


# Modeling of Fast-Switching Transformers for Voltage Stability Studies in Python

MASTER THESIS

by

**Maximilian Markus Veit Köhler, B. Eng.**

May 2nd, 2025



**DISCLAIMER:**

This is not the version for the examination procedure, the chair, and therefore not graded. It is a for printing purpose, but its content is completely identical to the submitted version.

Maximilian Markus Veit Köhler, B. Eng.:  
*Modeling of Fast-Switching Transformers  
for Voltage Stability Studies in Python,*  
Master Thesis, © May 2025

Thesis number *M347*

**SUPERVISORS:**

Ilya Burlakin, M. Sc.

Georg Kordowich, M. Sc.

Univ.-Prof. Dr.-Ing. Matthias Luther

Univ.-Prof. Dr.-Ing. Johann Jäger

**LOCATION:**

Erlangen, Bayreuth

**TIME FRAME:**

02nd November 2024 - 01st May 2025

**STUDENT ID:**

23176975

*The author was  
powered by*



# Preface

Who to thank, which contributions, whatever. . . Some text to fill a whole line with is some blibla with some explanation making no sense at all but just writing some characters.

- Maximilian Köhler -



## **Abstract**

English version of this Master Thesis abstract.



## **Kurzfassung**

Deutsche Version der Kurzzusammenfassung.





# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Revitalization of the OLTC</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Research Interests	1
1.2	Readers Guide	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Fundamentals</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Voltage Stability Basics	5
2.1.1	Analytical Stability Calculation of Simple Static Power Systems	7
2.1.2	Stability Indices for Time Series Calculation	9
2.2	Voltage Angle Stability of Machines	11
2.3	Power System Modeling	11
2.3.1	Transformer Electric Model and Behavior	12
2.3.2	Further Considerations of a Transformer Model	15
2.3.3	Open-Source Power System Simulation tools	15
2.4	On-Load Tap Changer Controls	17
2.4.1	Commonly Used On-Load Tap Changer Control	17
2.4.2	Advancement: Fast Switching Module and its Control	17
2.5	Summary in Short and Simple Terms	17
<b>3</b>	<b>Methodical Modeling</b>	<b>19</b>
3.1	Transformer Equipment Modeling	19
3.1.1	Software Architecture Design	19
3.1.2	Implementing a $\Pi$ -Representative Circuit with Variable Ratio	19
3.1.3	Tap Changer Control Modeling	23
3.1.4	Experimental: Extended Ideas and Improvements	26
3.2	Application of Voltage Stability	27
3.2.1	Generation of Nose Curves	28
3.2.2	Using Voltage Envelopes for Criticality Evaluation	30
3.2.3	Utilization of Time Series Calculations	32

3.2.4	Combination of Static Methods with Time Domain Solutions	32
3.3	Summary in Short and Simple Terms	33
4	<b>Validation Setup and Results</b>	<b>35</b>
4.1	Representative Electrical Networks	35
4.2	Validation Steps	37
4.2.1	Validation of the Modeled Transformer with Variable Tap Position	37
4.2.2	Parenthesis: Accountability of the Load Model	41
4.2.3	Validation of the OLTC Control Schemes	41
4.2.4	Validation of the FSM Control Scheme	46
4.2.5	Voltage Stability Rating Plausibility	51
4.3	Model Limitations and Improvements	51
4.4	Summary in Short and Simple Terms	52
5	<b>Case Study</b>	<b>53</b>
5.1	Practical Application of the FSM in Comparison to the OLTC	53
5.2	Influence of FSM on Power or Voltage Swings of Machines	54
5.3	Utilization of FSM with a Power Swing Damping Effect	54
5.4	Novel Control Strategy FSM	54
5.4.1	Scenario Setting	55
5.4.2	Simulation	55
5.4.3	Results	55
5.5	Possible Extension for Power Flow Congruent Control	55
5.6	Summary in Short and Simple Terms	55
6	<b>Discussion of the Results</b>	<b>57</b>
6.1	Transformer Model and Validation	57
6.2	Voltage Stability Rating and Assessment	57
6.3	Case Studies and Practical Applications	57
6.4	Summary in Short and Simple Terms	57
7	<b>Summary and Outlook</b>	<b>59</b>
	<b>Acronyms</b>	<b>IX</b>
	<b>Symbols</b>	<b>IX</b>
	<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>XIII</b>

List of Tables [XV](#)

Bibliography [XVII](#)

Appendix [a](#)



” For knowledge is limited to all we know and understand, while imagination embraces the entire world, and all there will be ever to know and understand.

— Albert Einstein

# 1 Revitalization of the OLTC

Some blibla as introduction. [1]

## 1.1 Research Interests

Here are gaps and possible extension of knowledge.

Here are the research objectives and questions.

- Influence of OLTC control on possible operational uses: Short-term voltage stability, long-term voltage stability;
- Can a increased dynamic regulation help machine recovery?
- Does the increased tap ratio gradient harm transient stability of machines? Does it help or harm CCT of machines or machine groups?
- Transformers act as big low-pass filters: Can this behavior be beneficial as well for the interactions of inverters in the grid on AC side (in the sense of Harmonic Stability)? [Quelle]

### Research Question of this Thesis

How do different control types and characteristics of Tap Changing transformers influence the voltage stability of the given system?

Therefore following questions/steps can be imagined as supportive:

1. How can Voltage stability of a system be classified and be looked at? Which indices, measurements, etc.
2. Which transformer model has to be considered to show influences?

*Influence of FSM on  
Voltage Stability*

3. Which systems are useful to consider in showing effects? Which circumstances lead to a stability support, which to a decrease? Where can limits be drawn?

Additionally during the process of the thesis, the following question came up as an extension. Is is the second interest of this thesis, and shall be more focused in the later part. Therefore some assessments in the [chapter 5](#) are conducted.

### Additional Question of this Thesis

Can the already existing Tap Changer Control of the Fast Switching Module ([FSM](#)) be improved towards a more operation oriented control?

*FSM Control Advancement? Operational Orientation*

This question has following thoughts, concerning the different characteristics and dynamics of the [FSM](#):

1. How do the different time constants of [OLTC](#) and [FSM](#) influence different stability aspects in the system?
2. Can the [FSM](#) be used as a „damping element“ in the system?
3. Does this possible different behavior of the [FSM](#) lead to different operating strategy?
4. What are thoughts on realizing such a strategy with different approaches on the [FSM](#) controller?

## 1.2 Readers Guide

The afore stated research interests in combination with the yet not sufficient framework to use make demands on the structure of this work. Therefore it seems not sufficient trying to apply a completely standard sequence of chapter like „Introduction - Fundamentals - Methods - Results - Discussion“. Instead, the following structure is chosen to fulfill the research interests and to give a clear and understandable overview of the work. This leads to the following structure for the thesis:

- **Chapter 2: Fundamentals**, is illustrating and recalling fundamentals for modeling, stability assessments, and discussions;

- **Chapter 3: Methodical Modeling**, describes the process of modeling in the tool *diffpssi*, and the implementation of voltage stability indices;
- **Chapter 4: Verification Setup and Result**, is showing the verification of the implemented models and tools with the help of common and simple test systems;
- **Chapter 5: Case Study**, is looking at the novel control methods from different perspectives and applications;
- **Chapter 6: Discussion**, discusses the FSM control strategies, considering the fundamentals, verification, and case study results;
- **Chapter 7: Summary**, is summarizing with regards to the research questions, and looking towards research potential and future developments.

When reading this thesis, one might consider its motivation and its prior knowledge for allocating attention to the different chapters. For someone interested in the strategic development of the [FSM](#) or [OLTCs](#) in general, the introduction with its research interests ([section 1.1](#)) are most important. Combined with the Summary and Outlook ([chapter 7](#)), the contents of the thesis, answers to the research questions and some perspectives are included. For this level basic knowledge in power system stability and the electrical energy grid is sufficient. When one is also interested in the explanations and thoughts why the answers to the research questions are as they are, the [chapter 6](#) is additionally recommended. Eventually, the [chapter 2](#) is giving a few basics for an eased understanding of discussion itself. The third level would be a demonstration of practical applications in the case studies ([chapter 5](#)). Lastly, if one wants to further improve or develop the tool *diffpssi* or the control strategies in particular, the [chapters 3](#) and [chapter 4](#) are recommended. Additionally the referenced literature and the [section A.2](#) are giving valuable insights and information.





” So many books, so little time.

— Frank Zappa

## 2 Fundamentals

Following chapter shall introduce the basics for implementing an OLTC equipped transformer into a existing PSS framework. This is considering the already existing surrounding, more detailed the electric behavior of the transformer itself and some control engineering theory for the corresponding OLTC. Thus its main goal is increasing voltage stability [1], main indices and assessment methods are considered as well.

### 2.1 Voltage Stability Basics

A Practical introduction to voltage stability assessment, methods and indices is given in the standard and extending literature of Danish [2] and Cutsem and Vournas [3]. Further, some useful definitions about voltage sagging and practices are mentioned by Shoup, Paserba, and Taylor [4], some other best practices, current standards, and development potential is presented by Rueda-Torres, Annakage, Vournas, *et al.* [5].

