

(19)



**Octrooi centrum
Nederland**

(11)

2016810

(12) B1 OCTROOI

(21)

Aanvraagnummer: **2016810**

(51)

Int. Cl.:
H02J 50/10 (2016.01)

(22)

Aanvraag ingediend: **23/05/2016**

(41)

Aanvraag ingeschreven:
30/11/2017

(73)

Octrooihouder(s):
Optimos Apto B.V. te Rotterdam.

(43)

Aanvraag gepubliceerd:
-

(72)

Uitvinder(s):
Fredrik Frank Arie van der Pijl te Amsterdam.

(47)

Octrooi verleend:
30/11/2017

(74)

Gemachtigde:
ir. P.J. Hylarides c.s. te Den Haag.

(45)

Octrooischrift uitgegeven:
16/01/2018

(54)

A METHOD, A CONTROLLER AND A NETWORK

(57)

The invention relates to a method of controlling power input into an energy transferring inductive network, the network being at least connectable with at least one energy source and comprising an inductive transfer exhibiting storage and a number of power consuming loads. The method comprises determining an amount of power to be input by the source into the network by adaptively balancing energy of the source (E_{source}) against energy in the network (E_{network}).

Furthermore, the invention also relates to a controller and a network comprising a controller.

A METHOD, A CONTROLLER AND A NETWORK

The present disclosure relates to a method, a controller and a network as set out in the appended claims.

5 Prior art according to WO-2011/031143 is acknowledged here. Therein, determination of a fixed relation between energy in a source and energy stored in a network is disclosed. The prior art is rigid and not sufficiently flexible to cope with loads and sources being added or removed. Moreover, by
10 basing the approach of this prior art on a heaviest possible accumulated load (ΣP_0), efficiency could be improved on and losses reduced.

To this end, the present disclosure teaches adaptively balancing energy of the source (E_{source}) against energy in the
15 network (E_{network}). Preferably this may be achieved by willfully adapting a value of for instance a balance factor α in $\alpha * E_{\text{source}} = E_{\text{network}}$, ascertaining the effect in terms of approximation of a desired maximal minimum of α , and progressively adapting this α towards the desired maximal
20 minimum value. A source could be considered required, but a load node may also verify, upon connection to a network, if any source or sufficient source capacity is available. Further, a number of loads can include no loads being connected to the network.

25 Advantageous embodiments according to the invention are described in the appended dependent claims. More detailed information on the present disclosure is provided below. By way of example only, embodiments of the present invention will be described herein below, with reference to the
30 accompanying figures in which Fig. 1 shows a schematic perspective view of an electric supply network according to the invention;

Fig. 2 shows a schematic view of a part of the electric supply network of Fig. 1;

Fig. 3 shows a simple electric scheme of the partial electric supply network of Fig. 2;

5 Fig. 4 shows a more detailed electric scheme of the partial electric supply network of Fig. 2;

Fig. 5 a more schematic representation of the configuration according to figure 4;

Fig. 6 shows an inductive connection of a load to the
10 electric supply network of Fig. 1;

Fig. 7 shows a number of energy plots;

Fig. 8 shows a flow chart of a prior method;

Fig. 9 exemplifies switch behavior;

Fig. 10 exhibits an exemplary flexible network with more
15 freely connectable loads and at least one and possibly more than one source;

Fig.'s 11-17 exemplify graphs and curves for explaining considerations underlying the present disclosure;

Fig.'s 18 and 19 exemplify characteristics of a network
20 current or a voltage over a resonant capacitor.

The figures are merely schematic views of preferred embodiments according to the present disclosure. In the figures, the same reference numbers may refer to the same and/or corresponding parts.

25 Figure 1 shows a schematic perspective view of an electric supply network 1 arranged in a rectangular shaped chamber 2. Via a monitoring element 4 the network 1 is connected to a grid point 3 of a public electric power supply system. From the monitoring element 4, a mains line extends towards the
30 chamber 2. The mains line includes distribution points 5, 6 branching off electric supply lines 7, 8 that are located near the floor and the ceiling respectively. Electric loads, such as domestic electrical appliances, can be connected to

the electric supply lines 7, 8 in an inductive manner, as explained in more detail below.

Figure 2 shows a schematic view of a part 9 of the electric supply network 1. Here, a distribution point 5 is connected to an electric supply line 7 at the floor of the chamber 2. The distribution point 5 includes a capacitor that is arranged in series with the electric supply line 7. The electric supply line 7 is formed as an electrically conducting wire in a closed loop, so that the line 7 and the capacitor form a resonance circuit, also called LC-circuit or resonant tank. The distribution point 5 also includes a converter for converting electrical energy from the electrical source, e.g. a harmonic 50 Hz signal, into electrical energy having a central frequency at the resonance frequency of the resonant tank. The converter comprises an adaptive controller according to the invention for controlling energy supplied by an electrical source, viz. from the grid point 3, to the resonant tank connectable to an electric load.

In order to connect an electrical load to the electric supply line 7, a magnetic ferrite kernel 10a-c can be shifted around a section of the electric supply line 7 that forms a primary coil. Through the opening of the magnetic ferrite kernel 10a-c also a secondary coil 11a-c extends so that a transformer element is formed. The secondary coil 11a-c is connected to an output converter 12a-c for converting the resonance signal to a harmonic signal that is suitable for powering the electrical load 13a-c, viz. a 230 V, 50 Hz signal. Since the electrical load 13a-c is inductively connected, there is no danger for an electrical short cut.

Figure 3 shows a simple electric scheme of the partial electric supply network 9. Here, the resonant power

converter including the controller for controlling electrical energy supplied to the resonant tank is represented by a controlled electrical source 14. Further, the capacitor C_r , included in the grid point 5, is shown as well as the inductor L_r representing the coil 7. The resonant tank C_r , L_r is connected in series with electrical loads 13a-b. Obviously, also another number of electrical loads might be connected to the resonant tank, e.g. a single load or three loads.

Figure 4 shows a more detailed electric scheme of the partial electric supply network 9 and figure 5 exemplified a further simplified representation thereof. The inductance representing the electric supply line is replaced by a more complex inductor circuit 7 while the controlled electrical source 14 is separated in an electrical source 14a and a converter including a switching stage 14b and the controller for controlling the energy supplied to the resonant tank. The switching stage 14b is interconnected between terminals of the electrical source 14a and the resonant tank, respectively. The controller drives switching stage 14b switching elements, e.g. semiconductor switches, preferably high power MOSFET switches. At the load side, the output converter 12a-b includes a switching stage that is controlled to generate a desired electrical signal from the resonance signal in the resonant tank. The secondary coil 11a is inductively connected to the primary coil via a magnetic coupling 15.

Figure 6 shows an exemplary inductive connection of a load to the electric supply network 1. Advantageously, the coil of the electric supply line 7 has an elongated structure such that an offset between electrically conducting elements of the coil is small with respect to the length of said conducting elements, so that magnetic fields by the

individual electrically conducting elements mutually substantially cancel. In the shown embodiment in Fig. 5, a first section 22 of the coil including conducting elements wherein, during use, electrical currents flow in a particular direction 20, surround a second section 23 of the coil including conducting elements wherein electrical currents flow in an opposite direction 21. By arranging the coil in such a way, a first section 22 of conducting elements or wires surround a second section 21 of conducting elements or wires, and a net magnetic field outside the electric supply line 7 substantially vanish. Further, the electric supply line 7 can be split, e.g. by using a clamp, at least locally, so that the inner section 21 of conducting elements or wires can be pulled locally out of the surrounding outer section 22 of elements. The magnetic ferrite kernel 10 can then be moved between the first and second section of the primary coil, so that the magnetic field can be coupled to the secondary coil 11.

During operation of the adaptive controller according to the invention, information of energy in the resonant tank is used as a basis for determining an energy amount to be supplied to the resonant tank.

Figure 7 shows a number of energy plots associated with energy in the resonant tank ($E_{Lr} + E_{Cr}$) as a function of time.

The upper left plot shows the inductive energy E_{Lr} as a function of time t . Similarly, the upper right plot shows the capacitive energy E_{Cr} as a function of time t . The lower left plot shows the total energy (inductive energy E_{Lr} added to capacitive energy E_{Cr}) as a function of time. As expected, the total energy is mainly constant meeting an ideal situation wherein the amount of energy that is input to the resonant tank is equal to the energy that is output to the loads. The right lower graph of figure 7 exemplifies energy

supplied by the source (E_{in}) and energy absorbed by the loads (E_{out}) changing in time. Due to a disturbance with respect to the ideal situation, a seemingly harmonic ripple is present in the total energy, as exemplified in the left lower graph of figure 7. The lower right plot shows the energy E_{in} (dashed line) that is input to the tank and the energy E_{out} (solid line) that is output from the tank.

