

March 23, 2015

Phuc Huynh Hao Zhu



Power & Energy Systems Group Dept. of Electrical & Computer Engineering University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Acknowledgements: Siming Guo (UIUC), and PSERC



Complexity Analysis for PMU Measurement-based Load Modeling

ECE ILLINOIS



Motivation

- Transient stability is key in many current analyses, and is being proposed to replace steady state contingency analysis
 - Operations: accurate dynamic models will be needed that reflect the current grid state in real time so operators can perform appropriate controls to ensure grid stability
 - Planning: fast models needed to reduce computation time and allow case studies with more dimensions
- Load models have traditionally been neglected
- Many dynamic studies attribute uncertainty of their solutions to load

models ECE ILLINOIS



Source: wikipedia

LINOIS



Measurement-based load modeling

- Goal: accurate dynamic load models for transient stability studies
- Increasing interests in a measurement-based load modeling framework
- Thanks to wide deployment of PMUs and other DFRs, it is possible to fit the recorded fault data to parameterized dynamic





Challenges

- Loads cannot be separately tested and have to be determined while on-line
- Existing aggregated load models are complicated and highly non-linear
 - include diverse components, such as transformers, power electronics, and motors
 - account for switching events
- Difficult to validate the results as loads are constantly changing
- Our contributions: develop the analytical framework to address the adequacy or necessity of existing dynamic load models

ECE ILLINOIS

ILLINOIS

Complexity analysis

- Extremely large number of parameters; 100 + for the WECC CMPLDW
- Some parameters more significantly affect dynamic responses

					-						
0	Vd2	0.65	CompPF D	0.97	VrstD	0.9	Ttr2D	5			
0.04	Frcel	0.25	LsA	1.8	EtrqA	0	Ftr2A	0.47	-		Motor
0.05	pfs	-0.99	LsB	1.8	EtrqB	2	Ftr2B	0.3			Exection
0.75	P1e	2	LsC	1.8	EtrqC	2	Ftr2C	0.3			Praction
0.08	P1c	0.54546	VstallD	0.6	TrstD	0.4	Vc1offD	0.4		*	Parameters
1	P2e	1	LpA	0.1	Ftr1A	0.2	Vrc1A	0.9			(%)
1	P2c	0.45454	LpB	0.16	Ftr1B	0.2	Vrc1B	0.65			. /
1	Pfrq	0	LpC	0.16	Ftr1C	0.2	Vrc1C	0.65			
0.9	Q1e	2	RstallD	0.1	FuvrD	0.17	Vc2offD	0.4			
1.1	Q1c	-0.5	LppA	0.083	Vtr1A	0.75	Trc1A	9999			
0.00625	Q2e	1	LppB	0.12	Vtr1B	0.5	Trc1B	0.6			
1	Q2c	1.5	LppC	0.12	Vtr1C	0.5	Trc1C	0.6			
1.02	Qfrq	-1	XstallD	0.1	Vtr1D	0.65	Vc1onD	0.45			
30	MtypA	3	TpoA	0.092	Ttr1A	999	Vrc2A	0.639			
5	MtypB	3	ТроВ	0.1	Ttr1B	0.02	Vrc2B	0.85			
0	MtypC	3	TpoC	0.1	Ttr1C	0.02	Vrc2C	0.85			
0	MtypD	1	Tstal1D	0.02	Ttr1D	0.02	Vc2onD	0.45			Thermal
0.17	LfmA	0.7	ТрроА	0.002	Vtr2A	0.5	Trc2A	0.73			D
0.1	LFmB	0.8	TppoB	0.0026	Vtr2B	0.7	Trc2B	99999			Protection
0.05	LFmC	0.8	TppoC	0.0026	Vtr2C	0.7	Trc2C	99999			Parameters
0.23	LFmD	1	FrstD	0	Vtr2D	0.9	TthD	30			
0.1	RaA	0.04	ΗA	0.05	Ttr2A	0.02	Th1tD	0.3	-		
1	RaB	0.03	НB	1	Ttr2B	0.02	Th2tD	2.05			
0.75	RaC	0.03	НC	0.1	Ttr2C	0.02	TvD	0.025			
	0 0.04 0.05 0.75 0.08 1 1 1 1 0.9 1.1 0.00625 1 1 0.00625 1 1 0.00625 1 1 0.00625 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 0.05 0.08	0 Vd2 0.04 Frcel 0.05 pfs 0.75 P1e 0.08 P1c 1 P2e 1 P2c 1 Pfq 0.9 Q1e 1.1 Q1c 0.00625 Q2e 1 Q2c 1.02 Qfrq 30 MtypA 5 MtypB 0 MtypD 0.17 LfmA 0.11 LFmB 0.05 LFmC 0.1 RaA 1 RaB 0.75 RaC	0 Vd2 0.65 0.04 Frcel 0.25 0.05 pfs -0.99 0.75 P1e 2 0.08 P1c 0.54546 1 P2e 1 1 P2c 0.45454 1 Pfrq 0 0.99 Q1e 2 1.1 Q1c -0.5 0.00625 Q2e 1 1 Q2c 1.5 1.02 Qfrq -1 30 MtypA 3 0 MtypB 3 0 MtypD 1 0.17 LfmA 0.7 0.1 LFmB 0.8 0.05 LFmD 1 0.1 RaA 0.04 1 RaB 0.03 0.75 RaC 0.03	0 Vd2 0.65 CompPF D 0.04 Frcel 0.25 LsA 0.05 pfs -0.99 LsB 0.75 P1e 2 LsC 0.08 P1c 0.54546 VstallD 1 P2e 1 LpA 1 P2c 0.45454 LpB 1 Pfrq 0 LpC 0.9 Q1e 2 RstallD 1.1 Q1c -0.5 LppA 0.00625 Q2e 1 LppB 1 Q2c 1.5 LppC 1.02 Qfrq -1 XstallD 30 MtypA 3 TpoA 5 MtypB 3 TpoA 0 MtypD 1 TstallD 0.1 LFmB 0.8 TppoA 0.05 LFmC 0.8 TppoC 0.1 LFmB 0.8 TppoC 0.1 RaA	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $

