

THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE

School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering

**Performance Evaluation of
Measurement Algorithms used in IEDs**

Mohammad Nizam IBRAHIM

A thesis presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

January 2012

Performance Evaluation of Measurement Algorithms used in IEDs

Mohammad Nizam IBRAHIM

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

January 2012

Abstract

Many Intelligent Electronic Devices (IEDs) are available for the protection of power systems. These IEDs use a series of mathematical algorithms for fault detection and execute various protection functions. The first and essential mathematical algorithm of any IED is the measurement algorithm. The aim of the measurement algorithm is to estimate the fundamental frequency component (phasor) of input current and voltage signals. Most protection algorithms use the estimated phasor for their executions. The most important factors for the successful use of the protection algorithms in IEDs are accuracy and speed of the phasor estimation by the measurement algorithms.

A fault in a power system produces step changes in the current and voltage phasors recorded by IEDs as well as a variety of nuisance signals. The nuisance signals introduce significant input distortions to measurement algorithms. Measurement algorithms that estimate the fundamental frequency phasor component from the distorted input signals produce some errors. Different measurement algorithms produce different amounts of

error. This is because their design is based on different approaches with different assumptions that result in different performance in the presence of nuisance signals.

It is important to evaluate the performance of measurement algorithms in the presence of nuisance signals. The evaluation is to ensure that measurement algorithms estimate the fundamental frequency component at the required design accuracy and speed. The result of the performance evaluation can be used to select appropriate measurement algorithms for specific protection applications. However, the parameters of nuisance signals are uncertain due to their dependence on unpredictable factors such as fault location and fault impedance. Thus, a methodology for the evaluation of measurement algorithm performance should take into account the uncertainty of the parameters of nuisance signals.

The traditional method of evaluating the performance of measurement algorithms is based on the local sensitivity method using a linear function approximation at a nominal point. The local sensitivity method varies only a single nuisance parameter (factor) while other factors are fixed at their nominal values. The studied factor is varied to observe errors in the output of the measurement algorithm. Such an approach, however, does not provide the overall performance of measurement algorithms. Besides, varying the single factor does not represent realistic scenarios.

This thesis proposes a new methodology to evaluate the performance of measurement algorithms implemented in IEDs. The proposed methodology uses the global uncertainty and sensitivity analysis method. In this method, all factors representing nuisance components are varied simultaneously. Uncertainty analysis measures the uncertainty in output of the measurement algorithm due to the uncertainty of input factors. Sensitivity analysis measures the contribution of all factors and their interactions to output uncertainty.

In general, the global uncertainty and sensitivity method that is based on the Monte Carlo approach requires extensive evaluations. Its implementation can be prohibitive, particularly in practical testing, because the number of factors is large. Thus, a two-stage methodology with a significantly smaller number of evaluations is used. The first-stage is the use of the Morris method as a preliminary (screening of factors) sensitivity analysis and

the second-stage is the implementation of the Extended Fourier Amplitude Sensitivity Test (EFAST) technique for comprehensive global uncertainty and sensitivity analysis. A single evaluation involves one run of the IED injection test which can take a few minutes. Thus, it is justifiable to search for the methodology that uses the smaller number of evaluations.

The proposed methodology contributes to an automated testing method integrating ATP/EMTP, MATLAB and SIMLAB programs as well as the injection test facility. The ATP/EMTP program is used to generate fault test scenarios. The MATLAB program is used to model elements of the IED to calculate performance indices on the output of measurement algorithms and automatically control the process of extensive evaluations (simulations). The main role of the SIMLAB is to analyze the uncertainty and sensitivity of the measurement algorithms outputs.

The proposed methodology has been demonstrated by evaluating the performance of a known measurement algorithm in simulation and an unknown measurement algorithm of a commercial IED (SEL-421). The methodology has been successfully performed in the simulation as well as in practical testing. The results of the analysis indicate that the performance is typically most sensitive to a few parameters out of many possible factors. These important parameters should then be the focus of research for the optimization of measurement algorithms.

Declaration and Publications

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

The author acknowledges that copyright of published works contained within this thesis (as listed in the following) resides with the copyright holder(s) of those works.