It is noted that the ripple in the total energy is associated with an instantaneous buffer component of the resonant tank energy. In the process of controlling an amount of energy to be supplied to the tank, the instantaneous buffer component might be set strictly positive while the component is also minimized. Thus, the energy buffer component is used as a basis of information of energy in the resonant tank for the purpose of determining an energy amount to be supplied to the resonant tank.

Advantageously, a filtered increase of resonant tank energy is integrated and subsequently controlled to a value depending on energy supplied to the resonant tank. As an example, said value might be related to the supplied energy in a linear or quadratic way. Depending on a particular application, a proper relation of said value with the supplied energy can be established. Further, the time scale of the filtering process is then different, preferably larger than the time scale of the integrating process, so that a filtered increase of the instantaneous energy buffer component is integrated and related to said value depending on energy supplied to the resonant tank.

Resonant tank energy information can be determined by measuring at least one physical parameter associated with the resonant tank, e.g. an electrical current and/or an electrical voltage.

A control objective, such as relating a filtered increase of resonant tank energy to a value depending on energy supplied to the resonant tank, can be implemented in various ways, e.g. depending on the converter type and switch stage type.

5 As an example, pulse width modulation (PWM), phase-shift modulation (PSM) or frequency modulation (FM) can be employed. Also a combination is possible. As a further example, a quantum conversion (QC) modulation method can be used wherein the modulation is controlled synchronous with
10 the resonance frequency of the resonant tank.

Further, different control algorithms can be applied, both linear and non-linear. As an example, a controller based on sliding-mode control theory is explained in more detail below. In order to arrive at a specific controlling method,
15 one or more control objects have to be rewritten as a valid sliding surface.

In a state-space annotation, the configuration of figures 4 and 5 may be expressed as follows:

$$20 \quad \frac{\pi^2}{4} L_r \frac{d\bar{i}_r}{dt} = V_i \bar{u}_p - r_r \bar{i}_r - \bar{v}_o u_s \quad (1a)$$

$$C_o \frac{d\bar{v}_o}{dt} = \frac{\bar{i}_r}{n} \bar{u}_s - \bar{i}_o \quad (1b)$$

It is intended to transport energy from the source 14a, V_i in
25 figures 4 and 5 to the load(s) as efficiently as possible. Power control may be achieved by appropriate driving of switching stage 14b. Clamps 11a, 11b, 11c all in principle comprise the same configuration, for example in terms of the switch stage applied therein. The system as a whole,
30 comprising cable 15, clamps 11, switching stages 12, 14, and other components, such as possibly externally arranged capacitors, may be referred to as an electronic power converter, connected to the resonant source.

By modeling figure 4 into the simplified representation of figure 5, it becomes apparent that monitoring the tank's behavior may result in appropriate control of the tank's output. The resonant tank, modeled by the dashed lines box in figure 5, has relevant information and in any case all information necessary, for tuning input energy E_{in} and the total output energy ΣE_{out} ($= E_{clamp\ 1} + E_{clamp\ 2} + \dots + E_{clamp\ n}$). Power supplied by the resonant tank and energy stored therein may then be expressed as follows:

$$P_{LC} = v_{Cr} \cdot C_r \frac{dv_{Cr}}{dt} + i_r \cdot L_r \frac{di_r}{dt} \quad [W]=[J/s] \quad (1c)$$

$$E_{LC}(t) = \int_0^t \left(v_{Cr} \cdot C_r \frac{dv_{Cr}}{dt} + i_r \cdot L_r \frac{di_r}{dt} \right) dt = \frac{1}{2} C_r v_{Cr}^2(t) + \frac{1}{2} L_r i_r^2(t) \quad [J] \quad (1d)$$

The amount of energy E_{LC} in the resonant tank at any given time consists essentially of two components, of which one represents ideal energy transfer at $E_{in} = \Sigma E_{out}$, where the other component is a disturbance of the ideal energy transfer. This disturbance of the ideal transfer is the buffer energy or surplus energy, which may be absorbed back by the source, referred to above in relation to figure 7 as a ripple due to a disturbance.

In principle, buffer energy at any given time can be positive, defining a reserve or buffer, or negative,

defining a shortage. However, it's possible to separate the buffer from the "perfect" DC-component, where the idea is to ensure that the buffer component is always positive and thus that sufficient energy is present at all times for the load(s). To avoid this leading to waste of energy, the amount should be as low as possible and at the same time sufficient to avoid that the buffer component becomes negative, in which case control of the buffer component may be or become unstable.

The buffer component represents an increase of energy in the

tank, being $\Delta E_{LC}(t) = \frac{\partial E_{LC}(t)}{\partial t}$.

However, this representation is filtered, in which the differentiator t is referred to as being "slow". The

5 filtered increase may be represented as an average or

integrated value $\overline{\Delta E_{LC}(t)}$.

By equating an integral of the filtered energy increase and a positive constant will ensure that the energy component of the buffer remains constant, in which case there will be at

10 all times a surplus of energy for the loads. However, at the same time it is desirable to reduce this surplus to as low a constant value as possible. It has been found that an

amplitude of the ripple, referred to above in relation to figure 7, in relation to the constant energy component of

15 the buffer is responsible for how low the constant of the buffer component can be set. The magnitude of the ripple superimposed on the average buffer component is then

dependent on absolute or total input power. For this reason the buffer component is not just set to just any constant,

20 but to have a relation with the input energy: constant $\cdot E_{in}$.

In summary, the control objective is to set the integrated filtered energy increase in the tank equal to a portion of the input energy. This can be expressed in one of several formulae, such as:

25
$$\int \overline{\Delta E_{LC}(t)} dt = \text{constante} \cdot E_{in}. \quad (2a)$$

or, as an alternative:

30
$$\int \overline{\Delta E_{LC}(t)} dt = \text{constante} \cdot E_{in}^2 \quad (2b)$$

In any case, to arrive at this control objective, it was necessary to understand and utilize, that the resonant tank comprises all the necessary information to tune the source and load(s), without a need for communication across

5 inductive couplings. To this end the integrated change (differentiation) is used on different time scales, because a filter alters the time scale. Normally, integration of a differentiation should yield the original; mathematically not effective operation will have been performed, which is
10 why the different time scales are of the essence.

In the configuration of figure 4 relates to a series-resonant converter, of which it is assumed that a single source is provided with a plurality of loads, but the representation of figure 5 allows for more complex

15 configurations forming for example a parallel-resonant converter and/or comprising multiple sources and one or more than one load (see below in relation to figures 9 and higher).

Even implementation of a transformer is not a necessary pre-
20 condition for implementing the invention according to the present application.

For the switching stages 12, 14, a number of modulation methods are available. Pulse Width Modulation (PWM) allows for "grasping" the input voltage using a fixed frequency,

25 but for example at different times within one period of the frequency, such as at 30% of such a period from a beginning thereof. Frequency modulation (FM) can "grasp" the input voltage using a variable frequency. Combinations of the two modulations can be considered, as well. A

30 disadvantage of PWM and of FM in current day resonant converters is the control range thereof in terms of power. For this reason an alternative modulation technique has been considered, which is Quantum Conversion (QC). When

implementing Quantum Conversion, switching is performed precisely in synch with the resonant frequency of the tank. In theory, the control range is infinite, when implementing Quantum Conversion.

5 Figure 9 exemplifies switch behavior in conjunction with modulation. Thick lines indicate current flowing and switches along a path of a thick line are conductive or open. All other switches are closed. This relates to the switching stages 12 at source 14a in figure 4. In figure 9a
10 energy is supplied to the circuit, and in figure 9b the source disconnected and output pins are short circuited. Figure 9c relates to energy flowing back into the source from the circuit.

The modeled configuration of figure 4 is controlled by a
15 power controller to implement the elementary switching modulation method of figure 9, wherein the power controller sets each individual switch to be open or closed.

Several distinct elementary control methods are available, which allow division into several groups, such as linear and
20 non-linear algorithms. An example of a non-linear method is based on so-called "Sliding-Mode Control Theory" (SMCT).

Although SMCT is prima facie just one of many linear or non-linear algorithms, that may lead to a workable controller.

In the present instance, SMCT is implemented, as it
25 corresponds closely the type of control challenge underlying the present disclosure. SMCT is mainly based on defining a sliding surface to comply with three mathematical conditions, whereby control objectives of formula 2a or of formula 2b are transformed into a valid sliding surface.

30 The input sliding surface is to relate to the input converter formed by switching stage 14b in figure 4. The switching stages 12 in clamps 13 are also controlled on a basis of an output sliding surface.

Herein below, first a candidate input sliding surface is determined. Then it will be proven when (for which α) the candidate sliding surface complies with conditions under the implemented theory. Finally, an exemplary configuration is proposed, and the minimal and therefore optimal α is determined.

A key observation is that the tank transfers energy from one quantum period to the next, although each of the tank components discharges completely during a (quantum) period.

