Journal of Progress in Engineering and Physical Science
ISSN 2709-4006
www.paradigmpress.org/jpeps
Volume 4 Number 6 December 2025

Grid Stability Risks Under High Penetration of Renewable Energy

Qiming Zhao[1], Liang Chen[1], Yonghao Liu[1] & Haoran Wang[1]

[1] Nanjing University of Science and Technology, Nanjing, China
Correspondence: Haoran Wang, Nanjing University of Science and Technology, Nanjing, China.

doi:10.63593/JPEPS.2025.12.05

Abstract

The increasing penetration of renewable energy fundamentally alters the structural and dynamic properties of modern power systems. As inverter-based generation replaces synchronous machines, traditional assumptions regarding inertia, control hierarchy, and network behavior become less reliable. This paper examines grid stability risks under high renewable penetration from a non-empirical, system-oriented perspective. Rather than focusing on specific technologies or case studies, the analysis explores how structural transformation, control interaction, and system coupling reshape the conditions under which stability is maintained. The paper discusses key risk mechanisms related to low-inertia frequency dynamics, voltage behavior in inverter-dominated networks, and the interaction of heterogeneous control strategies. It further examines how coupling among frequency, voltage, network structure, and control logic can amplify local disturbances into system-wide stability challenges. By situating these risks within the broader context of the energy transition, the paper argues that instability should be understood as a structural feature of transitional power systems rather than as an exceptional failure. The analysis highlights the limitations of component-level optimization and emphasizes the need for flexibility, coordination, and adaptive design at the system level. This conceptual approach provides a framework for understanding grid stability as an emergent system property in renewable-dominated power systems.

Keywords: grid stability, renewable energy penetration, low-inertia power systems, inverter-dominated networks, system coupling, energy transition

1. Introduction

The expansion of renewable energy generation has reshaped the structure of modern power systems. Wind and solar power, once treated as supplementary sources, now occupy a central position in electricity supply in many regions. Policy commitments to decarbonization, concerns over long-term energy security, and continuous cost reductions have accelerated this transition. As a result, renewable penetration has reached levels at which it directly influences system operation, planning practices, and reliability considerations. Power systems are no longer organized around a small number of large, synchronous generators operating under relatively stable conditions.

With this shift, questions of grid stability take on a different character. Traditional stability concepts were developed in a context where inertia was abundant, generation was centralized, and control structures followed clear hierarchical lines. Frequency and voltage behavior could be interpreted through well-established models, and system response to disturbances followed familiar patterns. When a large share of generation is inverter-based, variable, and widely distributed, these assumptions no longer hold in the same way. Stability challenges become less about isolated disturbances and more about how the system behaves as a whole under changing structural conditions.

In renewable-dominated grids, instability does not arise only from fluctuations in wind or solar output. More fundamental changes affect how disturbances propagate, how control actions interact, and how quickly the system can restore balance. Reduced physical inertia alters frequency dynamics. Distributed control systems introduce multiple response paths that may not align in time or direction. Network behavior becomes more complex as power flows vary across locations and operating states. These changes reshape the conditions under which stable operation can be maintained.

Much of the existing literature addresses these challenges through specific technical measures. Advanced inverter control, energy storage deployment, and network reinforcement are often presented as solutions to stability concerns. While such measures play an important role, they tend to focus on particular components or operational scenarios. They offer limited insight into why stability risks emerge at the system level and why similar technical interventions may succeed in one context and fail in another. Practical experience increasingly shows that stability problems in high-renewable systems are not confined to single assets or locations. They develop through interactions among multiple elements and may spread beyond their point of origin.

This paper approaches grid stability from a different angle. It treats stability risks under high renewable penetration as a systemic issue rooted in structural and dynamic changes to the power system. The analysis does not evaluate individual technologies or rely on empirical case studies. Instead, it adopts a non-empirical, conceptual perspective aimed at clarifying how stability is redefined when renewable generation becomes dominant. By examining the mechanisms through which reduced inertia, altered control structures, and increased system complexity shape grid behavior, the paper seeks to explain why traditional stability frameworks face growing limitations. This system-oriented perspective provides a basis for understanding stability risks as an inherent part of the energy transition, rather than as isolated technical problems requiring ad hoc solutions.