Interesting to note / implement here: Basic classification, definitions, and the nature or conditions of voltage stability. Such as

- Short term vs. long term
- Static vs. dynamic
- Transmission driven vs. load driven vs. generation driven; stability/in-stability, and/or contributions
- Load vs. transmission aspects
- **Influence OLTC:** Restoring voltage level, but not adding reactive capacities; hence adding risk of voltage collapses
- Example mechanism: **Collapse effect of the nordic test system** [3], [6]

Illustrate possible tools for Voltage Stability Analysis:

**Table 2.1:** Voltage instability types and different time frames with examples;  
after [Quelle]


No	Type	Cause of incident	Time frames
1	Long-term	Slowly use up of reactive reserves and no outage	Several minutes to several hours
2	Classical	Key outage leads to reactive power shortage	One to five minutes
3	Short-term	Induction motor stalling leads to reactive power shortage	Five to fifteen seconds

- Nose Curves as static assessment
- Voltage - Power Gradients -> Some sort of Load stiffness
- FRT curves
- And the overall possibilities / goals: Increase time until collapse or problematic behavior: Other units, FACTS, generators, inverters, controllable shunts, load shedding, can begin to act, has more time etc. to impact the system and its voltage stability
- The longitudinal OLTC can't be really "supporting" in voltage support -> no change in  $\tan \phi$  possible; phase shifting transformers could address this problem

An important comment has to be added towards the dynamic behaviors and the connected analysis strategy towards this. This thesis aims to partly enlighten the dynamic influence of OLTC control strategies on the dynamic behavior of the, or resp. one power system. According to many standard literatures, it is quite complicated to simplified state or predict stable or unstable operation of a power system in terms of voltage behavior [1]. Simply the complex interaction between different units, their control schemes and characteristics, and at least the characteristics of protectional devices, are too many influences. As this thesis is only considering a few aspects of the previous mentioned, only a relative comparison can be targeted. The use of one stability index for this analysis or predictions is highly unlikely. Therefore mixtures of possible illustrations, analysis techniques or similar are combined, enabling a discussion about the thesis scope, transformers and their tap changer control schemes.

### 2.1.1 Analytical Stability Calculation of Simple Static Power Systems

When looking at a simple power system, consistent of a load and a source, analytically deriving the behavior of voltage over power is in its simplest form. The resulting curves show how the system behaves in (quasi-) stationary scenarios. Following a system like [Figure 2.2](#) is used. All following equations and analysis methods can be re read in standard literatur like Machowski, Lubosny, Bialek, *et al.* [1], Kundur and Malik [7], or [3].



**Figure 2.1:** Simplest Load - Source system for deriving voltage - power behaviors; own illustration after [1], [7], [8]

When looking at the load flow equations, the transferable power over the system from bus one to bus two can be represented by

$$\begin{aligned}
 S &= P + jQ = \underline{V} \cdot \underline{I}^* \\
 &= \underline{V} \cdot \frac{\underline{E}^* - \underline{V}^*}{-jX} \\
 &= \frac{j}{X} (EV \cos \phi + jEV \sin \phi - V^2).
 \end{aligned}$$

These equations can be split up into the transferable real power in [Equation 2.1](#) and the transferable reactive power in [Equation 2.2](#), which might be more common in knowledge and use.

$$P = -\frac{EV}{X} \cdot \sin \phi \quad (2.1)$$

$$Q = -\frac{V^2}{X} + \frac{EV}{X} \cdot \cos \phi \quad (2.2)$$

After elimination of  $\phi$ , a second order equation dependent on  $V^2$  can be obtained. Simplifying the terms and rearranging is giving the following [Equation 2.3](#).

$$-P^2 - \frac{E^2}{X}Q + \left(\frac{E^2}{2X}\right)^2 \geq 0 \quad (2.3)$$

$$P \leq \frac{E^2}{2X} \quad \text{for} \quad Q = 0 \quad (2.4)$$

$$Q \leq \frac{E^2}{4X} \quad \text{for} \quad P = 0 \quad (2.5)$$


The easy intuitively accessed functions, which can be kept in mind are [Equation 2.4](#) and [Equation 2.5](#). These represent the functions of the voltage dependent on the real power, when setting the reactive power to zero, and vice versa. This accounts for power factors of  $\cos \phi = 0$  or respectively  $\sin \phi = 0$ , or translated to the angle itself  $\phi = \{0^\circ; 90^\circ\}$ .<sup>1</sup> One note to take here, is that the power factor is not consistently used. For load flow calculations mostly the sine and cosine representation of the angle between current and voltage is used, for stability analysis, often the tangent function is preferred. A table and plot comparison of relations between the functions  $\cos$ ,  $\sin$ , and  $\tan$  are included in the appendix [section A.1](#). This also leads to the dependency of  $\tan \phi$  in the plotting of the so called Nose Curves, the result of when one is plotting the solutions of [Equation 2.3](#).

**Describe the Nose Curves here briefly: What can one see and extract from that?**

The typical nose shape is visible for a simple network, with only considering reactances  $X$  as attributes of the line or transportation grid. Directly visible, that no static solution can be found, when surpassing a certain level of real power. This maximum often is referred to as the power transfer limit of the grid or network.

---

<sup>1</sup> for all angles in the interval of  $\phi = [0^\circ, 180^\circ]$



**Figure 2.2:** Nose Curves resulting from maximum power transfer equations; own illustration after [1], [3], [7]

Comment on  $X$ : If completely reactive then Nose curve shape, if real part in there, then form is drastically changing. There is a more complex illustration in 3D with axis P-Q-V.

### 2.1.2 Stability Indices for Time Series Calculation

The idea behind stability indices is monitoring the current voltage stability state of the power system in relation to the critical point. This applies not only to static load flow cases, but for time series calculations of short circuits, load shedding or other disturbances. Therefore the dynamic contribution can be included as well. **[Quelle]**

*Basic idea  
and references*

Reviewing possible indices, either for online resp. real time monitoring or for subsequent analysis after a simulation, is out of the scope of this thesis. Danish [2] has already included an extensive review in his work, with reference to Doig Cardet [9], which is focussing on indices in interest for this thesis in particular. **Jacobian Matrix based interesting, because of the possible observability in diffpssi.**

One easy idea for obtaining a stable operation is looking at the Jacobian Matrix. Although it is mainly used in load flow calculations, it is possible to derive statements about the voltage stability as well. This can be realized through the relation of real power  $P$ , reactive power  $Q$ , voltage angle  $\delta$ , and the voltage resp. voltage gradients  $\Delta V$ . If the Jacobian Matrix is getting

*The basics of the  
Jacobian Matrix*

singular, the System will not remain in a stable operation. Singularity of matrices is checked by following two hypothesis tests:

$$\det(\mathbf{J}) = 0 \quad (2.6)$$

$$J \times J^{-1} \uparrow \quad (2.7)$$

The Jacobian Matrix is defined as:

$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta \mathbf{P} \\ \Delta \mathbf{Q} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H} & \mathbf{M}' \\ \mathbf{N} & \mathbf{K}' \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \Delta \delta \\ \Delta V/V \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta P_1 \\ \vdots \\ \Delta P_n \\ \Delta Q_1 \\ \vdots \\ \Delta Q_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial P_1}{\partial \delta_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial P_1}{\partial \delta_n} & V_1 \frac{\partial P_1}{\partial V_1} & \dots & V_n \frac{\partial P_1}{\partial V_n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial P_n}{\partial \delta_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial P_n}{\partial \delta_n} & V_1 \frac{\partial P_n}{\partial V_1} & \dots & V_n \frac{\partial P_n}{\partial V_n} \\ \frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial \delta_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial \delta_n} & V_1 \frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial V_1} & \dots & V_n \frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial V_n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial Q_n}{\partial \delta_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial Q_n}{\partial \delta_n} & V_1 \frac{\partial Q_n}{\partial V_1} & \dots & V_n \frac{\partial Q_n}{\partial V_n} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \Delta \delta_1 \\ \vdots \\ \Delta \delta_n \\ \Delta V_1/V_1 \\ \vdots \\ \Delta V_n/V_n \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.8)$$

Although this method seems easy to implement, there are some numerical problems related to that. Checking if a Matrix is singular with numerical methods, can only be realised as a probability expression. A result could be, that the determinant of the matrix is below a certain threshold. The algorithm would propose, that the matrix is probabilistic singular. **[Quelle]**

This problem leads to the necessity of applying other methods or indices for stability assessment. Further, the relation of the system state to the critical voltage collapse point is highly nonlinear in the Jacobian Matrix. This problem is addressed by the indices in various ways, leading to a more or less linearized relation. **[Quelle]** Danish [2] is proposing a few other indices, that are based on the Jacobian Matrix, and shows comparative characteristics between Jacobian Matrix and system variable based voltage stability indices. These Jacobian Matrix based indices are listed and further described in [section A.3](#), while the comparative characteristics are described in [section A.4](#). The aforeside mentioned work of Doig Cardet [9] is focussing on these indices in particular.

