

NASPI Work Group Meeting, Oct 7, 2021

# GE's Solution-2021 IEEENASPI Oscillation Source Location Contest

Gang(George) Zheng Sr. Manager, GE gang.zheng@ge.com









#### **Contest Objective:**

- Oscillations are a significant concern for reliable power system operation.
- Locating the "sources" is the first step to mitigate them
- Evaluate constants'OSL methods and highlight the robust methods

#### **Contest Challenges:**

- White noise is added to the load to mimic random load fluctuations
- Data quality problems present in the provided PMU data
- A mix of P Class(2-cycle window) and M Class(6-cycle window) PMUs
- Sustained oscillations may be **forced** or due to a poorly damped **natural** mode
- A forced oscillation may **resonate** with a natural mode
- Source(s): synchronous machine, load, HVDC, or any combination
- Frequency and amplitude of a forced oscillation may be time -varying
- Source(s) of an oscillation, may not be monitored by or close to a PMU
- A short -circuit fault and/or a line tripping event may initiate the oscillation(s)

#### 13 cases reflect real-world challenges

Contest main website: https://www.naspi.org/node/890



### The 240-bus Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC) model

#### Case Summary<sup>1</sup>:

243 AC Buses

146 Generators at 56 power plants

- 109 Conventional model set with GOV, EXC, PSS etc.
- 37 Renewable model set

139 Loads

329 Lines and 122 Transformers

Four areas: NORTH, SOUTH, CALIFORNIA, and MEXICO

HVDC terminals at CELILO and SYLMARLA

#### PMU Coverage in the Contest Dataset:

#### PMUs voltage phasors coverage:

• 58 of 243 buses are monitored

#### **PMUs current phasors coverage:**

- 23 of 56 power plants are monitored
- 23 tie-lines between areas
- Total current phasors: 49, 50, 68, or 89

![](_page_3_Figure_17.jpeg)

<sup>1</sup> H. Yuan, R. S. Biswas, J. Tan and Y. Zhang, "Developing a Reduced 240-Bus WECC Dynamic Model for Frequency Response Study of High Renewable Integration," 2020 IEEE/PES Transmission and Distribution Conference and Exposition (T&D), 2020, pp. 1-5, doi: 10.1109/TD39804.2020.9299666.

![](_page_4_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### Scoring Criteria from contest committee:

- 1. Total score of for each field is listed on the solution template.
- 2. Evidence/explanation

| Case<br># | Frequency<br>(Hz) | Area Name | Bus #   | Asset Type   | Controller   |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------|---|--|--|
| N/A       | N/A               | 3 pt.     | +3 pt. – correct<br>+1 pt. – within 1 bus<br>+0 pt. – other | +1 pt. – correct<br>+0 pt. – N/A<br>-1 pt. – wrong | +1 pt. – correct<br>+0 pt. – N/A<br>-1 pt. – wrong |

- 1. Total case score = 0 if Area is wrong
- 2. Asset Type: choose from **Generator, Load, HVDC or N/A** if not sure or not specific.
- 3. Controller: choose from **Exciter, Governor, Other or N/A** if not sure or not specific.

Woodpecker's Results Summary

![](_page_5_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Strategies used in this contest

![](_page_6_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Picture_2.jpeg)

| Challenges  | Countermeasures  | Tools/Data                                | Impact |
|---|--|---|--------|
| White noise is added to the load to mimic random load fluctuations  | Oscillation detection  | FFT                                       | low    |
| <b>Data quality problems</b> present in the provided PMU data   | Data preprocessor  | Bad data detection;<br>Data gap filling   | medium |
| A mix of P Class(2-cycle window) and M Class<br>(6-cycle window) PMUs   | Be mindful   | Simple load flow estimation               | high   |
| Sustained oscillations may be <b>forced</b> or due to a<br>poorly damped <b>natural</b> mode<br>A forced oscillation may <b>resonate</b> with a natural<br>mode | Select proper time window;<br>DEF method;<br>OSL verifications | Equipment models;<br>Playback simulations | low    |
| <b>Frequency and amplitude</b> of a forced oscillation may be <b>time -varying</b>  | Target on one frequency  | FFT, DEF                                  | low    |
| Source(s): synchronous machine, load, HVDC, or any combination  | OSL verifications  | Equipment models;<br>Playback simulations | low    |
| Source(s) of an oscillation, may not be<br>monitored by or close to a PMU   | Machine learning   | System models;<br>Simulations             | high   |
| A short -circuit fault and/or a line tripping<br>event may initiate the oscillation(s)  | Select proper time window                                      | Oscillation time-window<br>estimation     | medium |

![](_page_7_Picture_1.jpeg)

The oscillation energy  $^{1}$  is flowing from the source to the devices, where the energy is dissipated.

