Journal of
Artificial Intelligence

Evolutionary Programming Based Technique for Secure Operating Point Identification in Static Voltage Stability Assessment

Abdul Rahman Minhat, Ismail Musirin and Muhammad Murtadha Othman
Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Universiti Teknologi MARA,
40450 Shah Alam, Malaysia

Abstract: This study presents a critical evaluation of maximum loadability point estimation in a power system network. The critical point estimation involved maximum loadability estimation on individual load buses and simultaneous increase at several load buses. Different modes of evaluation determine the margin of load increase between the single and several loads. To obtain the optimum load values prior to voltage instability occurrence Evolutionary Programming (EP) technique is introduced. IEEE (30-Bus) Reliability Test System (RTS) was adopted for validation purposes, while comparative studies were performed with other techniques such as Artificial Immune System (AIS) and Automatic Voltage Stability Analysis (AVSA) to highlight the merit of EP.

Key words: Voltage stability, maximum loadability, evolutionary programming, artificial immune system

INTRODUCTION

Power system growth has resulted in the increase of power system plant which needs to cope with the high demand. This has caused the power system to be more complex in the future. Power systems are becoming heavily stressed due to the difficulty in constructing new transmission systems as well as the complexity of building new generating plants near the load centres. Most of the load demands are in form of reactive power effect such as heavy machines confining windings, transformers and other elements rather than the real power effect.

There have been a number of incidents in the past few years which were diagnosed as voltage instability problem due to the increase in loading and decrement of stability margin. The stability margin can be defined as the distance between the base loading of the system and the maximum loading limit of the system. The contingencies occur in the system would lead to the decrease in stability margin and the system approaches a very critical stage, which may lead the system to a total collapse. Various techniques were reported in the literature to identify and estimate the maximum loadability (Musirin and Rahman, 2002a; Rahman and Jasmon, 1997; S-Yome *et al.*, 2006; Kundur *et al.*, 2004; Morison *et al.*, 1993) to indicate its importance in power system studies.

One of the conventional techniques is the repetitive power flow in which load was increased in steps until load flow diverges (Semlyen *et al.*, 1991; Obadina and Berg, 1998). At this point, it was assumed that the system is at its maximum loading point prior to the system collapse. The inaccuracy in determining the maximum loadability point through the conventional technique has been identified as the setback of the technique.

This technique estimates the maximum loadability through the implementation of automatic voltage stability assessment in estimating the maximum. Previous work on determining maximum loadability was proposed by Musirin and Rahman (2002a) using an index termed as Fast Voltage Stability Index (FVSI). This index is based on the evaluation of transmission line indices interconnected

Corresponding Author: Abdul Rahman Minhat, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Universiti Teknologi MARA,
40450 Shah Alam, Malaysia Tel: (6-03)-55435044 Fax: (6-03)-55435044

among buses in the system. Determination of Point of Collapse (POC) in the load flow studies can also be conducted using Automatic Voltage Stability Assessment (AVSA) as reported by Musirin *et al.* (2005a). However, this technique has the demerit in terms of inaccuracy of the collapse point. The implementation of optimization process could help identifying the accurate point of collapse.

One of the popular techniques and fast search techniques is by using the Artificial Intelligence (AI) search techniques. Musirin and Rahman (2002b) developed a new algorithm to execute the Evolutionary Programming (EP) based optimization technique for estimating maximum loadability or critical loading condition in power system for one load bus. Other optimization techniques which can also perform similar task are linear programming, Genetic Algorithm, quadratic programming, Ant Colony Optimization (ACO) (Kalil *et al.*, 2002) and Artificial Immune System (AIS) (Musirin *et al.*, 2005b).

This study presents the application of EP technique for searching single and multi-load optimal points critical loading condition utilizing a pre-developed voltage stability index as the measuring instrument. In this study, optimization engines for identifying single point maximum loadability and load increase at several buses were developed separately. This technique can assist the power system operators to plan and study the system capability in terms of incremental of loads in simultaneously. Comparative studies were performed with respect to AIS and AVSA. Results had indicated the merit of the proposed technique.