*Indices addressing  
numerical problems*

For this thesis, the indices in Table 2.2 are chosen on the basis of the work of Danish [2] and Doig Cardet [9]. They will be implemented in the Python framework in section 3.2, and used for with the theoretical calculated limits of subsection 2.1.1 and ??.

**Table 2.2:** Voltage stability indices for the assessment of the power system stability in this thesis; after [Quelle]

Index	Basis	Description
VCPI	Jacobian Matrix	The index is based on the Jacobian Matrix, and is showing the proximity of the current system state to the critical voltage collapse point.
VSI	System Variables	The index is based on the system variables, and is showing the proximity of the current system state to the critical voltage collapse point.


## 2.2 Voltage Angle Stability of Machines

Just short and briefly Describe

- What is Voltage Angle Stability?
- Why relevant to this thesis?
- How to evaluate: EAC and CCT of a generator
- Maybe something like a max. utilization of max power angle?

## 2.3 Power System Modeling

The simulation of power systems is a crucial tool, not only for stability studies, but for evaluating extensions or modifications in the planning process, the development of Assistance systems for operational management, and many other applications. [Quelle] Due to the complexity of the systems, simulations are often simplified. Not only with model constraints, bus as well in the way of calculations. Mainly separating between Electromagnetic Transient (EMT) and Root Mean Square (RMS) simulations, the latter is used in this thesis. The section A.2 is giving more details, literature, and summarizing the processes behind the used tool *diffpssi*, if the reader is further interested in the topic.



**Figure 2.3:** Two-Winding Transformer Circuit in the Positive Sequence; a) ideal representation with impedances on the HV side and b) simplified circuit with only the series impedance related on the HV side; own figure after [1], [7], [8]

### 2.3.1 Transformer Electric Model and Behavior

Typical for RMS-modeling is the usage of sequence components, especially the positive sequence for symmetrical grid operation and test cases. [Quelle] An equivalent circuit for the positive sequence is shown in Figure 2.3 part a), respectively reduced to the transformer ratio, the series impedances of the windings on the LV and HV side, and the shunt branch affected by iron and magnetization losses. [1], [7], [8]

The transformer ratio is typically noted as  $\underline{v}$ . Generally speaking it is the ratio between the number of windings of the secondary side to the primary side, as noted in Equation 2.9. With the typically used calculation unit „per unit“<sup>2</sup>, the ratio becomes one in the standard case. A transformer ratio, which is only shifting current angles with the shifting angle  $\phi$ , is represented through a complex number using the Euler Identity, as shown in Equation 2.10.

$$\underline{v} = \frac{N_2}{N_1} \quad (2.9)$$


$$\underline{v} = \frac{N_2}{N_1} \cdot \exp\left(j \cdot \phi \cdot \frac{\pi}{180}\right) \quad (2.10)$$

#### Simplifications

The first simplification is step is considering two assumptions. First, the iron and magnetization losses are neglectable. This can be illustrated with a

<sup>2</sup> means standardization to a reference value; further information on page XI and Machowski, Lubosny, Bialek, *et al.* [1], Appendix A





**Figure 2.4:**  $\Pi$ -representative circuit of an idealized transformer with a tap changer; own figure after [8], [10]

short-circuit test of the transformer on the secondary side. During this test, one can obtain with the concept of a voltage divider, that

$$\underline{U}_{\text{Fe},\mu} \ll \underline{U}_{\text{T,rated}},$$

meaning that the shunt branch impedance is much greater than the series impedance of the transformer. Secondly, it is assumed, that the on the primary side related impedance of the secondary side, is equal to the impedance on the primary side. This leads to a symmetrical circuit of the transformer and the positive sequence equivalent circuit simplifies to Figure 2.3 part b). Mathematically this is shortly expressible as Equation 2.11, Equation 2.12, and Equation 2.13. [1], [7], [8]

$$\underline{Z}_1 = R_1 + jX_1; \quad \underline{Z}_2 = R_2\vartheta^2 + jX_2\vartheta^2 \quad (2.11)$$

$$\underline{Z}_1 = \underline{Z}_2 \quad (2.12)$$

$$\underline{Z}_T = \underline{Z}_1 + \underline{Z}_2 \quad (2.13)$$

The afore described simplification leads to only the necessity of considering the series impedance. Considering the afore mentioned normal ratio of  $\vartheta = 1$  in the per unit system, the Python framework *diffpssi* has been using this model with only the series impedance and no variable ratio, meaning no shunt branches, before.

When one wants to look at variable transformer ratios, either with representing vector groups, or implementing On-Load Tap Changers (OLTCs), this model of only considering the series impedance has to be extended. Using shunt branches, the variable ratio behavior can be represented in a  $\Pi$ -model, as shown in Figure 2.4. [1], [7], [8]

*Introducing variable transformer ratios*

Looking at the transformer as a black box two-port, with the index one being the LV side, the index two being the HV side, the admittance matrix for the variable ratio behavior can be expressed as in Equation 2.14. The voltages and current are defined as in Figure 2.3 part b). With rearranging the equation, one can obtain the admittance matrix of the  $\Pi$ -model with to the HV side related values as in Equation 2.15. [8], [10]

$$\begin{bmatrix} \underline{\vartheta}^* I_1 \\ I_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \underline{Y}_T & -\underline{Y}_T \\ -\underline{Y}_T & \underline{Y}_T \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\underline{\vartheta}} U_1 \\ U_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.14)$$

$$\underline{Y}_{\Pi,T} = \underline{Y}_T \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\underline{\vartheta}\underline{\vartheta}^*} & -\frac{1}{\underline{\vartheta}^*} \\ -\frac{1}{\underline{\vartheta}} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.15)$$

For calculation of the individual shunt branches, one can apply the standard representation of two-ports consistent of a linear  $\Pi$ -circuit:

$$\begin{bmatrix} I_1 \\ I_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \underline{Y}_{10} + \underline{Y}_{12} & -\underline{Y}_{12} \\ -\underline{Y}_{21} & \underline{Y}_{20} + \underline{Y}_{21} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} U_1 \\ U_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

When equating this with Equation 2.15, the shunt branches can be calculated respectively giving the admittances written down as Equation 2.16, Equation 2.17, and Equation 2.18, as they are noted in Figure 2.4 as well. [8], [10]

$$\underline{Y}_{12} = \frac{1}{\underline{\vartheta} \cdot \underline{a}_T^*} \cdot \underline{Y}_T, \text{ and} \quad (2.16)$$

$$\underline{Y}_{21} = \frac{1}{\underline{\vartheta} \cdot \underline{a}_T} \cdot \underline{Y}_T$$

$$\underline{Y}_{10} = \frac{1}{\underline{\vartheta}} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\underline{\vartheta}} - \frac{1}{\underline{a}_T} \right) \cdot \underline{Y}_T \quad (2.17)$$

$$\underline{Y}_{20} = \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\underline{\vartheta} \cdot \underline{a}_T} \right) \cdot \underline{Y}_T \quad (2.18)$$

Reactances and resistances are referred to the base voltage and apparent power of the operational unit, such as the transformer. The power system

simulation uses its own base voltage and base apparent power, enabling the use of one single calculation domain. This is done to simplify the calculation and to make the results easily comparable to each other. Hence, the referred values have to be transformed from the equipment based values to the simulation based values. The relation for the transformer admittance is defined as follows. Generally speaking, this thesis is using and referring to the per unit based values, although it is not denoted in the index of the values.

$$\underline{Y}_{T, \text{ based}} = \underline{Y}_T \cdot \frac{S_n}{S_{n, \text{ sim}}} \quad (2.19)$$

$$\underline{Z}_{\text{line, based}} = \underline{Z}_{\text{line}} \cdot \frac{S_{n, \text{ sim}}}{V_{n, \text{ sim}}^2} \quad (2.20)$$

Displayed like in Equation 2.19, the characteristic of the operational unit is referred to the simulation base value. Here, the admittance of the transformer is multiplied with its own rated apparent power, then divided by the apparent power of the simulation system. Similar, the impedance of the lines are calculated via Equation 2.20. This specialities are considered in the tap changer modeling, thus further information is given in [1], Appendix A.

### 2.3.2 Further Considerations of a Transformer Model


Describe here the asymmetric and non-idealized transformer; phase shifting transformers; transformers, which can control longitudinal and transversal ratios; ...

Just briefly describe the influence of an asymmetric vs. an ideal transformer. Why the difference and how the representation could work.

*Ideal vs. asymmetric ratio*

### 2.3.3 Open-Source Power System Simulation tools

For this thesis relevant are mainly two Power System Simulation tools. The first and main objective, *diffpssi* is an open source project from Georg Kordowich, member of the chair hosting this thesis. This open source tool provides a RMS domain simulation of Power Systems, considering passive grid elements like lines, shunts, loads etc., but dynamic and controlled models like Synchronous Machines, Inverters or similar as well. The project and the integration of a full Synchronous Machine model is presented in the published paper of Kordowich and Jaeger [20]. The project is based on little dependencies like numpy, but can as well use the Python module *PyTorch* as



**Figure 2.5:** Illustration of the tap ratio vector for an ideal and an asymmetric transformer; from the **DIGSILENT Technical Reference Manual** ... [Quelle]

backend. *PyTorch* allows for differentiation of simulation variables. With this, optimization of grid and machine parameters is possible. Future extension and usage in the topics like voltage stability and resp. or control strategies is likely as well.