Energy flow is composed of two components:

- transient energy
- energy dissipated

The equation of the energy flow:

$$\int \operatorname{Im}(-I_{Gi}^* \mathrm{d}U_i) = \left(\frac{1}{2}T_{Ji}\omega_0\omega_i^2 - P_{mi}\delta_i\right) + \int D_i\omega_0\omega_i^2 \mathrm{d}t.$$
$$W_{ij} = \int (P_{ij,s}\mathrm{d}\Delta\theta_i + Q_{ij,s}\mathrm{d}(\Delta\ln U_i))$$

ISONE<sup>2</sup> implemented DEF method for online OSL.

![](_page_7_Figure_9.jpeg)

+  $\int (\Delta P_{ij} d\Delta \theta_i + \Delta Q_{ij} d(\Delta \ln U_i)).$ 

<sup>1</sup> L. Chen, Y. Min and W. Hu, "An energy-based method for location of power system oscillation source," in IEEE Transactions on Power Systems, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 828-836, May 2013. <sup>2</sup> S. Maslennikov and E. Litvinov, "ISO New England Experience in Locating the Source of Oscillations Online," in IEEE Transactions on Power Systems, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 495-503, Jan. 2021.

### Dissipating Energy Flow (DEF) - continued

- Impact to the DEF values <sup>2</sup> : resistances, load model, and etc.
- The pattern of DEF values may reveal the disguised OSL.

![](_page_8_Figure_3.jpeg)

<sup>1</sup>L Chen, Y. Min and W. Hu, "An energy-based method for location of power system oscillation source," in IEEE Transactions on Power Systems, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 828-836, May 2013. <sup>2</sup>S. Maslennikov and E. Litvinov, "ISO New England Experience in Locating the Source of Oscillations Online," in IEEE Transactions on Power Systems, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 495-503, Jan. 2021.

![](_page_9_Picture_1.jpeg)

• A simulated case EXC FO at 7031 with varying the load composition

75% MVA + 25% Z Load

74% MVA + 26% Z Load

73% MVA + 27% Z Load

### Machine learning pattern recognition (ML-PR) using DEF values as Input

![](_page_10_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_2.jpeg)

Feature extraction  $I_{DUL_{b}}$   $I_{DUL_{b$ 

Neural Network

Various oscillatory scenarios and factors, such as:

- generator/load location,
- controller type,
- ambient noise level,
- oscillatory frequency and magnitude,
- load model composition, etc.

DEF values of monitored branches

#### INFO:

- Over 20,000 cases were simulated
- The DEF values of monitored locations from simulated cases were used in ML-PR as the training dataset.
- The output of ML-PR (trained neural network) gives the bus number as the estimated OSL
- ML-PR was used to batch process all given cases and provide the initial estimation.
- When process the case, ML-PR used the same DEF values calculated through the DEF method
  - ML-PR generated its independent result.
- ML-PR showed good tolerance when the number of measurement points were changed.

Predicted OSLBus

### **OSL** verifications

![](_page_11_Picture_1.jpeg)

- Playback simulation (Model Validation type of simulation) at power plant level.
  - Pinpoint and verify the OSL bus and the faulty controller once potential OSL candidates were selected.
  - Residuals are mismatches between the simulated P/Q response and the actual response.
  - Residuals are used to determine if any significant deviation in the generators' dynamic performance.
- Controller parameter identification (Model Calibration type of simulation) at individual generator level.
  - Uses optimization method to estimate the possible type of faulty controller.