Next important observation is the fact that the resonant inductor L_r can not transfer energy between periods, because by definition a consecutive period starts with zero current, and therefore with an energetic empty resonant inductor. The buffer energy of formula 2a above is developed into:

$$\int \overline{\Delta E_{LC}(t)} dt = \overline{E_{buf}} = \int_0^t \left(v_r \cdot i_r + \cancel{\left[i_r \cdot L \frac{di_r}{dt} \right]} \right) dt = \overline{v_r i_r} \quad (3)$$

As schematically indicated at the formula (3) above, the contribution of $i_r \cdot L (di_r/dt)$ is negligible and can be approximated as 0 (zero). The right-hand side of (2a) is provided in (4).

$$\overline{E_{buf}} = \alpha' \cdot \overline{E_{in}} \quad (4)$$

The input sliding surface - related to the input converter - then follows in (5) as the difference of equations (3) and (4).

$$S_{input} = \frac{\omega_c}{s + \omega_c} v_r \operatorname{sgn}(i_r) \overline{i_r} - \alpha' \frac{\omega_c}{s + \omega_c} v_{in} \operatorname{sgn}(i_r) \overline{i_r} \quad (5)$$

The purpose of (5) is to become zero, which implies that (5) can be divided by the average of i_r .

$$S_{input} = \frac{\omega_c}{s + \omega_c} v_r \operatorname{sgn}(i_r) - \frac{\omega_c}{s + \omega_c} \alpha' v_{in} \operatorname{sgn}(i_r) \quad (6)$$

5

While surface (6) is the basic sliding surface, a rewritten form is better suited for mathematical analysis. First step is to rewrite the second right hand term in (6) into (7).

$$v_{in} \operatorname{sgn}(i_r) \equiv V_{in} u_p \quad (7)$$

In (7), the DC input voltage is denoted V_{in} and the control input is denoted by u_p . The left term is rewritten by noting that

15

$$\frac{\omega_c}{s + \omega_c} v_r \operatorname{sgn}(i_r) \approx C \cdot \bar{i}_r, \quad (8)$$

where C is a constant dependent on the resonant capacitor value and the angular resonant frequency: $C = \frac{2}{\pi} \cdot \omega_c \cdot C_r$.

The motivation behind the (close) approximation (8) is that applying the low-pass filter on $v_r \operatorname{sgn}(i_r)$ is equivalent to the average of i_r (up to the constant C), when accepting the loss of phase information between voltage and current. Though, one of the strengths of quantum conversion is that phase information is not used at all, because switching occurs only at zero resonant current. If for example the control method would be applied to a different conversion method than quantum conversion (e.g., PWM or FM, see previous paragraph), (8) would not be true.

Substitution of (7) and (8) in sliding surface (6) leads to the rewritten sliding surface (9). Note that phase

30

information is also discarded from the second right hand term by only using the magnitude of the filter.

$$S_p = \bar{i}_r - \alpha \left| \frac{\omega_c}{s + \omega_c} \right| \frac{u_p}{C_r} V_{in} = \bar{i}_r - \alpha u_p V_{in} \quad (9)$$

5

Interpreting (9), the first right hand side term represents the buffer energy in the resonant tank when it is multiplied by the resonant current. The second term represents a fraction α of the supplied energy, when also multiplied by the resonant current. Note that both terms originally contained the same resonant current factor i_r , which has been left out of the equation, but the energetic origin of the terms is still clear.

10

The intuitive reason that (9) 'works' is that the supplied energy reacts little more slowly than the buffer tank energy. For example, adopting the common control law (10), it is clear that the buffer will grow faster than the average supplied energy when $S_p > 0$ and as a result S_p becomes < 0 , and vice versa.

15

20

$$u_p = \begin{cases} 1, & S_p > 0 \\ 0, & S_p < 0 \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

In the following a formal proof of the validness of (candidate) sliding surface (9) is provided. In sliding-mode control theory the following 3 conditions must be formally met to guarantee stable closed-loop operation: Reaching condition, Existence condition and Stability condition. Reaching considers the fact that the control law must assure to reach the sliding surface (in finite time) starting from all possible initial states. Existence means that the system dynamics must be able to stay at the sliding surface once it

25

30

is reached. The stability condition considers internal stability of the closed-loop system. Sliding mode control design effectively linearizes the non-linear plant system, but those invisible reminiscent terms must be checked on stability also.

We start with forming the closed-loop system dynamics with the help of the sliding surfaces. First step is to put S_p equal to zero. Rewriting (9) with $S_p=0$ results in (11).

$$\alpha \omega_c u_p = (s + \omega_c) \bar{i}_r = \frac{d\bar{i}_r}{dt} + \omega_c \bar{i}_r \quad (11)$$

Substituting for $\frac{d\bar{i}_r}{dt}$ in (11) in the averaged state-space model (i.e., (0a) and (0b)) leads to the following expression for u_p in (12). The terms u_{sj} denote the control variables of the output switching bridges.

$$\bar{u}_p = \frac{\left(r_r - \frac{\pi^2}{4} \omega_c L_r \right) \bar{i}_r + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{v_{ojref}}{n} \bar{u}_{sj}}{v_i - \frac{\pi^2}{4} \omega_c L_r \alpha} \quad (12)$$

Substituting (12) in (0a) leads to a linear first-order differential expression in $\bar{i}_r^2$, which is given in (13).

$$\frac{d\bar{i}_r^2}{dt} = \frac{2\omega_c}{v_i - \frac{\pi^2}{4} \omega_c L_r \alpha} \left(\alpha \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\frac{1}{2} C_{oj} \frac{dv_{ojref}^2}{dt} + \frac{v_{ojref}^2}{r_{oj}} \right) - (v_i - r_r \alpha) \bar{i}_r^2 \right) \quad (13)$$

Equation (13) contains the entire dynamics of the closed-loop system. Consulting linear system analysis, stability of the linear system is assured when

$$-(v_i - r_r \alpha) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{2\omega_c}{v_i - \frac{\pi^2}{4} \omega_c L_r \alpha} > 0.$$

Rewriting the latter equations leads to the stability condition for α in (14).

5

$$\alpha < \min \left\{ \frac{v_i}{r_r}, \frac{v_i}{\frac{\pi^2}{4} \omega_c L_r} \right\} \quad (14)$$

This shows the upper bound of α for which the system is stable. Result of choosing α larger than the bound in (14) is an unlimited increase of stored energy in the primary circuit. There is no lower bound from a stability point of view, because we look from the primary side (assuming the secondary side dynamics being situated at the sliding surface) and the system will converge to zero-power throughput in the worst case. See Fig. x2 for an illustration.

10

The existence conditions will put a lower bound for α , in order to assure stable regime; enough input power to supply the secondary sides. For the outputs the existence conditions are straightforward:

15

$$-1 < u_{sj} < 1 \quad \rightarrow \quad \bar{i}_r > \max_{j=1 \dots n} \left| C_{oj} \frac{dv_{ojref}}{dt} + i_{oj} \right| \quad (15)$$

Condition (15) simply states that the input current must be larger than load current plus the current through the output filter capacitor.

20

The input existence condition is the most interesting one. The conditions follow from the fact that the equivalent input control parameter must be between 0 and 1: $0 < u_{p,eq} < 1$. Setting the equivalent input larger than 0 leads to (16).

5

$$r_r > \frac{\pi^2}{4} \omega_c L_r \quad (16)$$

Note that in (16) the radial frequency is the cut-off frequency of the low-pass filter and not the resonant frequency. Equation (16) reflects the idea that the 'filtered' impedance of the averaged resonant tank must be smaller than the loss resistance in order to have enough real damping. In other words, the resonant tank must be able to release its energy fast enough.

10

The remaining condition, $u_{p,eq} < 1$, reveals when the buffer-energy percentage in the resonant tank is enough to assure local stability. Substituting for $u_{p,eq}$ the expression in (12) and rewriting, the final condition follows in (17).

15

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(v_i + \frac{\pi^2}{4} \omega_c L_r \bar{i}_r \right) \bar{i}_r > \\ & \left(r_r \bar{i}_r + \frac{\pi^2}{4} \omega_c L_r \alpha \right) \bar{i}_r + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{2} C_{oj} \frac{dv_{ojref}^2}{dt} + \frac{v_{ojref}^2}{r_{oj}} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

20

25

Expression (17) has the structure of an energy balance. On the right hand side, 'loss' terms are present. To be precise, from left to right: copper loss energy, virtual resonant tank energy, filter capacitor energy and load energy. The 'virtual' energy will be explained shortly. On the left hand side of (17) source terms are present. The left-most term is clearly the averaged input energy, while

the right term represents the averaged stored resonant tank energy.