VOLTAGE STABILITY ASSESSMENT

Voltage stability is defined as the ability of a system to maintain its equilibrium condition when it is subjected to a disturbance. A system enters a state of voltage instability when a disturbance, increase in load demand, or change in system condition causes a progressive and uncontrollable decline in voltage (Kundur *et al.*, 2004). The main factor which has profoundly caused instability condition is the constraint in reactive power support. Voltage stability problems normally occur in heavily stressed systems. While the disturbance leading to voltage collapse may be initiated by various causes, the underlying problem is an inherent weakness in the power system.

To ensure boundary of system in reliability and security; the incremental loads have to be monitored closely. The loads can be increased individually and also simultaneously for several chosen loads. Maximum loadability is one aspect which determines the load limit of a system prior to system instability. The determination of maximum loadability of one load or several chosen loads can be assessed by voltage stability analysis. This will require optimization technique to search the optimal point which may require an indicator. In this study a line-based voltage stability index termed as Fast Voltage Stability Index (FVSI) is utilised as the indicator.

The formulation of FVSI forms in as shown:

$$FVSI_{ij} = \frac{4Z_{ij}^2 Q_j}{Q_i^2 X_{ij}} \qquad (1)$$

Where:
Z_{ij} = Line impedance
X_{ij} = Line reactance
V_{ij} = Voltage at the sending end
Q_j = Reactive power at the receiving end

FVSI was developed by Musirin and Rahman (2002b) which could determine the voltage stability condition of all lines in a power system. This index has a range between 0 at no load and 1.0 at

instability condition. To indicate voltage instability of the whole system, the maximum FVSI value for the system is indicative enough to imply the situation.

ALGORITHMS FOR MAXIMUM LOADING IDENTIFICATION

Identification of load flow analysis is used for searching the maximum loadability point of a particular load bus and also to compute the values of FVSI. The following procedures were implemented to identify the maximum loadability point in power system:
Choose load bus for the test.

- Run voltage stability analysis
- Evaluate the FVSI values for all lines in the system using the load flow solution
- Monitor the highest FVSI value for the system
- If maximum FVSI is less than 0.95; increase the load at the selected bus and go to step (ii), otherwise go to (iv)
- Record the loading conditions of the chosen load bus
- For other load buses, repeat steps (i) to (vi). These are the maximum permissible load at the buses increased concurrently prior to system instability

The steps described above are the conventional techniques which are computationally burdensome since heuristic technique is involved. In order to reduce the computation burden and to achieve more accurate results, optimization technique could be an effective technique. In this study Evolutionary Programming (EP) is proposed to alleviate the setback of the existing technique.

EVOLUTIONARY PROGRAMMING

Evolutionary Programming (EP) is a stochastic optimization technique based on the natural generation. It was invented by D. Fogel in 1962 and further extended for the optimization process by Burgin (Gomes and Saavedra, 1999). EP is a stochastic optimization technique based on the natural generation. The process involves random number generation at the initialization, followed by statistical evaluation, fitness calculation, mutation and finally the new generation created as a result of the selection (Lai and Ma, 1997; Ma and Lai, 1996). The generated random numbers represent the parameters which will responsible for the optimization of the fitness.

Evolutionary Programming Algorithm
The optimization process implemented using EP can be represented in the flowchart as shown in Fig. 1.

Random Number Generation
In EP, initialization process was conducted by generating a series of random number using a uniform distribution number generator. The random numbers represent the reactive power loading at the chosen load buses for estimating the maximum loadability. The number of variables depends on the number of buses chosen for the simultaneous load increase. Since the objective of adopting EP is to estimate the maximum loadability using accelerated search technique, therefore the parameters would be only the reactive power on the chosen loads. Some constraints must be set at the beginning so that the EP will only generate random numbers that satisfy some pre-determined constraint. For the purpose of maximum loadability estimation, only one constraint was identified i.e., the calculated FVSI must be less than 0.95 and it is termed as FVSI_set. The FVSI value calculated using the generated random numbers must be smaller than FVSI_set so that the fitness could be optimized.

Fig. 1: Flow chart for the Evolutionary Programming (EP)

Fitness Calculation and Statistical Evaluation

In this study FVSI is taken as the fitness equation, which needs to be maximized and it was calculated by conducting the ac load flow program. It was done by calling the load flow program into the EP main program. Thus in this problem, the objective function was not going to be a single mathematical equation but rather a subroutine which is executed accordingly in the EP main program.