List of Publications

- (P1) Ibrahim, M.N.; Zivanovic, R.; "An advanced method for evaluation of measurement algorithms used in digital protective relaying," *Power Engineering Conference, 2009 (AUPEC 2009)*. *Australasian Universities on*, vol., no., pp.1-6, Adelaide, Australia, 27-30 Sept. 2009.

- (P2) Ibrahim, M.N.; Rohadi, N.; Zivanovic, R.; "Methodology for automated testing of transmission line fault locator algorithms," *Power Engineering Conference, 2009 (AUPEC 2009). Australasian Universities on*, vol., no., pp.1-4, Adelaide, Australia, 27-30 Sept. 2009.
- (P3) Ibrahim, M.N.; Zivanovic, R.; "Impact of CVT transient on measurement algorithms implemented in digital protective relays," *Electrical Energy and Industrial Electronic Systems (EEIES 2009), International Conference on*, vol., no., pp.1-6, Penang, Malaysia, 7-8 December 2009.
- (P4) Ibrahim, M.N.; Zivanovic, R.; "Impact of CT saturation on phasor measurement algorithms: Uncertainty and sensitivity study," *Probabilistic Methods Applied to Power Systems (PMAPS 2010), 2010 IEEE 11th International Conference on*, vol., no., pp.728-733, Singapore, 14-17 June 2010.
- (P5) Ibrahim, M.N.; Zivanovic, R.; "Factor-Space Dimension Reduction for Sensitivity Analysis of Intelligent Electronic Devices," *TENCON 2011, 2011 IEEE Region 10 Conference on*, Bali, Indonesia, 21-24 November 2011.
- (P6) Ibrahim, M.N.; Zivanovic, R.; "A novel global sensitivity analysis approach in testing measurement algorithms used by protective relays," *Journal of European Transactions on Electrical Power*, February 2012. Doi: 10.1002/etep.673.

In Press Publications

- (P7) Ibrahim, M.N.; Zivanovic, R.; "Global Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analysis for Evaluation of Measurement Algorithm Performance as Affected by CVT Transients," *Journal of Electric Power Systems Research*. Submitted for review.

Signed:

Date:

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest appreciation and gratitude to Dr. Rastko Zivanovic for his guidance, support and supervision throughout this research work. His continuous advice and assistance on the preparation of this thesis are thankfully acknowledged. I would also like to grateful Dr. Nesimi Ertugrul for his co-supervision of this work. Additionally, I would also like to thank to the secretarial and technical staff at the Electrical Engineering School at the University of Adelaide for all their support during this research work. I also like to thank my research partners: Mustarum Masarudin, Olley Adam, Nanang Rohadi, Yang Liu and Ming Tan for their valuable supports.

I also gratefully acknowledge for the use of SIMLAB (2009) Version 2.2 Simulation Environment for Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analysis, developed by the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission.

This acknowledgement will not complete without thanking my family. I extend a special thank to my family for their endless love, support and understanding. The completion of this work also would not have been possible without the support from friends who are living in Adelaide as well.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT.....	I
DECLARATION AND PUBLICATIONS.....	IV
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	VI
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VII
LIST OF FIGURES	X
LIST OF TABLES	XIII
SYMBOLS.....	XV
ABBREVIATIONS.....	XVIII
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. BACKGROUND	1
1.2. OBJECTIVES.....	5
1.3. CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE THESIS	7
1.4. OUTLINES OF THE THESIS	10
1.5. CONCLUSION	13
CHAPTER 2. MEASUREMENT ALGORITHMS OF IEDS	14
2.1. INTRODUCTION.....	14
2.2. DIGITAL PROTECTIVE RELAY	15
2.3. LITERATURE REVIEW OF DIGITAL MEASUREMENT ALGORITHMS	19
2.3.1. <i>Digital and DFT Algorithms</i>	19
2.3.2. <i>Performance of Measurement Algorithms</i>	23
2.4. DISCUSSION.....	26