The virtual energy term with α turns out to be a safety measure. It represents the dynamics of the resonant tank in essence. The momentary resonant tank energy can not be viewed as a term completely available (to compensate instantaneously) for the loss energies, because when the tank is empty it must be charged, before it can transfer energy again.

- 10 The control parameter α is a function of $\bar{i}_r$ (and vice versa) through the sliding surface and the state-space dynamics. The only problem to advance further into an explicit condition for α is that $\bar{i}_r$ is a function of its own derivative; see (13). The resulting first order differential equation is difficult to solve analytically, due to the non-homogeneous sinusoidal output terms.

The following simplification is justified by the fact that interest is in a (rough) design guidance value for α ; in practice the value for α will be tuned by observation.

- 20 Returning to expression (13), the simplification consists of assuming zero ripple in $i_r(t)$, which makes the left hand side of (13) equal to 0. Rewriting (13) results in an approximate expression for $\bar{i}_r$ as a function of α :

$$25 \quad \bar{i}_r \approx \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{V_i - r_r \alpha} \sum_{j=1}^m P_{oj}} \quad (18)$$

In (18), P_{oj} replaces $\frac{1}{2} C_{oj} \frac{dv_{ojref}^2}{dt} + \frac{v_{ojref}^2}{r_{oj}}$. Substitution of (18) in (17) and rearranging terms leads to design condition (19).

$$\left(V_i - \frac{\pi^2}{4} \omega_c L_r \alpha \right) \left(\frac{\alpha}{V_i - r_r \alpha} \sum_{j=1}^m P_{oj} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} > \left(r_r - \frac{\pi^2}{4} \omega_c L_r \right) \left(\frac{\alpha}{V_i - r_r \alpha} \sum_{j=1}^m P_{oj} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^m P_{oj} \quad (19)$$

In the following the previous design conditions are applied to a design

example. Table 1 shows values for the parameters as

5 introduced in Fig. 4.

Table I

Parameter values for two-clamp cable prototype as referred to in Fig. 4

Symbol	QUANTITY	Value
V_i	input DC voltage	600 [V]
L_r	input side leakage inductance	40 [uH]
r_r	Primary side winding resistance	2 [Ω]
r_{o1}, r_{o2}	output load resistances	240 [Ω]
ω_c	radial resonant frequency	100k [Hz]
v_{o1}, v_{o2}	required output voltages	240 [V]
P_{o1}, P_{o2}	required output powers	240 [W]
n	number of clamps	2

10

Stability is assured when (14) applies:

$$\alpha < \min \left\{ \frac{600}{2}, \frac{600}{\frac{\pi^2}{4} 2\pi \cdot 10^5 \cdot 40 \cdot 10^{-6}} \right\} \approx 9.7$$

15 The sliding surface for the output exists if (15) holds, where expression (18) is substituted for $\bar{i}_r$:

$$\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{600-2\alpha}} 480 > 1 \rightarrow \alpha > 1.24$$

The input sliding surface exists if (19) holds:

5

$$\begin{aligned} \left(600 - \frac{\pi^2}{4} 2\pi \cdot 10^5 \cdot 40 \cdot 10^{-6} \cdot \alpha\right) \left(\frac{480\alpha}{600-2\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} > \\ \left(2 - \frac{\pi^2}{4} 2\pi \cdot 10^5 \cdot 40 \cdot 10^{-6}\right) \left(\frac{480\alpha}{600-2\alpha}\right) + 480 \end{aligned} \rightarrow 0.8 < \alpha < 9.7$$

Combining the previous conditions, the design solution gives:

10

$$1.24 < \alpha < 9.7 \quad (20)$$

Whereas α represents the fraction of the input energy that is used for the buffer energy in the tank, the best (i.e., most energy efficient) solution for α is the minimum allowed value in (20).

15

Figure 8 shows a flow chart of an embodiment of the above described method. A controlling method is used for controlling energy supplied by an electrical source to a resonant tank connectable to an electric load. The method comprises the step 100 of determining an energy amount to be supplied based on information of energy in the resonant tank.

20

Up to here the description relates to setting an α to be robust and essentially fixed, at a level for safe operation, basically based on a galvanic connection of a source to the network.

25

ADAPTIVE α

Building on the above theoretical basis, it was already indicated at a reference to figure 5 that the principles underlying the determination of a minimal and thus optimal α could additionally apply to a configuration with more than one source and one or more than one load. Additionally, a fixed α results in potentially rigid configurations, whilst it would be desirable to be able to use the system and method of the present disclosure also under varying circumstances, such as adding or removing loads and / or sources, with the same efficiency and keeping to the desires and objectives as set out above, of minimizing α , while at the same time preventing instability of the control and ensuring that the buffer component doesn't become negative. Figure 10 exemplifies a more flexible network 30, enabling easy connection or disconnection of different types of loads, each having specific requirements in terms of connecting voltage or current, and sources, as well as storages. The system 30 can be connected to a DC grid 31 and a utility grid 35, from which the system can receive energy and to which energy can also be fed via respective connections 32, 36. The system has a back bone conductor 33, to which a source 34 and a buffer or storage 37 may be connected. Several types of loads may connected to the backbone conductor 33, such as a 12V (re)chargeable tooth brush 38, a 230V power tool 39, a 5V network apparatus 40, such as a 5V USB device, etc. A network controller 41 may be embodied in the form of an app on a mobile device. Each of these load apparatuses is connected to the backbone conductor 33, which could have a flexible or rigid form, via a coupler 42. In principle couplers or nodes 42 are the same for source and loads. Nodes 42 are autonomous in the sense that no data transfer is required between nodes and / or

between sources and nodes and/or between sources. As a consequence the additional challenge of this more versatile configuration is how sources can determine autonomously (without data transfer) how much power they are to insert
5 into the network over the backbone conductor 33, in a sufficient amount for all the loads to be able to function. Herein above prior art is described, which originates from the inventor's own previous publication WO-2011/031143, relating to a basic algorithm, system and method to
10 determine a power need for all connected loads from a single source.

In order to allow for a desired degree of versatility, further developments have been contemplated. Therein, the network in its entirety is configured to distribute power in
15 accordance with a novel and inventive algorithm from one or more than one source to one or more than one load.

Again it is assumed that a power requirement of all loads ΣP_0 together is available or can at least be deduced from the energy in the source, which may be a resonant tank or an
20 arbitrary energy buffer of the network. Temporary energy storage or buffering appears to be very important though possibly not essential to the invention. This may point to an inductive network or as an alternative, potentially an adequate buffer connected to the backbone conductor 33 may
25 suffice. In any case, where in the following description reference is made to a resonant tank in an inductive network, these exemplary features are not to be taken as limitations on the scope of protection.

A sliding surface equation for a source may be expressed, in
30 line with the principles underlying the prior art discussed above, see formula (4) above. However, this is where all comparison ends:

$$S = \alpha \cdot E_{\text{source}} - E_{\text{network, stored}} \quad (21)$$

Namely, in the prior art technology described above, the parameter α is constant and is determined beforehand, in advance of an actual use situation. The determination, beforehand, of the parameter α is based on expectations about maximum anticipated load power requirement ($\max\{\Sigma P_0\}$) in the network. Based on this assumption, control of the source in the network and the network itself will normally be robust and not lead to unstable operation.

Determination beforehand of parameter α has a number of drawbacks.

A fixed value of α can result in a limitation on the degree to which the full source power can be deployed, so that a maximum less than full source power is available to be released onto the network.

The source cannot prevent that the assumed maximum load requirement $\max\{\Sigma P_0\}$ is exceeded, for example if more loads are connected to the backbone conductor 33.

An optimal value of α is, at any given time, determined by an actual value of a sum of all loads ΣP_0 rather than any expectation about a maximum $\max\{\Sigma P_0\}$ thereof. This has for a consequence that for all situations, wherein $\Sigma P_0 < \max\{\Sigma P_0\}$, efficiency is less than optimal for the network; more power is made available over the network than what is required to drive and supply power to the actually connected and combined loads.

Formula (21) does not suffice to tune α in operation and continuously to an instantaneous optimum thereof, taking the actually connected combined loads into account.

Surprisingly, as it turns out, the information missing to be able to achieve instantaneous adaptation of α has been found

to reside in formula 18 above, which is reproduced here for completeness, brevity and clarity:

$$\bar{i}_r \approx \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{V_i - r_r \alpha} \sum_{j=1}^m P_{oj}} \quad (18)$$

5

By further developing formula (21) above, it is obtained that:

$$S = \alpha \cdot \bar{u}_p - \bar{i}_r = 0 \quad (22)$$

10

and by further assuming that $S = 0$, it is obtained that:

$$\bar{u}_p = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\alpha(V_i - r_r \alpha)} \sum P_o} \quad (23)$$

15

The graph in figure 11 provides relations between α and u_p in accordance with equation (23), for three distinct load profiles $\Sigma P_0(1)$, $\Sigma P_0(2)$, and $\Sigma P_0(3)$. Also shown is $\max \Sigma P_0$, on which the prior art determination of a fixed α is based. It is evident, that in the prior art, α is determined at a level or value that is relatively high for all of the three distinct load profiles, indicating that energy supplied to the loads is too high for the actually connected loads according to each of the three load profiles $\Sigma P_0(1)$, $\Sigma P_0(2)$, and $\Sigma P_0(3)$. Thus efficiency is reduced.