Mutation

Mutation was performed on the generated random numbers, to produce the offsprings. The mutation process was implemented based on the following equation:

$$x_{i+m,j} = x_{i,j} + N(0, \gamma^2) \tag{2}$$

$$\gamma^2 = \beta(x_{jmax} - x_{jmim})(\frac{f_i}{f_{max}}) \tag{3}$$

Where:

$x_{i+m,j}$ = Mutated parents (offspring)

x_{ij} = Parents

N = Gaussian random variable with mean μ and variance γ^2

β = Mutation scale, $0<\beta<1$

$x_{j\,max}$ = Maximum random number for every variable

$x_{j\,min}$ = Minimum random number for every variable

f_i = Fitness for the random number

f_{max} = Maximum fitness

The mutation scale β could be manually adjusted in order to achieve better convergence. Large value of β implies large search step, which causes slow convergence of the EP leading to large computation time and vice versa (Lai and Ma, 1997). The value of was determined by using the heuristic technique to produce the best results (Musirin, 2004).

Selection

The offsprings produced from the mutation process were combined with the parents to undergo a selection process in order to identify the candidates to be transcribed into next generation. In this study, elitism technique was performed to select the candidates to be transcribed for the next generation.

Convergence Test

Convergence test is conducted to determine the stopping criterion of the evolution. The pre-determined accuracy is normally dependent on the problem orientation. In this study the convergence criterion is defined by the difference between the maximum and minimum fitness 0.0001. The mathematical equation is given by:

$$\max_{fitness} - \min_{fitness} \leq 0.0001 \tag{4}$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this study, maximum loadability estimation was conducted considering single load and multi-load bus increment. In realizing the effectiveness of the proposed technique, a reliability test system namely the IEEE 30-bus system was used as the test specimen. The IEEE 30-bus system has 6 generator buses and 25 load buses with 41 interconnected lines. To perform optimization of maximum loadability, the number of variables will represent the number of load buses which will be chosen for the optimization process. The results from this study are consequently compared with the results obtained from Artificial Immune System (AIS) and Automatic Voltage Stability Analysis (AVSA). Comparison is made in terms of the maximum loadability allowed with the highest fitness reached.

Optimization of Maximum Loadability

Maximum loadability of load buses is identified by increasing the reactive power loading at particular load with the FVSI value set as 0.95. FVSI value at 0.95 is chosen as the maximum limit to imply the cut off point prior to voltage collapse occurrence. This is due to the fact that any lines connected to the system will collapse when FVSI is reaching 1.0. This limit is specified in order to search the Q_{max} before system loses its stability.

Maximum Loadability at Single Load

One load bus was chosen at a time randomly for this analysis. In this case, four load buses namely buses 4, 14, 16 and 24 were chosen for the test. EP was implemented to search the maximum loadability, Q_{max} for all these load buses one at a time. Prior to this implementations AVSA was conducted to monitor the voltage and FVSI profile with respect to the variation in reactive power loading. In this study, it is obvious that only reactive power loading was varied instead of the active/real power. This is due to the fact that, active power is not significant in affecting the voltage stability. This statement can also be referred to several previous works (Obadina and Berg, 1988; Gao *et al.*, 1992; Musirin *et al.*, 2005b; Vournas, 1995).

From Fig. 2, it is observed that the voltage increases accordingly as reactive power loading at bus 4 increase. The minimum voltage; i.e., 0.80097 p.u is resulted when the load is subjected

Fig. 2: Max FVSI and voltage profile in p.u versus reactive power varied at bus 4


Fig. 3: Max FVSI and voltage profile in p.u versus reactive power varied at bus 4, 14 and 24

to 380 Mvar prior to the divergence of load flow. Therefore this value is identified as the maximum loadability for bus 4 with its corresponding FVSI of 0.92694. It is also observed that the FVSI value increases accordingly as Q increases. At the minimum voltage level, the computed FVSI value is closed to 0.95. This is the maximum FVSI value before system started to lose its stability.

Simultaneous Load Increase

In this study, simultaneous load increase at several load buses was also conducted. Voltage and FVSI profiles were also monitored during this process. The results for the voltage profile at buses 4,

14 and 24 when reactive powers at these buses were increased are shown in Fig. 3. The maximum FVSI value stopped at 0.92779 p.u with the respective Q_{max} of each bus equal to 70 Mvar. From the figure, it is also observed that the Q value for each bus is 70 Mvar. This implies that simultaneous load increase has caused a low reactive power loading at the corresponding buses.