2.5. DISCRETE FOURIER TRANSFORM MEASUREMENT ALGORITHMS	29
2.5.1. <i>The Full-Cycle DFT</i>	31
2.5.2. <i>The Half-Cycle DFT</i>	32
2.5.3. <i>The Cosine Filter</i>	33
2.6. CONCLUSION	37
CHAPTER 3. UNCERTAINTY AND SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS METHODS.....	39
3.1. INTRODUCTION.....	39
3.2. UNCERTAINTY ANALYSIS (UA).....	41
3.3. SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS (SA).....	43
3.4. UA/SA STRUCTURES	46
3.5. MORRIS METHOD	49
3.6. EFAST METHOD.....	51
3.6.1. <i>Introduction of Variance-based Method</i>	52
3.6.2. <i>Details of EFAST Method</i>	55
3.7. UNCERTAINTY OF NUISANCE FACTOR	61
3.7.1. <i>The Factors of Network Systems</i>	61
3.7.2. <i>The Factor of Instrument Transformers</i>	64
3.8. NUISANCE COMPONENTS IN FAULT SIGNALS	66
3.8.1. <i>The Decaying DC offset</i>	67
3.8.2. <i>The Third Harmonic</i>	68
3.8.3. <i>The Fifth Harmonic</i>	68
3.8.4. <i>The Off-nominal Fundamental Frequency</i>	69
3.9. CONCLUSION	69
CHAPTER 4. THE DESIGN OF THE METHODOLOGY FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. 71	71
4.1. INTRODUCTION.....	71
4.2. METHODOLOGY REQUIREMENTS.....	73
4.2.1. <i>Automatic Creation of Extensive Fault Scenarios</i>	73
4.2.2. <i>Issue of Unknown Measurement Algorithms Implemented in IEDs</i>	74
4.2.3. <i>Practical Evaluation</i>	75
4.2.4. <i>Quantitative Results</i>	77
4.3. DESIGN STAGES	77
4.3.1. <i>Fault Test Scenarios</i>	77
4.3.1.1. <i>The Power Network Fault Model</i>	78
4.3.1.2. <i>The CT Model</i>	79
4.3.1.3. <i>The CVT Model</i>	81
4.3.2. <i>IED Digital Protective Relay Model</i>	84
4.3.2.1. <i>The Analog LPF</i>	84
4.3.2.2. <i>The A/D Converter</i>	85
4.3.2.3. <i>The Cosine Filter Algorithm</i>	85
4.3.2.4. <i>The Amplitude Estimation</i>	85
4.3.3. <i>Transient Response Performance Criteria and Indices</i>	86
4.3.3.1. <i>Transient Response Performance Criteria</i>	86
4.3.3.2. <i>Transient Response Performance Indices</i>	89
4.3.4. <i>Two-Stage Global SA</i>	92
4.4. LIMITATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS	94
4.5. METHODOLOGY FOR STEADY STATE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION	94
4.5.1. <i>Steady State Performance Criteria and Indices</i>	95
4.6. CONCLUSION	99

CHAPTER 5. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED METHODOLOGY.....	100
5.1. INTRODUCTION.....	100
5.2. EVALUATION IN TRANSIENT RESPONSE.....	102
5.2.1. <i>Generating Current Scenarios</i>	103
5.2.2. <i>Generating Voltage Scenarios</i>	106
5.2.3. <i>The IED Model</i>	109
5.2.4. <i>The Simulation Methodology</i>	110
5.2.5. <i>Practical Methodology</i>	117
5.3. STEADY STATE EVALUATION	121
5.4. CONCLUSION	122
CHAPTER 6. THE RESULTS OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION.....	124
6.1. INTRODUCTION.....	124
6.2. TRANSIENT RESPONSE EVALUATION RESULTS.....	126
6.2.1. <i>The Morris Method</i>	127
6.2.2. <i>The EFAST Method</i>	132
6.2.2.1. Results of Uncertainty Analysis	133
6.2.2.2. Results of Sensitivity Analysis	139
6.3. STEADY STATE RESPONSE EVALUATION RESULTS.....	144
6.4. CONCLUSION	147
CHAPTER 7. CONCLUSIONS.....	150
7.1. SUMMARY	150
7.2. FUTURE WORK.....	153
APPENDIX A. SAMPLING STRATEGY OF MORRIS.....	154
APPENDIX B. PARAMETERS OF CT AND CVT	157
APPENDIX C. MODEL OF IED	159
APPENDIX D. SAMPLE FILE	161
APPENDIX E. ATP TEMPLATE FOR CREATING FAULT SCENARIOS	163
APPENDIX F. COMPARISON OF OUTPUT TRANSIENT RESPONSE BETWEEN ACSELERATOR AND DEVELOPED SCRIPT	165
APPENDIX G. COEFFICIENTS OF MEASUREMENT ALGORITHMS.....	168
APPENDIX H. MATLAB SCRIPTS FOR PLOTTING AMPLITUDE RESPONSE.....	170
REFERENCE LIST.....	172

