This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/JESTPE.2021.3051876, IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics

A Review of Current Research Trends in Power-Electronic Innovations in Cyber-Physical Systems

S.K. Mazumder, *Fellow*, IEEE (University of Illinois at Chicago), A. Kulkarni, *Member*, IEEE (Honeywell Technologies), S. Sahoo, *Member*, IEEE (Aalborg University), F. Blaabjerg, *Fellow*, IEEE (Aalborg University), A. Mantooth, *Fellow*, IEEE (University of Arkansas), J. Balda, *Senior Member,* IEEE (University of Arkansas), Y. Zhao, *Senior Member,* IEEE (University of Arkansas), J. Ramos-Ruiz, *Student Member,* IEEE (Texas A&M University), P. Enjeti, *Fellow,* IEEE (Texas A&M University), P.R. Kumar, *Fellow,* IEEE (Texas A&M University), L. Xie, *Senior Member,* IEEE (Texas A&M University), J. Enslin, *Fellow*, IEEE (Clemson University), B. Ozpineci, *Fellow*, IEEE (Oak Ridge National Lab), A. Annaswamy, *Fellow*, IEEE (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), H. Ginn, *Senior Member*, IEEE (University of South Carolina), F. Qiu, *Senior Member*, IEEE (Argonne National Laboratory), J. Liu, *Member*, IEEE (Argonne National Laboratory), B. Smida, *Senior Member*, IEEE, (University of Illinois at Chicago), C. Ogilvie, *Student Member,* IEEE (Florida State University), J. Ospina, *Member,* IEEE (Florida State University), C. Konstantinou, *Senior Member,* IEEE (Florida State University), M. Stanovich, *Member,* IEEE (Florida State University), K. Schoder, *Member,* IEEE (Florida State University), M. Steurer*,* *Senior Member,* IEEE (Florida State University), T. Vu, *Member,* IEEE (Clarkson University), L. He, *Member*, IEEE, (University of Illinois at Chicago), and E. Pilo de la Fuente, *Member*, IEEE (Universidad Francisco de Vitoria and EPRail Research and Consulting)

(Invited Paper)

Abstract— **In this paper, a broad overview of the current research trends in power-electronic innovations in cyber-physical systems (CPSs) is presented. The recent advances in semiconductor device technologies, control architectures, and communication methodologies have enabled researchers to develop integrated smart CPSs that can cater to the emerging requirements of smart grids, renewable energy, electric vehicles, trains, ships, internet of things (IoTs), etc. The topics presented in this paper include novel power-distribution architectures, protection techniques considering large renewable integration in smart grids, wireless charging in electric vehicles, simultaneous power and information transmission, multi-hop network-based coordination, power technologies for renewable energy and smart transformer, CPS reliability, transactive smart railway grid, and real-time simulation of shipboard power systems. It is anticipated that the research trends presented in this paper will provide a timely and useful overview to the power-electronics researchers with broad applications in CPSs.**

I. Introduction

The recent advancements in wide-bandgap semiconductor devices, electric vehicles and locomotives, and a general push from the government agencies worldwide towards renewable energy integration have resulted in a number of advancements in power electronics research. These include, but are not limited to, high efficiency power circuit topologies, sophisticated battery management and charging systems, intelligent power converters, wireless power transfer, internet of things (IoT) devices, etc. A feature that distinguishes the current research from the conventional power electronics is the attempt to seamlessly integrate the cyber layer consisting of control, communication and computing with the physical layer that includes the power semiconductor devices, passive and active circuit components. It is this integration that helps in developing smart power solutions for applications such as IoT, fast charging solutions for electric vehicles, aircraft for urban air mobility, etc.

In this paper, a review of the current research trends in power electronics innovations in CPSs [1] is presented. This is described with reference to several broad application areas such as smart/micro/nano grids, e-mobility, smart energy routing, IoTs, and resilient energy systems. The topics include alternate power distribution architectures, topologies, protection schemes, communication technologies, smart power components, and reliability of CPS. Fig. 1 pictorially depicts all the sections presented in this paper and maps them to the components of CPS.

It must be noted that such a broad collection of research topics that come under CPS has not been presented in literature. This paper is targeted at enabling the research community in the areas of power electronic hardware, control techniques and communication technology (wired/wireless) to look for integrated CPS solutions that can help in developing smart and resilient power converter technologies with the ultimate goal of achieving energy sustainability.

The organization of the paper is as follows. Section II introduces resilient energy CPS. Section III describes a power architecture and protection technology in modern and smart grids. Section IV discusses the recent trends and issues in e-mobility and power and information co-transmission. In Section V, promising methods for coordinated control of power-electronics based network are discussed. Section VI gives an overview of the reliability in CPSs while Section VII describes power topology advances and smart transformer modules. In Section VIII, a transactive approach to cost of electricity reduction in a smart railway grid is outlined followed by a description of real-time simulation for shipboard power systems in Section IX. Conclusions are provided in Section X.

II. Cyber-Physical and Resilient Energy Systems

A power/energy system can be described as a CPS [1], where a network of heterogeneous energy-suppliers and end-users form the physical layer; and the sensors, communication networks, supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) systems, and control systems form the cyber layer, as shown in Fig. 2. The proper operation of an energy system relies heavily on data collection, processing, and transmission, all conducted by the cyber layer. For

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/JESTPE.2021.3051876, IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics



Fig. 1. Mapping of topics covered in this paper to the components of cyber-physical systems.



Fig. 2. Overview of an energy CPS.

example, a variety of system measurements are synthesized at a SCADA to assist in system monitoring, protection, real-time control, and economic dispatch [2]. Recently, the increasing deployment of advanced metering infrastructure, emerging communication networks, and powerful computing units have allowed for an even more wide-ranging monitoring and remote-control capability for energy systems.

Although it is expected that the increasing investment in the cyber layer will make an energy system more resilient to contingencies, many still are concerned that the increasing dependence of system operations on cybernetic technologies might introduce new challenges. First, a malfunction of a cyber-domain component could lead to high-impact physical-domain contingencies. For example, the cause of the costly Northeastern 2003 blackout was believed to be a software bug in the alarm system that hindered it from responding to a supposedly minor fault [3]. Second, adversaries might exploit or even plant loopholes in the cyber-layer to maliciously maneuver system operations or to steal private and security-related information. In the 2015 Ukraine power grid cyber-attacks, the adversaries corrupted the information system to paralyze the power supply for tens of thousands of customers [1]. Third, when cyber-events are accompanied by physical contingencies such as faults, as shown in Fig. 2, the harmful impacts might be even more severe. Fourth, many recent works have underlined the emerging challenges owing to the rapid integration of distributed energy resources [4]-[6], as their growing distributed capacity calls for the need of coordination to a certain extent, however, the sheer number creates difficulty for monitoring of cyber-physical threats. Fifth, the expanding datasets about an energy system may be eluding proprietary and security related data; advanced data mining approaches can recover safety-critical information [7][8]. For example, it is shown in [9] that using only publicly available data is enough to launch attacks to disrupt the operation of the power system of New York city. Sixth, many are concerned about the cyber-security of new technologies like Internet of Things and cloud computing [10]-[11]. While the former promotes more communications, the latter requires the concentration of data, both of which could be vulnerable to cyber-attacks [10]. To build a full-fledged energy CPS, the resilience issue with respect to all sorts of cyber-physical threats needs to be thoroughly addressed.

Resilience-related problems for an energy CPS have been studied recently with transdisciplinary approaches. For instance, functional analysis [12], data-driven approaches [13], and stochastic optimization techniques [14] have shown promising results in studying system analysis, attack detection, and system-hardening problems. Many cyber-attack detection methods have been developed recently [15]-[19]. Both model-based and model-free methods have been developed [15]. For the former, attack detection techniques based on weighted least squares (WLSs) formulations to be used in applications like state estimations [16][17]; meanwhile, standard fault detection and isolation methods like observer-based fault detection methods have been developed as well [18]. As for model-free methods, a variety of machine learning based methods have been developed [7][8][19], ranging from supervised learning approaches [8][19] and unsupervised counterparts [7].

III. Power Architectures and Protection Schemes in Modern Power Grids

A. *Power Electronics Intelligence at the Network Edge - (PINE) Inverter Technology at the Grid Edge*

Distributed energy resources such as solar are expected to grow substantially in the near future thanks to the sharp drop

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/JESTPE.2021.3051876, IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics

in the cost of solar panels. More than half of the total U.S. photovoltaic (PV) capacity comes from distributed PV connected to distribution systems [20]. High penetration of distributed energy resources typically has variable output, therefore, maintaining a good voltage profile becomes challenging due to the relatively low spatial and temporal resolution of voltage control devices [21]. In traditional residential systems, the house/load is directly connected to the grid and the residential load is susceptible to grid voltage variations. Further, it is not possible to limit the amount of power delivered to each consumer in case of limited availability such as during disasters. Furthermore, nonlinear residential loads inject current harmonics into the grid.

A solution for fast volt-VAR control has been studied in [22], where an edge of network grid optimization (ENGO) device is used to inject reactive power at the secondary side of distribution transformers, correcting the voltage variations between 2-13 V at the edge of the grid. Such a device has been shown to work autonomously, with a sub-cycle response. Another option is the use of smart transformers to compensate for voltage variations at the grid edge [23][24]. These transformers combine line and medium frequency transformers with partially rated power electronic modules.

In a recent study [25], a self-organizing power electronics converter (Fig. 3) with control intelligence at the edge of the electric distribution network has been introduced. The proposed system, called Power Electronics Intelligence at the Network Edge (PINE), shown in Fig. 3, consists of three main stages: a front-end PWM converter that reduces current harmonics and maintains constant dc-link voltage, rooftop solar PV/Battery system connected to the dc-link and an output PWM converter that feeds the load. The proposed approach enables several advantages. The PINE converter processes all the power from/to the grid, adding the ability to manage and route the energy in all directions, this enables utility companies to limit the amount of energy delivered to each customer, particularly useful during power outages. Also, because PINE allows for output voltage to be regulated, the voltage regulation needed from the utility company can be significantly reduced. Finally, the rectifier section of the topology can be controlled to exhibit a power factor close to unity, reducing the rms value of distribution line currents and thereby minimizing losses.



Fig. 3. Proposed power electronics at the grid edge – a self-organizing converter with control intelligence at the edge of the grid.

