



Citation for published version:

Ma, K, Li, R, Hernando Gil, I & Li, F 2017, 'Quantification of Additional Reinforcement Cost from Severe 3-Phase Imbalance', *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 32, no. 5, 7769197, pp. 4143-4144.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/TPWRS.2016.2635383>

DOI:

[10.1109/TPWRS.2016.2635383](https://doi.org/10.1109/TPWRS.2016.2635383)

Publication date:

2017

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

© 2016 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. Permission from IEEE must be obtained for all other users, including reprinting/ republishing this material for advertising or promotional purposes, creating new collective works for resale or redistribution to servers or lists, or reuse of any copyrighted components of this work in other works.

University of Bath

Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:
openaccess@bath.ac.uk

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Quantification of Additional Reinforcement Cost from Severe 3-Phase Imbalance

Kang Ma, Ran Li, Ignacio Hernando-Gil, *Member, IEEE*, Furong Li, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—This letter is an enhancement to our previous paper that quantifies additional reinforcement costs (ARCs) for low voltage (LV) assets under moderate degree of 3-phase imbalance. The original formulas cause an overestimation of the ARCs under severe imbalance. This letter first quantifies the threshold of the severe degree of imbalance (DIB), below which the original formulas are applicable. Then, the ARC formulas are extended to account for the whole range of DIB. Case studies demonstrate that when the asset loading level is below 33.3% (50%) for a feeder (a transformer), the DIB never exceeds the threshold and the original ARC formulas are applicable; otherwise, the DIB can exceed the threshold and the extended formulas yield correct ARCs.

Index Terms—Distribution network investment, three-phase imbalance, low voltage

I. INTRODUCTION

THREE-PHASE imbalance causes additional reinforcement costs (ARCs) beyond the reinforcement costs for the balanced case because: for low voltage (LV) main feeders (referred to as ‘feeders’), it reduces the available capacity as the phase with the least margin determines the available capacity; for LV transformers (referred to as ‘transformers’, i.e. the typical 11kV/415V Delta-Wye-n transformers), it reduces the available capacity by inducing a power flow along the neutral wire [1]. When facing the three-phase imbalance issue without customers’ phase connectivity data, it is common for distribution network operators (DNOs) to reinforce the network in a conventional way (e.g. investing in new lines and transformers) when the asset capacity is reached, i.e. a passive option [2]. As a key cost element, the ARC has to be quantified for DNOs to appraise the passive option. In future, with increasing knowledge of customers’ phase connectivity, it is possible to use alternative ‘smart’ options for short-term phase balancing. The ARC quantified in this letter will therefore serve as a benchmark cost, with which the cost of alternative solutions can be compared.

We previously published a paper on the quantification of the ARC from three-phase imbalance for feeders and transformers [1]. The previous ARC formulas work only under a moderate degree of three-phase imbalance. A time horizon is defined as the number of years for the peak demand to reach the thermal limits of the asset under long-term demand growth. Under a severe degree of imbalance (DIB), the previous formulas lead to negative time horizons and overestimated ARCs. The border

between a moderate DIB and a severe DIB is the threshold of the severe DIB. The novelty of this letter lies in the quantification of this threshold and the extended ARC formulas that work under the full range of DIB, including the severe DIB case. The methodology applies to European style three-phase four-wire low voltage networks.

II. EXTENDED ARC FORMULA FOR FEEDERS

A time horizon is defined in Section I. The original formula for calculating the time horizon of a feeder under 3-phase imbalance was [1]:

$$n_{T_IB} = -\frac{\log U_N + \log(3D_{IB} + 1)}{\log(1 + r)} \quad (1)$$

where U_N denotes the nominal utilization rate as the three-phase peak power over the rated capacity ($0 < U_N \leq 1$); D_{IB} and r denote the feeder’s DIB as defined in [1] and the annual demand growth rate, respectively.

The natural boundary of the DIB is $0 \leq D_{IB} \leq 2/3$ [1]. The threshold of severe DIB is found by solving the equation $n_{T_IB} = 0$, subject to the above limit:

$$D_{IB_thre} = \min\left\{\frac{1}{3U_N} - \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\right\} \quad (2)$$

It should be noted that $U_N \in [0, 100\%]$.

The original feeders’ ARC formula in [1] only works when $D_{IB} \leq D_{IB_thre}$. When $D_{IB} > D_{IB_thre}$, the original n_{T_IB} equation in [1] yields a negative n_{T_IB} . Equation (9) in [1] then calculates the reinforcement cost based on the negative n_{T_IB} – this makes no sense in reality because network reinforcements can only take place no earlier than now. Consequently, equation (10) in [1] overestimates the ARC when $D_{IB} > D_{IB_thre}$.

When $D_{IB} = D_{IB_thre}$, the phase imbalance becomes so severe that the peak demand of the ‘heaviest’ phase reaches the thermal capacity of that phase (corresponding to $n_{T_IB} = 0$) – the distribution network operator (DNO) needs to make network reinforcements immediately [1]. When $D_{IB} > D_{IB_thre}$, the peak demand exceeds the thermal capacity of the ‘heaviest’ phase, in which case this letter keeps n_{T_IB} at zero rather than letting it go negative, thus avoiding an overestimation of the ARC: this is justified because the network reinforcements can only take place no earlier than now.

When $U_N \geq 1/3$, D_{IB_thre} decreases with the increase of U_N – a greater nominal utilization corresponds to a lower tolerance on three-phase imbalance; when $U_N < 1/3$, there is $D_{IB_thre} = 2/3$ and it is certain that $D_{IB} \leq D_{IB_thre}$ and $n_{T_IB} > 0$.

