Transmission Loss Allocation (TLA) among the power system through Function Decomposition (LFD) Algorithm: A Review

Bhawna[1], Monika Dhankhar[2]

[1]M. Tech. Scholar, [2]Assistant Professor
CBS Group of Institutions, Jhajjar, Haryana
Maharishi Dayanand University, Rohtak.

***Abstract*: In this survey paper different Transmission Loss Allocation methodology are considered. It is a centralized issue in today's deregulated market. With the increase of the competition level in electricity markets the problem of Transmission Loss Allocation (TLA) among the power system agents has become more important. Which is not available in the literature, has been made is the comparison between them. The methods considered in this thesis is Loss Function Decomposition (LFD) methods. Algorithms have been implemented for these methods. These methodologies are illustrated on IEEE 3-bus system, IEEE-4 bus system and IEEE-6 bus system.**

***Keywords*: IEEE-6 bus system, Transmission Loss, IEEE 3-bus system, Independents System Operators**

Introduction

In the twentieth century, the transformation of The Electricity Supply Industry (ESI) started with reform, and then transparent electricity strategy. And this restructured system brought electricity market competition. This transition comprises of two different aspects: reform and privatization. Nonetheless, several issues and difficulties have emerged as a consequence of this move. The topic of the distribution of power losses is significant among all the problems. The allocation of loss of transmission among electricity producers and consumers has become a controversial issue. It will lead to power losses as electrical power is transmitted via a network. More power is needed to compensate these losses by the generating unit. Yet no generation device will choose to generate more electricity to cover losses because of deregulation yet rivalry. The damages would theoretically be compensated for from all manufacturers and customers. There is a possibility that the Independents System Operators (ISO), a non-profit organization, will be responsible for these power losses if this issue is not solved by specified methods. Such expenses will be compensated by the running systems. This work aims to present a systematic distribution of damages among the producing units. Without closed methods, different companies use multiple methods to assign transmission losses .Most of these methods require complex math and time-consuming measurements.

Literature Review

In recent years, literature has reported certain methods of allocating transmission losses. Throughout the lack of an optimal or consensus way of allocating transmitting failure, companies worldwide use all of these strategies. Power was licensed in many states before legalization via a transmission line. H. H. Happ has implemented such approaches to quantify control wheeling costs.

The method of allocating transmitting losses is to delegate the liability for paying part of the network loss to each specific person. This is important because the energy sector utilizes a straightforward auction process for purposes of efficiency and technical convenience, but neglects the lack of sector clearing. Since losses in networks cannot be reversed, though, the losses should be produced in a variety of generators and the costs should be vulcanized as insurance for losses is supplied.
By turning to the transaction-based paradigm, when calculating the compensation amount according to the loss allocation procedure, the transaction entity hopes to select the loss compensation bus and the appropriate compensation amount.The distribution of the proceeds and payments between market participants would change both the loss allocation and the loss compensation. Since system losses can represent between 5 and 10 percent of the entire production, a fair allocation between the generators and the loads has a significant effect on their benefits for a quantity of several million dollars per year. Nonetheless, due to its nonlinearity, the issue of the distribution of losses is not straightforward and is still under discussion and growth.

In the previous research, a variety of loss allocation approaches were suggested. One of the most uncooked is pro rata procedures. The loss allocated to each generator or load in the proportional allocation phase is calculated by the active power rather than its relative position in the network.The Pro Rata protocol (PR), a system for delegated losses of transmission, employed by generators and users on the mainland of Spain was discussed by Conejo et al [9] and a relative distribution laws were adopted afterwards. Conejo et al. The failure to a generator or user is commensurate with the power output level. The PR protocol lacks the network and thus does not conform with the solved method

Thus, turbines or loads placed remotely profit from the power movement at the cost of everybody. Two other approaches called Marginal Procedure and Proportional S haring were both discussed by Conejo et al. In 'marginal method' a so-called proportional transmission loss coefficient (ITL) is used to delegate losses to generators and customers. Standardization has to be achieved upon transfer, as this approach contributes to recovery. Two other approaches called Marginal Procedure and Proportional S haring were both discussed by Conejo et al. . Losses are distributed to producers and customers in the 'marginal cycle'-called the equation of incremental loss of transmission (ITL). Standardization has to be achieved upon transfer, as this approach contributes to recovery. The traditional ITL-based marginal method relies on the set of slack buses, because the ITL coefficients are related to slack buses.Through design, the ITL sleep bus coefficient is negative, and there are no losses for the slack bus. It is a significant drawback with this strategy, which allows pool managers to determine the slack bus in advance.