To study the behavior of multiple PINE converters connected in a distribution network (Fig. 4), an average model for an individual converter is developed. The average model is exercised on a test feeder based on the IEEE-37 test-node feeder [26], as shown in Fig. 4. A detailed study of this concept is available in the reference [25].



Fig. 4. Test feeder used to simulate high penetration levels of PINE in a distribution feeder, based on the IEEE-37 test node feeder.

B. Coordinated Protection of HVDC and MVDC Systems in Microgrids

Voltage-source converter (VSC) based high voltage direct-current (HVDC) systems have been well accepted as feasible solutions for grid interconnection and large-scale renewable energy integration over long distances [27]. Recently, the application of medium voltage direct-current (MVDC) systems has increased significantly due to their deployment in microgrids [28]. Protection of HVDC and MVDC systems is challenging since the dc circuit has a lower inductance, a higher rate of change of fault currents, and a faster fault propagation than an ac circuit with an identical rating. Therefore, next-generation protection system for HVDC and MVDC systems are being developed using advanced cyber and physical techniques, such as digital relays, communication links, and dc circuit breakers (DCCBs), to enhance security and resilience of hybrid ac/dc power systems.

Pilot protection schemes, such as those based on wavelet transform and differential current methods, require communication links between relays at both ends of a dc line to compare measured signals at two ends for fault detection [29][30]. Specifically, the wavelet transform method is to detect the transient signals that travel along a dc line with multiple frequencies' waves moving away from the fault location towards both ends of the line, as shown in Fig. 5. The wavelet transform method can identify the time and frequency characteristics of a fault current travelling wave at two ends and extract their polarities to discriminate the internal faults located on a dc line. The differential method relies on the detection of difference between fault currents (I_{fa} and I_{fb}) that feed into the fault location from two ends of a dc line. With the detection of dc faults, the relays on both ends of the dc line will trigger DCCBs to interrupt fault currents and isolate faults. These detection methods are reliable but rely heavily on a communication link between the relays at two ends. The communication link can be costly for a long dc line and with a communication delay that cannot be neglected. Alternative protection schemes detect dc faults based on local signals, such as voltages, currents, and their derivations [31]. Although these methods cost less, they require a high sampling frequency and are less reliable since they are easily affected by signal noises and measurement errors.

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/JESTPE.2021.3051876, IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics



Fig. 5. Protection schemes of meshed dc grids.

There are protection schemes based on the coordination between converters and DCCBs. Currently, the existing DCCB techniques are limited by their response time, voltage rating, and cost. These protection schemes perform a flexible control of converters to limit dc fault currents to reduce the rating and cost of the DCCBs. The corresponding strategies include (1) applying full-bridge modular multilevel converters (MMCs) to block the fault current flowing through IGBTs' diodes (Fig. 6a) and (2) using half-bridge MMCs to form bypassing circuits using additional thyristors or controlling their own IGBTs (Figs. 6b and 6c) [32][33]. These bypass circuits can convert the dc fault circuit into a balanced ac circuit. As a result, the MMC capacitors stop discharging and the dc fault current is reduced dramatically to enable a successful tripping of the DCCBs with a lower rating.



Fig. 6. Protection of MMC-HVDC.

The protection coordination between dc and ac systems is also significant for hybrid ac/dc power systems because the control and operation of dc systems have significant impacts on traditional protection systems of ac systems. The research work in [34]-[36] proposed a fast and reliable algorithm to identify mis-coordinated relays in an ac system due to an interconnection of the HVDC and determine their appropriate relay settings.

IV. E-Mobility and Wireless Information and Power Transfer

A. E-Mobility and Charging

Electric vehicles are here and this time they are here to stay. All-electric propulsion systems can be powered by a battery, a fuel cell, or a gasoline powered alternator to form battery electric, fuel cell hybrid, and extended range electric vehicles. The electric propulsion includes a traction inverter and an electric motor. In the fuel cell hybrid case, there is also a need for a voltage regulator to supply constant voltage to the inverter even when the fuel cell output voltage reduces at higher loads. The battery electric vehicle includes either an on-board charger or an off-board charger. Typically, more than 100 kW power will be transferred through the inverters to move the vehicle. Cyber physical security of these components is important to ensure that the right amount of power is produced at the right time. Hijacking the torque command or charging command can result in major damage to the vehicles and to the people riding in them. In addition to these, the sensors on these vehicles must process the right data and output the correct results for the vehicle to function properly without posing danger to anyone. These vehicles will be carrying a lot of energy in the form of batteries, hydrogen, and gasoline which could be volatile if not controlled properly using appropriate sensor data.

There are some semi-autonomous vehicles on the road today with some navigation, at least on the highways. The future promises more of the connected and autonomous vehicles. These vehicles will have all the power electronics mentioned above along with many more sensors and computers requiring additional power [37]. Such vehicles, comprising communication, controls, and computing systems including edge computing at the sensor level there is the potential for more vulnerabilities. Eventually, with the humans out of the loop, for full Level 5 autonomy [38], these systems will be even more critical since there will not be a human driver to take control in case of danger.

Charging systems connect vehicle electronics to the grid systems allowing critical communication between two important infrastructures. With an all-electric transportation system, there will be thousands and eventually millions of these vehicles connected to the grid at any time allowing people trying to gain access to the grid through the vehicle systems or vice versa, which is why both systems should be designed in a secure manner and not necessarily independently but in coordination with each other preventing vulnerabilities [39][40]. With charging power levels going beyond 350 kW for passenger vehicles and beyond 1 MW for commercial vehicles, an interruption could disable vehicles or reduce the charging power which would take them out of service impacting large segments of society. These power levels also indicate much higher energy levels being transferred to the batteries which makes it critical to have secure chargers and battery management systems to avoid any catastrophic failures.

Another charging technology that will allow autonomous vehicles is wireless charging [41], after all, if someone must plug the vehicles in, they cannot be considered completely autonomous. There is also dynamic or in-motion wireless charging which, together with autonomous static charging, potentially allows vehicles to have unlimited range eliminating the range anxiety of electric vehicles [42][43]. For static charging, the vehicles are parked at home or at work. There is also dynamic or in-motion wireless charging which, together with autonomous static charging, potentially allows vehicle to have unlimited range

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/JESTPE.2021.3051876, IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics

eliminating the range anxiety associated with electric vehicles [42][43]. Experimental evaluation of a 120 kW (Fig. 7a) and a 20 kW (Fig. 7b) static wireless charging system demonstrated a dc-to-dc efficiency of 97% with a 150 mm gap between the transmitter (Fig. 7a) and receiver coils. The feasibility of this system resulted in the team looking into 300 kW static wireless charging systems and 200 kW dynamic wireless charging systems.



(a) (b)

Fig. 7. (a) A double-D coil that was used by Oak Ridge National Laboratory's (ORNL's) 120 kW static wireless charging demonstration. (b) An earlier 20-kW static wireless charging system demonstrated on a Rav4 EV at ORNL.

Static wireless charging at home or work brings the same concerns about connection to grid [41]. With vehicles being charged from the road dynamically, in addition to the all the electronics mentioned earlier with respect to autonomous vehicles, high power, a medium voltage connected power electronics system will be a part of the traffic system connecting roads directly to the grid. This will open more ways for hackers to infiltrate vehicle and grid systems potentially causing havoc in traffic.

For these systems to be secure, not just cyber security of software but also cyber physical security of power electronics is extremely important. While designing these systems, more consideration needs to be given regarding what part of controls and data processing needs to be software- or hardware-based.

B. Power and Information Co-transmission

Although radio waves can carry both energy and information simultaneously, the radiofrequency transmission of these quantities have traditionally been treated separately. Some recent studies have provided experimental evidence for wireless information and power transmission (WIPT), in which information and energy flow together through the *same* signal. From a communication theory perspective, transmitting data and power over different spectra – such as using pulse width to overlay information on top of power transfer - or sending two signals over two time slots (not simultaneous) or using two antennas are conceptionally identical for wireless communication and not spectrum efficient. This is especially challenging in the case of massive-connected IoT devices that monitor, for instance, structural health, logistics, security, health care, and agriculture. The main open challenge here lies in the limited available frequency-spectrum, shared by all devices to transmit data and receive power, combined with the requirement of maintenance-free and high-reliability data transmission, especially from the standpoint of energy sustainability. Most implementation of WIPT receivers did not operate using wireless power transfer (WPT) and wireless information transmission (WIT) on the same received signal [44]-[48]. There are two facets to this restriction: first, the WPT operation on the WIT signal destroys the information content of the signal; second, the WIT and WPT have very different power sensitivity (e.g., -10 dBm for energy harvesters versus -60 dBm for information receivers) [44]. These limitations inspired several research efforts on splitting the received signal into two orthogonal parts. The common practical techniques include: Time switching, power splitting and antenna switching [44]-[48]. All prior approaches have the disadvantage of interrupted information transmission and low-spectrum efficiency. This is logical since up until recently it was assumed that simultaneous reception and transmission on the same frequency, i.e., in-band full-duplex (FD) communication is impossible. Recent works have provided experimental methodologies for full-duplex communication, in which a node can transmit and receive signals at the same time and on the same frequency band [49]-[51]. This research guarantees low latency transmission as required by, among others, delay-sensitive sensor information. It also allows the use of wide-band optimum waveforms for WPT to increase the dc power level at the receivers [52]-[56]

Motivated by the advances in RF-power transfer and FD communication, we believe FD-WIPT (see Fig. 8) is a promising approach to sustainable-power low-latency data transmission IoT network. This is very relevant for low-power IoT devices with massive connections such as communication in disaster scenarios. Within this framework, the IoT devices will harvest energy from incident RF signals and transmit a message to the base-station at the same time and on the same frequency. The integration of wireless power and wireless communications receivers brings also new challenges related to self-interference cancellation and RF-power transfer enhancement.



Fig. 8. Wireless co-transmission of power and information.

While wireless power and information is typically transmitted using a common electromagnetic (continuous) mechanism, recently, [57][58] has introduced a mechanism where power and data flow is no longer restricted to be continuous. In other words, and as shown in Fig. 9, the power/energy and data can be sent (with or without a waveguide) in discretized form. This, yields added reliability and interestingly, just like data, energy packets can be coded. Further, the signals can be modulated and do not need to be pulsating. Instead, the signals are Boolean in a generalized sense. Further, the form of power transmission can be multi-quadrant. Preliminary results have been provided in [59] and exciting research is ongoing with broad applications [60].