The time horizon formula is updated as:

This work was sponsored by Engineering and Physical Science Research Council, UK, under Grant RC-EE-1057.

All authors are with University of Bath, UK. (e-mail: K.Ma@bath.ac.uk).

$$n_{T_IB} = \begin{cases} -\frac{\log U_N + \log(3D_{IB} + 1)}{\log(1+r)} & \text{when } D_{IB} < D_{IB_thre} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

The new ARC formula for feeders is extended to account for the full range of DIB:

$$\Delta PV_{3\phi IB} = \begin{cases} Asset_i (1+d)^{\frac{\log U_N}{\log(1+r)}} \left[(1+d)^{\frac{\log(3D_{IB}+1)}{\log(1+r)}} - 1 \right] & \text{when } D_{IB} < D_{IB_thre} \\ Asset_i \left[1 - (1+d)^{\frac{\log U_N}{\log(1+r)}} \right] & \text{when } D_{IB} \geq D_{IB_thre} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where $Asset_i$ and d denote the future investment cost and the discount rate, respectively.

III. EXTENDED ARC FORMULA FOR TRANSFORMERS

Similar to feeders, the original formula for calculating the time horizon n_{T_IB} of a transformer under imbalance was equation (19) in [1]. The threshold of severe DIB, $D_{IB_thre_T}$, is obtained by solving the equation $n_{T_IB} = 0$, subject to $D_{IB_thre_T} \in [0, 1.0]$.

$$D_{IB_thre_T} = \min\left\{\frac{1}{U_N} - 1, 1\right\} \quad (5)$$

When $D_{IB_T} \geq D_{IB_thre_T}$, the degree of imbalance is severe enough that a sizable neutral line power causes the thermal capacity of the transformer to be reached. In this case, this letter keeps the time horizon n_{T_IB} at zero rather than letting it go negative, thus avoiding an overestimation of the ARC.

When $U_N \geq 1/2$, $D_{IB_thre_T}$ decreases with the increase of U_N – a greater nominal utilization corresponds to a lower tolerance on three-phase imbalance; when $U_N < 1/2$, $D_{IB_thre_T} = 1$, in which case D_{IB_T} never exceeds the threshold (i.e. $D_{IB_T} \leq D_{IB_thre_T}$) and $n_{T_IB} > 0$.

The time horizon formula is extended as:

$$n_{T_IB} = \begin{cases} -\frac{\log U_N + \log(D_{IB_T} + 1)}{\log(1+r)} & \text{when } D_{IB_T} < D_{IB_thre_T} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

The new ARC formula applicable for the full range of DIB for transformers is extended from [1]:

$$\Delta PV_{3\phi IB} = \begin{cases} Asset_i (1+d)^{\frac{\log U_N}{\log(1+r)}} \left[(1+d)^{\frac{\log(D_{IB_T}+1)}{\log(1+r)}} - 1 \right] & \text{when } D_{IB_T} < D_{IB_thre_T} \\ Asset_i \left[1 - (1+d)^{\frac{\log U_N}{\log(1+r)}} \right] & \text{when } D_{IB_T} \geq D_{IB_thre_T} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where $Asset_i$ and d denote the future investment cost and the discount rate, respectively. Other variables are defined the same as in previous formulas.

IV. CASE STUDY

All input data are field data from Network Design Manual published by the DNO [3]. The future reinforcement costs of a feeder (e.g. a suburban cable of 300m) and a transformer (e.g. an urban one) are £13,440 and £26,400, respectively [3]. For the feeder, Fig. 1 proves the relation between D_{IB_thre} and U_N to be consistent with the statement in Section II. Fig. 2 demonstrates that when $U_N = 60\%$ ($> 33.3\%$), the ARC increases with D_{IB} until reaching a ceiling when $D_{IB} \geq D_{IB_thre}$ – the imbalance is too severe and network reinforcements need

to take place now; when $U_N = 30\%$, the ARC increases with D_{IB} which never exceeds D_{IB_thre} .




Fig.1. The relation between D_{IB_Thre} and U_N for the feeder




Fig.2. ARCs for the feeder under varying D_{IB}

For the transformer: Fig. 3 proves the statement about the relation between $D_{IB_thre_T}$ and U_N in Section III. Fig. 4 demonstrates that when $U_N = 80\%$ ($> 50\%$), the ARC increases with D_{IB_T} until reaching a ceiling when $D_{IB_T} \geq D_{IB_thre_T}$ – the imbalance is too severe and network reinforcements need to take place now; when $U_N = 40\%$, the ARC increases with D_{IB_T} which never exceeds $D_{IB_thre_T}$.




Fig.3. The relation between $D_{IB_Thre_T}$ and U_N for the transformer




Fig.4. ARCs for the transformer under varying D_{IB_T}

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Ma, R. Li, and F. Li, "Quantification of Additional Asset Reinforcement Cost From 3-Phase Imbalance," *Power Systems, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 31, pp. 2885-2891, 2015.
- [2] R. Bryans, C. Cleary and C. Higgins, *RIO-ED1 HV and LV network investment analysis*, TNEI Consultancy, 2013. [Online] Available: http://www.spenergynetworks.co.uk/userfiles/file/201303_A2_4_TNEI_HV_LV_network_investment_analysis.pdf
- [3] T. Haggis, *Network Design Manual Version 7.7*, E.On Central Networks, 2006. [Online] Available: <https://www.scribd.com/document/33735606/Network-Design-Manual-v-7-7>