List of Figures

Figure 2.1	Typical power system protection.....	16
Figure 2.2	Basic block diagram of digital protective relay [19]	17
Figure 2.3	Transient response of short data window measurement algorithm to distorted signal. (a) Input signal with DC offset (b) Amplitude transient response	21
Figure 2.4	Transient response of short data window measurement algorithm to distorted signal. (a) Input signal with 1% third harmonic (b) Amplitude transient response.....	22
Figure 2.5	Data window of measurement algorithms	30
Figure 2.6	Transient responses of the DFT measurement algorithms to an input signal. (a) A purely sinusoidal input signal (b) Amplitude transient responses.....	34
Figure 2.7	Transient responses of DFT measurement algorithms to an input signal. (a) An input signal with high DC offset (b) Amplitude transient responses.....	36
Figure 2.8	Enlarge version of amplitude transient responses of measurement algorithms to an input signal contains high DC offset	36
Figure 3.1	Graphical illustration of uncertainty analysis	41
Figure 3.2	Sensitivity of two simple linear models.....	44
Figure 3.3	Steps for performing global uncertainty and sensitivity analysis	47
Figure 3.4	Comparison between two grid levels (a) $L_G=4$, (b) $L_G=8$	50

Figure 3.5	Response surface using the variance-based method [43].....	53
Figure 3.6	Transformation curves and histograms for different angular frequency (a) $\omega_1 = 11$, (b) $\omega_2 = 21$	57
Figure 3.7	Illustration of variance contributed by factor x_i, x_{group} and their interaction ($x_i, group$).....	60
Figure 3.8	Typical FSC (a) active (b) passive [58].....	65
Figure 3.9	Impact of high amplitude of decaying DC offset with time constant of ($\tau = 100\ ms$) on output transient response of Cosine filter	67
Figure 3.10	Impact of high amplitude of decaying DC offset with time constant of ($\tau = 20\ ms$) on output transient response of Cosine filter.....	67
Figure 3.11	Impact of 20%* amplitude of third harmonic component on output transient response of the Cosine filter	68
Figure 3.12	Impact of 20%* amplitude of fifth harmonic component on output transient response of the Cosine filter	68
Figure 3.13	Impact of power system frequency of 45 Hz on output transient response of the Cosine filter	69
Figure 4.1	Ideal fault network.....	78
Figure 4.2	A CT equivalent circuit [62].....	79
Figure 4.3	A CVT equivalent circuit	81
Figure 4.4	A simplified CVT equivalent circuit	83
Figure 4.5	An IED block diagram [63].....	84
Figure 4.6	Typical response of measurement algorithm to step-up signal	88
Figure 4.7	Typical response of measurement algorithm to step-down signal	88
Figure 4.8	Block diagram of two-stage global sensitivity analysis	93
Figure 4.9	Ideal amplitude frequency response	95
Figure 4.10	Benchmark of ideal frequency response (<i>FRI</i>).....	96
Figure 4.11	Methodology to evaluate performance of measurement algorithms in steady state.....	98
Figure 5.1	System model to produce current test scenarios.....	105
Figure 5.2	Example of 50Hz element setting in the ATP/EMTP program.....	105
Figure 5.3	Fault current test scenario in ATP/EMTP	106
Figure 5.4	System model to produce voltage test scenarios	108
Figure 5.5	Fault voltage test scenario in ATP/EMTP	109
Figure 5.6	The amplitude tracking of Cosine filter to the fault current	110
Figure 5.7	The amplitude tracking of Cosine filter to the fault voltage.....	110
Figure 5.8	Block diagram for evaluation measurement algorithms uncertainty and sensitivity output using the simulation	111
Figure 5.9	Parameters setting for the Morris method in SIMLAB	113
Figure 5.10	The sample file and the output text file in SIMLAB	116
Figure 5.11	Block diagram for the evaluation measurement algorithms' uncertainty and sensitivity output in practice	118