Fig. 9. A Boolean power and data transfer mechanism.

V. Coordinated Control

Systems where converters are the interfaced between many of the main sources of energy and load centers, have the ability to direct the flow of energy if the control of the converters is appropriately coordinated. This allows for optimizing source operating points for a system cost function and directing load sharing and energy storage usage to meet operational requirements. Perhaps the most common methods of coordination utilized in microgrids are droop based. Droop coordination methods [61]-[64] are robust and are often adjusted via low bandwidth communication links making them relatively insensitive to communication failures or delays. However, adjustments to sharing allocations are slow as compared to fast communication-based methods and bus voltage cannot be stiffly regulated. Higher-bandwidth communication can form the basis of coordinating system control that allows for system wide energy management strategies [65]-[67] as an alternative to droop-based methods when faster and tighter energy flow control is desirable.

A. Multi-Hop Network Based Coordination of Power Electronics

There has been progress in the area of modular converter systems due to continued research and development of the power-electronics-building-block (PEBB) concept [68]. The PEBB concept has driven advancements in highly modularized converter systems with many identical subsystems such as the modular multilevel converter (MMC). In addition, recent developments in SiC power devices are yielding converters with far greater switching frequencies and resulting in an order of magnitude reduction of the time scales as compared to converter systems utilizing conventional Si IGBTs. Faster time scales translate to a need for more capable control systems that is usually being met using FPGA based platforms. Communication and computational capabilities of new FPGA based controllers provides opportunities beyond simply supporting SiC PEBB based converters.

Modules that form the control system for single converters are traditionally co-located within the converter. In a PEBB-based power distribution system, control and measurement modules are spatially distributed. Thus, modules at the application level of each converter control can be networked and furthermore with sufficient communication speed do not even have to be co-located with converter equipment. A study [69] was performed to determine the feasibility of distributing converter application control among the modules within converters and at control layers above individual converter control. The study determined that it is acceptable since application control for converter has a cycle time that is typically in the lower millisecond range [70].

The stability and performance of a system of PEBB modules is affected by the delay between when measurements are taken and when updated references are received from the controller. Since each level of the PEBB control hierarchy is connected in a local network topology, transitioning packets between control levels will also contribute to the delay. Latency serves as a constraint for the overall control system design. As such, both the physical topology of the communication network and the routing algorithm are important considerations for the system design.

Several network topologies were evaluated [71], and some of the candidate topologies are shown in Fig. 10. Fig. 10a shows a simple 1-D bidirectional ring topology, where there is only one minimal-distance path between any two endpoints. The worst-case round-trip path delay is n, where n is the number of nodes (where a message must traverse $n/2$ rings in both directions). In this topology, each module requires only two bidirectional channels. Fig. 10c shows a 2-D torus topology, which offers more than one possible minimum-length paths between any two endpoints that are not horizontally or vertically aligned. The 2-D torus has a worst-case round-trip latency of $n^{1/2}$ and requires four bidirectional channels per node. Extending further, a 3-D torus would require six channel per node and have a worst-case round-trip latency of $n^{1/3}$. The 2-D torus was selected as the best compromise of number of communication links and performance.



Fig. 10. PEBB control node communication network topologies.

The proposed multi-hop network topology is widely used for large-scale distributed computing systems to smaller-scale networks-on-chip [72]-[75]. However, while these networks seek to minimize average-case latency for varying dynamic traffic, a PEBB controller network must guarantee a worst-case latency for regular static traffic. Power electronic control systems consist of multiple control loops and levels or layers of control within a hierarchy.

Single hop communication latency in the 0.7 µs range has been achieved [69] which includes all necessary subsystems to implement application level control functions. An additional advantage of mesh networks is multiple re-route paths in the event of a network or control node failure. In the event of a node failure the network can re-route by adding two additional hops resulting in a worst-case additional latency of 1.4 µs. This is acceptable since Application control for converter control systems has a cycle time that is

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/JESTPE.2021.3051876, IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics

typically in the > 100 µs range [70]. With worst case hop timing needing less than 1% of the application control cycle time several tens of converters can be coordinated via the 2-D torus PEBB control network.

Increasing communication and computational capabilities of new FPGA based controllers provides a new paradigm where, as opposed to two distinct converters outlined in the pink boxes of Fig. 11, this can be viewed as a single cluster of PEBBs. The cluster with tight synchronization and coordination across the multi-hop network reduces the need for energy-storage-based decoupling at buses and other points in the electrical network. Capacitive storage, for example, provides sufficient energy to maintain voltage at a bus within an acceptable range when converters attached to the bus interact. The capacitive storage must buffer response lags between converter control subsystems. Low latency and tight synchronization of control subsystems enabled by the network reduces response times of systems interacting on a bus and thus the required storage is reduced for the same bus transient limit.



Fig. 11. Cluster of PEBBs coordinated over 2-D torus multi-hop network.

B. *Event-Triggered and Encoding based Control of Distributed Power-Electronic Systems*

An important question is how the communication-based coordination workload, with the increasing penetration of power electronics in networked power systems (e.g., microgrid, VPP, naval integrated power systems, more electric aircrafts) be ensured notwithstanding the advantages of coordination of such CPSs. Conventional approaches often use periodic data transmission, which typically incur progressively higher latency as the number of power-electronic nodes increase. As such, there is ongoing exploration if a need-based and/or control-centric communication (guided by event- or self-triggering) would be more beneficial [66]-[69], [76]. Preliminary work, as illustrated in Fig. 12 [66], seems to suggest promise by reducing the data rate for communication.



Fig. 12. Comparison of rate of data packet transmission using conventional periodic data transmission and that obtained using self-triggering (need) based data transmission for a centralized or a distributed coordination framework in a power network. The efficacy of local event triggered (need) based communication is evident.

While event-triggering and control-centric communication reduces data rate by carrying out need-based packet exchange, a coding-based approach essentially focuses on the information content of the data. For instance, such an approach may reduce the rate of communication by transmitting a data packet between control nodes when there is new information content or sending only the new information content. Fig. 13 [72] illustrates the result of one such case study. The latter pertains to coordinated control of multiple parallel inverters. The figure shows that if a differential data transmission is adopted, then, the number of inverters that can be coordinated for the same delay are significantly higher thereby boosting the scalability of the coordinated inverter control. As power-electronics penetrates networks at a larger scale, such coding approaches become increasingly relevant.



Fig. 13. Illustration of the ability of a coding approach to reduce the computation delay involved in coordination of plurality of inverters.

VI. Reliability in Power-Electronic based Cyber-Physical Power Systems

CPS for power have facilitated the integration of physical power networks with embedded computing processes, thereby adding new capabilities. Furthermore, with the aim to decarbonize the energy production process, power

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/JESTPE.2021.3051876, IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics

electronics is dominating in modern power systems acting as the key enabler in the energy conversion unit to extract "green" energy from renewable energy sources. By virtue of these increasing demands, the cyber layer was brought in to become the "brain" in handling and coordinating the operation and control of modern power systems, which acts as the "body" (as shown in Fig. 14).



Fig. 14. Reliability evaluation and situational awareness of power-electronics-based power CPSs.

The addition of more sensing, communication, variable power sources and storage under the renewable energy thrust and smart grid initiative will add even higher orders of dimensionality and complexity. This order of complexity, intended to achieve higher levels of efficiency, flexibility, and fault tolerance, can also be a source of higher failures of complex nature that can degrade the reliability. Since most of the literature is focused on reliability indices emerging only from the physical layer [78], it is crucial to assess the failure modes resulting from the cyber-physical interactions in power-electronics-based power CPSs.

As the cyber interdependence keeps growing, new reliability indices from power systems operation perspective need to be developed to account for issues in the cyber layer such as, communication traffic, delay, data packet loss, link failure and cyber security (as shown in Fig. 14). With higher degree of cyber-physical interoperability, cyber failure modes may indirectly trigger events in the physical layer such as, power electronics component level reliability, stability concerns, overloading of converters finally leading to emergency contingencies. An account of the power CPS has been shown in Fig. 15, where large communication delay affects the system performance. In the long run, these high-frequency oscillations will not only degrade the component's lifetime but will also alter system stability.

Finally, new reliability metrics need to be defined for power-electronic-based power CPSs to account cyber-



Fig. 15. Impact of large communication delay on operation of power CPS.

physical disturbances and evaluate the failure, availability and lifetime of cyber-physical components [79], specifically for applications such as protection against faults where the omnipresence of both cyber and physical layer is inevitable. Moreover, further research can be carried out to recommend the degree of cyber-physical interoperability to ensure reliability of power electronics based cyber-physical power systems.

VII. Advances in Hardware and Power-Converter Topologies

A. *Power Electronic Converters for Solar Plus Storage Systems*

The solar-plus-storage system is a typical configuration for a distributed energy resource (DER) generation system, where a battery energy storage system (BESS) can be integrated with a solar photovoltaic (PV) system to mitigate the irregularities of the PV system and improve system reliability [80]. In a dc-coupled solar plus storage system, both the PV and BESS are connected to a common dc bus to supply energy to a grid-tied inverter or directly to the loads in a microgrid. A bidirectional multi-port dc-dc converter is desirable to achieve power transfer among the PV arrays, BESS, and the common dc bus. Among various solid-state transformer topologies, the triple-active-bridge (TAB) converter [81][82], where three dc-ac converters are coupled through a three-port transformer [83], can enable galvanic isolation and transfer power among three dc ports with less components. Moreover, like its two-port counterpart, i.e., the dual-active-bridge (DAB) converter [84], the TAB converter can operate at the zero-voltage-switching mode to reduce switching losses. Thus, the TAB converter inherently satisfies the needs of the solar plus storage system.

Compared to the conventional system configuration, the TAB converter based solar plus storage configuration enables integration at the converter level, which will provide a faster dynamic response and improve system robustness, as a centralized controller can adjust the power distribution between the PV port and BESS port rather than controlling power through communication between different dc-dc converters [85]. To increase system efficiency and power density, SiC devices have been adopted in the TAB design. Fig. 16 shows the test setup of a 150 kW TAB system developed by University of Arkansas [83] using 1.7 kV SiC power modules.