Flow-through methods were introduced. A dynamic method of measuring the power flow is recently suggested. These technologies achieve the realization of the concept of proportional distribution by topological evaluation of the contribution of the load to the power flow and loss in the generator and transmission line based on the "proportional" method.In compliance with this rule, « the flows to the bus are equal to the outflows from the bus ».By tracking the contribution of the load to the generator and pipeline flow, Strbac et al proposed a method for allocating transmission loss. Although the input is negligible, this method still tracks the load on each generator input and line flux. Because of maximum flows in lines, the allocation method was proposed, it does not reflect the actual conditions of load. Another form of loss allocation has been proposed by Bialek et al. which tracks power flows and uses a proportionate sharing theory.

Incremental Load Flow Approach (ILFA) and Marginal Transmission Loss Approach (MTLA) have been suggested by Bhuiya and C Howdhury. The former uses a modified procedure for the estimation of load flow depletion. In this way, at In a separate phase-load bus rises, while loads are held steady at the other buses. The resultant lack of differential propagation is due to the engine. The latter approach is focused on Kron's concept of lack of transmission. Kron 's definition of loss is modified and represented in terms of load rather than generations to show the impact of bilateral contracts. In MTLA, a transmission failure of the generator is observed by a progressive shift in the active power demand of the generator when retaining all other loads. This approach includes a number of complicated math and operations.

Circuit theory-based approaches have become rather diligent lately as such systems involve the network characteristics and circuit theories in the distribution of losses [29]. Conejo et al have proposed the "Z-bus allocation" method. The incomplete entry matrix is the foundation for all measurements. Because of control streaming, it utilizes dynamic current flows. Power flow approach involves an applied bus current and a new transfer. In, a process for Z bus distribution is proposed, which indicates the failure of the entire device based on the Z bus matrix and the signal injected when the bus is present. During the damage propagation period, the bus current injection is converted to the bus power injection to attribute the accumulated loss of the equipment to the bilateral trade.

Cheng et al presented numerous issues in the deregulated power grid network relevant to bilateral contracts. The authors identified a transaction matrix simulation of bilateral agreements. An energy producing two-dimensional vector and load demands is called the operation matrix.

The mechanism to assess the transmission machine usage has been suggested by Anderson and Yang. The approach of the analysis of power flow utilizes load flow measurements to determine the output of a generator by overlaying the turbine on the base charge. The disparity between the two load flows is due to the account of generators. Damage classification relies on the generator series used. Results for different sequences vary widely.

In the grid structure governed by bilateral and multilateral transmission agreements, Fand and David discussed power transmission issues. A market system-a deregulated network process was established and an efficient transmitting method was established.

Shipping is recommended. This paper focuses on the challenges of dealing with bilateral and multilateral power systems contracts.

Only the distribution of overall device errors is obtained by the above processes. The losses in-division will be unbundled for the purposes of accountability and equity in the distribution of losses. A procedure based on unbundled branch flows has been proposed by Exposito et al. The approach in this paper has been updated and is nodally equivalent to the proportional loss factor process. The writers recommended four ways of separating the flows of branches: proportional distribution, square assignment and linear assignment and quick linear division. The losses in each branch are naturally divided for current injections. In we propose to allocate a loss process based on a change of the bus entry matrix.

References suggest methods for decomposing power flows and allocating branch losses to bilateral trade based on an acid flow test. In addition when transforming vaccines into existing vaccines it takes into consideration the different reactive power sector. So it is important to evaluate the cross-balance between transactions. The share of each current and branch loss input into the power flow is determined based on the currents belonging to the branch power flow. The consequence of the presence of the branch reaction in an active loss allocation will be irrational loss allocation. This paper proposed a circuit centered approach for decomposition of the branch power flow and distribution of branch losses in pool power markets centered on the orthogonal projection definition.

The first step is equivalent to power injection using a circuit-based process. Within the literature one mode for equivalence converts both generation units and loads, as seen to actual injections. Yet when the bus approval matrix is special because having no shunt components, the equivalence mode fails. And it suggests another form of equivalence. The load (generator) is converted the equivalent injection volume of the generator (load).The two forms of equivalence will give birth to separate losses. Nonetheless, no work has yet been undertaken to discuss and explain the question of the most logical and effective equivalence style. The article mostly deals with this topic and gives useful ideas and conclusions.

Conclusion and future work

An orthogonal projection definition is defined as a circuit-based approach for determining branch losses. Theoretical research and analytical observations suggest the following characteristics for the proposed method:

• It incorporates circuit theory and the orthogonal projection principle to generate divisions' failure distribution.

• The division risk allotments received are similarly expressed in the concept of damage distribution. The suggested approach offers an intuitively simple explanation of the division failure allocation obtained relative to the system.