Figure 5.12	Block diagram for evaluation measurement algorithms performance in the steady state	121
Figure 6.1	Sensitivity results of the output of the Cosine filter when its input is fault current signals (a) overshoot (b) steady state error (c) settling time	128
Figure 6.2	Sensitivity results of the output of the unknown measurement algorithms when its input is fault current signals (a) overshoot (b) steady state error (c) settling time	129
Figure 6.3	Sensitivity results of the output of the Cosine filter when its input is fault voltage signals (a) undershoot (b) steady state error (c) settling time	130
Figure 6.4	Sensitivity results of the output of the unknown measurement algorithms when its input is fault voltage signals (a) undershoot (b) steady state error (c) settling time	131
Figure 6.5	Distribution of overshoot in the output of the Cosine filter.....	135
Figure 6.6	Distribution of overshoot in the output of the unknown measurement algorithms	135
Figure 6.7	Distribution of undershoot in the output of the Cosine filter.....	138
Figure 6.8	Distribution of undershoot in the output of the unknown measurement algorithms	138
Figure 6.9	Magnitude responses of measurement algorithms from (0 – 300)Hz (a) full-cycle DFT (b) half-cycle DFT (c) Cosine filter	145
Figure 6.10	Overall magnitude responses of the full-cycle DFT, half-cycle DFT and Cosine filter algorithms	146

List of Tables

Table 2.1	Two common categories of DFT algorithms	29
Table 3.1	Two common classes of sensitivity analysis	45
Table 3.2	Source of nuisance signals in the power network	62
Table 3.3	Source of predictable nuisance signals in instrument transformers	65
Table 4.1	Functionality of software tools used in evaluating the performance of measurement algorithms	74
Table 4.2	Number of factors and the corresponding required executions required using Sobol sequence sampling technique.....	75
Table 4.3	The criteria in step-response for the evaluation of the measurement algorithm performance	87
Table 5.1	Nuisance factors on fault current scenarios	104
Table 5.2	Nuisance factors on fault voltage scenarios.....	107
Table 5.3	Sample files created in SIMLAB for creating fault scenarios in the Morris and EFAST method.....	114
Table 6.1	Result of the uncertainty analysis on the output of the Cosine filter using the EFAST method. (Fault current signals)	133
Table 6.2	Result of the uncertainty analysis on the output of unknown measurement algorithms using the EFAST method. (Fault current signals)	134
Table 6.3	Result of the uncertainty analysis on the output of the Cosine filter using the EFAST method. (Fault voltage signals).....	136

Table 6.4	Result of the uncertainty analysis on the output of unknown measurement algorithms using the EFAST method. (Fault voltage signals)	136
Table 6.5	Results of the sensitivity analysis on the output of the Cosine filter using the EFAST method. (Fault current signals)	140
Table 6.6	Results of the sensitivity analysis on the output of the unknown measurement algorithms using the EFAST method. (Fault current signals)	141
Table 6.7	Results of the sensitivity analysis on the output of the Cosine filter using the EFAST method. (Fault voltage signals)	142
Table 6.8	Result of the sensitivity analysis on the output of the unknown measurement algorithms using the EFAST method. (Fault voltage signals)	143
Table 6.9	Numerical results of the measurement algorithms performance in the steady state	147