For residential applications, various power router designs are proposed to provide solar plus storage solutions. For instance, a power router is proposed in [86], which has a PV terminal, a BESS terminal, an isolated dual half-bridge (DHB) converter and a split-phase inverter for load connection. The residential power router (RPR) is controlled

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/JESTPE.2021.3051876, IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics



Fig. 16. The test setup of a 150 kW TAB converter for solar plus storage systems.

by a hierarchical energy management system (EMS) shown in Fig. 17. The secondary control of the EMS can minimize and lifetime of cyber-physical components [79], specifically expenses on residential electrical utilities when grid-connected and maximize the power supply duration when off-grid. To prevent the over-generation at PV terminal in islanded mode, the RPR system can operate with limited power point tracking. In addition, the RPR can provide grid support, e.g., compensate reactive power and phase imbalance.



Fig. 17. The EMS for the solar plus storage based residential power router.

In addition to the enhanced electrical performance reliability described above, the RPR described as been further enhanced with advanced cybersecurity features that provide enhanced resiliency and availability [87]. This follows a defense-in-depth strategy to enhance the overall cybersecurity of the device and system, but addressing communications, controls, and hardware aspects of the design in Fig. 17. This includes encryption, authentication, and protections that span both hardware and firmware in addition to communications that provide added assurance that solar plus storage systems can remain safely in operation – even in the event of a cyber-attack. These measures address detection and mitigation methods against the attack surface of the power electronics device as a whole – preventing compromise and physical damage. These cyber-hard by design approaches cost relatively little in terms of additional hardware components but provide great benefit for the RPR and grid.

B. Smart Transformer Conversion Module

The current US power network is undergoing revolutionary structural and functional changes with the proliferation of renewable, converter-based distributed energy resources and increased use of active loads. Advancements in digital sensor networks, data analytics and communication technologies add new challenges to power system control, grid visualization, operation, communication bandwidth, physical and cyber security, with a resulting threat to grid resilience and reliability [88]-[91].

One of the most strategic power equipment, in the legacy power network, is the substation transformer. It is important to transition traditional transformers into smart transformers that can perform a variety of advanced grid support functions [85], [92]-[94]. While the concept of smart solid-state transformers (SSTs) is being widely recognized, their respective lifetime and reliability raise serious concerns with power utilities, thus, hampering the replacement of traditional transformers with fully electronic SSTs. It is therefore proposed to introduce smart features in conventional transformers utilizing simple, cost-effective, and easy to install modules is highly desirable [91][93] [94]. These include voltage regulation, voltage and impedance balancing, harmonics isolation, voltage ride through (VRT), blocking dc in ac networks and prevention of the critical grid assets from natural or man-made disturbances, as shown in Fig. 18.



Fig. 18. Enhancement of substation transformer to perform advanced system support

Adding more controllability in a traditional power transformer does provide greater flexibility and mitigation features in power network operation, microgrid forming and mitigation, but it also provides challenges in terms of vulnerabilities in terms of system protection, unintending islanding, reliability and cyber security. Additional requirements in terms of localized self-healing and controllability from local system parameters are essential in moving forward with more advanced power system control and mitigation using AI [88][95] [96].

This power electronics enhanced hybrid transformer concept [91], was evaluated for several applications of these grid support and mitigation functions on a 9-bus power system with [97], as shown in Fig. 19. The HIL simulation results of some of these functions are plotted in Fig. 20.

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/JESTPE.2021.3051876, IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics



Fig. 19. IEEE 9-Bus system depicting hybrid smart transformers with high penetration of intermitted resources and active loads [97].



Fig. 20. Mitigation of transformer saturation due to unwanted DC injection using hybrid smart transformers [97].

C. Applications of CPSs in Wind Energy Systems

More interest needs to be directed towards the generation stage, especially the renewable energy sources like wind energy, which has developed rapidly on a worldwide scale [98]. Global advancement of wind energy has encompassed deployments in large scale such as offshore, floating, and airborne wind turbines. Apart from facilitating monitoring and control of wind energy conversion systems (WECS), SCADA systems are also prominently being used for operation and maintenance. Specifically, in the wind turbine level, SCADA systems are used for control system interface and diagnostics [99] along with data collection facilities. These data can further be used for troubleshooting applications, reducing the downtime and improving the reliability and availability of a wind turbine. On the other hand, in the wind farm level, SCADA is typically used for robust security model, verification of grid codes and for configured displays to monitor the generation [100].

Apart from these basic tasks, SCADA is primarily used for condition monitoring (CM) using fault identification techniques to alleviate the operation and maintenance in WECS [101]. CM systems usually deploy high sampling rate sensors, thereby imposing challenges on data communication, computation, and storage within a reasonable cost margin. Nevertheless, it has been shown in [102] that SCADA using a cyber-physical mechanism has managed to improve the fault diagnosis over conventional physical methods. A general trend of reducing the cost and computational as well as communication burden can be to extract the features during critical events using event-triggering methods [103].

Modeling also becomes a major challenge by integrating heterogenous wind turbine models into the cyber layer. Hence, different aspects need to be considered for a detailed compositional CPS modeling hierarchy [104]. It is also crucial to assemble the abstract CPS models and information flow graphs from the sensor networks into the physical models of mechanical and electrical parts inside wind turbines. Recent innovations in the sensor network, such as the internet of things (IoT) has facilitated interactive sensing, communication, and control, which could serve as an upgradation to the next-generation WECS. However, the abovementioned advancements also limit its operation as it increases the security concerns [105], thereby mandating a security framework for cyber-physical WECS. Hence, further research efforts need to consider these aspects for a cost-effective, reliable, and resilient WECS.

VIII. Transactive Smart High-speed Railway Grid

One of the application areas where power electronics has made a tangible societal impact world-wide is high-speed electrical trains. With the burgeoning population, the need for electrical trains and their faster travel is increasing. This also translates to increasing energy requirements. However, as the demand of such locomotive power increases, so arises the challenges associated with operating such infrastructures with manageable cost. This is especially important since an electrical train is a unique spatio-temporal load [106][107], as captured in Fig. 21 for the overall energy CPS.

Currently, the cost of electricity usage for a high-speed electrical train is typically determined by solving an energy-minimization-based optimization problem. However, recently, guided by [107] new approaches [108][109] based on transactive optimization, have been explored that have the potential to appreciably reduce the cost of electricity consumption in such high-speed trains. The transaction is essentially between the electrical train and the grid. In one such approach, instead of minimizing only the energy consumption, the focus, instead, is on minimizing the weighted product of unit cost of electricity and energy demand (while satisfying the time-scheduling constraints) recognizing the spatio-temporal navigation of a high-speed electrical train via plurality of geographical regions at different instances of time. As illustrated in Fig. 22, the new approach leverages the instantaneous velocity profile of the train to vary power consumption while ensuring that the average velocity satisfies the scheduling constraint. In another approach, the transaction stretches beyond the electrical train and the grid to include other real-time loads and outlines an innovative concept of demand-shifting based transactive optimization to further reduce the cost of electricity usage.

These preliminary works have been conducted using primarily a centralized approach. With the advancements of power electronics and intelligent microelectronics, such transactive control can be explored at the power-converter

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/JESTPE.2021.3051876, IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics



Fig. 21. (a) An illustration of emerging high-speed smart railway grid. (Acronym: ESO: Electrical system operator; ESS: Energy storage systems) of the cyber-physical electric railway system. (b) An illustration of the smart railway grid CPS transactive control architecture: The independent system operator (ISO) controls the transmission grid (TG). The TG feeds the trains (T) via the railway power system (RPS) after voltage step-down or through a distribution grid (DG). RPS is controlled by the railway system operator (RSO), which also coordinates with the ISO and commands any dedicated distributed railway power plant (RPP)/ESS that can also support part of the train's load demand. ACC or area control center supervises the train control and coordinates with RSO and coordinates with other ACCs.



Fig. 22. Two power and speed curves measured in a high-speed train with identical trains and time schedules yielding different instantaneous power profiles and potentially different cost of electricity consumption. This forms the basis for transaction based on weight cost-energy minimization.

level using coordinated CPS approach by further incorporating dispatchable and non-dispatchable energy sources and extending control objectives to achieve spatio-temporal multi-scale optimization.

IX. Real-Time Simulation of Shipboard Power Systems

A. Overview

There is a pressing need for frameworks that provide the ability to analyze and evaluate cyber-physical shipboard power system (SPS) in real-time (RT) environments. These RT environments are intended to provide system relevant characteristics that capture the physical-level (electrical, mechanical, and thermal-fluid) and the cyber-levels (computer network and computational resources). Fig. 23 illustrates some requirements in terms of hardware and software simulation solutions. The simulation capability in Fig. 23 is based on developments of the controls evaluation framework (CEF) [110]-[112]. For the physical system, the electrical and mechanical components are simulated using hardware and application-specific tools; and support interfacing controls and power devices in hardware-in-the-loop (HIL) implementations. The HIL implementations are mainly realized using interfaces that support control HIL (CHIL) and power HIL (PHIL). Similarly, the cyber-system is modeled using specialized hardware and software tools that support the representation of complex communication network characteristics that exist in deployed communication networks. Such characteristics include packet delays, packet drops, and bandwidth limitations. In addition, the real-time simulation environment is designed to support the integration of external devices, which can be proprietary external controllers or generic physical network devices such as wired/wireless routers, switches, or hubs.



Fig. 23. Top-level diagram of cyber-physical SPS in a RT simulation environment.

The modeling, simulation, and interfacing of SPS components as shown in the framework can then be used to define performance metrics. These performance metrics are determined by the application being evaluated and would depend on the tests being conducted. In the past, the CEF has been primarily used to evaluate power and energy management algorithms specifically tailored for naval applications; various metrics such as power quality, ability to serve load, and controllers' response (based on communication degradation) have been used as for

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/JESTPE.2021.3051876, IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics

evaluating the IPES operation. Overall, multi-domain simulations are valuable for helping ensure evaluation coverage of naval power systems and their operation. The multi-domain simulation provides system-relevant scenarios. In the next section, an example case study is given to help describe an SPS RT simulation.

