 1143–1154.
- [13] S. Schuler, D. Schlipf, P. W. Cheng, F. Allgower,  $l_1$ -optimal control of large wind turbines, Control Systems Technology, IEEE Transactions on 21 (4) (2013) 1079–1089.
- [14] M. L. Corradini, G. Ippoliti, G. Orlando, Robust control of variable-speed wind turbines based on an aerodynamic torque observer, Control Systems Technology, IEEE Transactions on 21 (4) (2013) 1199–1206.
- [15] P. Sørensen, A. D. Hansen, P. A. C. Rosas, Wind models for simulation of power fluctuations from wind farms, Journal of wind engineering and industrial aerodynamics 90 (12) (2002) 1381–1402.
- [16] L. C. Henriksen, Model predictive control of a wind turbine, Ph.D. thesis, Technical University of Denmark, DTU, DK-2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark (2007).
- [17] A. Kumar, K. Stol, Scheduled model predictive control of a wind turbine, in: Proc. AIAA/ASME Wind Energy Symp, 2009, pp. 2009–0481.
- [18] A. Koerber, R. King, Nonlinear model predictive control for wind turbines, Proc. EWEA.
- [19] J. Laks, L. Y. Pao, E. Simley, A. Wright, N. Kelley, B. Jonkman, Model predictive control using preview measurements from lidar, in: Proc. 49th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting, Orlando, FL, 2011.

- [20] M. Soltani, R. Wisniewski, P. Brath, S. Boyd, Load reduction of wind turbines using receding horizon control, in: Control Applications (CCA), 2011 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE, 2011, pp. 852–857.
- 665 [21] D. Castaignet, I. Couchman, N. K. Poulsen, T. Buhl, J. J. Wedel-Heinen, Frequency-weighted model predictive control of trailing edge flaps on a wind turbine blade, Control Systems Technology, IEEE Transactions on 21 (4) (2013) 1105–1116.
- 670 [22] A. Koerber, R. King, Combined feedback–feedforward control of wind turbines using state-constrained model predictive control, Control Systems Technology, IEEE Transactions on 21 (4) (2013) 1117–1128.
- [23] D. Schlipf, D. J. Schlipf, M. Kühn, Nonlinear model predictive control of wind turbines using lidar, Wind Energy 16 (7) (2013) 1107–1129.
- 675 [24] M. D. Spencer, K. A. Stol, C. P. Unsworth, J. E. Cater, S. E. Norris, Model predictive control of a wind turbine using short-term wind field predictions, Wind Energy 16 (3) (2013) 417–434.
- [25] M. N. Soltani, T. Knudsen, M. Svenstrup, R. Wisniewski, P. Brath, R. Ortega, K. Johnson, Estimation of rotor effective wind speed: A comparison, Control Systems Technology, IEEE Transactions on 21 (4) (2013) 1155–1167.
- 680 [26] N. Wang, K. E. Johnson, A. D. Wright, Comparison of strategies for enhancing energy capture and reducing loads using lidar and feedforward control, Control Systems Technology, IEEE Transactions on 21 (4) (2013) 1129–1142.
- 685 [27] J. M. Jonkman, S. Butterfield, W. Musial, G. Scott, Definition of a 5-MW reference wind turbine for offshore system development, National Renewable Energy Laboratory Golden, CO, 2009.
- 690 [28] R. Burkart, Nonlinear control of a wind turbine, Semester Project, ETH Zürich.
- [29] M. M. Hand, M. J. Balas, Systematic controller design methodology for variable-speed wind turbines, WIND ENGINEERING-LONDON- 24 (3) (2000) 169–188.
- 695 [30] D. Q. Mayne, J. B. Rawlings, C. V. Rao, P. O. Scokaert, Constrained model predictive control: Stability and optimality, Automatica 36 (6) (2000) 789–814.
- [31] I. Gurobi Optimization, Gurobi optimizer reference manual (2014).  
URL <http://www.gurobi.com>
- [32] Y. Wang, S. Boyd, Fast model predictive control using online optimization, Control Systems Technology, IEEE Transactions on 18 (2) (2010) 267–278.
- 705 [33] A. Alessio, A. Bemporad, A survey on explicit model predictive control, in: Nonlinear model predictive control, Springer, 2009, pp. 345–369.