2. Grid Stability as a System Property

Grid stability is often discussed through measurable technical indicators, including frequency deviation, voltage range, or recovery time after a disturbance. These indicators are useful for monitoring system performance, yet they describe outcomes rather than underlying conditions. When treated in isolation, they risk reducing stability to a checklist of thresholds, overlooking the deeper system behavior that produces stable or unstable operation. From a broader perspective, grid stability refers to the capacity of a power system to continue operating within acceptable limits when exposed to disturbances, while maintaining coordinated behavior among its major components.

Stability is not produced by a single element. It emerges from the interaction of physical characteristics, control structures, network configuration, and operational rules. Physical inertia affects how quickly frequency changes when supply and demand are unbalanced. Control mechanisms determine how the system reacts once a deviation occurs. Network topology shapes how power and disturbances move across the grid. Operational logic defines how decisions are made, prioritized, and implemented in real time. None of these factors alone can guarantee stability. Stable operation depends on how well they function together.

In traditional power systems dominated by synchronous generators, this interaction was relatively consistent and predictable. Rotating machines supplied physical inertia by design. Control systems followed clear hierarchical structures, with centralized decision-making and well-defined response paths. Power flows were largely unidirectional, and system behavior under disturbance had been studied and codified over decades. Under these conditions, stability analysis could rely on assumptions that inertia was plentiful, control responses followed expected sequences, and disturbances remained confined to limited areas of the network.

As renewable energy penetration increases, these assumptions lose reliability. Inverter-based generation changes the source of system response to imbalance. Inertia is no longer an inherent physical feature of generation but a function of control design and implementation. System reaction to disturbances becomes more dependent on software settings and coordination among devices. Control actions occur across multiple locations and time scales, without a single dominant hierarchy. Power flows vary more frequently and in more directions, reflecting the distributed nature of renewable generation.

This shift complicates the interpretation of stability indicators. Frequency or voltage deviations may reflect not only local issues but also interaction effects between control systems and network structure. A stable reading at one location does not guarantee system-wide robustness. Stability problems may develop gradually through interaction and coupling, rather than appearing as immediate threshold violations. Relying solely on traditional indicators can mask these processes until instability becomes difficult to contain.

Viewing grid stability as a system property helps explain why stability risks in renewable-dominated grids often appear sudden or unexpected. It directs attention away from individual components and toward patterns of interaction that shape system behavior over time. This perspective also clarifies why technical fixes applied in isolation may have limited effect. Addressing stability under high renewable penetration requires understanding how inertia, control, network structure, and operational practice jointly define system response. Only through this system-level view can the changing nature of grid stability be adequately understood.

3. Structural Transformation of Power Systems Under High Renewable Penetration

The move toward a high share of renewable energy reshapes the basic structure of power systems in ways that extend beyond changes in the generation mix. It alters how electricity is produced, how imbalance is managed, and how different parts of the system interact during normal operation and disturbance. Renewable energy is no longer an auxiliary source added to an otherwise stable framework. It becomes a defining element of system behavior. As this shift takes place, the structural conditions that once supported predictable and robust grid operation are reconfigured.

A central aspect of this transformation concerns the source and role of system inertia. In conventional power systems, inertia was an inherent physical feature provided by large synchronous generators. The rotating mass of these machines slowed the rate at which frequency changed following a disturbance. This buffering effect was continuous and did not depend on measurement or control logic. As inverter-based renewable generation replaces synchronous machines, this physical inertia declines. The system's immediate response to imbalance becomes faster and less damped. Frequency behavior depends increasingly on how controls are designed and coordinated, rather than on mechanical properties embedded in generation assets. As a result, frequency dynamics become more sensitive to operating conditions and to differences in control implementation across the system.

Variability in power output further contributes to structural change. Wind and solar generation respond directly to environmental conditions that evolve over time and space. These variations are not occasional disruptions but persistent features of operation. The system must accommodate frequent changes in supply that occur on multiple time scales. Balancing resources are activated more often, and operating points shift continuously. Daily operation no longer follows stable patterns built around predictable generation schedules. Instead, flexibility becomes a defining requirement, influencing how reserves are planned, how networks are utilized, and how control actions are prioritized.