The second relevant tool is a commercial software called *PowerFactory* by the company *DIGSILENT*. Modeling of the power system elements is described in its technical references, but not open source like *diffpssi*. Some blibla about PF...

To give an overview of other open source power system simulation projects, this section shall be used as well.

Some information about other open source python power system simulation tools, such as:

- Pandapower,
- TOPS,
- ... .

Maybe relate to [this GitHub Repo](#), comparing different Open-Source Power System Simulation tools. See at source [11]. Build up like a scan (see Georg's thesis).

## 2.4 On-Load Tap Changer Controls

### 2.4.1 Commonly Used On-Load Tap Changer Control

A few basics are in the interest, understanding differences between real world behavior, or possible ways of building up a **OLTC** transformer control. This control theory difference can be limiting as well for the results and objectives compared to the actual possible control in the field.

The target voltage is typically set from the control room of the grid operator, coming from pre-calculated load flow analysis. This can be set hours before, or even day-ahead with the estimated loads of the grid. This value is set locally for each operating unit subsequently. The control is then operating locally and without further involvement of the grid operator. **[Quelle]**

*Typical presets are manually set*

Typically the used controller in the field is a discrete controller, which can change tap positions under load within a time frame of around few seconds. Practical tap steps are around 2 % of the overall transforming ratio. The control is set up with a dead band, to avoid unnecessary tap changes. It is necessary to note here, that this control and its mathematical characteristics contains logical elements, blocks, and delays, which cannot be translated in a typical control theory transmission function. This leads to the missing possibility to easily obtain mathematical stability for the control of the overall considered power system. **[Quelle]**

*Discrete controllers are used in the field*

### 2.4.2 Advancement: Fast Switching Module and its Control

Describe the findings of Ilya:

1. Approach and technological (short and not too detailed),
2. Control proposal of Ilya,
3. (Hardware) Development potential.

## 2.5 Summary in Short and Simple Terms

Shortly summarize the bullet points / key takeaways from the topics

- Voltage Stability - Static and dynamic

- Power System Modeling - especially Transformer Modeling
- New Advancement from Ilya

” All models are wrong, but some are useful.

— Albert Einstein

## 3 Methodical Modeling

This chapter methodical modeling focusses on the description of thoughts and structures of the implementation in Python. It is not evolving more than necessary details about the package *diffpssi*, but trying to comprehensible illustrate the structure of the algorithms themselves and the necessary bordering interfaces.

### 3.1 Transformer Equipment Modeling


This section respectively focusses on the dynamics and model behavior of the transformer itself. It is split according to the structure of the implementation itself, into the modeling of the  $\Pi$ -model and the tap changer control. For the last mentioned, there are different control schemes implemented and thus described in the subsequent section. In the beginning, the rough software structure idea of the extension is described, continuing with a dive into the mathematical relations, and specialities.

#### 3.1.1 Software Architecture Design

The first scope of the *diffpssi* extension is to form a modular and easy to maintain class structure. The background is to enable support of adding other types of transformers and resp. or connected control circuits. A conceptual chart of this architecture is shown in [Figure 3.1](#). It is representing only necessary classes or packages for the transformer and its control.

#### 3.1.2 Implementing a $\Pi$ -Representative Circuit with Variable Ratio

Before detailing in the software side of the implementation, some mathematical differences are explained. This results on the one hand from the major



**Figure 3.1:** Architecture of the implemented models in *diffpssi*; Using abstract classes for correct interfaces and improved reusability; only necessary packages, modules and classes are depicted



differences in the standard literature, especially between Machowski, Lubosny, Bialek, *et al.* [1] and Kundur and Malik [7], resp. Milano [8]. On the other hand, these differences occur as well in the comparative and validation simulation software *DIGSILENT PowerFactory*. The use of these different models is described in its technical reference manual [Quelle] .

### Mathematical Description and Definitions

Firstly it is important to comment on the use of indices in this thesis, and especially following for this chapter. The index 1 is always referring to the LV side, the index 2 to the HV side. The impedances can be concentrated and related to either the LV, or as usual to the HV side of the transformer. The in subsection 2.3.1 used derivation is using a relation on the HV side. The same accounts for the definition of the OLTC ratio  $\vartheta$ . The OLTC ratio  $\vartheta$  in this thesis is always placed on the HV side.

*Important definitions and literature differences*

This thesis focusses on an ideal tap changer model at first, other possible considerations from subsection 2.3.2 are neglected. As vector groups are as well not considered, the tap ratio stays solely a rational number. Like previously mentioned, and consequently described, the ratio  $\vartheta$  is then placed on the HV side of the transformer. The OLTC ratio  $\vartheta$  is then defined as:

*Definition OLTC ratio*

$$\vartheta_{HV} = 1 + k \cdot \Delta v \quad (3.1)$$

$$\text{with } k \in [k_{\min}; k_{\max}]; k_{\min} \equiv -k_{\max} \quad (3.2)$$

Within this definition,  $k_{\min}$  defines the minimum tap position,  $k_{\max}$  the maximum OLTC position. The variable  $\Delta v$  defines the change of the ratio in percent for alternating one position.

### Mathematical Different Representations

When one either wants to relate the transformer admittance, or the tap ratio to the LV side, a different admittance matrix definition has to be used. The admittance matrix is then defined as:

*Relation to the LV side*

$$\underline{\mathbf{Y}}_{\Pi,T} = \begin{bmatrix} \underline{Y}_T & -\vartheta \underline{Y}_T \\ \vartheta^* \underline{Y}_T & -\vartheta^* \vartheta \underline{Y}_T \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.3)$$

**[MK1]:** Is this actually the case? Or is it a different condition?

The following mathematical result leads to a necessary change in the software implementation. Either

- the admittance matrix bus indices have to be changed,
- the tap ratio has to be reciprocal according to [Equation 3.4](#), or
- using the [HV](#) side admittance matrix, but changing the tap ratio definition and the bus indices.

These different ways of variable and placing definitions also characterize the ways, the admittance matrix of the [OLTC](#) transformer is derived from either Machowski, Lubosny, Bialek, *et al.* [1], versus Kundur and Malik [7], Milano [8], or Burlakin, Scheiner, Mehlmann, *et al.* [10]. Another thought or way of representing a transformer with off-nominal ratio is described in the appended [section B.4](#).

$$v_{LV} = \frac{1}{1 + k \cdot \Delta v} \quad (3.4)$$

#### Thoughts, Design, and Implemetation of Algorithmics

Base idea here:

- Show the thought process, design sketches and the implemetation algorithmics in the Python framework.
- Add a class diagram of the transformer model, with all needed interface / logable data, interface methods, and the abstract design.
- Describe addtional methods.
- Show the algorithmic implemetation logic of the Pi model, but not the Tap Changer, as this is seperated.

Additionally interesting extensions:

- How to automatically determine switching direction?  
-> switchin direction dependent on what? (load-flow direction?)
- Controller set points: also dependent on load flow?
- How can I change the transformer control setpoints to be load flow dependent?
- How can I ensure, utilization of the transformer is not  $> S_n$ ?

### 3.1.3 Tap Changer Control Modeling


This is the description of the ideas, development, and implementation of a OLTC control scheme.

#### Discrete Control Loop

- Describe implementation
- Describe benefits / drawbacks
- Control scheme
- Switching logic and behavior (voltage tracking)

This control method represents the currently most used and thus representative control scheme for OLTCs. With the mechanic nature of the switching mechanism, the control loop can only access discrete ratios within time frames of around a few seconds. Such a discrete control loop is described by Milano [8], [12]. A scheme of this control loop is shown in Figure 3.2.

*General aspects  
and references*



**Figure 3.2:** Discrete control loop of an OLTC; scheme based on Milano [12]

This control loop type is beneficial due to its accurate representability of current OLTC abilities. It gains access to assess stability within simulation environments, as analytical methods are not suited.

A negative aspect of a discrete control loop is the missing opportunity of generating a transfer function. This blocks the stability assessment with standard control engineering methods. Further, popular analysis methods like eigenvalue analysis is not possible, due to the lack of possibility to form derivatives.


The structure of the implementation is illustrated in the block diagram of Figure 3.3. The controller is actively changing the algebraic functions of the simulation environment, therefore it is quasi dynamic. The controller output logic is called, when updating the admittance matrix of the transformer.

*Implementation  
Structure*

Additionally, the differential functions of the connected simple controllers, like integrators, PT1-blocks, etc., are called by the solver and are thus part of the differential equations. The logic determines the physical interpretation of the OLTC, and therefore

1. If the OLTC has to switch,
2. When the switching operation is finished, and
3. What the current, or in case after a switching the new, tap ratio is.

It is important to note, that this structure relies on the calculation of the dynamic admittance matrix on each time step.