•According to the general principles of physics, the bus share obtained in the current and energy passing through the branch has nothing to do with the selection of the reference voltage bus.

As with the first stage of the circuit-based approach, the related power injection is usually discussed. Equivalence, that is, the load (generator) is converted to equal admission and the generator (unit) is converted to the actual injection volume, which is basically the same, so it should be considered.

The circuit-base approaches in pool markets are employed.

References

[1] A. Conejo, J. Arroyo, N. alguacil, and Guijarro,"transmission loss allocation comparison of different practical algorithms", IEEE transactions on power systems, vol.17, no.3,pp.571-576, August 2002

[2] S.Abdelkader,"A new method for transmission loss allocation considering the circulating currents between generators", IEEE power systems conference 12th international Middle- East, pp.282- 286, March2008.

[3] F.Galiana, A.Conejo, and I.Kockar," Incremental transmission loss allocation underpool dispatch", IEEE transactions on power systems, vol.17,no.1,pp 26-32, February2002.

[4] Janusz Bialek, "Topological generation and Load Distribution factors for supplement charge allocation in transmission open access", IEEE transactions on power systems, vol.12, no.3, August 1997. ISSN 2394-9678 International Journal of Novel Research in Electrical and Mechanical Engineering Vol. 2, Issue 3, pp: (76-82), Month: September-December2015,
Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com Page | 82 Novelty Journals

[5] Juan Carlos Mateus and Pablo Cuervo Franco, "transmission loss allocation throughequivalent Bilateral Exchanges and Economical analysis", IEEE transactions on power systems, vol.20, no.4, pp.1799-1807, November2005.

[6] A.G. Exposito, J.M. R. Santos, T.G. garcia et al, "Fair allocation of transmission power losses", IEEE transactions on powersystems,vol.15,no.1,pp,184-188,Feb.2001.

[7] G. Gross and S. Tao, "A physical-flow based approach to allocating transmission losses in transaction frame work", IEEE transactions on power systems, vol.15, pp.631-637, May2000.

[8] "Power system restructuring and deregulation- trading, performance and information technology", Edited by Loi Lei Lai, john Wiley &sons Ltd,Chichester.

[9] "Computer methods in power system analysis" by Glenn W.Stagg and Ahmed H.El-Ablad.

[10] Mala De, Nalin B. Dev choudhury, and swapan, k.Goswami,"transaction based power flow solution and transmission loss allocation using Neural Network", IEEE transactions on power systems.

[11] F. Gubina, D. Grgic, and I. Banic, "A method for determining the generators share in a consumer load", IEEE Trans. Power Syst., vol. 15, pp.1376–1381, Nov.2000."

[12] M. R. Ebrahim, Z. Ghofrani and M. Ehas, "Transmission Loss Allocation via Loss Function Decomposition and Current Injection Concept", World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology 62, pp. 675-678,2010.

[13] S. Abdelkader, "A new method for transmission loss allocation considering the circulating currents between generators", IEEE Power Systems Conference 12th International Middle-East, pp. 282- 286, March2008.

[14] S. N. Kkeshmiri and M. Ehsan, "Transmission Loss Allocation using Normalized Loss weight Factors", Int. Conf. on Electric Utility Deregulation and Restructuring and Power Technologies (DRPT), pp. 431 -435, April2008.

[15] Ansyari, C. S. Ozveren and D. King, "Allocation of Transmission Losses using Three Different Proportional Sharing Methods", Int. Conf. on Universities Power Engineer, pp. 1234-1238,2007.

[16] Juan Carlos Mateus and Pablo Cuervo Franco, "Transmission Loss Allocation Through Equivalent Bilateral Exchanges and Economical Analysis", IEEE Transactions on Power Systems, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 1799-1807, November2005.

[17] Francisco D. Galiana, Antonio J. Conejo, and Hugo A. Gil, "Transmission Network Cost Allocation Based on Equivalent Bilateral Exchanges", IEEE Transactions on Power Systems, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 1425-1431, November2003.

[18] A. J. Conejo, J. M. Arroyo, N. Alguacil and A. L. Guijarro, "Transmission Loss Allocation: A Comparison of Different Practical Algorithms", IEEE Transactions on Power Systems, Vol. 17, No. 3, August2002.

[19] Janusz Bialek, "Topological Generation and Load Distribution Factors for Supplement Charge Allocation in Transmission Open Access", IEEE Transactions on Power Systems, Vol. 12, No. 3, August1997.

[20] Mohammad Shahidehpour, Hatim Yamin and Zuyi Li, "Market Operations in Electric Power Systems Forecasting, Scheduling, and Risk Management", A John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Publication.