The spatial organization of the power system also changes in important ways. Renewable generators are typically distributed across wide geographic areas and connected at different voltage levels, including distribution networks that were once largely passive. Generation and consumption are no longer clearly separated. Power flows change direction depending on local conditions, and network loading varies more widely across regions. This spatial redistribution weakens the traditional top-down structure of power delivery and increases interdependence among network segments. Disturbances and control actions at one location can affect conditions elsewhere through complex network paths.

The role of generation units within the system is reshaped as well. Conventional power plants were designed to provide stability support as part of their normal operation. Their physical characteristics and position within control hierarchies made them central actors in frequency and voltage regulation. Renewable generation units rely on control logic to provide similar functions. Their contribution to stability depends on software settings, operating limits, and interaction with other devices. This shift changes how responsibility for stability is distributed across the system. Support functions that were once implicit become conditional and design-dependent.

Taken together, these developments form a new system structure in which stability is less a property of individual components and more a result of interaction. Reduced physical inertia, persistent variability, and distributed generation alter how disturbances are absorbed and how control responses combine. Stability risks emerge from the way these elements interact over time, rather than from isolated weaknesses. Understanding this structural transformation is essential for explaining why stability challenges become more frequent and less predictable under high renewable penetration, and why traditional assumptions about system behavior are increasingly difficult to maintain.

4. Core Stability Risk Mechanisms

This chapter examines the mechanisms through which stability risks take shape when renewable energy reaches a high share of system generation. The focus is not on individual technologies or operational events, but on how structural change and control behavior alter the way the system responds to imbalance. Among these mechanisms, frequency stability under low-inertia conditions represents one of the most fundamental sources of vulnerability.

4.1 Frequency Stability Under Low-Inertia Conditions

Frequency stability reflects the ability of a power system to contain and recover from imbalances between generation and demand. In conventional systems, this ability relied heavily on the physical inertia of synchronous generators. Rotating masses stored kinetic energy, which slowed frequency change immediately after a disturbance. This delay provided a natural buffer, allowing control actions to take effect before frequency deviations reached critical levels.

As renewable penetration increases, this buffering function weakens. Inverter-based generation does not contribute inertia in the same physical sense. The system's initial frequency response becomes faster and more abrupt, even when the size of a disturbance remains unchanged. A given loss of generation or load produces a steeper rate of change of frequency, reducing the time available for corrective action. Frequency deviation therefore becomes more difficult to arrest once it begins.

The reduction of inertia also changes the role of control systems in frequency regulation. In traditional grids, primary frequency response supplemented inertia rather than replacing it. Under low-inertia conditions, control systems carry a larger share of responsibility for stabilizing frequency. Their effectiveness depends on sensing accuracy, response speed, and coordination across multiple devices. Delays, mismatches, or limited response capacity can directly translate into larger frequency excursions.

Low inertia also affects frequency recovery. In conventional systems, frequency restoration followed a relatively smooth trajectory shaped by predictable generator behavior. In renewable-dominated systems, recovery depends on the collective response of diverse control schemes. Some inverter-based resources may respond aggressively, while others may remain passive or constrained by design limits. The resulting response can be uneven, leading to overshoot, oscillation, or prolonged deviation from nominal frequency.

Another source of risk lies in the spatial distribution of inertia and control capability. As synchronous generation is displaced unevenly across regions, inertia becomes concentrated in fewer locations. Local disturbances can therefore have system-wide frequency effects, even when network constraints would previously have limited their impact. Frequency behavior becomes less tied to physical proximity and more dependent on system-wide interaction.

These changes reveal why frequency stability under high renewable penetration cannot be understood through disturbance size alone. The same event can produce very different outcomes depending on inertia distribution, control coordination, and operating conditions.

Frequency instability emerges not as an isolated failure, but as a result of structural dependence on fast, tightly coupled control responses. This makes frequency stability one of the most sensitive and revealing indicators of system vulnerability in low-inertia power systems.

4.2 Voltage Stability in Inverter-Dominated Networks

Voltage stability concerns the ability of a power system to maintain acceptable voltage levels under normal operation and following disturbances. In conventional power systems, voltage regulation was closely tied to the physical behavior of synchronous generators and passive network elements. Reactive power support followed well-understood relationships between voltage, current, and generator excitation, and voltage control was largely localized, with predictable interaction across the network.