B. Case Study

In this section, a case study is described for a notional cyber-physical SPS. In this case study, a distributed power and energy management system is deployed in a 4-zone MVDC ship power system (Fig. 23) [112]. The physical system, i.e., the electrical and mechanical properties of the SPS, are modeled and simulated on a RT Simulator (RTS) while sensor data coming from the devices modeled inside the RTS are sent, through fiber optic and an FPGA, to the communication infrastructure connected to the respective external controllers. The power system modeled is a notional 12 kV/100 MW class MVDC distribution system with multiple energy storage modules (ESM) with maximum capacities of 1 GJ and a charging/discharging rated power of 5 MW and 10 MW, respectively. The power system also has multiple loads modeled as motors and pulse loads that try to replicate the operation of an SPS under different scenarios.

Eventually, the communication network infrastructure of the SPS will be modeled in a high-performance server running the Common Open Research Emulator (CORE) to achieve RT performance [113]. To explore this approach, an Ethernet switch was modeled in CORE for the example shown here. Controllers, running the distributed management system, are connected through Network Interface Cards (NIC) and mapped to virtual nodes inside the emulated environment. The controllers communicate through a virtual Ethernet switch using DDS and TCP/IP communication protocols.

Fig. 24 shows the results of two scenarios wherein each scenario five energy storage modules are controlled in a distributed fashion and are designed to maintain an 80% state-of-charge (SoC) consensus value but diverge during operation of pulse loads at $t = 50$ s. The differences in the controllers' responses are shown when 100 ms packet delays are introduced into the communication network links connecting the ESM controllers. The consensus of the distributed algorithm is heavily affected since multiple SoC measurements present higher oscillations before reaching consensus.



Fig. 24. SoC graphs of distributed controllers during case study: (a) (ESM1-ESM1) are these scenarios where no delays are introduced and (b) (ESM1d-ESM5d) are the scenarios where 100 ms delays are introduced into the emulated communication network.

X. Conclusions

This review covers a broad range of topics involving the confluence of power electronics and CPSs encompassing plurality of emerging applications. It provides an overview on multiple research issues and challenges in these application areas and the solutions that are being pursued.

To begin with, the issue of vulnerability of CPSs based on power-electronic converters to cybernetic technologies and the evolving need for resilience to such vulnerabilities have been introduced. On a similar note, reliability of power-electronic systems that form the backbone of energy CPSs needs careful consideration and incorporation of emerging data-centric methodologies, as have been captured in this paper.

Subsequently, a discussion on self-organizing power-electronic converter with control intelligence at the edge of grid is presented, which can improve the system performance for large-scale renewable energy integration. Following this, protection of MVDC/HVDC systems is discussed with practical considerations on the power-circuit topologies such as modular multilevel converters.

Challenges and implementation approaches in e-mobility such as fast charging wireless are highlighted next. On a related note, co-transmission of power and information in wireless (and waveguided) medium are outlined, which may have a significant impact on mobile and stationary IoT technologies.

Coordinated control is an important feature in modularized-converter-based CPSs. In this context, a multi-hop-network-based coordination scheme for distributed and fast-switching converters using a two-dimensional torus topology is discussed with an eye on latency reduction. Regarding the latter, two complementary methodologies, based on coordinated control guided by event triggering (i.e., need-based communication) and encoding (information- and not data-centric communication) are outlined next.

The other important aspect in energy CPS is the topological advances that form the physical layer. Triple-active-bridge converter topology and smart transformers for systems such as solar plus storage are outlined.

Finally, energy CPS involving smart spatio-temporal high-speed railway grid (with focus on transactive optimization for cost of electricity usage reduction) and control for novel and next-generation electrical ships with focus on RT simulation of a complex shipboard power systems are outlined.

The wide range of research topics presented in this review paper are expected to provide an overview of ongoing research in power-electronics-based energy/power CPSs and help the researchers working in this area with the eventual aim of energy sustainability and smart power solutions.

Acknowledgement

The information, data, or work presented herein was funded in part by the Agencies/Organizations U.S. Office of

Naval Research, U.S. Department of Energy, U.S. National Science Foundation, Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL) under Award Numbers N00014-16-1-2956, N00014-17-1-2695, N00014-16-1-2956, EE0008349, EE0009026, DE-OE0000779, M615000478, 1239118, 1644874, 1644877, 1620902, 1760554, 1747757, and TOA: 0000492006. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the above-mentioned agencies/organizations thereof.

REFERENCES

[1] A X. Yu and Y. Xue, "Smart Grids: A cyber–physical systems perspective," Proceedings of the IEEE, vol. 104, no. 5, pp. 1058-1070, May 2016.

[2] Y. Zhang, J. Wang and J. Liu, "Attack identification and correction for PMU GPS spoofing in unbalanced distribution systems," IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 762-773, Jan. 2020.

[3] NERC Steering Group. "Technical analysis of the August 14, 2003, blackout: What happened, why, and what did we learn." report to the NERC Board of Trustees 13 (2004).

[4] M. Gunduz and R. Das. “Cyber-security on smart grid: Threats and potential solutions,” Computer Networks, vol. 169, 2020.

[5] H. Parastvand et al., “Cyber-security constrained placement of FACTS devices in power networks from a novel topological perspective,” IEEE Access 8 (2020): 108201-108215.

[6] S. Dey and M. Khanra. “Cybersecurity of plug-in electric vehicles: Cyber-attack detection during charging,” IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 478-487, 2020.

[7] C. Roberts et al. "Deep reinforcement learning for DER cyber-attack mitigation." arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.13088 (2020).

[8] B. Chen et al., "Cybersecurity of wide area monitoring, protection and control systems for HVDC applications," in IEEE Transactions on Power Systems, doi: 10.1109/TPWRS.2020.3022588.

[9] S. Acharya, Y. Dvorkin and R. Karri, “Public plug-in electric vehicles + grid data: Is a new cyberattack vector viable?,” in IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 5099-5113, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1109/TSG.2020.2994177.

[10] Rubio, Juan Enrique, et al. “Current cyber-defense trends in industrial control systems,” Computers & Security 87 (2019).

[11] F. Li et al. “Enhanced cyber-physical security in internet of things through energy auditing,” IEEE Internet of Things Journal 6.3 (2019): 5224-5231.

[12] J. Liu, Y. Du, S. Yim, X. Lu, B. Chen and F. Qiu, "Steady-state analysis of microgrid distributed control under denial of service attacks," accepted by IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics.

[13] P. Wang and M. Govindarasu, "Multi-agent-based attack-resilient system integrity protection for smart grid", IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 3447-3456, July 2020.

[14] F. Qiu and P. Li, "An integrated approach for power system restoration planning," Proceedings of the IEEE, vol. 105, no. 7, pp. 1234-1252, July 2017.

[15] S. Tan et al., "Brief Survey on Attack Detection Methods for Cyber-Physical Systems," in IEEE Systems Journal, doi: 10.1109/JSYST.2020.2991258.

[16] R. Deng, P. Zhuang and H. Liang, "False Data Injection Attacks Against State Estimation in Power Distribution Systems," in IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 2871-2881, May 2019, doi: 10.1109/TSG.2018.2813280.

[17] L. Liu et al. "Detecting false data injection attacks on power grid by sparse optimization." IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid 5.2 (2014): 612-621.

[18] W. Ao, Y. Song and C. Wen, "Adaptive cyber-physical system attack detection and reconstruction with application to power systems," in IET Control Theory & Applications, vol. 10, no. 12, pp. 1458-1468, 8 8 2016, doi: 10.1049/iet-cta.2015.1147.

[19] C. Alippi, S. Ntalampiras and M. Roveri, “Model-free fault detection and isolation in large-scale cyber-physical systems,” IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computational Intelligence, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 61-71, Feb. 2017, doi: 10.1109/TETCI.2016.2641452.

[20] B. Palmintier, R. Broderick, B. Mather, M. Coddington, K. Baker, F. Ding, M. Reno, M. Lave, A. Bharatkumar, “On the path to sunShot: emerging issues and challenges in integrating solar with the distribution system,” National Renewable Energy Laboratory, 2016.

[21] M. Farivar, R. Neal, C. Clarke and S. Low, "Optimal inverter VAR control in distribution systems with high PV penetration,"2012 IEEE Power and Energy Society General Meeting, San Diego, CA, 2012, pp. 1-7.

[22] D. Divan, R. Moghe, A. Prasai, "Power electronics at the grid edge: The key to unlocking value from the smart grid" in IEEE Power Electronics Magazine, Dec. 2014.

[23] T. Kang, S. Essakiappan, P. Enjeti and S. Choi, "Towards a smart distribution transformer for smart grid," 2015 9th International Conference on Power Electronics and ECCE Asia (ICPE-ECCE Asia), Seoul, 2015, pp. 1997-2003.

[24] H. Chen, R. P. Kandula, A. Prasai, J. Schatz and D. Divan, "Flexible transformers for distribution grid control," 2016 IEEE Energy Conversion Congress and Exposition (ECCE), Milwaukee, WI, 2016, pp. 1-6.

[25] J. Ramos-Ruiz, B. Wang, H. Chou, P. Enjeti and L. Xie, "Power electronics intelligence at the network edge (PINE) – An approach to interface PV and battery energy storage systems at the grid edge," in IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics, doi: 10.1109/JESTPE.2020.2991019.

[26] A. R. Malekpour and A. Pahwa, "Radial test feeder including primary and secondary distribution network," 2015 North American Power Symposium, Charlotte, NC, 2015, pp. 1-9.

[27] N. Flourentzou, V. G. Agelidis, and G. D. Demetriades, “VSC-based HVDC power transmission systems: An overview,” IEEE Trans. Power Electron., vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 592–602, Mar. 2009.

[28] Q. Deng and R. A. Dougal, "Fault protection in medium voltage dc microgrids," 2017 IEEE Second International Conference on dc Microgrids (ICDCM), Nuremburg, 2017.

[29] M. Hajian, L. Zhang and D. Jovcic, "Dc transmission grid with low-speed protection using mechanical dc circuit breakers," IEEE Trans. Power Delivery, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 1383-1391.

[30] G. Zou, Q. Feng, Q. Huang, and etc., “A fast protection scheme for VSC based multi-terminal DC grid,” International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems, vol. 98, pp. 307-314, Jun. 2018.

[31] J. Sneath, A. Rajapakse, “Fault detection and interruption in an earched HVDC grid using ROCOV and hybrid DC breakers,” IEEE Trans. Power Delivery, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 971-981, June 2016.