**Figure 3.3:** Implementation structure of the discrete OLTC controller

The output of the controller is based on the following logic.

*Output logic*


*Characterization plot  
and validation*

#### Continuous Control Loop

#### Control Schemes for the Fast Switching module

**ATTENTION:** Two models available, described in the paper, where the FSM is preferred and the 'novel' scheme where usage of FSM or OLTC is dependent on the tap skipping and the dead band. Only the last is usable for verification!

- Describe implementation
- Describe benefits / drawbacks
- Control scheme
- Switching logic and behavior (voltage tracking)




**Figure 3.4:** Characterization of the OLTC control loop; the input function simulates the to be regulated voltage, the output functions are characterized by  $o(t) = i(t) \cdot \underline{\vartheta}_{\text{trafo}}$

Describe the operational logic and structure of the Fast Switching Module (FSM) first.

A control logic for a so called FSM has been presented from Burlakin, Scheiner, Mehlmann, *et al.* [10], and illustrated in Figure 3.5.

Control logic



**Figure 3.5:** Control loop of a FSM; scheme based on Burlakin, Scheiner, Mehlmann, *et al.* [10]

However, the implementation logic in Python is slightly differing from the presented scheme in [10], simply for not overcomplication of the code and therefore debugging. The implementation is similar to the afore discussed one of a standard OLTC controller.

Implementation differences

Characterization and validation

### 3.1.4 Experimental: Extended Ideas and Improvements

#### Operational Oriented FSM Control

The time constants are used in the control model to model the influence of switching operation duration. This is coming from the mechanical movement of the OLTC, therefore it is the „maximum possible dynamic behavior“. The FSM doesn't have this limitation, as it can switch after every sin period (0.02 s).

Currently we can access two different operational modes: Prefer the FSM, or switching on how far is the voltage deviated in both time constants. This is a first, more targeted approach towards concerning dynamics in the voltage behavior, but still based on the time constants, not only limited through them.

Why don't we approach a control strategy, which is only considering dynamics, and let the time constants just restrain and block the switching. Meaning, that the faster the voltage deviates, the more the FSM gets preferred, the slower the dynamics, the more the standard OLTC gets preferred. This could also lead to neglecting a dead-band, and still preventing so called tap-hunting.

Combined with an operational oriented thought, keeping the possible switching movements of the FSM at its maximum / optimal position. This would mean, that in more static times, the FSM switches in its defined „as neutral defined“ position and the OLTC is balancing the deviations. One might call this a corrective supervision or monitoring.

#### Alternative Tap Skipping Logic

Currently the tap skipping logic is formulated as

*How many times does the deadband fit into the voltage deviation?*

to determine the floored number of skips (with constraints). Meaning in mathematical terms:

$$\eta(t) = \text{floor}\left(\frac{|\Delta v(t)|}{db_v \cdot \Delta m}\right) \quad (3.5)$$

An alternative approach would be:

*How many switches of the FSM would the current offset voltage bring back to the reference value? How many times does one FSM switch fit into the voltage deviation?*

Meaning in mathematical terms:

$$\eta(t) = \text{floor}\left(\frac{|\Delta v(t)|}{\Delta k \cdot \Delta m}\right) \quad (3.6)$$

Last approach should be more accurate for different pairs of preset values (deadband, added voltage per tap, etc.). BUT: both approaches do not consider the true effect on the dynamic loads and the grid. Different grid strengths could react differently on the applied transformer ratio.

### Varying the Voltage Setpoint and Target Calculation

Here, another idea of control target creation shall be mentioned. Instead of a fixed bus voltage reference, the difference of both bus voltages is considered. Further, the sign of that difference is used to determine the direction of the tap change.

Different things to consider here:

- **Load-flow Direction** with ranking the bus voltages in p.u. against each other,
- **Dynamic Setpoints** through automated calculation of target voltage (nose curves),
- **Different Control Input** as not with a fixed target value, but the difference between both bus voltages; thus tentative, because it is not considering supporting the load, but falsely trying to prevent a wrong switching direction.

## 3.2 Application of Voltage Stability

As previously discussed in the fundamentals of voltage stability, [section 2.1](#), ensuring power quality is a secondary goal. Concerning that voltage stability, regardless of short- or long-time evaluation, is a topic of power quality, it is hard to determine stability or instability. In terms of static possible solutions,

there are a lot of tools determining the critical points, as well as the current distance to it. Looking into the short-term, more dynamic assessment, there are less elegant solutions. This thesis is trying to keep the perspective on both, short- and long term voltage stability. The following is the approach to synthesize a toolset for voltage stability analysis, that is at least dynamically comparable. As nose curves are a valid and popular tool, they shall be implemented first. Afterwards the time series calculation is tried to integrate into this static evaluation, including tap changer dependent behavior. Lastly, a more dynamic rating of a scenario shall be computed, enabling also the conformity with grid codes for example.

#### 3.2.1 Generation of Nose Curves

**NOTE: Please reconsider and remake this section after completion of the Rating Tool / Assessment Method.**

This section describes the implementation of a previously discussed static voltage analysis tool. The generation of nose curves helps in finding the critical loading of the system at the bus of interest, although it is static nature.

##### Basic Simplification Idea

Ajjarapu and Christy [13] and Ajjarapu [14] are presenting a method for numerical calculation of nose curves in their work. It is called *Continuation Power Flow* and is based on a modified Newton-Raphson method. The differences rely in a slightly different definition of the power flow equations, considering a load factor  $\lambda$ . Combined with a predictor-corrector iterative solver method, this algorithm is capable of nose curve calculation, and finding the critical loading of the system. While in the first work [13], only the upper part of the curve including the critical point is calculated, the second work [14] is capable of calculating the complete curve with both solutions. As the trade off between implementation effort and the benefits, this method is not exchanging the reduced and simplified one.

While this method would be appealing to implement, an additional load flow algorithm, solver, and wrapper seem not profitable for this thesis. An idea was occurring, just iteratively using the available implemented standard Newton-Raphson algorithm, and implementing a wrapper around it. The proposed result should be the upper and stable nose curve branch, with the



critical point of active power loading. This shall seem sufficient, as the lower branch solutions are not stable load flow solutions.

The often used parameterization of a function of voltage dependent on the active power and the power angle  $\phi$  should be implemented. In mathematical term, this is expressed as [Equation 3.7](#).

$$|V| : P \mapsto f(P, \phi) \quad (3.7)$$

$$Q : V \mapsto f(V, \phi) \quad (3.8)$$

Under consideration of a complex representation of voltage and powers, this algorithm can calculate  $V - Q$  curves as well. Mathematically this is expressable as [Equation 3.8](#).

### Implementation Details

The implementation of the nose curve generation is realized as a class in the package *diffpssi.stability\_lib.voltage*. Its class diagram with all attributes and methods is shown in [Figure 3.6](#), an extended version is included in [section B.2](#). For an easy and generic use of the *diffpssi* package, *PowerSystemSimulation* objects are used, as well as the function *do\_load\_flow()* from the package.

NoseCurve
+ results
+ ps_sim
- p_vector
- phi_vector
- loadmodel
+ run_calculation()
+ reset_sim_parameters()
+ plot_nose_curve()
+ get_max_loadings()

**Figure 3.6:** Class diagram of the NoseCurve class in the package *diffpssi*

As the afore mentioned idea, the method for running the calculation is a iterative wrapper of the load flow calculation. This can be as well applied for mutiple busses as a list input. At first, the grid and therefore models of the *PowerSystemSimulation* object has to be cleared with the method *reset\_sim\_parameters()*. Then the active power vector is iterated as load input, together with the power angle  $\phi$  for the reactive power in the model. Important to note here, is the usage of an *\*\*kwargs* argument. The callable for the model is called with load parameters for each load bus as the Bus name, and a list with active and reactive power. The initials of this grid callable are used as the standard values, so only one bus can be varied at a time. The result is saved as a *pandas DataFrame* in a dict, with the keys being the bus names.

The method `plot_nose_curve()` is used to plot the results, and is using the `matplotlib` package. Further, the method `get_max_loadings()` can provide details about the critical point. Giving back a dict with keys as bus names, the values itself are dicts with key of the power angle parameter  $\tan \phi$  and the values as `pandas DataFrame`. The contained details are maximum active power  $P_{\max}$ , the reactive power  $Q$  at this point, and the voltage magnitude  $|V|$  at the bus.

#### Results of the Nose Curve Generation

The following figure [Figure 3.7](#) shows the generated nose curve for a simple grid as illustrated in [Figure 4.3](#). The grid is characterized at Bus 1, with a varying power angle as parameter  $\tan \phi$ . The power angle  $\tan \phi$  is used to vary the power factor of the load, thus representing different load characteristics, as


$$\tan \phi = \frac{Q}{P}.$$

Displayed are a few combinations with different load characteristics, leading to a different possible maximum active power transfer. [Figure 3.8](#) shows the comparison between the analytical calculation and the implemented solution. The analytical calculation is carried out with the method described in [subsection 2.1.1](#). For this specific example, the complete calculation, including the set of used parameters, is shown in [section B.3](#). What seems conspicuous is the missing lower part of the curve, meaning the second possible solution when solving the power flow equations. Although this seems like a major drawback, the resulting curve contains all the necessary parts, where a stable solution can occur. **[Quelle]** The solution is reaching exactly until the critical point of power transfer.