In inverter-dominated networks, the logic of voltage regulation changes in fundamental ways. Inverter-based resources do not respond to voltage variations through inherent electromagnetic behavior. Instead, voltage support is provided through control algorithms that determine how and when reactive power is injected or absorbed. This shift replaces continuous physical response with discrete, rule-based action. Voltage behavior therefore depends less on system physics and more on control design, parameter settings, and coordination among devices.

Local voltage stability becomes more sensitive under these conditions. In distribution-level and sub-transmission networks with high concentrations of renewable generation, small changes in power output or network conditions can lead to significant voltage variation. Inverters may reach reactive power limits quickly, especially when operating near maximum active power output. Once these limits are reached, voltage support capacity drops sharply, increasing the risk of local voltage collapse.

The system-wide implications of local voltage behavior are also altered. Inverter controls often operate independently, responding to local measurements without full awareness of broader network conditions. When many devices follow similar control rules, their combined response can amplify voltage deviations rather than suppress them. Local corrective actions may interact in unexpected ways, creating patterns of voltage fluctuation that spread across network segments.

Voltage stability risk in inverter-dominated networks is further shaped by the coupling between active and reactive power control. In some operating states, efforts to regulate voltage through reactive power adjustment can constrain active power output, affecting overall power balance. This coupling introduces trade-offs that were less pronounced in conventional systems, where generators could draw on mechanical reserves and excitation systems with greater flexibility.

These characteristics give voltage instability a system-level dimension that extends beyond isolated weak points. Local voltage problems may signal broader coordination issues within the network, reflecting limits in control interaction rather than in component capability alone. Under high renewable penetration, voltage stability becomes less a question of individual device performance and more a question of how control strategies collectively shape network behavior.

4.3 Control Interaction and Oscillation Risks

As power systems move toward higher levels of renewable penetration, control becomes a central element in maintaining stable operation. Inverter-based resources rely on control algorithms to regulate frequency, voltage, and power output. At the same time, conventional generators, energy storage systems, and network devices continue to operate under their own control schemes. The coexistence of these heterogeneous strategies creates a control environment that is more layered and less predictable than in traditional grids.

In conventional systems, control interactions were largely structured within clear hierarchies. Primary, secondary, and tertiary controls operated on distinct time scales, and interactions among them were well understood. Under inverter-dominated conditions, control actions occur across overlapping time frames and are distributed across many devices. Fast-acting inverter controls respond within milliseconds, while other controls operate more slowly. When these responses are not aligned, their interaction can produce unintended dynamic effects.

Oscillation risks arise when control loops influence one another in reinforcing ways. A response intended to correct a local deviation may trigger a reaction elsewhere in the system, which then feeds back into the original control loop. When multiple devices follow similar control logic, synchronized responses can amplify disturbances rather than dampen them. This effect becomes more pronounced as the number of inverter-based resources increases.

Resonance risk is also heightened by the growing reliance on power electronics. Inverter controls introduce new dynamic modes that were absent in systems dominated by synchronous machines. These modes can interact with network impedance characteristics and with other control systems. Under certain operating conditions, small disturbances may excite these modes, leading to sustained oscillations that are difficult to predict using conventional stability models.

The lack of a unified control perspective further contributes to instability risk. Devices are often designed and configured independently, optimized for local performance rather than for system-wide interaction. Without coordination, control parameters that are stable in isolation may interact poorly when deployed at scale. Oscillation and resonance thus emerge not from faulty design of individual components, but from the combined behavior of multiple control strategies operating simultaneously.

These interaction effects help explain why oscillatory instability becomes more common in renewable-dominated grids. The risk does not lie in any single control scheme, but in the structure of control coexistence itself. As control complexity increases, stability depends less on the robustness of individual controllers and more on how their actions combine across the system.

5. System Coupling and Risk Amplification

In power systems with high renewable penetration, stability problems rarely remain limited to a single variable or a specific location. Frequency behavior, voltage behavior, and control response are intertwined through both physical connections and operational logic. What begins as a localized disturbance can propagate through these links, changing form and scale as it moves across the system. In this setting, risk amplification is less a consequence of disturbance magnitude and more a result of how tightly system elements are coupled.

A key source of coupling lies in the relationship between active power, reactive power, and control action. Frequency reflects the balance between active power supply and demand, while voltage depends on reactive power support and network conditions. In inverter-dominated systems, these functions are often managed through integrated control schemes. A control action intended to correct frequency deviation may change reactive power output, altering local voltage conditions. In response, voltage control mechanisms may adjust operating points or limit active power injection. Through this process, a correction in one domain can introduce stress in another, creating a chain of dependent responses.