[32] C. Petino et al., “Application of multilevel full bridge converters in HVDC multiterminal systems,” IET Power Electron., vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 297–304, Feb. 2016.

[33] S. Wang, C. Li, O. D. Adeuyi, et al., "Coordination of MMCs with hybrid DC circuit breakers for HVDC grid protection," IEEE Trans. Power Delivery, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 11-22, Feb. 2019.

[34] L. He, C.–C. Liu, A. Pitto, et al., “Distance protection of AC grid with HVDC connected offshore wind generators,” IEEE Trans. Power Delivery, vol. 29, no. 2, Apr. 2014.

[35] L. He and C.–C. Liu, “Effects of HVDC connection for offshore wind turbines on AC grid protection,” in Proc. IEEE PES General Meeting, Vancouver, BC, Canada, Jul. 2013.

[36] L. He and C.–C. Liu, “Protection coordination between a HVDC offshore wind system and AC grid,” in Proc. CIGRE, Bologna, Italy, Sep. 2011.

[37] J. A. Baxter, D. A. Merced, D. J. Costinett, L. M. Tolbert and B. Ozpineci, "Review of electrical architectures and power requirements for automated vehicles," 2018 IEEE Transportation Electrification Conference and Expo (ITEC), Long Beach, CA, 2018, pp. 944-949, doi: 10.1109/ITEC.2018.8449961.

[38] SAE Recommended Practice, J3016_201806, “Taxonomy and definitions for terms related to driving automation systems for on-road motor vehicles,” https://www.sae.org/standards/content/j3016_201806/, 2018

[39] E. Ucer, M. Kisacikoglu and M. Yuksel, “Analysis of an internet-inspired EV charging network in a distribution grid,” 2018 IEEE/PES Transmission and Distribution Conference and Exposition (T&D), Denver, CO, 2018, pp. 1-5, doi: 10.1109/TDC.2018.8440252.

[40] Y. Park, O. C. Onar and B. Ozpineci, “Potential cybersecurity issues of fast charging stations with quantitative severity analysis,” 2019 IEEE CyberPELS (CyberPELS), Knoxville, TN, USA, 2019, pp. 1-7, doi: 10.1109/CyberPELS.2019.8925069.

[41] J. Pries et al., "Coil power density optimization and trade-off study for a 100kW electric vehicle IPT wireless charging system," 2018 IEEE Energy Conversion Congress and Exposition (ECCE),

Portland, OR, 2018, pp. 1196-1201, doi: 10.1109/ECCE.2018.8557490.

[42] J. M. Miller, P. T. Jones, J. Li and O. C. Onar, "ORNL experience and challenges facing dynamic wireless power charging of EV's," in IEEE Circuits and Systems Magazine, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 40-53, Second quarter 2015, doi: 10.1109/MCAS.2015.2419012.

[43] A. Foote, B. Ozpineci, M. Chinthavali and J. Li, "Sizing dynamic wireless charging for light-duty electric vehicles in roadway applications," 2016 IEEE PELS Workshop on Emerging Technologies: Wireless Power Transfer (WoW), Knoxville, TN, 2016, pp. 224-230, doi: 10.1109/WoW.2016.7772096.

[44] R. Zhang and C. K. Ho, "MIMO broadcasting for simultaneous wireless information and power transfer," IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 1989–2001, May 2013.

[45] X. Lu, P. Wang, D. Niyato, D. I. Kim, and Z. Han, "Wireless networks with rf energy harvesting: A contemporary survey," IEEE Communications Surveys Tutorials, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 757–789, Second quarter 2015.

[46] T. D. Ponnimbaduge Perera, D. N. K. Jayakody, S. K. Sharma, S. Chatzinotas, and J. Li, "Simultaneous wireless information and power transfer (swipt): Recent advances and future challenges," IEEE Communications Surveys Tutorials, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 264–302, First quarter2018.

[47] K. Huang and E. Larsson, "Simultaneous information and power transfer for broadband wireless systems," IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, vol. 61, no. 23, pp. 5972–5986, Dec 2013.

[48] Chao Shen, Wei-Chiang Li, and Tsung-Hui Chang, "Simultaneous information and energy transfer: A two-user [miso," in 2012 IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM).

[49] S. Khaledian, F. Farzami, B. Smida, and D. Erricolo, "Inherent self-interference cancellation for in-band full-duplex single-antenna systems," IEEE Transactions on Microwave Theory and Techniques, vol. 66, no. 6, pp. 2842–2850, 2018.

[50] B. Smida and S. Khaledian, "ReflectFX: In-band full-duplex wireless communication by means of reflected power," IEEE Trans. on Communications, vol. 65, no. 5, pp. 2207–2219, 2017.

[51] D. Bharadia, E. McMilin, and S. Katti, "Full duplex radios," ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 375–386, 2013.

[52] M. S. Trotter, J. D. Griffin and G. D. Durgin, "Power-optimized waveforms for improving the range and reliability of RFID systems," 2009 IEEE International Conference on RFID, Orlando, FL, 2009, pp. 80-87, doi: 10.1109/RFID.2009.4911196.

[53] A. S. Boaventura and N. B. Carvalho, "Maximizing dc power in energy harvesting circuits using multisine excitation," 2011 IEEE MTT-S International Microwave Symposium, Baltimore, MD, 2011, pp. 1-4, doi: 10.1109/MWSYM.2011.5972612.

[54] A. Collado and A. Georgiadis, "Optimal waveforms for efficient wireless power transmission," in IEEE Microwave and Wireless Components Letters, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 354-356, May 2014, doi: 10.1109/LMWC.2014.2309074.

[55] B. Clerckx and E. Bayguzina, "Waveform design for wireless power Transfer," in IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, vol. 64, no. 23, pp. 6313-6328, 1 Dec.1, 2016, doi: 10.1109/TSP.2016.2601284.

[56] B. Clerckx, E. Bayguzina, D. Yates and P. D. Mitcheson, "Waveform optimization for wireless power transfer with nonlinear energy harvester modeling," 2015 International Symposium on Wireless Communication Systems (ISWCS), Brussels, 2015, pp. 276-280, doi: 10.1109/ISWCS.2015.7454345.

[57] S.K. Mazumder, "CPS: Synergy: Collaborative Research: Boolean microgrid", U.S. NSF Award Number 1239118, 2012.

[58] S.K. Mazumder and A. Gupta, "Systems and methods for co-transmission of discrete power and data", USPTO Application Number 20190222259, 2019.

[59] A. Gupta and S.K. Mazumder, "Sequential co-transmission of high-frequency power and data signals", IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics, vol. 14, no. 10, pp. 4440-4445, 2018.

[60] A. Gupta and S.K. Mazumder, "Smart LED lighting using GaN-based discrete power and data sequential co-transfer network", IEEE Workshop on Wide Bandgap Power Devices and Applications, pp. 68-72, 2018.

[61] J.M. Guerrero, J. C. Vasquez, J. Matas, L. G. de Vicuna and M. Castilla, "Hierarchical control of droop-controlled ac and dc microgrids - A general approach toward standardization," in IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics, vol. 58, no. 1, Jan. 2011, pp. 158-172.

[62] E. Barklund, N. Pgaku, M. Prodanovic, C. Hernandex-Aramburo, T. C. Green, "Energy management in autonomous microgrid using stability-constrained droop control of inverters," in IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics, vol. 23, no.5 , Sept. 2008, pp. 2346-2352.

[63] W. Yao, M. Chen, J. Matas, J. M. Guerrero and Z. M. Qian, "Design and analysis of the droop control method for parallel inverters considering the impact of the complex impedance on the power sharing," in IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics, vol. 58, no. 2 , Feb. 2011, pp.576-588.

[64] M. N. Marwali, J-W. Jung, and A. Keyhani, "Control of distributed generation systems - Part II: Load sharing control," in IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics, vol. 19, no. 6 , Nov. 2004, pp. 1551-1561.

[65] M. R. Hossain and H.L. Ginn III, "Real-time distributed coordination of power electronic converters in a dc shipboard distribution system," IEEE Transactions on Energy Conversion, Vol. 32, No. 2, June 2017, pp. 770-778.

[66] M. Tahir and S.K. Mazumder, "Self-triggered communication enabled control of distributed generation in microgrids", IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 441-449, 2015

[67] M. Tahir and S.K. Mazumder, "Event- and priority-driven coordination in next-generation grid", IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 1186-1194, 2016.

[68] R. Han, L. Meng, J. M. Guerrero and J. C. Vasquez, "Distributed nonlinear control with event-triggered communication to achieve current-sharing and voltage regulation in dc microgrids," in IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics, vol. 33, no. 7, pp. 6416-6433, July 2018, doi: 10.1109/TPEL.2017.2749518.

[69] S. Wen, X. Yu, Z. Zeng and J. Wang, "Event-triggering load frequency control for multiarea power systems with communication delays," in IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 1308-1317, Feb. 2016, doi: 10.1109/TIE.2015.2399394.

[70] T. Ericsen, "Power electronics building blocks – a systematic approach to power electronics," Proceeding of the 2000 IEEE Power Engineering Society Summer Meeting, Volume: 2, 16-20, pp. 1216-1218, July 2000.

[71] H.L. Ginn III, C.A. De La O, and A. Benigni "Multi-hop network based coordination of converters in dc microgrids", International Conference on DC Microgrids (ICDCM) 2019.

[72] H.L. Ginn, N. Hingorani, J.R. Sullivan, and R. Wachal, R., "Control architecture for high power electronics converters", Proceedings of the IEEE, Vol. 103, No. 12, pp. 2312-2319, Dec. 2015.

[73] I. Panchenko, J.D. Bakos, and H.L. Ginn, "Control system communication architecture for power electronic building blocks", 2017 IEEE Electric Ship Technologies Symposium (ESTS), pp. 544 – 550, August 2017.

[74] W. Dally and B. Towles. Principles and practices of interconnection networks. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA, 2003.

[75] A.G. Schmidt, W.V. Kritikos, R.R. Sharma, and R. Sass, "AIREN: A Novel Integration of On-Chip and Off-Chip FPGA Networks," Proc. 17th IEEE Symposium on Field Programmable Custom Computing Machines, 2009.