#### 3.2.2 Using Voltage Envelopes for Criticality Evaluation

Using the methods of [\[15\]](#), [\[16\]](#): Trajectory Violation Index. Not only for this classified envelope, but as well for FRT envelopes (MV, HV; Type 2 generation units)

Adding the envelopes described in Scheiner, Burlakin, Strunz, *et al.* [\[15\]](#), and Wildenhues, Rueda, and Erlich [\[16\]](#), but as well the [FRT](#) curves from the



**Figure 3.7:** Exemplary generated nose curve for a simple generator - load grid for various power angle level parameters  $\tan \phi$ ; Applied on the grid of Figure 4.3 with a characterization at Bus 1



**Figure 3.8:** Comparison between the analytical calculation and the implemented solution

the regulations for technical connections to the medium- and high-voltage networks [17], [18].

#### 3.2.3 Utilization of Time Series Calculations

As section before:

- Finding critical points of the given system and load parameters
- At every load change: Find static voltage stability point
- Map distance between those points on the Nose Curves. As well for different Tap changer positions.
- Find the time between an event / begin of non-static behavior, until the critical point is reached and overstepped
- Nice visualization possible?

With similar structure as before:

1. Idea and background
2. Implementation
3. Results

#### 3.2.4 Combination of Static Methods with Time Domain Solutions

Idea here: Show the dynamic RMS simulation results in the quasi-stationary assessment techniques. These are static solutions to the network, the electromechanic equalization processes should on a long-term watch result in these states. With controls of the machines etc. one can obtain more or less a following of the static solutions until a certain point. If the grid, or the machine, or its control units are stronger, a certain (heavy) level of load increase can be better and faster compensated.

Combining here:

- Nose Curve plots
- Curves for different positions of the OLTC control
- Time Domain projection in the Nose Curves
- Static load solutions of a Transient increase
- Time Indices: Transfer Maximum, Voltage Band, FRT cut

- Integration of Voltage difference over time: Difference between voltage and voltage envelope

### **3.3 Summary in Short and Simple Terms**



” If you tell the truth, you don’t  
have to remember anything.

— Mark Twain

## 4 Validation Setup and Results

### 4.1 Representative Electrical Networks

The following section shall introduce the used power systems in the simulation with the Python framework, considering verification, and also extension meaning the performed case studies in [chapter 5](#). The models are chosen to represent different network sizes and complexities, thus allowing the objective of graded interaction levels of the developed (transformer) model. The models are based on the work of Machowski, Lubosny, Bialek, *et al.* [1], Kundur and Malik [7], *IEEE Guide for Load Modeling and Simulations for Power Systems* [19], and Van Cutsem, Glavic, Rosehart, *et al.* [6]. On important note to take for all the presented networks in the following, is the consequent absence of machine control units. Only where mentioned explicitly, they are used.

#### Single Machine Infinite Bus (SMIB) Model

One very popular and thus powerful electrical network for the verification of power system stability is the [SMIB](#) model. It is a compact and simplified model of a power system, allowing easy analytical calculation, verification and development. Mutual influences are comparably simple to understand and calculate, as the infinite bus bus is acting as a fixed grid connection point with a large adjoining grid. The generator is connected to the bus bar via a transmission line and a transformer. The model was largely discussed by Kundur and Malik [7], and is shown in [Figure 4.1](#). The generator and the [IBB](#) are represented by synchronous machines, developed and discussed by Kordowich and Jaeger [20]. The specific model details are included in ??, additionally the simulation setup for verification is described in [Table 4.1](#).




**Figure 4.1:** Single Machine Infinite Bus (SMIB) model for verification and validation of the Python framework; own figure after [1], [7]

**Table 4.1:** Simulation Setup for validation of the  $\Pi$ -modeled transformer; considering a transforming ratio  $\underline{v} \neq 1$  and  $\underline{v} \in \mathbb{C}$

Parameter	Value
Generator inertia $H$	3.5 s
Generator damping $D$	0.1 p.u.
Generator resistance $R$	0.01 p.u.
Generator reactance $X$	0.1 p.u.
Transformer resistance $R$	0.01 p.u.
Transformer reactance $X$	0.1 p.u.
Transmission line resistance $R$	0.01 p.u.
Transmission line reactance $X$	0.1 p.u.

Further, this model shall be slightly modified according to Figure 4.2. A load is added at the secondary bus of the transformer, the rest of the system is kept. Table 4.1 already contains this modification.




**Figure 4.2:** Modified Single Machine Infinite Bus (SMIB) model with additional load

### Simple Single Machine Load Model

Following model is often recommended [Quelle] for easy voltage control studies, in explicit for OLTCs. Similar to the SMIB model, it consists from one



synchronous generator, busses, and lines in a single branch. The IBB is thus removed and changed to a load. This two element type o configuration allows for an easy analytical calculation of voltage stability and control. Although this thesis is focussing on OLTC transformers, the model is extended with one in between. A single line representation is depicted in Figure 4.3.



**Figure 4.3:** Single line representation of a simple single machine load model; own illustration with characteristics from [Quelle]

Further details about its configuration and simulation setup are included in ?? . It should be noted, that simple load models are not useful for simulation of this example network. Usually constant Z models are used as loads, therefore simulation results can be misleading and not showing desired effects or voltage instability mechanisms [Quelle] .

## 4.2 Validation Steps


Following section shall guide through the validation process. Beginning with the new transformer II-model, therefore looking deeper into characteristic behavior dependent on the rated apparent power and the longitudinal ratio. Proceeding with the three modeled control circuit and their behavior. Lastly, some applied plausibilisations shall be done with the implemented voltage stability rating tools.

### 4.2.1 Validation of the Modeled Transformer with Variable Tap Position

As mentioned before, the base validation is concerning the basic transformer model. For this, a parameter variation and comparison to the results from

*DigSILENT PowerFactory* shall give a good representation of the accuracy. The varied parameters are the apparent rated power  $S_n$  of the transformer, the longitudinal ratio  $\vartheta$ , the transformer reactance  $X$ , and the phase shifting angle  $\phi$ , resulting from the applied vector group. The last two parameters are not included, because the transformer reactance is passively included in the ratio. The reason for excluding the vector angle  $\phi$  relies in the not congruent results.

### Variation of the Apparent Power



**Figure 4.4:** Absolute errors while comparing the tool *diffpssi* with the software *DigSILENT PowerFactory*; One plot each for every parameter variation, concerning the errors for each bus

The rated apparent power  $S_n$  shall be varied in three steps according as described in [Equation 4.1](#). The used grid model is the afore described [SMIB](#) model. This is showing some predictable dynamics, but enabling a relative uncomplicated and easy to overview troubleshooting, if necessary. The used

grid parameters staying as described before, only the transformer apparent power is varied.

$$S_n \in \{1100; 2200; 4400\} \text{ MVA} \quad (4.1)$$

The used model for the comparative tool *DIGSILENT PowerFactory* is as well included in the *diffpssi* repository. A plot of both results is depicted in [Figure C.1](#). Looking deeper into one parameter, but plotting both tools in one diagram, [Figure C.2](#) in [section C.1](#) is showing the results. The three split diagrams account for each bus, where nearly no difference is obtainable.


Supporting this observation is the comparison of errors as illustrated in [Figure 4.4](#). The error is not exceeding 0.005 p.u. in any case. One note to make here is, that due to the per unit nature of the calculation the initial values are often around 1 p.u. Therefore the separate calculation of a relative error is neglected, as the absolute error is containing more information, and thus not surpassing the feel of relative nature. Following this argumentation, the maximum relative error shall be around 0.05 % for this parameter variation.

### Variation of the Longitudinal Ratio


In similar way as the validation approach for the rated apparent power, the longitudinal ratio shall be varied. Therefore the same network, with identical parameters is used, only that at this time the rated apparent power is fixed as well and the longitudinal ratio of the transformer is fixed during the simulation time according to following variation:

$$\vartheta \in \{0.9; 1.0; 1.1\} \text{ p.u} \quad (4.2)$$

Looking into the results, in the same form as previously. On the left side of [Figure C.3](#) is the result from the Python module *diffpssi*, the right side is accounting for the validation tool *DIGSILENT PowerFactory*. The focussed comparison for the fixed ratio of 0.9 p.u. is included in [section C.1](#). As well [Figure 4.5](#) is showing absolute errors in the same manner. The obtainable error for this case is comparably high, excluding for the reductive ratio of 0.9 p.u. This increasing with simulation time, to around a factor of 10 of the other errors. But still, this error is in a margin of lower than 1 %.