20

25

In relation to each profile $\Sigma P_0(1)$, $\Sigma P_0(2)$, and $\Sigma P_0(3)$, there's a minimal α ($\alpha_{\min, x}$), at which there's certainty that the source and the controller thereof insert precisely enough power into the network for all actually connected loads in combination, and as little more as is needed to

30

prevent with certainty that the unstable state, referred to above, occurs.

On the other hand, to be able to set a beforehand determined value of α as a fixed parameter, this value needs to be set higher than a maximum value of α at any load situation, which could be referred to as $\max(\alpha_{\min, x})$. Such a "maximal minimum" would therefore correspond with a maximum load $\max \Sigma P_0$. At such a value of α , network efficiency would be less than optimal for all of the potentially realistic power profiles. However, this issue can be addressed using an adaptive approach to α . In figure 11, the precise load profile is not known beforehand. However, it is known in advance of any load profile potentially occurring, that the following functioning occurs:

$\alpha = \alpha_{\min, x} \leftrightarrow \text{stabil} \& \eta_{\max}$	stability and high efficiency
$\alpha > \alpha_{\min, x} \leftrightarrow \text{stabil} \& \eta \downarrow$	Stability, but reduced η
$\alpha < \alpha_{\min, x} \leftrightarrow \text{instabil}$	Unstable, or even instable

The source has no control over the amount or power requirement of connectable or even connected loads. As a consequence, stable and highly efficient, inefficient but stable and unstable behavior may occur, in particular respectively when:

$\alpha = \alpha_{\min, x} \leftrightarrow \text{stabil} \& \eta_{\max}$
$\alpha > \alpha_{\min, x} \leftrightarrow \text{stabil} \& \eta \downarrow$
$\alpha_{\text{a priori}} < \alpha_{\min, x} \leftrightarrow \text{instabil}$

However, it is uncertain in which area or zone operation of the system is, when it isn't known how many loads are actually connected and what the respective power requirement(s) thereof is/are, as there is no communication
 5 about such aspects over the backbone conductor 33.

The graph of figure 12 clearly exhibits that an unwanted unstable situation may occur unpredictably and undesirably in the prior art, if more loads are connected than anticipated or at least if the power requirement of the
 10 actually connected load(s) exceed(s) the anticipated $\max\{\Sigma P_0\}$.

One further result of the prior art worst case approach, according to which the predetermined fixed α , which is calculated and then fixed a priori, may be much higher than
 15 required for an actually connected (amount of) load at any given time ($\alpha_{a \text{ priori}} \gg \alpha_{\min}(t)$), as shown in figure 13, is considerable efficiency loss and costs, although the system remains to be stable.

The above described basic disclosure of WO-2011/031143
 20 refers to adaptive control, but in fact, due to fixing α at a value determined a priori and then set, there's no temporal adaptation of α .

Therefore, the core issue underlying the present disclosure is how to enable determination of $\alpha_{\min}(t)$; how is it possible
 25 to determine between area's A (unstable) and B (stable) in figure 14. The answer to this question is not in formula (22) above. This formula (22) only reveals a single point (at the questions mark "?" in Figure 14), while the rest of the shape and form of the graph associated with the
 30 determined point is unknown. In fact, the entire curve is unknown, which can also be the reason for the indication of a question mark in figure 14.

The solution to this challenge turned out to reside in formula (18) above, as already indicated. This will be explained herein below.

In area B of figure 14, the total load power may be assumed constant, based for area B on:

$$\frac{\delta \sum P_o(t)}{\delta \alpha} = 0 \quad (24)$$

This formula (24) results, based on formula (23) above, in

$$\overline{u_p}^2 \cdot \alpha \equiv \text{constant} \quad (25)$$

This formula (25) only holds in area B of figures 14 - 16.

By continuously varying α , which can be achieved by varying

u_p , the following algorithm in formula (26) provides a proper indication of the direction (decrease /increase) in which α needs to be varied further to most closely approximate the most optimal and stable value:

$$\left(\text{sign} \left(\frac{\delta u_p(\alpha)}{\delta t} \right) < 0 \text{ OR } \text{sign} \left(\frac{\delta \alpha(u_p)}{\delta t} \right) > 0 \right) \quad (26)$$

As long as the criterion of formula (25) is complied with, it may be established that:

$$\alpha \geq \alpha_{\min}(t) \quad (27)$$

and $\alpha_{\min}(t)$ can be sought using formula (26).

This is precisely what was sought. However, from the bulge shaped anomaly in the left hand side of figure 15, indicated by the dashed line therein, it will be evident to the

skilled person that the criterion of formulae 25 may be complied with, and that it could be then erroneously be assumed that formula (27) also holds. However, based on the notion that formula (25) only holds in area B of figures 14

- 16, the error can be prevented. Apparently, it does not suffice to determine $\alpha_{\min}(t)$ by maximizing u_p . After all, in area A in figures 14 and 15, the shape of the graph is not fixed and may vary, which is why the bulge shaped anomaly is represented in the dashed line graph shape in figure 15. The reason for this is that in area A the load power has become a function of α and consequently of the power in time, depending on α : $\Sigma P_0(\alpha, t)$. In other words, the maximum of u_p could be in area A, as shown at the bulge shaped, dash lined anomaly in the graph of figure 15, as indicated in the dashed line, even though the conditions of formulae (25) and (26) are met.

Although the bulge shape in dashed line is referred to above as an anomaly, this is not precisely correct as it is simply the curve in area A, having a higher $\text{MAX}(u_p)$ than at the sought $\alpha_{\min}(t)$, thus rendering a strategy of maximizing u_p to escape from area A unworkable.

The shape of the curve $[\alpha, u_p]$ in area B of figures 14 and 15 is to a considerable degree fixed, and is defined in

equation 23 above. However, as an absolute value of ΣP_0 is unknown, the controller is unable to determine a current position on the curve in area B, as shown in figure 16. On the other hand, surprisingly, this position does not necessarily have to be determined precisely in order to

arrive at a determination of $\alpha_{\min}(t)$. To determine an $\alpha_{\min}(t)$ it suffices - again surprisingly - to have the shape of the curve in figure 16. By slightly varying α , from α_1 to α_2 in figure 16 or vice versa, the effect on u_p becomes apparent, as it changes from point 1 on the curve to point 2 (or vice versa). Thus, by varying α , the shape of the curve becomes apparent, at least in and for area B, and then α can be adapted further to approximate $\alpha_{\min}(t)$ better, by hollowing the shape of the curve in the predicted direction, which is

to the left in figure 16, by decreasing the value of α . In fact this finding is the algorithm of formula (26) above. In contrast, and as shown in figure 17, the shape of the curve in area A to the left of the unknown $\alpha_{\min}(t)$ is

5 unknown. Figure 17 exemplifies some of the erratic shapes that the curve can have in area A. This is understandable from the fact that the sliding surface equation 22 above does not hold in area A. Most often, the behavior may follow curve 2 in figure 17. However, the occurrence of curve 1
10 cannot be excluded.

As a first strategy to try to resolve this matter, the skilled person may decide to maximize u_p , which could resolve for curves 2 and 3 in figure 17, but not for curve 1.

Although this obvious strategy may succeed in some
15 situations, it would not be robust for all situations, such as for curve 1 in figure 17.

To resolve this issue, surprisingly the solution is provided on the basis of the fact that in area A, behavior does not follow the sliding surface equation 22 above, and behavior
20 does not follow formula (25). In other words, in area A the curve is not the one of area B, and/or formula (25) does not hold in area A, because ΣP_0 varies in area A. A reason why the curve can exhibit erratic shapes in area A is because instantaneous power input into conductor 33 at any given
25 time is $P_i = u_p * V_i * i_r$. In the sliding surface equation 22 above, resonant current is shared by all sources and loads. All of the deductions from equation 22 rely on the assumption of a small ripple on the amplitude of the resonant current i_r , whereas this holds true to a larger or
30 lesser extent, depending on the low-level switch-modulation method.

In short, and in simplified representation, when a series $u_p = [1, 0, 1]$ (on average 2/3) occurs with averaged $i_r = [1, 3,$

1], this yields less input power $P_i = 2$ than in a situation wherein $u_p = [0, 1, 0]$ (on average 1/3) and averaged $i_r = [1, 3, 1]$, yielding $P_i = 3$. As a consequence, it is possible to provide relatively less energy at a relatively high average of u_p .