EP Implementation for Maximum Loadability Identification

From the Table 1, it is observed that the maximum loadability value for bus 4 identified using EP is 386.5 Mvar with FVSI value of 0.94945, which has been achieved in 76.781 sec. On the other hand, the maximum loadability value for bus 14 identified using EP is 76.341 Mvar with FVSI value of 0.94178, which has been achieved in 99.281 sec. The maximum loadability value for bus 16 identified using EP is 60.391 Mvar with FVSI value of 0.94271, which has been achieved in 115.24 sec. The maximum loadability value for bus 24 identified using EP is 66.031 Mvar with FVSI value of 0.9498, which has been achieved in 110.9 sec. From the results it is shown that EP managed to search the closest point to 0.95.

From the Table 2, it is observed that the Q_{max} for buses 4, 14 and 24 increased simultaneously is 79.767, 71.656 and 68.47 Mvar, respectively. The corresponding FVSI value is 0.9424. This is achieved within 49.531 sec. In the second combination; reactive power loading at buses 4, 16 and 24 were increased simultaneously. The result is 77.032 Mvar, 63.92 Mvar, 95.308 Mvar for buses 4, 16 and 24, respectively with FVSI value of 0.94948. This is achieved within 175.859 sec. In the third combination reactive power loading at buses 14, 16 and 24 is 63.818, 76.877 and 63.478 Mvar, respectively with FVSI value of 0.94862. This is successfully optimized within 119.328 sec.

From the Table 3, it is observed that for bus 4; EP managed to search Q_{max} up to 386.5 Mvar, while AIS result is 385.51 Mvar and AVSA result is 380 Mvar. This implies that EP outperformed AIS and AVSA in terms of accuracy. Results for other load buses can be obtained from the same Table 3.

From the Table 4, it is observed that when reactive load at buses 4, 14 and 24 was increased simultaneously, EP technique managed to search up to 79.07, 71.656 and 68.47 Mvar, respectively with FVSI value of 0.9424. On the other hand, AIS only managed to search for 59.779, 73.009 and 36.318 Mvar with corresponding FVSI value of 0.93595. AVSA technique gives Q_{max} value of 70 Mvar at all the buses with its corresponding FVSI value of 0.89013. This shows the high accuracy achieved using EP over AIS and AVSA. Similar phenomenon can be observed from the same table for other load combinations.

Table 1: Maximum loadability using EP

Bus No.	Q_{max} (Mvar)	FVSI	Computation time (sec)
4	386.500	0.94945	76.781
14	76.341	0.94178	99.281
16	60.391	0.94271	115.240
24	66.031	0.94980	110.900

Table 2: Several load increase using EP

Combination	Bus No.	Q_{values}	FVSI	Computation time (sec)
1	Q_4	79.767	0.94240	49.531
	Q_{14}	71.656		
	Q_{24}	68.470		
2	Q_4	77.032	0.94948	175.859
	Q_{16}	63.920		
	Q_{24}	95.308		
3	Q_{14}	63.818	0.94862	119.328
	Q_{16}	76.877		
	Q_{24}	63.478		

Table 3: Results for comparative studies for single load Q_{max} (Mvar)

	EP			AVSA			AIS		
Bus No.	Q_{max} (Mvar)	FVSI	Comp time (sec)	Q_{max} (Mvar)	FVSI	Comp time (sec)	Q_{max} (Mvar)	FVSI	Comp time (sec)
4	386.500	0.94945	76.781	380	0.92694	5.234	385.510	0.94596	142.250
14	76.341	0.94178	99.281	70	0.80306	0.766	76.127	0.93690	283.562
16	115.240	0.94271	60.391	110	0.83888	1.297	115.010	0.93775	171.875
24	110.900	0.94980	66.031	110	0.90335	12.750	110.830	0.93687	130.344

Table 4: Results for comparative studies for multiple load

		EP			AVSA			AIS		
Comb.	Bus No.	Reactive power loading	FVSI	Comp time (sec)	Reactive power loading	FVSI	Comp time (sec)	Reactive power loading	FVSI	Comp time (sec)
1st comb.	4	79.767	0.9424	49.531	70	0.89013	0.875	59.779	0.93595	161.078
	14	71.656						73.009		
	24	68.470						36.318		
2nd comb.	4	77.032	0.94948	175.859	80	0.73502	0.938	88.237	0.93076	330.625
	16	63.920						94.888		
	24	95.308						85.358		
3rd comb.	14	63.818	0.94862	119.328	60	0.73494	0.766	73.325	0.94683	259.610
	16	76.877						26.081		
	24	63.478						23.906		