ECE ILLINOIS

5

Simpler CLOD model

- Parameters: percentage level of
 - Large Motors (LM)
 - Small Motors (SM)
 - Discharge Lighting (DL)
 - Transformer Saturation (TS)
 - Voltage-dependent Loads (VL)
- Use PowerWorld generator playback function to input real voltage data recorded during FIDVR disturbances





IILLINOIS

ECE ILLINOIS





ILLINOIS

ECE ILLINOIS

Sparse principal component analysis (S-PCA)

- Without sparsity, PCA is related to SVD matrix decomposition
- Sparsity is advocated to further explore hidden data structure/redundancy for noisy measurements or missing data

$$A = U \cdot W \cdot V^{\mathsf{T}}$$







Preliminary studies

- Both real and reactive power mismatch matrices are almost of rank 1
- The first principal component for Pmat is [0.7020, 0.7122, 0.0000, 0.0000]
 - Only changes of LM or SM would affect dynamic response
 - It is the aggregated LM and SM percentages would matter
- The first two principal components for Qmat are [0.6212, 0.7627, -0.1800, 0.0000]
 [0.6886,-0.4216, 0.5900, 0.0000]
 - Q response would depend on DL percentage



9

Conclusions

- Load models are crucial for accurate transient stability studies
- PMUs provide high resolution for measurement-based load models, but it is important to first understand the adequacy or redundancy of models itself
 - Preliminary studies point out parameter identifiability issues
 - (Sparse) PCA method offers the analytical solution to characterize this effect
- Ongoing work
 - Test Sparse PCA for the WECC load model
 - Characterize the dependence on loading conditions
 - Leverage the complexity analysis results to facilitate load estimation in real time

LLINOIS