**Figure 4.5:** Comparison of different varied parameters between *diffpssi* and *DIgSILENT PowerFactory*



**Figure 4.6:** Comparison of the constant impedance model for each bus between the Python module *diffpssi* and *DIgSILENT PowerFactory*

### 4.2.2 Parenthesis: Accountability of the Load Model

A static load model with quadratic dependency on the voltage had been implemented in the Python module before. The load model can thus be classified as constant impedance model, or often referred as constant  $\underline{Z}$  model [19]. As this is playing a role in the chain of accumulating errors, following parenthesis shall give a feeling what contribution is generated through this load model. For this evaluation the Single Line with Load model from [section 4.1](#) is used, with a load jump from  $P = 400$  MW to  $P = 800$  MW at the time stamp 1 s. The overall simulation time is set to 20 s. Other parameters are set as described in [section 4.1](#).



**Figure 4.7:** Absolute error of the already implemented constant impedance model over time; Accounted for both busses zero and one

[Figure 4.6](#) is showing the time series computation for each bus compared between both tools *diffpssi* and *DIgSILENT PowerFactory*. Visible is the more extreme pronounciation of the overshoot and the convergence value over time of the Python package. Looking at the absolute error comparison for each bus in [Figure 4.2.3](#) showing a increase over time, and peak offsets of around 0.006 p.u. This accounts for an error lower than 1 % in this scenario.


### 4.2.3 Validation of the OLTC Control Schemes

To begin with this section of control scheme validation, the basic strategy accounted for all the considered models and verification setups. The characterizations of the control loop feedbacks has already been carried out in the modeling chapter [subsection 3.1.3](#). To validate the in-simulation behavior of

the control loops, two different scenarios are accounted for the **OLTC** and the **FSM**. First, the Simple Load against Machine grid is used with the declared parameters as in [section 4.1](#). To bring the system in a dynamic state, a load increase is added at the simulation time point 1 s. All differing values are pointed out in the validation result presentation later on. Secondly, the more complex version of a **SMIB** model with a connected load at the middle bus is used to account for a different scenario including a load flow direction change. It would be expected, that neither *DigSILENT PowerFactory* or *diffpssi* would be able to react on this supposed load flow direction change.

### Application of the Afore Described Logic


The first consideration for validation of the **OLTC** control is the simple load model against a machine. The applied load change is shifting the real power of the load from  $P = 400$  MW to  $P = 800$  MW at the simulation time 1 s.



**Figure 4.8:** Time Domain Solution (**TDS**) of the standard discrete **OLTC** control scheme; Result of the extended or modified **SMIB** model with additional load

When comparing the time series solution from [Figure 4.8](#) for both bus voltages, one can obtain a similar course of the curves. Only a small deviation is visible, the tap changes of the **OLTC** clearly visible and around the same times. A similar picture is drawn, when looking at the absolute error of this scenario in [Figure 4.9](#). In the areas of time, where the switching occurs, peaks of errors are visible, showing just the less congruent development of bus voltages and switching. After the half of the simulation time, a new (quasi-) stationary state is showing a static offset or error. This error is around 0.005 p.u., showing

a slightly higher error than when looking at this scenario without the tap changing transformer in subsection 4.2.2.




**Figure 4.9:** Comparison of the standard discrete OLTC control scheme applied on the extended SMIB model with additional load; One plot for each bus with data from *diffpssi* and *DIGSILENT PowerFactory*; Additional plot for showing the absolute error for each bus


Taking in consideration the second verification scenario, applying the discrete OLTC control scheme to the extended SMIB model with added load, one can obtain the TDS visible in Figure C.7. For reasons of volume, this plot is just added to the appendix. The added event at time step 1 s is a load jump at bus 1 from  $P = 100$  MW to  $P = 1100$  MW. Comparing the results for each bus between the two tools *diffpssi* and *DIGSILENT PowerFactory* Figure 4.10 is giving an overview.

Two observations can be drawn, when looking at the evolution of the bus voltage magnitudes. First, the tap changing of the OLTC is not addressing the problem of letting the voltage drifting away. The control is supporting the destabilization of the voltage at bus 2, and hence the connected machine. Secondly, although the initial evolution of the voltages after the load increase event is showing similar results with small deviation between the two tools, the first OLTC intervention is happening at a different time step. All following ones are as well time shifted between the two tools, ending up with a absolute static offset voltage between the two tools of around 0.01 p.u.

When looking deeper in the model and its signals, one can obtain, that the OLTC control is thus switching correctly. As displayed in Figure 4.11, the deadband filter is correctly surpassing just values greater than the deadband,



**Figure 4.10:** Comparison of the standard discrete OLTC control scheme applied on the extended SMIB model with additional load; One plot for each bus with data from diffpssi and DigSILENT PowerFactory; Additional plot for showing the absolute error for each bus




**Figure 4.11:** Internal signals of the OLTC control in the extended SMIB model; a) the longitudinal transformer ratio  $u_l$  or mathematically referred as  $\vartheta$ , b) the deadband filtered voltage difference signal  $v_{dead}$



otherwise zero. As well as the longitudinal ratio on the other side, where distances of 5 s are visible, considering the time constant and the constant overshoot of the voltage difference of greater than the deadband, the control mechanisms seem to operate fine and plausible.

### Found Discreptancies or Strange Behavior



**Figure 4.12:** Discreptancy when looking at the validation of the simple load model with discrete OLTC control

While looking into and analyzing the results from the tool *DIGSILENT PowerFactory*, a strange interaction was found. Figure 4.12 is showing the error comparison between the same grid and events as firstly illustrated. The only change was the placement of the tap changer, respectively in which direction the ratio of the transformer was defined. In this case it was set to the **LV** side of the transformer, while the comparing *diffpssi* data was produced with a tap changer on the **HV** side, the same data as before. Figure C.6 is showing the **TDS** for this comparison.

Unexpectedly and strangely, the error one can evaluate with this semantic false comparison is lower as the actual correct comparison. This is leading to the question of a relation to the wrong side in the modeling. But as described in the overall section 3.1, exactly this confusion had been marked as important and explained detailed. One further aspect is, that the occurring error with this additional model is now lower as the error with only the load model and parameter event considered, as displayed in from the previous subsection.

### 4.2.4 Validation of the FSM Control Scheme

[MK2]: Sure the same?


The idea and proceeding of the validation of the **FSM** is carried out similar to the subsection before. First, a simple load against machine model is used, with the same parameters as described in [section 4.1](#). Extending this model, a second look into the extended **SMIB** model is done. Here the parameterization stays the same as well.

As described in the modeling chapter, specifically [subsection 3.1.3](#), of the **FSM** module control, two control methods are implemented. First, as described in the paper of Burlakin, Scheiner, Mehlmann, *et al.* [10] with preferring the switching of the **FSM**, and secondly the dependence on the function of tap skipping. As only the last model is available in the comparative tool *DIgSILENT PowerFactory*, only this can be compared and validated. The other control scheme is implemented similarly and used as well for further studies.

#### Voltage Difference Dependent Activation


##### Simple Load model

**SMIB Model with Added Load** from  $P = 100$  MW to  $P = 700$  MW




**Figure 4.13:** TDS and error comparison for a **FSM** control scheme based on the voltage difference applied on the extended **SMIB** model


[Extendend SMIB from here](#)




**Figure 4.14:** TDS and error comparison for a FSM control scheme based on the voltage difference applied on the extended SMIB model




**Figure 4.15:** TDS and error comparison for a FSM control scheme based on the voltage difference applied on the extended SMIB model



**Figure 4.16:** TDS and error comparison for a FSM control scheme based on the voltage difference applied on the simple scenario



**Figure 4.17:** TDS and error comparison for a FSM control scheme based on the voltage difference applied on the extended SMIB model




**Figure 4.18:** Differing TDS for a FSM control scheme preferring the FSM

### Preferring the FSM over the Normal OLTC

For the simple load against machine model no different result to the afore presented could be found. The less drastic increase in voltage magnitude difference is resulting in the same switching behavior and module activation as with the voltage dependent **FSM** control. Therefore the **FSM** is acting just as an increase in switchable tap positions, resp. transformer ratio spread.

Accounting for the second validation set up, the same network is chosen as for the validation of the first **FSM** control scheme. The event magnitude is increased to a change from  $P = 100$  MW to  $P = 1100$  MW. Because no implemented version of this control was available for the tool *DIgSILENT PowerFactory*, no comparison can be drawn. The result, a **TDS** as alternative to the afore illustrated behavior, can be evaluated through [Figure 4.18](#), where one can clearly distinguish between the first four switches as related to the **FSM**. The magnitude is apparently twice as big as the following switches.



**Figure 4.19:** Illustration of the dead band with the FSM preferring FSM control scheme

One quite interesting error in this switching logic is the problem of a deaf area between the deadband and  $\Delta m \cdot v_{db}$ . If the occurring event is causing a rise in voltage deviation between these two values, but not exceeding the limit, the **FSM** control is not being activated. Therefore no tap changing is occurring, and because the **FSM** can not getting into any extreme position, the normal **OLTC** control is not getting activated as well. Therefore the tap

changing transformer is not doing anything, and acting sort of „deaf“ to the voltage deviation in that band. [Figure 4.19](#) is illustrating such a scenario, with considering the extended [SMIB](#) model, having a load increase at 1 s from  $P = 100$  MW to  $P = 700$  MW.