The physical structure of the network further amplifies these interactions. Distributed renewable generation increases the number of injection points and weakens the traditional separation between transmission and distribution functions. Bidirectional power flows mean that changes at one node can influence conditions elsewhere in less predictable ways. Voltage fluctuations, impedance characteristics, and power flow redistribution can trigger additional responses in nearby devices. As these responses accumulate, the disturbance may spread beyond its point of origin and affect larger portions of the system.

Control logic plays an equally important role in shaping how disturbances evolve. Many inverter-based resources rely on local measurements and predefined thresholds to determine their response. When similar control logic is deployed widely, devices may react in parallel to the same signal. This synchronized behavior can intensify system stress rather than alleviate it. Instead of damping a deviation, collective action may deepen it or shift it into another stability domain. In such cases, amplification emerges from coordination effects rather than from the failure of individual components.

Timing and response strength also influence amplification. In tightly coupled systems, small delays in sensing or response can allow deviations to grow before corrective action takes effect. Conversely, rapid and aggressive responses may overshoot, pushing the system toward oscillatory behavior. Because multiple control loops operate simultaneously, mismatches in response speed or magnitude can interact in ways that are difficult to anticipate. These dynamics reduce tolerance for error and increase sensitivity to operating conditions.

Coupling also affects how stability margins are perceived. Traditional assessment methods often assume that frequency, voltage, and control behavior can be evaluated separately. In renewable-dominated systems, these separations become less meaningful. A condition that appears stable when examined through one indicator may conceal growing stress in another domain. Instability may develop gradually through accumulation rather than appearing as a sudden threshold violation.

From a system perspective, risk amplification reflects the combined effect of interaction, timing, and structure. Local disturbances gain significance as they move through interconnected frequency, voltage, and control processes. Understanding stability under high renewable penetration therefore requires attention to how these processes reinforce one another across the network. Stability can no longer be assessed by examining isolated components or single indicators. It must be understood as an emergent outcome shaped by the structure of coupling and the logic of coordinated response.

6. Implications for Grid Operation and Design Thinking

The stability risks observed in renewable-dominated power systems indicate that long-standing approaches to grid operation and design are under growing pressure. Many operational routines and planning principles were developed in environments where generation patterns were stable and system behavior could be anticipated within relatively narrow limits. Under high renewable penetration, uncertainty becomes a persistent feature of daily operation rather than an occasional disturbance. This shift challenges the assumption that stability can be ensured through predefined operating rules and fixed response strategies.

One key implication concerns the limits of component-level optimization. Grid operation has traditionally emphasized improving the performance of individual assets, whether by enhancing generator efficiency, accelerating control response, or tightening operational margins. In systems characterized by strong coupling and interaction, these improvements do not automatically enhance overall stability. A control scheme that appears robust when evaluated in isolation may interact poorly with other schemes once deployed across the system. Local optimization can therefore introduce unintended stress at the system level. Operational decision-making must move beyond the assumption that aggregate stability emerges naturally from well-performing components.

Operational flexibility emerges as a core requirement rather than a supplementary capability. High renewable penetration introduces continuous variation in supply conditions and operating states. Fixed schedules and rigid response hierarchies offer limited protection against instability in this environment. Operators require the ability to reconfigure system operation as conditions change, adjusting control priorities, reserve allocation, and response intensity in real time. Flexibility must be embedded in the structure of the system, not confined to specific assets or emergency measures.

Coordination across control layers becomes equally important. As control responsibility shifts from a small number of centralized generators to a large number of distributed devices, maintaining coherent system behavior depends on how these controls interact. Differences in response speed, control objectives, and parameter settings can undermine stability even when each controller operates as designed. Without explicit coordination principles, distributed control actions may conflict or reinforce one another in undesirable ways. Effective coordination requires a shared understanding of system goals and response priorities, rather than reliance on implicit hierarchy or after-the-fact adjustment.

Design thinking faces parallel challenges. Traditional grid design emphasized robustness under a limited set of expected operating scenarios, often focusing on worst-case events defined in advance. In renewable-dominated systems, operating conditions vary more widely, and rare events are harder to distinguish from normal variability. Design choices must therefore account for interaction and uncertainty from the outset. Network structure, control architecture, and operational rules should be evaluated together, with attention to how they shape system behavior over time.