CONCLUSION

Maximum loadability identification for single and multi load using Evolutionary Programming (EP) has been presented. In this study EP, was used as the optimization technique to optimize the exact reactive power loading values increased in several loads chosen randomly one at a time and several load simultaneously. In this study, EP technique was developed considering the optimized maximum loadability in particular loads as the objective function. Results obtained from the study utilizing EP were compared with the results using AIS and AVSA.

It was also found that EP outperformed AIS and AVSA in terms of accuracy on the maximum optimum loadability values and computation time. It can be concluded that EP technique is a better optimization technique as compared to AIS in searching the optimum value of reactive power loading at a single or multi-load. The developed EP engine could be beneficial for solving other optimization problems.

REFERENCES

Gao, B., G.K. Morison and P. Kundur, 1992. Voltage stability evaluation using modal analysis. IEEE Trans. Power Syst., 4: 1529-1542.

Gomes, J.R. and O.R. Saavedra, 1999. Optimal reactive power dispatch using evolutionary computation: Extended algorithm. IEE Proceedings-Gener. Trans. Distrib., 146 (6): 586-592.

Kalil, M.R., I. Musirin and M.M. Othman, 2002. Ant colony based optimization technique for voltage stability control. Proceeding of the WSEAS International Conference on Power System, Lisbon, Portugal, pp: 149-154.

Kundur, P., J. Paserba and V. Ajjarapu, 2004. Definition and classification of power system stability. IEEE Trans. Power Syst., 19 (2): 1387-1401.

Lai, L.L. and J.T. Ma, 1997. Application of evolutionary programming to reactive power planning-comparison with nonlinear programming approach. IEEE Trans. Power Syst., 12 (1): 198-206.

Ma, J.T. and L.L. Lai, 1996. Evolutionary programming approach to reactive power planning. IEEE Proceedings-Gener. Trans. Distrib., 143 (4): 365-370.

Morison, G.K., B. Gao and P. Kundur, 1993. Voltage Stability analysis using static and dynamic Approaches. IEEE Trans. Power Syst., 8: 1159-1171.

Musirin, I. and T.K.A. Rahman, 2002a. Novel fast voltage stability index (FVSI) for voltage stability analysis in power transmission system. Proceeding IEEE International Student Conference of Research and Development SCOReD, pp: 265-268.

Musirin, I. and T.K.A. Rahman, 2002b. Estimating maximum loadability for weak bus identification using FVSI. IEEE Power Eng. Rev., 22: 50-52.

Musirin, I., 2004. Novel Techniques for voltage stability assessment and improvement in power system. Ph.D Thesis, Universiti Teknologi MARA Malaysia.

Musirin, I., S. Sabri and T.K.A. Rahman, 2005a. Development of automatic voltage stability analysis algorithm for power system security assessment. Colloquium on Signal Processing and Its Application CSPA, 28-30, pp: 61-65.

Musirin, I., M.H. Ismail and T.K.A. Rahman, 2005b. Optimization of reactive power dispatch via artificial immune system for voltage stability enhancement. Proceeding of Colloquium of Signal Processing and its Applications, Pangkor Perak, Malaysia, 28-30.

Obadina, O.O. and G.J. Berg, 1988. Determination of voltage stability limit in multimachine power systems. IEEE Trans. Power Syst., 4: 1545-1554.

Rahman, T.K.A. and G.B. Jasmon, 1997. A new voltage stability index and load flow technique for power system analysis. Int. J. Power Energy Syst., 17 (1): 28-37.

Semlyen, A., B. Giao and W. Janischevskj, 1991. Calculation of the extreme loading condition of a power system for the assessment of voltage stability. IEEE Trans. Power Syst., 6: 307-315.

S-Yome, A., N. Mithulananthan and K.Y. Lee, 2006. A maximum loading margin method for static voltage stability in power systems. IEEE Trans. Power Syst., 21 (2): 799-808.

Vournas, C.D., 1995. Voltage stability and controllability indices for multimachine power systems. IEEE Trans. Power Syst., 3: 1183-1194.