[76] W.P.M.H. Heemels, K.H. Johansson and P. Tabuada, "An introduction to event-triggered and self-triggered control", IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, pp. 3270-3285, 2012.

[77] S.K. Mazumder and K. Acharya, "Sequence-based control for standalone and networked switching power converters", IEEE Energy Conversion Conference and Exposition, pp. 1104-1111, 2009.

[78] S. Peyghami, F. Blaabjerg and P. Palensky, "Incorporating power electronic converters reliability into modern power system reliability analysis", IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics, doi: 10.1109/JESTPE.2020.2967216, 2020.

[79] V. Aravinthan, et. al.," Reliability modeling considerations for emerging cyber-physical power systems", 2018 IEEE Intl. Conf. on Probabilistic Methods Applied to Power Systems, 2018.

[80] R. Fu, T.W. Remo, and R.M. Margolis, "2018 US utility-scale photovoltaics-plus-energy storage system costs benchmark," No. NREL/TP-6A20-71714. National Renewable Energy Lab. (NREL), Golden, CO (United States), 2018.

[81] C. Zhao, S. D. Round and J. W. Kolar, "An isolated three-port bidirectional dc-dc converter with decoupled power flow management," IEEE Trans. Power Electron., vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 2443-2453, Sept. 2008.

[82] V.N.S.R. Jakka, A. Shukla and G.D. Demetriades, "Dual-Transformer-based asymmetrical triple-port active bridge (DT-ATAB) isolated dc-dc converter," IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron., vol. 64, no. 6, pp. 4549-4560, Jun. 2017.

[83] S. Christian, R. A. Fantino, R. Amir Gomez, J. C. Balda, Y. Zhao and G. Zhu, "150-kW three-port custom-core transformer design methodology," 2020 IEEE Applied Power Electronics Conference, pp. 1020-1024, 2020.

[84] B. Zhao, Q. Song, W. Liu and Y. Sun, "Overview of dual-active-bridge isolated bidirectional dc-dc converter for high-frequency-link power-conversion system," IEEE Trans. Power Electron., vol. 29, no. 8, pp. 4091-4106, Aug. 2014.

[85] R. Chattopadhyay and S. Bhattacharya, "ZVS analysis and power flow control for three limb transformer enabled SiC MOSFET-based three port DAB integrating PV and Energy Storage (ES)," 2016 IEEE Energy Conversion Congress and Exposition (ECCE), Milwaukee, WI, 2016, pp. 1-8.

[86] S. Zhao, Z. Wang, J. Umuhoza, A. Mantooth, Y. Zhao and C. Farnell, "Distributed power quality enhancement using residential power routers," 2018 IEEE Applied Power Electronics Conference and Exposition (APEC), San Antonio, TX, 2018, pp. 513-520, doi: 10.1109/APEC.2018.8341060.

[87] S.J. Moquin, S.Y. Kim, N. Blair, C. Farnell, J. Di, H.A. Mantooth, “Enhanced uptime and firmware cybersecurity for grid-connected power electronics,” IEEE CyberPELS Workshop, 6 pgs., Knoxville, TN, April 30, 2019.

[88] M. Babakmehr, F. Harirchi, P. Dehghanian, and J. Enslin, "Artificial intelligence-based cyber-physical events classification for islanding detection in power inverters," IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics, JESTPE.2020.2980045, 2020.

[89] H. Alatrash, A. Mensah, E. Mark, R. Amarin and J. Enslin, "Generator emulation controls for photovoltaic inverters," 8th International Conference on Power Electronics - ECCE Asia, Jeju, 2011, pp. 2043-2050, doi: 10.1109/ICPE.2011.5944502.

[90] J. Enslin and P. Heskes, “Harmonic interaction between a large number of distributed power inverters and the distribution network”, IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics, Vol. 19, No. 6, pp. 1586 - 1593, Nov. 2004.

[91] M. Nazir, K. Burkes and J. Enslin, "Converter-based power system protection against dc in transmission and distribution networks," in IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics, vol. 35, no. 7, pp. 6701-6704, July 2020.

[92] X. She, X. Yu, F. Wang and A.Q. Huang, "Design and demonstration of a 3.6-kV–120-V/10-kVA solid-state transformer for smart grid application," in IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics, vol. 29, no. 8, pp. 3982-3996, Aug. 2014, doi: 10.1109/TPEL.2013.2293471.

[93] D. Divan and P. Kandula, "Distributed power electronics: An enabler for the future grid," in CPSS Transactions on Power Electronics and Applications, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 57-65, Dec. 2016, doi: 10.24295/CPSSTPEA.2016.00006.

[94] H. Abdulrahman, P. Bauer and J.H.R. Enslin, "Smarttrafo and Flicker," 2006 IEEE PES Power Systems Conference and Exposition, Atlanta, GA, 2006, pp. 803-809, doi: 10.1109/PSCE.2006.296418.

[95] J.C. Balda, A. Mantooth, R. Blum, and P. Tenti. "Cybersecurity and power electronics: Addressing the security vulnerabilities of the internet of things." IEEE Power Electronics Magazine 4, no. 4 (2017): 37-43.

[96] S.M. Muyeen and Rahman Saifur, “Communication, control and security challenges for the smart grid”, Institution of Engineering and Technology, 2017.

[97] M. Nazir, K. Burkes and J. Enslin, "Converter-based solutions: Opening new avenues of power system protection against solar and HEMP MHD-E3 GIC," in IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, Early Access:- 10.1109/TPWRD.2020.3016207.

[98] F. Blaabjerg and K Ma, “Wind energy systems”, Proceedings of the IEEE, vol. 105, no. 11, pp. 2116-2131, 2017.

[99] B. Badrzadeh et al., “Wind power plant SCADA and controls,” Proc. IEEE Power Energy Soc. Gen. Meeting, 2011, pp. 1–7.

[100] M. Schlechtingen, I.F. Santos, and S. Achiche, “Wind turbine condition monitoring based on SCADA data using normal behavior models - Part 1: System description,” Appl. Soft Comput., vol. 13, pp. 259–270, Jan. 2013.

[101] A. Kusiak, Z. Zhang, and A. Verma, “Prediction, operations, and condition monitoring in wind energy,” Energy, vol. 60, pp. 1–12, Jan. 10, 2013.

[102] W. Yang, P.J. Tavner, C. J. Crabtree, Y. Feng, and Y. Qiu, “Wind turbine condition monitoring: Technical and commercial challenges,” Wind Energy, vol. 17, pp. 673–693, 2014.

[103] S. Sahoo and S. Mishra, “An Adaptive Event-Triggered Communication Based Distributed Secondary Control for DC Microgrids”, IEEE Trans. Smart Grid, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 6674-6683, 2018.

[104] W. Kaiyu, D. Hughes, M. Ka Lok, and T. Krilavicius, “Composition challenges and approaches for cyber physical systems,” Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Netw. Embedded Syst. Enterp. Appl. (NESEA), pp. 1–7, 2010.

[105] S. Sahoo, T Dragicevic, and F. Blaabjerg, “Cyber security in control of grid-tied power electronic converters - challenges and vulnerabilities”, IEEE Journ. Emerg. Sel. Top. Power Electron., 2019. DOI: 10.1109/JESTPE.2019.2953480

[106] S.K. Mazumder, A. Annaswamy, and E. Pilo, “CPS: Breakthrough: Collaborative Research: Transactive control of smart railway grid”, U.S. National Science Foundation Project, Award Numbers 1644874 and 1644877, 2017.

[107] E.P. de la Fuente, S.K. Mazumder, and I.G. Franco, “Railway electrical smart grids”, IEEE Electrification Magazine, doi: 10.1109/MELE.2014.2338411, 2014.

[108] D. D’Achiardi, E. Pilo, S.K. Mazumder, and A.M. Annaswamy, “Transactive control approach to trip optimization in electric railways”, in Proc. 58th IEEE Conf. Decision and Control IEEE, doi: 10.1109/CDC40024.2019.9029626, December 2019.

[109] P. Sarma, S.K. Mazumder, and E. Pilo, “Cost-reducing optimization strategies of electrical trains,” in 4th IEEE Workshop on the Electronic Grid (eGRID), doi: 10.1109/eGRID48402.2019.9092686, November 2019.

[110] K. Schoder et al., "Evaluation framework for power and energy management shipboard distribution controls," 2017 IEEE Electric Ship Technologies Symposium (ESTS), Arlington, VA, 2017, pp. 388-393, doi: 10.1109/ESTS.2017.8069311.

[111] T. v. Vu et al., "Large-scale distributed control for MVDC ship power systems," IECON 2018 - 44th Annual Conference of the IEEE Industrial Electronics Society, Washington, DC, 2018, pp. 3431-3436, doi: 10.1109/IECON.2018.8591346.

[112] C. Ogilvie et al., “Modeling communication networks in a real-time simulation environment for evaluating controls of shipboard power systems,” in 2020 IEEE CyberPELS, 2020, pp. 1–7.

[113] J. Ahrenholz, C. Danilov, T. R. Henderson and J. H. Kim, "CORE: A real-time network emulator," MILCOM 2008 - 2008 IEEE Military Communications Conference, San Diego, CA, 2008, pp. 1-7, doi: 10.1109/MILCOM.2008.475361

Sudip K. Mazumder (S’97–M’01–SM’03–F’16) received his Ph.D. degree from Virginia Tech in 2001. He is a Professor in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at the University of Illinois, Chicago. He also serves as the President of NextWatt LLC since 2008. He was an IEEE Power Electronics Society (PELS) Distinguished Lecturer and the Chair for IEEE PELS Technical Committee on sustainable energy systems. He is the Editor-in-Chief at Large of IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics. He is a Fellow of the IEEE and a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS).

Abhijit Kulkarni (S’05–M’16) received the Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering from the Department of Electrical Engineering, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India, in 2016. During July 2016–July 2017, he was a Postdoctoral Research Associate with the University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA. He is a Scientist with the Honeywell Technology Solutions Lab. Pvt. Ltd., Bengaluru, India.

Subham Sahoo (S'16-M'18) received the Ph.D. degree in Electrical Engineering from the Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi, India in 2018. Currently, he is working as a postdoctoral researcher in the Department of Energy Technology, Aalborg University, Denmark. He is a recipient of the Indian

This article has been accepted for publication in a future issue of this journal, but has not been fully edited. Content may change prior to final publication. Citation information: DOI 10.1109/JESTPE.2021.3051876, IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics

National Academy of Engineering (INAE) Innovative Students Project Award for his PhD thesis across all the institutes in India for the year 2019.