These implications point toward a broader shift in how stability is approached. Rather than attempting to eliminate uncertainty, grid operation and design must be capable of functioning within it. Stability depends on the system's ability to adapt to changing conditions while preserving coherent behavior. This capacity cannot be achieved through single technologies or isolated improvements. It requires an integrated approach that treats adaptability, coordination, and system awareness as fundamental principles guiding both operation and design in renewable-dominated power systems.

7. Discussion

When placed within the broader process of energy transition, grid stability risks should be understood as part of a long-term structural shift rather than as isolated technical failures or temporary side effects. The transition toward low-carbon energy systems is not limited to changing fuel sources. It involves a reorganization of how power systems generate, transmit, and regulate electricity. As synchronous machines are gradually replaced by renewable and inverter-based resources, the underlying operating logic of the grid is redefined. Stability challenges arise from this redefinition, not from individual errors or incomplete deployment of technology.

Within this context, instability represents a structural condition rather than an abnormal outcome. Power systems were originally designed around predictable generation, strong physical coupling, and centralized coordination. High renewable penetration alters these conditions. Physical inertia is reduced, control becomes more distributed, and system response depends increasingly on programmed behavior. These changes reshape the balance between predictability and responsiveness, making stability more sensitive to interaction and coordination. Risk emerges as the system adapts to functions it was not originally structured to perform.

Viewing stability problems as isolated incidents can obscure the mechanisms that produce them. Corrective actions applied at specific locations or times may resolve immediate operational issues, yet leave deeper interaction patterns unchanged. As renewable penetration continues to grow, similar problems may surface elsewhere in the system or reappear under different operating conditions. This repetition suggests that stability risks are rooted in system structure rather than in particular technologies or operational choices.

The energy transition also introduces a prolonged period of coexistence between legacy and emerging technologies. During this phase, conventional generators, inverter-based resources, and various control philosophies operate side by side. Differences in response characteristics, time scales, and design assumptions create conditions in which coordination becomes more difficult. Stability risks reveal these points of misalignment, highlighting where existing frameworks no longer match evolving system behavior. Such risks are likely to persist as long as system architecture and operational practice remain in transition.

Temporal complexity further shapes how stability risks unfold. Changes to power systems occur incrementally, while operating requirements remain continuous. Systems must maintain reliability while undergoing ongoing modification, which limits the possibility of clean separation between old and new operating regimes. Stability issues may develop gradually as interaction patterns shift, making them harder to detect through short-term performance metrics alone. Understanding these dynamics requires attention to long-term trends rather than isolated events.

From this perspective, effective responses to stability challenges depend on system-level understanding. Incremental fixes and localized upgrades address specific symptoms but do not resolve the conditions that generate instability. Greater emphasis is needed on how system architecture, control logic, and operational practice evolve together. Stability becomes a question of coherence across changing system elements, rather than of compliance with fixed technical thresholds. Recognizing stability risks as an inherent aspect of the energy transition helps move the focus from reactive intervention toward anticipatory design and long-term operational alignment.

8. Conclusion

This paper has explored grid stability risks under conditions of high renewable energy penetration from a system-oriented and non-empirical perspective. Rather than focusing on specific technologies, case studies, or operational events, the analysis has traced how stability risks arise from deeper structural changes in power system organization. As renewable generation moves from the periphery to the core of electricity supply, long-standing assumptions about inertia, control hierarchy, and network behavior no longer hold in the same way.

The discussion has shown that stability challenges cannot be attributed to a single cause. Frequency instability under low-inertia conditions reflects the loss of passive physical buffering that once shaped system response. Voltage instability in inverter-dominated networks reveals how control-dependent behavior replaces inherent electrical characteristics. Control interaction and oscillation risks emerge from the coexistence of multiple control strategies operating across different time scales. These mechanisms are interconnected, and their effects are amplified through system coupling rather than confined to local disturbances.

A key insight of this study is that stability risks should be understood as structural outcomes of the energy transition. As power systems evolve, old and new operating logics coexist, often without full alignment. Instability arises not because renewable technologies are flawed, but because system architecture, control design, and operational practice are adjusting at different speeds. During this period of transition, uncertainty and interaction become defining features of system behavior.