Further, it is assumed that ΣP_0 does not vary faster than a rate of variation of $\alpha(t)$. This is considered to be a consequence of an actual difference in desired power delivery. This result in a further requirement:

$$\frac{\delta \alpha}{\delta t} \gg \frac{\delta \Sigma P_0}{\delta t} \quad (28)$$

Yet, $\alpha(t)$ should not vary too quickly, as formula (22) must have time to stabilize to zero, which involves reaching phase in sliding mode control:

$$\frac{\delta \alpha}{\delta t} \ll t(S \rightarrow 0) = t(\{\alpha \cdot \bar{u}_p - \bar{i}_r\} \rightarrow 0) \quad (29)$$

In summary: for a predetermined α , this will be robust only if $\Sigma P_0(\infty) < \max \Sigma P_0$, but involves a loss of efficiency η if at any given time $\Sigma P_0(t) < \max \Sigma P_0$. The minimum of α at any given time can always be robust and at all times secure optimal network efficiency. In order to determine, it is proposed to vary α , or varying any of

In case that α is in the undesired area A, the algorithm of

$$\text{sign}\left(\frac{\delta u_p(\alpha)}{\delta t}\right) < 0 \text{ AND } \frac{\delta(\bar{u}_p^2 \cdot \alpha)}{\delta t} = 0 \quad (30)$$

can resolve a strategy to bring α in the stable area B. If a change in U_p results in an increase of α , then a further change in the same direction of U_p is tried to see if that yields a further increase of α .

- 5 The adaptive controlling method for controlling energy supplied by an electrical source to a resonant tank connectable to an electric load can be performed using dedicated hardware structures, such as FPGA and/or ASIC components. Otherwise, the method can also at least
- 10 partially be performed using a computer program product comprising instructions for causing a processor of the computer system to perform the above described one or more steps of the method according to the invention. All steps can in principle be performed on a single processor.
- 15 However, it is noted that at least one step can be performed on a separate processor, e.g. the step of minimizing a buffer component of the resonant tank energy.

MULTI SOURCE APPROACH

- 20 Reverting to the configuration of figure 10, multiple sources are connected, such as DC grid 31, source X 34, utility grid 35 and storage X 37. A source can have a double role as energy can be supplied for example to a utility grid
- 25 35, then acting as a load, and at other times the utility grid 35 may supply energy. The same holds for a battery that may charge or discharge to respectively act as a load and a source.

- The network primarily serves to transfer power from at least
- 30 one source to a number of loads (including zero loads). The at least one source and the number of loads are connected inductively via nodes 42. Each node is autonomous, avoiding a need for any information exchange between nodes 42. In the

inventor's own previous prior art disclosure WO-2011/031143 a basic approach is described to determine a required amount of power for all of the connected load nodes.

However, in WO-2011/031143, the source was coupled to the network via a galvanic connection. Referring back to formulae (1c) and (1d) above, P designated power transferred through the tank and E designated energy stored on the tank. Through deductions a sliding surface was determined that

$$S = E / P - C \quad (31)$$

based on the notion that stored energy should be available in an amount related to transferred power via a fixed ratio C. In a preferred situation energy stored in the tank should approximate zero, but for a reliable and correct functioning a small buffer amount should be available in the tank.

As mentioned above, the starting point of the disclosure of WO-2011/031143 is a galvanic connection of the source to the network. Below, this starting point does not apply and the

source or sources will be connected through a galvanic connection or inductively to the network. For the below discussion, an inductive connection is assumed, though the disclosure is not limited thereto. To this end a source node comprises a capacitor to define the resonant tank with the inductance of the network. In a case of a plurality of nodes, there's no singular source. Therefore the above sliding surface needs some adjustment, but still holds for a plurality of inductively coupled sources.

$$S = \frac{E_{t,stored}}{P_t} - C \quad \rightleftharpoons \quad S = \frac{E_{network,stored}}{P_{network}} - C \quad (32)$$

A preceding implementation of the sliding surface equation 21 above is provided in formula 22, based on a simplification:

$$S = \alpha \cdot \overline{u_p} - \overline{i_r} = 0 \quad (22)$$

However, here (with more than one source):

$$\beta \cdot i_r^2 \neq E_{\text{network,stored}} \quad (33)$$

10

in which β defines a constant related to tank inductance. However, the following equation does hold:

$$\beta \cdot i_r^2 = E_{\text{network,throughput}} + E_{\text{network,stored}} \quad (34)$$

15

An average current amplitude through the resonant tank inductance corresponds with the sum of the energy through the tank and energy stored in the tank. A more formal definition of eq. 34 is therefore:

20

$$S = \gamma(t) \cdot E_{\text{network,throughput}} - \beta(E_{\text{network,throughput}} + E_{\text{network,stored}}) \quad (35)$$

Rewriting eq. 35 to the format of eq. 21 results in:

25

$$S = \left(\frac{\gamma(t) - \beta}{\beta} \right) \cdot E_{\text{network,throughput}} - E_{\text{network,stored}} \quad (36)$$

$$\text{Therein, } \frac{\gamma(t) - \beta}{\beta} = \alpha(t) .$$

30 In an inductively coupled multi-source configuration, for a single source node j , the sliding surface can be expressed as:

$$S_j = \alpha_j(t) \cdot E_{\text{source},j} - E_{\text{network},\text{stored}} \quad (37)$$

5 Therein, $E_{\text{source},j}$ is the total input power. In a configuration of a plurality of sources:

$$S_j = \alpha_j(t) \sum_i E_{\text{source},i} - E_{\text{network},\text{stored}} \quad (j=0..i) \quad (38)$$

10 The challenge in this approach resides in the fact that in the sliding surface j for multiple sources:

$$S_j = \alpha_j(t) \cdot (E_{\text{source},j} + \sum_{i \neq j} E_{\text{source},i}) - E_{\text{network},\text{stored}} \quad (39)$$

15 the summation $\sum_{i \neq j} E_{\text{source},i}$ is not known for source j . Source node j has no direct knowledge about energy supplied by each of the other source nodes connected to the inductive network.

As a solution to this challenge, the summation $\sum_{i \neq j} E_{\text{source},i}$ is
 20 determined indirectly. By reverting to sliding surface equation (21):

$$S = \alpha(t) \cdot E_{\text{source}} - E_{\text{network},\text{stored}} \quad (21)$$

25 The basic idea of this sliding surface is the definition of a relationship between power going through the tank, and power stored in the tank and elsewhere in storages or sources connected to the network.

It should be noted that in case of multiple sources, these
 30 may be approximated as a single distributed source. Thus reference here to the tank implies the combined sources

connected to the network, but not forming part of the network. The distributed sources are each connected inductively to the network in order to avoid – in the case of direct connection of the multiple sources – that the entire network needs to be shut down when one source fails. As a consequence, a node connecting a source to the network comprises a resonant capacitor to generate a resonant current. Further, the reference to power going through the tank and stored in the tank is therefore to be interpreted as referring to the combined sources, inductively coupled to the network via the resonant capacitors in each of the source connecting nodes, and themselves therefore outside the network.

The ratio between these powers through and stored in the “tank” defines as, assuming $S = 0$ for the most efficient result:

$$\alpha(t) = \frac{E_{network,stored}}{E_{network,throughput}} \quad (40)$$

As a further clarification, it is noted that $E_{source} \equiv$

$E_{network,throughput}$, since power going through “the tank” equals power supplied by the combined sources. Again reverting to eq. 21, yields:

$$S_{network} = \alpha_j(t) \cdot \sum_i E_{source,i} - E_{network,stored} \quad (41)$$

Since it is of no importance which source (node) delivers the required amount of energy. As a consequence each individual source node can rely on the same surface form:

$$S_j = \alpha_j(t) \cdot (E_{source,j} + \sum_{i \neq j} E_{source,i}) - E_{network,stored} \quad (42)$$

Therein, $\alpha_j(t)$ is not necessarily the same for each source node, and hence the subscript j , since for each source node the ratio $\alpha_j(t)$ may converge to it's own optimum, as disclosed above.

Again assuming $S=0$, based on

$$E_{source,j} + \sum_{i \neq j} E_{source,i} = E_{network, throughput} \quad (43)$$

an unknown portion of supplied source power can be determined through analysis of the resonant tank.

In order to be able to determine $E_{network, throughput}$ this term must be separated from $E_{network, stored}$, again using eq. 22:

$$S = \alpha \cdot \overline{u_p} - \overline{i_r} = 0 \quad (22)$$

At the stage of developments of obtaining eq. 22, the aforementioned separation was not yet necessary, since for a single source the value of $E_{network, throughput}$ is known. For a plurality of sources (source nodes) it will therefore be necessary to determine (by measurement) peak-difference values, in addition to amplitude measurement of i_r . These measurements together characterize the behaviour of the combined total tank or combination of source nodes.