![](_page_11_Figure_8.jpeg)

#### .

### Case 9

![](_page_12_Picture_1.jpeg)

| Case | Frequency | Area  | Bus  | Asset Type | Controller | Comment   |  |
|------|-----------|-------|------|------------|------------|---|--|
| 9    | 0.762     | NORTH | 6533 | Generator  | Governor   | <ul> <li>Resonate with a natural mode</li> <li>Fault at hug 1121 at t=20s</li> </ul>                              |  |
|      | 0.762     | NORTH | 4131 | Generator  | Exciter    | <ul> <li>Fault at bus 1151 at t=30s</li> <li>Max oscillation amplitude in MW flow is not at the source</li> </ul> |  |

![](_page_12_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Figure_4.jpeg)

## Case 9- continued

Generators at Bus 4131 and 6533 are monitored (voltage and flow) 1. Verify the suspected OSL (Bus 4131 and Bus 6533) 200 2. Determine Controller Type: GOV or EXC? 3. Case9@ wpq -200 2.5 Q Provided vs Playback-Sim:6533-6503 -300 2 0 Provided Estimated \* 1.5  $(\hat{\circ})$ Time (ser 0.5 Q Provided vs Playback-Sim:4131-4101 0 ° ₽ 000\* MAM 0 -0.5 "3333-3303" 10 "3933-3923" 11 "4031-4001" 12 -60 "4131-4101" 13 "4132-4102" 14 20 25 15 Ň 10 "5031-5001" 15 "5032-5002" 16 "6333-6303" 17 -100 "6335-6305" 18 "6433-6403" 19 -150 "6533-6503" 20 "7031-7001" -200 15 Time (sec)

![](_page_13_Picture_2.jpeg)

Q Provided vs Playback-Sim:4131-4101

### Case 6

![](_page_14_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_2.jpeg)

## Case 6- Voltage Profile

![](_page_15_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_2.jpeg)

## Case 6- Frequency Profile

![](_page_16_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Figure_2.jpeg)

### Case 6- MW Profile

![](_page_17_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_2.jpeg)

### Case 6- MVarProfile

![](_page_18_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_2.jpeg)

### Case 6 - continued

- 1. Machine learning classifier points to bus 7031
- 2. DEF flow factors shows oscillation source from bus 7031
- 3. Flow of power plant at bus 7031 is not monitored

![](_page_19_Figure_4.jpeg)

| Bus  | ML       |
|------|----------|
| 7031 | 0.951815 |
| 7032 | 0.040598 |
| 3234 | 0.002665 |
| 2438 | 0.002332 |
| 4131 | 0.001459 |
| 1034 | 0.000435 |
| 1232 | 0.000408 |
| 1333 | 9.11E-05 |

| Branch        | DEF   |
|---------------|-------|
| "1004-7002-1" | -1    |
| "1004-7001-1" | -0.65 |
| "1431-1401-1" | -0.4  |
| "1232-1202-1" | -0.25 |
| "1034-1004-1" | -0.24 |
| "1202-1201-1" | -0.21 |
| "1202-1001-9" | -0.11 |
| "1202-1302-1" | 0.07  |

![](_page_19_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_8.jpeg)

## Case 6- continued

![](_page_20_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### To estimate the load at Bus 1004

#### The given are:

- Voltage at 1034, 1004, 1002
- Flow: 1034-1004-1, 1004-7002-1, 1004-7001-1
- So, the load intuitively is the sum of the followings:
  - ➤ 1004-7002-1 (given)
  - ➤ 1004-7001-1 (given)
  - 1004-1002-1 (calculated from voltage 1002 and 1004 using given impedance at line 1002-1004-1)
  - 1004-1034-1 (calculated from voltage 1004 and 1034 using given impedance at trf 1004-1034-1)

![](_page_20_Figure_11.jpeg)

## Case 6- continued

![](_page_21_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### Estimated load shows significant oscillations...200~300 MWM5@ar

![](_page_21_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_4.jpeg)

## Case 6- continued

![](_page_22_Picture_1.jpeg)

- Voltage at 1004 is not agree with the calculated value using voltage at 1034 and flow -11003041-1
  - Delta angle is as large as 0.1 degree
- Mixture of M class and P class PMUs could contribute to that...