The analysis also highlights the limits of traditional responses to stability problems. Technical upgrades and component-level optimization remain important, but they do not address the full range of system-level interactions that shape stability outcomes. Improvements applied in isolation may even introduce new forms of vulnerability when deployed across a highly coupled system. Stability therefore depends less on eliminating individual weaknesses and more on managing interaction, coordination, and adaptability across the grid.

From an operational and design perspective, this implies a need to rethink how stability is pursued. Flexibility must be treated as a system-wide attribute rather than as a property of selected assets. Coordination among control schemes must be addressed explicitly rather than assumed. Design choices should account for evolving operating conditions and interaction effects, rather than optimizing performance under fixed assumptions. Stability in renewable-dominated grids depends on the capacity of the system to respond coherently to change.

By framing grid stability as a system property shaped by long-term structural transformation, this paper offers a way to interpret stability risks as an integral part of the energy transition. This perspective shifts attention from reactive problem-solving toward anticipatory understanding of system behavior. Future research may build on this approach by developing analytical frameworks that better capture interaction and uncertainty, and by examining how emerging grid architectures can support stable operation as renewable penetration continues to rise.

References

Anderson, P. M., & Fouad, A. A. (2003). *Power system control and stability* (2nd ed.). Piscataway, NJ: IEEE Press.

Bevrani, H., François, B., & Ise, T. (2017). *Microgrid dynamics and control*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Bialek, J. (2019). What does the GB power outage on 9 August 2019 tell us about the future of the electricity system? *Energy Policy*, *146*, 111821.

Debnath, S., et al. (2021). Control interactions and oscillations in inverter-dominated power systems. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, *36*(6), 5473–5485.

Dörfler, F., Simpson-Porco, J. W., & Bullo, F. (2016). Electrical networks and algebraic graph theory: Models, properties, and applications. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, *106*(5), 977–1005.

ENTSO-E. (2018). *High penetration of power electronic interfaced power sources and the potential contribution of grid forming converters*. Brussels: ENTSO-E.

Hatziargyriou, N. (Ed.). (2014). *Microgrids: Architectures and control*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.

IEEE Power & Energy Society. (2020). *IEEE PES task force on inverter-based resources*. IEEE.

Kundur, P. (1994). *Power system stability and control*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Machowski, J., Bialek, J. W., & Bumby, J. R. (2008). *Power system dynamics: Stability and control* (2nd ed.). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Markovic, U., et al. (2019). Understanding small-signal stability of low-inertia systems. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, *34*(5), 3793–3805.

Milano, F., Dörfler, F., Hug, G., Hill, D. J., & Verbič, G. (2018). Foundations and challenges of low-inertia systems. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, *107*(11), 2143–2166.

Morales, J. M., Conejo, A. J., Madsen, H., Pinson, P., & Zugno, M. (2014). *Integrating renewables in electricity markets: Operational problems*. New York, NY: Springer.

Poolla, B. K., Groß, D., & Dörfler, F. (2017). Placement and implementation of grid-forming and grid-following virtual inertia and fast frequency response. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, *32*(4), 2930–2940.

Rohden, M., Sorge, A., Timme, M., & Witthaut, D. (2012). Self-organized synchronization in decentralized power grids. *Physical Review Letters*, *109*(6), 064101.

Schäfer, B., Matthiae, M., Timme, M., & Witthaut, D. (2015). Decentral smart grid control: Phase shifts and stability. *New Journal of Physics*, *17*(1), 015002.

Tamrakar, U., Shrestha, D., Maharjan, M., Bhattarai, B. P., Hansen, T. M., & Tonkoski, R. (2017). Virtual inertia: Current trends and future directions. *Applied Sciences*, *7*(7), 654.

Ulbig, A., Borsche, T. S., & Andersson, G. (2014). Impact of low rotational inertia on power system stability and operation. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, *47*(3), 7290–7297.

van Hertem, D., Gomis-Bellmunt, O., & Liang, J. (Eds.). (2016). *HVDC grids: For offshore and supergrid of the future*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Zhou, Y., Mancarella, P., Mutale, J., & Strbac, G. (2016). Modeling and assessment of the contribution of demand response to power system flexibility. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, *31*(4), 2711–2720.