Symbols

ΔV	Voltage amplitude change
C	Equivalent capacitance
$EE_i(X)$	Elementary effect of changing the i^{th} input factor
f_c	Cut-off frequency
\hat{f}_c	Frequency response of measurement algorithm
f_{max}	Maximum frequency
f_{min}	Minimum frequency
FRI	Ideal/benchmark frequency response
F_L	Fault location
h_3	Amplitude of third harmonic
h_5	Amplitude of fifth harmonic
G_1, G_2	Equivalent generator 1 and 2
H	The highest harmonic order
j	Integer frequency
L	Equivalent inductance

L_C	Compensation inductance
L_G	Number of grid level
L_M	Magnetizing inductance
L_P	Primary leakage inductance
L_S	Secondary leakage inductance
N	Number of sample per cycle
N_S	Number of simulation
$N1:N2$	Turn ratio
O_S	Overshoot
$p(X)$	Probability distribution of X
PI_{DC}	Performance index for DC amplitude attenuation
PI_{FA}	Performance index for fundamental aggregate criterion
PI_{H3}	Performance index for third harmonic amplitude attenuation
PI_{H5}	Performance index for fifth harmonic amplitude attenuation
R	Equivalent resistance
R_F	Fault resistance
R_M	Magnetizing resistance
R_P	Primary winding resistance
R_S	Secondary winding resistance
U_S	Undershoot
s	Scalar variable
$s(k)$	Sample of signals, $k = 1,2,3 \dots \infty$
S_j	Imaginary part of the fundamental frequency
S_r	Real part of the fundamental frequency
S_{se}	Steady state error
SI_i	Sensitivity index for i^{th} . factor
$SI_{i,j}$	Sensitivity index for interaction of i^{th} . and j^{th} . factor
$SI_{i,total}$	Total sensitivity index for i^{th} . factor
T_S	Settling time
x_n	n^{th} . nuisance factor
V_i	Variance contributed by i^{th} . factor

$V_{i,j}$	Variance contributed by interaction of i and j factor
$V_{\sim i}$	Variance contributed by other than i^{th} . factor
V_{group}	Variance contributed by a group of factors
V_{total}	Total variance
ω	Angular frequency
\bar{y}	Output mean value
ZB	Burden of CT
α	Amplitude of decaying DC offset
τ	Time constant of decaying DC offset
λ	Remanent flux
δf_1	Off-nominal fundamental frequency
β	Fault inception angle
y_{true}	True value of fundamental frequency amplitude
y_{max}	The maximum value of estimated fundamental frequency
y_{min}	The minimum value of estimated fundamental frequency
y_{∞}	Steady state value of fundamental frequency amplitude
μ	Mean of error value
σ	Standard deviation of error
min_{error}	Minimum of error
max_{error}	Maximum of error
Δ	Predetermined perturbation
A_j	Fourier cosine
B_j	Fourier sine
Λ_j	Variance spectrum

Abbreviations

A/D	Analogue to Digital Converter
ATP	Alternative Transient Program
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
CB	Circuit Breaker
CT	Current Transformer
COMTRADE	Common Transient Data Exchange
CVT	Capacitive Voltage Transformer
DFT	Discrete Fourier Transform
EFAST	Extended Fourier Amplitude Sensitivity Test
EHV	Extra High Voltage
EMTP	Electromagnetic Transient Program
FAST	Fourier Amplitude Sensitivity Test
FIR	Finite Impulse Response
FSC	Ferro-resonant Suppression Circuit
GPS	Global Positioning System
LHS	Latin Hypercube Sampling

IED	Intelligent Electronic Device
IIR	Infinite Impulse Response
LPF	Low Pass Filter
MC	Monte Carlo
OAT	One Factor At A Time
PDF	Probability Distribution Function
PMU	Phasor Measurement Unit
PPE	Percentage peak error
PRMSE	Percentage root-mean-square error
p.u.	Per unit
QMC	Quasi-Monte Carlo
RL	Resistor-Inductor Element
RMS	Root-mean-square
RRTS	Remote Relay Test System
SA	Sensitivity Analysis
SIR	Source to Impedance Ratio
TSM	Taylor Series Method
TVE	Total Vector Error
U	Uniform distribution function
UA	Uncertainty Analysis
VT	Voltage Transformer