![](_page_22_Figure_5.jpeg)

### Case 10

![](_page_23_Picture_1.jpeg)

| Case | Frequency | Area  | Bus  | Asset Type | Controller | Comment   |
|------|-----------|-------|------|------------|------------|---|
| 10   | 0.614     | NORTH | 6335 | Generator  | Governor   | <ul> <li>Resonate with a natural mode</li> <li>Max oscillation amplitude in MW flow is not at the source</li> <li>Fault at bus 1131 at t=28s</li> <li>Bus 3931 is not monitored by a PMU</li> </ul> |
|      | 1.218     | CA    | 3931 | Generator  | Governor   |   |

![](_page_23_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_4.jpeg)

## Case 10-0.614 Hz

![](_page_24_Picture_1.jpeg)

- 1. Machine learning classifier points to bus 6335
- 2. DEF flow factors shows oscillation source from bus 6335
- 3. Generators at bus 6335 is monitored (voltage and flow)
- 4. Verify the suspected OSL (Bus 6335)
  - Playback simulation at bus 6335 using flow "6335-6305-1"
  - Compare MW and Mvar residues

| Bus  | ML      |
|------|---------|
| 6335 | 0.99485 |
| 3135 | 0.00315 |
| 2030 | 0.00065 |
| 4231 | 0.0003  |
| 5031 | 0.00029 |
| 2233 | 0.00028 |
| 2630 | 0.00022 |
| 2130 | 0.00018 |

| Branch        | DEF      |
|---------------|----------|
| "6335-6305-1" | 1        |
| "6101-4003-1" | 0.26491  |
| "6102-6103-1" | -0.2062  |
| "6202-6201-1" | -0.15733 |
| "6202-4102-1" | 0.1565   |
| "3906-4001-1" | -0.13127 |
| "3906-4001-2" | -0.13127 |
| "8001-4001-1" | -0.12394 |

![](_page_24_Figure_10.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_11.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_12.jpeg)

Q Provided vs Playback-Sim:6335-6305

## Case 10-0.614 Hz-continued

![](_page_25_Picture_1.jpeg)

- 5. Determine Controller Type: GOV or EXC?
  - Model calibration type of optimization problem...
  - Estimate the changed variable to minimize the residues

![](_page_25_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_6.jpeg)

## Case 10-0.614 Hz-continued

#### Additional Info:

- 1. What about other Gens who were also monitored...
  - take gen bus 7031 as example
- 2. Do need to compare MW&Mvar for all Gens? No...
  - A quick plot handy to check damping deviations

![](_page_26_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_8.jpeg)

|     | "5032-5002" | -0.0859 |
|-----|-------------|---------|
|     | "6333-6303" | -0.0235 |
| < - | "6335-6305" | T2100   |
|     | "6533-6503" | -0.0585 |
| <   | "7031-7001" | -0,1093 |
|     | "7032-7002" | -0.0193 |

![](_page_26_Figure_10.jpeg)

## Case 10- 1.218 Hz

- 1. Machine learning classifier points to bus 3931
- 2. DEF flow factors shows oscillation source near bus 3906
- 3. Generators at bus 3931 is not monitored

![](_page_27_Figure_4.jpeg)

| Bus  | ML       |       |
|------|----------|-------|
| 3931 | 0.99965  |       |
| 6333 | 9.85E-05 |       |
| 3432 | 7.69E-05 |       |
| 3333 | 6.54E-05 |       |
| 1333 | 3.84E-05 |       |
| 6433 | 2.83E-05 |       |
| 5031 | 2.40E-05 |       |
| 1232 | 6.20E-06 |       |
|      | 4031-4   | 001-1 |

![](_page_27_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_7.jpeg)

(ge

## Case 10-1.218 Hz- continued

![](_page_28_Picture_1.jpeg)

5. Region near bus 4001, 4031, 3931

![](_page_28_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_1.jpeg)

- ML complements DEF:
  - 1. handle the network conditions
  - 2. estimate the OSL in unobserved network
- Dynamic models and model-based analysis:
  - 1. verify the estimated OSL
  - 2. estimate device/controller type

![](_page_30_Picture_0.jpeg)