Frede Blaabjerg (S'86–M'88–SM'97–F'03) was with ABB-Scandia, Randers, Denmark, from 1987 to 1988. From 1988 to 1992, he got the PhD degree in Electrical Engineering at Aalborg University in 1995. He became an Assistant Professor in 1992, an Associate Professor in 1996, and a Full Professor of power electronics and drives in 1998. From 2017 he became a Villum Investigator. He is honoris causa at University Politehnica Timisoara (UPT), Romania and Tallinn Technical University (TTU) in Estonia. He has published more than 600 journal papers in the fields of power electronics and its applications. He is the co-author of four monographs and editor of ten books in power electronics and its applications.

H. Alan Mantooth (S'83 - M'90 - SM'97 – F'09) received the Ph.D. degree from the Georgia Institute of Technology in 1990. In 1998, he joined the faculty of the Department of Electrical Engineering at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, where he currently holds the rank of Distinguished Professor. He currently serves as Senior Past-President for the IEEE Power Electronics Society. He is a Fellow of IEEE. He helped establish the National Center for Reliable Electric Power Transmission (NCREPT) at the UA in 2005. He serves as the Executive Director for NCREPT and two of its centers of excellence: the NSF Industry/University Cooperative Research Center on GRid-connected Advanced Power Electronic Systems (GRAPES) and the Cybersecurity Center on Secure, Evolvable Energy Delivery Systems (SEEDS) funded by the U.S. Department of Energy. In 2015, he also helped to establish the UA's first NSF Engineering Research Center entitled Power Optimization for Electro-Thermal Systems (POETS) that focuses on high power density systems for transportation applications.

Juan Carlos Balda (M'78–SM'94) received the Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering from the University of Natal, Durban, South Africa, in 1986. Since 1989, he has been with the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, USA, where he is currently a University Professor, the Department Head of the Electrical Engineering Department, and an Associate Director of Applications with NCREPT and a Campus Director with the U.S. NSF Industry/University Cooperative Research Center under program GRAPES. He is the Chair of the PELS TC5 Committee and a Faculty Advisor of the local chapter of the PELS.

Yue Zhao (S'10 - M'14 - SM'20) received a Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA, in 2014. Since 2015, he has been an Assistant Professor in Electrical Engineering at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, USA. He is an Associated Editor of the IEEE Transactions on Industry Applications and IEEE Open Journal of Power Electronics. He was a recipient of 2018 U.S. NSF CAREER Award and the 2020 IEEE Industry Applications Society Andrew W. Smith Outstanding Young Member Achievement Award.



Jorge A. Ramos-Ruiz (S'15) received the Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering from Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA, in 2020 where he is currently a postdoc in the Electrical & Computer Engineering Department. His research interests include renewable energy grid integration, smart grid control, etc.

Prasad N. Enjeti (Fellow, IEEE) received Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering from the Concordia University, Montreal, QC, Canada, in 1988. He has been a Member of Texas A&M University faculty since 1988. He currently holds the Texas Instruments Professorship in Analog Engineering. He was the recipient of many honors including the IEEE Fellow Award in 2000, Texas A&M University Association of Former Students University Level Teaching Award in 2001, and the R. David Middlebrook Technical Achievement Award from the IEEE Power Electronics Society in 2012.

P. R. Kumar (Fellow, IEEE) received the D.Sc. degree from Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, USA, in 1977. He was a Faculty Member with UMBC (1977–1984) and University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign (1985–2011). He is currently with Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA. He is a member of the US National Academy of Engineering and The World Academy of Sciences. He was awarded a Doctor Honoris Causa by ETH, Zurich. He has Award for Control Systems, the Donald P. Eckman received the IEEE Field Award of the AACC, Fred W. Ellersick Prize of the IEEE Communications Society, the Outstanding Contribution Award of ACM SIGMOBILE, the INFOCOM Achievement Award, and the SIGMOBILE Test-of-Time Paper Award. He is a fellow of ACM.

Le Xie (Senior Member, IEEE) received the the Ph.D. degree from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, in 2009. He is currently a Professor with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA.

Dr. Johan H Enslin (M'85; SM'92; F'12) He received the PhD degrees in Electrical and Electronic Engineering from the Rand Afrikaans University (RAU), South Africa, in 1988. He is the Duke Energy Endowed Chaired Professor in Smart Grid at Clemson University in North Charleston SC, USA and Executive Director for the Energy Systems Program at the Zucker Family Graduate Education Center. He is currently serving as VP Standards for the IEEE Power Electronics Society (PELS). He is a registered Professional Engineer in South Africa, Fellow of the SAIEE and Fellow of the IEEE.

Burak Ozpineci (S'92-M'02-SM'05-F'20) received Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, USA, in 2002. He became a Full Time Research and Development Staff Member of Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL), Knoxville, TN, USA in 2002, the Group Leader of the Power and Energy Systems Group in 2008, and Power Electronics and Electric Machinery Group in 2011. Presently, he is serving as the Section Head for the Vehicle and Mobility System Research Section. He also serves as a Joint Faculty with the Bredesen Center, The University of Tennessee.

Dr. Anuradha Annaswamy is Founder and Director of the Active-Adaptive Control Laboratory in the Department of Mechanical Engineering at MIT. She has received best paper awards (Axelby; CSM), Distinguished Member and Distinguished Lecturer awards from the IEEE Control Systems Society (CSS) and a Presidential Young Investigator award from NSF. She is a Fellow of IEEE and IFAC. She is currently serving as the President of CSS.

Herbert L. Ginn III received the Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering from Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, in 2002. He is currently a Professor with the Electrical Engineering Department at the University of South Carolina. His areas of specialization are power electronics applications in energy systems, power phenomena and compensation in non-sinusoidal systems, and power quality.

Feng Qiu Feng Qiu (M'14) received his Ph.D. from the School of Industrial and Systems Engineering at the Georgia Institute of Technology in 2013. He is a principal computational scientist with the Energy Systems Division at Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, IL, USA. He is an editor for IEEE Transactions on Power Systems and an affiliate associate professor in the Electrical and Computer Engineering at Iowa State University.

Jianzhe Liu (S'13-M'18) received the Ph.D. degree in electrical and computer engineering from The Ohio State University, US, in 2017. He was a visiting scholar at Aalborg University, Denmark, in 2017. He is currently an Energy Systems Scientist at Argonne National Laboratory. He is a recipient of the Argonne Outstanding Postdoc Award.



Besma Smida (Senior Member, IEEE) received the Ph.D. degree from the University of Quebec (INRS), Montreal, QC, Canada. She is an Associate Professor of electrical and computer engineering with the University of Illinois at Chicago. She received the Academic Gold Medal of the Governor General of Canada in 2007 and the NSF CAREER award in 2015. She currently serves as an Editor for the IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications and as an Editor of the IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society.



Colin Ogilvie received a B.S. in Electrical Engineering from Florida State University in 2018 and a M.S. in Electrical Engineering from the same institution in 2020. Colin is a graduate research assistant at the Center for Advanced Power Systems beginning in 2018. Scope of ongoing work includes real-time co-simulation of microgrids. Research pertaining to Colin's M.S. included communication network modeling and simulation including the emulation of network components.

Juan Ospina (S'13-M'20) is a Postdoctoral Research Associate with Florida State University and the Center for Advanced Power Systems, Tallahassee, Florida, USA. His research interests include the development of intelligent systems for electric power systems (EPS) and smart-grid applications, machine learning and reinforcement learning models for DER control, renewable energy integration, cybersecurity, and real-time simulation.

Charalambos Konstantinou (S'11-M'18-SM'20) is an Assistant Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering with Florida A&M University and Florida State University (FAMU-FSU) College of Engineering and the Center for Advanced Power Systems, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL. His research interests include cyber-physical and embedded systems security with focus on power systems.



Mark Stanovich received his Ph.D. in Computer Science from the Florida State University in 2015 with a focus on real-time systems. Dr. Stanovich is currently a full-time researcher at the Florida State University's Center for Advanced Power Systems and has been since 2016. His work is focused on power systems and associated control design, modelling, simulation, and evaluation. Current projects include designing and implementing controller hardware-in-the-loop experiments and co-simulation techniques related to electric ship systems.

Karl Schoder received his M.S.E.E. (Diplom Ingenieur) from the University of Technology, Vienna, in 1997 and his Ph.D. from West Virginia University in 2002. He has been a researcher at the Florida State University (FSU) Center for Advanced Power Systems (CAPS) since 2007 and conducts research projects in both multi-physics co-simulation and hardware in the loop testing of all-electric ship architectures and components.

Dr. Michael "Mischa" Steurer (Senior Member, IEEE) received a PhD in Electrical Engineering from the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in 2001. Since 2001, he is a senior research faculty at Florida State University in the Center for Advanced Power Systems. He has authored and co-authored more than 180 technical papers. He is a member of the International Council on Large Electric Systems (CIGRE), the American Society of Naval Engineers (ASNE), and a Senior Member of IEEE.

Tuyen Vu (S'14–M'16) received his Ph.D. in electrical engineering from Florida State University in 2016. From 2016 to 2018, he was a postdoctoral research associate and then a Research Faculty at the Florida State University-Center for Advanced Power Systems. Since July 2018, he has been an Assistant Professor at Clarkson University, NY, USA.

Lina He received the Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering at University College Dublin, Ireland in 2014. She is currently an Assistant Professor in department of electrical and computer engineering, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, USA. She was a Project Manager and Senior Consultant at Siemens headquarter in Germany and Siemens US from 2014 to 2017.

Eduardo Pilo (IEEE SM) received his PhD degree in ICAI Engineering School of the Pont. Univ. of Comillas (Madrid, Spain) in 2003. From 2003 to 2010, he served as a researcher in the Institute for Research in Technology of the same university. From 2010 to 2013, he worked for the electrical industry as a consultant. From Jun 2013 to Jul 2014, he also served in the Univ. of Illinois at Chicago as a Visiting Professor and Research Scientist. Starting in May 2019, he serves as a full-time professor in the Universidad Francisco de Vitoria (Madrid, Spain).