Figure 18 exhibits measured i_r (or V_{cr}). Figure 19 exhibits the absolute values of the measured values.

Energy stored in the tank per resonant half period can be determined based on peak-difference measurements. Energy passing through the tank per resonant half period can be characterized by the amplitude - peak difference measurements.

For these measurements, as an alternative for i_r , voltage V_{cr} over the resonant capacities may be employed as an

alternative for current through the network i_r . To enhance robustness and accuracy, a combination of both measurements may be employed.

In figure 19, the amplitude measurements may follow the sequence from a to b to c to d. The peak difference measurement follow (a - ?) to (b - a) to (c - b) to (d - c). The peak difference measurements are based on i_r or V_{Cr} as these provide an indication of $E_{\text{network, stored}}$, and the peak difference measurements reflect changes in the sliding surface equation. Successive values thereof change and the changes indicate changes in $E_{\text{network, stored}}$ and quantify the resulting changes α . By monitoring the peak differences, it's turned out to be possible to monitor α .

In relation to the multi source approach, it is noted that the sources may be galvanic connected or inductively connected to the network via nodes, just like the loads, in contrast with the prior art according to WO-2011/031143, where it was implicitly assumed that the source was connected directly and in series to the network itself. In a multi-source approach, any defect of a source or source node would necessarily result in shut down, pending repairs. By inductive coupling of the source(s), an adaptation of the remaining sources to supply a desired amount of energy to the network will be possible.

Inductively connected source(s) (nodes) result in a consideration that the physical location of the source(s) (nodes) does not actually matter. In such inductively connected sources, a node may be equipped with a (resonant) capacitor, for example on the primary side of the source node. Equally, a resonant capacitor may be provided on the network side.

Nevertheless, the present disclosure also encompasses configurations having a plurality of sources physically

connected to the network, and thus physically part of the network, rather than being inductively coupled thereto.

One of the basic concepts of the present multi source approach of this disclosure is that one or more than one
5 source will send a quasi-sinusoidal current through the network, potentially using one or more than one resonant capacitor. The sinusoidal shape of the network current an/or of the voltage over the (resonant) capacitor(s) reveals characteristics of the loads and other sources connected to
10 the network, which can be used based on amplitude and peak-difference determination, because in a multi source configuration, the simplification of eq. 22 does not apply. The contribution of each source is not known at any of the other sources. To resolve for this challenge, the network
15 current characteristics or those of the voltage V_{cr} over the resonant capacities can yield the necessary information to allow each of the sources to optimise its corresponding contribution and maintain a sufficient supply over the network to each load.

20 The invention is not restricted to the embodiments described herein. It will be understood that many variants are possible. For instance and without limitation:

It is noted that the electric supply network according to the invention might in principle be arranged in building
25 rooms having an arbitrary room geometry, such as in a house or in an office, or even outside where inductive coupling has specific benefits, such as less susceptibility to water, cold and the like.

It is further noted that the resonant tank can be formed
30 otherwise, e.g. as a capacitor arranged in parallel with the coil of the electric supply line. Further, the electrical loads might be arranged in parallel with the resonant tank.

The resonant tank can not only be implemented as a first order LC-circuit but also as a higher order circuit including more than two reactive elements.

5 It is also noted that, as an alternative to an inductive connection, one or more electrical loads might be connected to the resonant tank by using an electrically conducting connection without eliminating the operation of the adaptive controller according to the invention.

CONCLUSIES

1. Een werkwijze voor het besturen van de invoer van vermogen in een energie overdragen and inductief netwerk, welke netwerk ten minste te verbinden is met ten minste een energiebron en een inductieve overdracht vertonende opslag en een aantal vermogenconsumerende lasten omvat, welke werkwijze omvat:
– het bepalen van een hoeveelheid door de bron in het netwerk in te voeren energie door adaptief energie te balanceren van de bron (E_{source}) ten opzichte van de energie in het netwerk (E_{network}).

2. De werkwijze volgens conclusie 1, waarbij het netwerk een resonans netwerk is.

3. De werkwijze volgens conclusie 1 of 2, omvattende het variëren van tenminste een besturingsinvoer (u_p) en een balanceerfactor (α) waarbij $\alpha * E_{\text{source}} = E_{\text{network}}$, onder aanname dat $\overline{u_p}^2 \cdot \alpha \equiv \text{constant}$.

4. De werkwijze volgens conclusie 3, verder omvattende het bepalen van een gedragskarakteristiek uit een respons op het variëren, en het bepalen of de gevarieerde tenminste ene van de besturingsinvoer (u_p) en de balanceerfactor (α) moet worden vergroot of verkleind, op basis van de gedragskarakteristiek.

5. De werkwijze volgens conclusie 3 of 4, omvattende het continu variëren van de tenminste ene van de besturingsinvoer (u_p) en de balanceerfactor (α).

6. De werkwijze volgens een willekeurige of meer dan een van de conclusies 3 – 5, verder omvattende het sneller variëren van de tenminste ene van de besturingsinvoer (u_p) en de balanceerfactor (α) dan een willekeurige verandering in een som van het vermogen, dat wordt onttrokken aan het netwerk door de tenminste ene last (ΣP_0).

7. De werkwijze volgens conclusie 6, verder omvattende het afdoende traag variëren van de tenminste ene van de besturingsinvoer (u_p) en de balanceerfactor (α) om een sliding surface toestand te stabiliseren, waarbij de sliding surface toestand een representatie is van een systeem, dat ten minste de ene bron en het netwerk omvat.

8. De werkwijze volgens ten minste conclusie 4, verder omvattende: het bepalen of de gevarieerde van de tenminste ene van de besturingsinvoer (u_p) en de balanceerfactor (α) een onstabiele werking oplevert, en het variëren van de gevarieerde tenminste ene van de

besturingsinvoer (u_p) en de balanceerfactor (α) in een versneld tempo naar een meer stabiele werking.

- 5 9. De werkwijze volgens een willekeurige of meer dan een van de voorgaande conclusies, waarbij oma voor een aantal met het netwerk verbonden begonnen, een afzonderlijke benadering wordt gevolgd voor energiedoorvoer door het netwerk heen en energie, die is opgeslagen in het netwerk.

- 10 10. De werkwijze volgens conclusie 9, verder omvattende het meten van piekverschilwaardes in netwerk stroom of van een resonans de condensator spanning als aanvulling op amplitudemetingen, om adaptieve optimalisatie mogelijk te maken van de verhouding tussen energie, die wordt doorgevoerd door het netwerk heen, en energie, die hierin is opgeslagen, met betrekking tot elke bron afzonderlijk.

- 15 11. Een besturing, welke is geconfigureerd voor het uitvoeren van de werkwijze van een willekeurige of meer dan een van de voorgaande conclusies.

12. Een netwerk, omvattende een besturing volgens conclusie 11.




FIG. 1




FIG. 2




FIG. 3






FIG. 4

**FIG. 5****FIG. 6**




FIG. 7



FIG. 8




FIG. 9A




FIG. 9B




FIG. 9C






FIG. 10

**FIG. 11****FIG. 12**

9/12




FIG. 13








FIG. 14

**FIG. 15****FIG. 16**

FIG. 17FIG. 18




FIG. 19

ABSTRACT

The invention relates to a method of controlling power input into an energy transferring inductive network, the
5 network being at least connectable with at least one energy source and comprising an inductive transfer exhibiting storage and a number of power consuming loads. The method comprises determining an amount of power to be input by the source into the network by adaptively balancing energy of
10 the source (E_{source}) against energy in the network (E_{network}).

Furthermore, the invention also relates to a controller and a network comprising a controller.

SAMENWERKINGSVERDRAG (PCT)

RAPPORT BETREFFENDE NIEUWHEIDSONDERZOEK VAN INTERNATIONAAL TYPE

IDENTIFICATIE VAN DE NATIONALE AANVRAGE	KENMERK VAN DE AANVRAGER OF VAN DE GEMACHTIGDE
	W/2SX38/ML/3
Nederlands aanvraag nr.	Indieningsdatum
2016810	23-05-2016
	Ingeroepen voorrangsdatum
Aanvrager (Naam)	
Optimos Apto B.V.	
Datum van het verzoek voor een onderzoek van internationaal type	Door de instantie voor Internationaal Onderzoek aan het verzoek voor een onderzoek van internationaal type toegekend nr.
24-09-2016	SN67400
I. CLASSIFICATIE VAN HET ONDERWERP (bij toepassing van verschillende classificaties, alle classificatiesymbolen opgeven)	
Volgens de internationale classificatie (IPC)	
H02J50/10	
II. ONDERZOCHE GEBIEDEN VAN DE TECHNIEK	
Onderzochte minimumdocumentatie	
Classificatiesysteem	Classificatiesymbolen
IPC	H02J
Onderzochte andere documentatie dan de minimum documentatie, voor zover dergelijke documenten in de onderzochte gebieden zijn opgenomen	
III.	☐ GEEN ONDERZOEK MOGELIJK VOOR BEPAALDE CONCLUSIES (opmerkingen op aanvullingsblad)
IV.	☐ GEBREK AAN EENHEID VAN UITVINDING (opmerkingen op aanvullingsblad)

**ONDERZOEKSRAPPORT BETREFFENDE HET
RESULTAAT VAN HET ONDERZOEK NAAR DE STAND
VAN DE TECHNIEK VAN HET INTERNATIONALE TYPE**

Nummer van het verzoek om een onderzoek naar
de stand van de techniek

NL 2016810

A. CLASSIFICATIE VAN HET ONDERWERP
INV. H02J50/10
ADD.

Volgens de Internationale Classificatie van octrooien (IPC) of zowel volgens de nationale classificatie als volgens de IPC.

B. ONDERZOCHETE GEBIEDEN VAN DE TECHNIEK

Onderzochte minimum documentatie (classificatie gevolgd door classificatiesymbolen)
H02J

Onderzochte andere documentatie dan de minimum documentatie, voor dergelijke documenten, voor zover dergelijke documenten in de onderzochte gebieden zijn opgenomen

Tijdens het onderzoek geraadpleegde elektronische gegevensbestanden (naam van de gegevensbestanden en, waar uitvoerbaar, gebruikte trefwoorden)

EPO-Internal, WPI Data

C. VAN BELANG GEACHTE DOCUMENTEN

Categorie	Geïsoleerde documenten, eventueel met aanduiding van speciaal van belang zijnde passages	Van belang voor conclusie nr.
X	WO 2008/149275 A1 (KONINKL PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NV [NL]; OOSTVOGELS LUDWIG [NL]; MARINUS A) 11 december 2008 (2008-12-11) * bladzijde 2, regel 20 - bladzijde 4, regel 13; conclusies 1,7; figuur 1 *	1-12
X	US 2007/236159 A1 (BELAND ROBERT [CA]) 11 oktober 2007 (2007-10-11) * alinea [0042] - alinea [0049]; figuur 2 *	1-12
X	EP 0 264 135 A2 (TOSHIBA KK [JP]) 20 april 1988 (1988-04-20) * kolom 3, regel 6 - kolom 4, regel 16; figuur 1 *	1-12



Verdere documenten worden vermeld in het vervolg van vak C.



Leden van dezelfde octrooifamilie zijn vermeld in een bijlage

* Speciale categorieën van aangehaalde documenten

"A" niet tot de categorie X of Y behorende literatuur die de stand van de techniek beschrijft

"D" in de octrooiaanvraag vermeld

"E" eerdere octrooi(aanvraag), gepubliceerd op of na de indieningsdatum, waarin dezelfde uitvinding wordt beschreven

"L" om andere redenen vermelde literatuur

"O" niet-schriftelijke stand van de techniek

"P" tussen de voorrangsdatum en de indieningsdatum gepubliceerde literatuur

"T" na de indieningsdatum of de voorrangsdatum gepubliceerde literatuur die niet bezwarend is voor de octrooiaanvraag, maar wordt vermeld ter verheldering van de theorie of het principe dat ten grondslag ligt aan de uitvinding

"X" de conclusie wordt als niet nieuw of niet inventief beschouwd ten opzichte van deze literatuur

"Y" de conclusie wordt als niet inventief beschouwd ten opzichte van de combinatie van deze literatuur met andere geïsoleerde literatuur van dezelfde categorie, waarbij de combinatie voor de vakman voor de hand liggend wordt geacht

"Z" lid van dezelfde octrooifamilie of overeenkomstige octrooipublicatie

Datum waarop het onderzoek naar de stand van de techniek van internationaal type werd voltooid

22 november 2016

Verzenddatum van het rapport van het onderzoek naar de stand van de techniek van internationaal type

Naam en adres van de instantie

European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL - 2280 HV Rijswijk
Tel. (+31-70) 340-2040
Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016

De bevoegde ambtenaar

Kreutz, Joseph

**ONDERZOEKSRAPPORT BETREFFENDE HET
RESULTAAT VAN HET ONDERZOEK NAAR DE STAND
VAN DE TECHNIEK VAN HET INTERNATIONALE TYPE**

Nummer van het verzoek om een onderzoek naar
de stand van de techniek

NL 2016810

C.(Vervolg). VAN BELANG GEACHTTE DOCUMENTEN

Categorie *	Geciteerde documenten, eventueel met aanduiding van speciaal van belang zijnde passages	Van belang voor conclusie nr.
X	EP 0 587 923 A1 (U R D CO LTD [JP]) 23 maart 1994 (1994-03-23) * kolom 3, regel 21 - kolom 5, regel 29; conclusie 4; figuur 1 * -----	1-12

**ONDERZOEKSRAPPORT BETREFFENDE HET
RESULTAAT VAN HET ONDERZOEK NAAR DE STAND
VAN DE TECHNIEK VAN HET INTERNATIONALE TYPE**

Informatie over leden van dezelfde octrooifamilie

Nummer van het verzoek om een onderzoek naar
de stand van de techniek

NL 2016810

In het rapport genoemd octrooigescrift	Datum van publicatie	Overeenkomend(e) geschrift(en)	Datum van publicatie
WO 2008149275	A1	11-12-2008	TW 200917902 A 16-04-2009
			WO 2008149275 A1 11-12-2008
US 2007236159	A1	11-10-2007	EP 1845755 A2 17-10-2007
			US 2007236159 A1 11-10-2007
			US 2012001564 A1 05-01-2012
EP 0264135	A2	20-04-1988	DE 3783551 D1 25-02-1993
			DE 3783551 T2 15-07-1993
			EP 0264135 A2 20-04-1988
			US 4939381 A 03-07-1990
EP 0587923	A1	23-03-1994	GEEN

WRITTEN OPINION

File No. SN67400	Filing date (day/month/year) 23.05.2016	Priority date (day/month/year)	Application No. NL2016810
International Patent Classification (IPC) INV. H02J50/10			
Applicant Optimos Apto B.V.			

This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the application

	Examiner Kreutz, Joseph
--	-----------------------------------

WRITTEN OPINION

Application number

NL2016810

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. This opinion has been established on the basis of the latest set of claims filed before the start of the search.
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ on paper
 - ☐ in electronic form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the application in electronic form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

Box No. V Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty	Yes: Claims	2-12
	No: Claims	1
Inventive step	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-12
Industrial applicability	Yes: Claims	1-12
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

ITEM V

1. Cited documents.

Reference is made to the following documents:

- D1 WO 2008/149275 A1 (KONINKL PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NV [NL]; OOSTVOGELS LUDWIG [NL]; MARINUS A) 11 december 2008 (2008-12-11)
- D2 US 2007/236159 A1 (BELAND ROBERT [CA]) 11 oktober 2007 (2007-10-11)
- D3 EP 0 264 135 A2 (TOSHIBA KK [JP]) 20 april 1988 (1988-04-20)
- D4 EP 0 587 923 A1 (U R D CO LTD [JP]) 23 maart 1994 (1994-03-23)

2. Independent claim 1.

D1 (see description p.2 line 20 - p. 4 line 13 and fig. 1; claim 7) discloses a

werkwijze voor het besturen van de invoer van vermogen in een energie overdragen and inductief netwerk 120 ... 152), welke netwerk ten minste te verbinden is met ten minste een energiebron (110) en een inductieve overdracht vertonende opslag en een aantal vermogenconsumerende lasten (150) omvat welke werkwijze omvat het bepalen van een hoeveelheid door de bron in het netwerk in te voeren energie door adaptief energie te balanceren van de bron ten opzichte van de energie in het netwerk (claim 7 of D1).

The subject matter of claim 1 is therefore not novel.

Documents D2 (fig. 2; description paragraphs [0042] - [0049]), D3 (fig. 1; description col. 3 line 6 - col. 4 line 16) and D4 (fig. 1; description col. 3 line 21 - col. 5 line 29; claim 4) are of an equivalent relevance to the novelty of the subject matter of claim 1.

2. Claim 2.

The use of a resonant circuit is suggested by the schematic diagram of D1, fig. 1 (120, 155, 115). The subject matter of this claim is therefore not novel.

3. Claim 3.

The text of this claim apparently is truncated. It is therefore not possible to give a meaningful opinion about its subject matter.

4. Claims 4-11.

These claims refer to ways to carry out the method defined in claim 1 which appear obvious in this technical field and are therefore obvious to the skilled man.

In particular, depending on the problem to solve, the skilled man can define the way to define the driving of such a system (claims 4-5) on basis of the technical context and of his experience.

5. Claim 12.

The use of a control system as defined in the preceding claims which is not novel nor inventive in a network is obviously per se not inventive.