### 4.2.5 Voltage Stability Rating Plausibility

Place results here, looking at: off nominal tap ratio, and with off nominal phase shifting (e.g.  $110^\circ$ )

Things to illustrate:

1. Validity of Top Branch Nose Curves: Analytical and PowerFactory; Simple Network and e.g. IEEE 9-bus
2. Analytical Validity OLTC ratio dependent Nose Curves
3. Time Domain Projection: Dependence and Stability in transient scenarios vs. continuous load increase; Dependence on Machine Controls; Dependence on Apparent Power Capacity of machine

#### Nose Curve Validation

#### Extension of Nose Curves: Plausibility

#### Including Time Series Domain in Static Nose Curves

## 4.3 Model Limitations and Improvements

Points to address from the transformer and the control modeling:

- Error chain and multiplication
- Numerical differences: (Unknown) Solver with variable time steps -> also NUMERICAL error propagation?
- Problematic PowerFactory implementation: When FSM module is implemented in PF the same way, maybe incompatible  $\vartheta$ 's are used in the FSM control and the Pi model of PF
- 

Points to address from the voltage stability monitoring:

- Stiffness of the models via apparent power: Comparison of static solutions and Dynamic Behavior

## 4.4 Summary in Short and Simple Terms



” *Insanity is doing the same thing,  
over and over again, but expecting  
different results.*

— Narcotics Anonymous

## 5 Case Study

Maybe interesting assessment: Can one prevent the forming of one weak bus?  
-> If the grid is weak, all busses are getting weaker / problematic during a fault. -> But does ONE get weaker than the others? Or can the FSM prevent that and utilize all busses similar?

In the interest of investigation / the Case Study are:

- Influence of switching times on stability margin/begin of destabilization,
- Influence of max. ratio change per switching event, and
- Influence on different test systems (destabilization mechanisms).

Does it make sense to structure like that? (Scenarios - Simulation - Results)

Or is it a better idea thinking in terms of specific „use cases“ as sections:

- What happens under strong grid conditions? -> Section: Strong grid condition behavior
- What happens under weak grid conditions? -> Section: Weak grid condition behavior
- Strongly interconnected grids
- Widely extended linear string grids

### 5.1 Practical Application of the FSM in Comparison to the OLTC

Here the discussed basic application / simulation with Ilya

- FRT curves of the FSM vs OLTC in SMIB with machine controllers
- Describe differences, untypical behavior, etc.
- Include visualizations, also with FRT curves
- Influences of faster response, bigger voltage range, etc.

## 5.2 Influence of FSM on Power or Voltage Swings of Machines

Thinking of Rotor Angle Stability, maybe considered by an EAC implementation?

What does the fast Switching, esp. at up to 8% of the nominal voltage, do to the machines?

Comparison between standard Transformer / OLTC and FSM control.

## 5.3 Utilization of FSM with a Power Swing Damping Effect

Thinking of the damping effect of the FSM, especially in the case of power swings, caused by shortages and following swinging of Generators.

## 5.4 Novel Control Strategy FSM

Thinking of fast and slow voltage gradients: fast gradients are compensated by the FSM, slow gradients are compensated by the OLTC. Therefore optimal utilisation of injected damping moment of the FSM.

Also thinking of different presets of the OLTC and FSM, which are tried to keep constant. Different grid operators can utilize for typical grid conditions of over- or undervoltage at [PCC](#).

Following contains:

- Implementation of different logic
- Testing of presets and switchin logic
- Damping moment beneficial?

### 5.4.1 Scenario Setting

### 5.4.2 Simulation

### 5.4.3 Results

## 5.5 Possible Extension for Power Flow Congruent Control

Extension in the Control Algorithm to decide which Bus has to be regulated, to avoid contrary actions of the OLTC and FSM against the power flow. Therefore not decrease of stability, but increase. Possible Application: Grid coupling Transformers, Battery Storage assisted Virtual powerplants, etc.

For this thinking maybe another control strategy is relevant:

- No setpoint from a load flow day-ahead or similar time frame; but rather current load and bus voltages are considered
- Not the deviation of one transformer bus voltage from a setpoint, but the deviation between the two bus voltages is relevant
- Maybe the absolute deviation to the optimal bus voltages at the current load situation is relevant

Big general problem: In which direction does the OLTC / the FSM have to switch? In some cases, the direction is not correct, in some it is correct.

## 5.6 Summary in Short and Simple Terms



” *The aim of argument, or discussion, should not be victory, but progress.*

— Joseph Joubert

## 6 Discussion of the Results

### 6.1 Transformer Model and Validation

One key missing model / aspect, especially for short term voltage stability in combination with stability support of the FSM: **INDUCTION MOTORS**.

This thesis is only presenting a control circuit for standard OLTCs, and their extensional FSM. Line Drop Compensations are not included, WAMPAC methods are excluded, parallel transformer realizations (N-1 criteria; redundancies), are not considered. For recent developments, Sarimuthu, Ramachandaramurthy, Agileswari, *et al.* [21] is presenting a review paper considering a few of these topics.

### 6.2 Voltage Stability Rating and Assessment

### 6.3 Case Studies and Practical Applications

### 6.4 Summary in Short and Simple Terms



” In three words I can sum up everything I’ve learned about life: it goes on.

— Robert Frost

## 7 Summary and Outlook

Some conclusion.

### 1. How do different control types and characteristics of Tap Changing transformers influence the voltage stability of the given system?

Research Questions

Some summary about Research Question 1. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetur id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

### 2. Can the already existing Tap Changer Control of the Fast Switching Module (FSM) be improved towards a more operation oriented control?

Additional Questions

Some summary about Research Question 2. Nam dui ligula, fringilla a, euismod sodales, sollicitudin vel, wisi. Morbi auctor lorem non justo. Nam lacus libero, pretium at, lobortis vitae, ultricies et, tellus. Donec aliquet, tortor sed accumsan bibendum, erat ligula aliquet magna, vitae ornare odio metus a mi. Morbi ac orci et nisl hendrerit mollis. Suspendisse ut massa. Cras nec ante. Pellentesque a nulla. Cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus. Aliquam tincidunt urna. Nulla ullamcorper vestibulum turpis. Pellentesque cursus luctus mauris.

Some outlook and nice blibli. Nulla malesuada porttitor diam. Donec felis erat, congue non, volutpat at, tincidunt tristique, libero. Vivamus viverra

Further Investigations

fermentum felis. Donec nonummy pellentesque ante. Phasellus adipiscing semper elit. Proin fermentum massa ac quam. Sed diam turpis, molestie vitae, placerat a, molestie nec, leo. Maecenas lacinia. Nam ipsum ligula, eleifend at, accumsan nec, suscipit a, ipsum. Morbi blandit ligula feugiat magna. Nunc eleifend consequat lorem. Sed lacinia nulla vitae enim. Pellentesque tincidunt purus vel magna. Integer non enim. Praesent euismod nunc eu purus. Donec bibendum quam in tellus. Nullam cursus pulvinar lectus. Donec et mi. Nam vulputate metus eu enim. Vestibulum pellentesque felis eu massa.

Some outlook and nice blibla. Nulla malesuada porttitor diam. Donec felis erat, congue non, volutpat at, tincidunt tristique, libero. Vivamus viverra fermentum felis. Donec nonummy pellentesque ante. Phasellus adipiscing semper elit. Proin fermentum massa ac quam. Sed diam turpis, molestie vitae, placerat a, molestie nec, leo. Maecenas lacinia. Nam ipsum ligula, eleifend at, accumsan nec, suscipit a, ipsum. Morbi blandit ligula feugiat magna. Nunc eleifend consequat lorem. Sed lacinia nulla vitae enim. Pellentesque tincidunt purus vel magna. Integer non enim. Praesent euismod nunc eu purus. Donec bibendum quam in tellus. Nullam cursus pulvinar lectus. Donec et mi. Nam vulputate metus eu enim. Vestibulum pellentesque felis eu massa.

*Future outlook on  
the Fast Switching  
Module*



# Acronyms

<b>EMT</b>	Electromagnetic Transient
<b>FRT</b>	Fault-Ride-Through
<b>FSM</b>	Fast Switching Module
<b>HV</b>	High Voltage
<b>IBB</b>	Infinite Bus Bar
<b>LV</b>	Low Voltage
<b>OLTC</b>	On-Load Tap Changer
<b>PCC</b>	Point of Common Coupling
<b>PSS</b>	Power System Simulation
<b>RMS</b>	Root Mean Square
<b>SG</b>	Synchronous Generator
<b>SMIB</b>	Single Machine Infinite Bus
<b>TDS</b>	Time Domain Solution



# Symbols

$\delta$	$^{\circ} / \text{deg}$	power angle (or power angle difference)
$\Delta\omega$	$\frac{1}{\text{s}}$	change of rotor angular speed
$\underline{\vartheta}$	-	transformer ratio; complex if phase shifting
$A$	-	acceleration or deceleration area
$\underline{E}$	V	voltage of <a href="#">SG</a> or <a href="#">IBB</a>
$H_{\text{gen}}$	s	inertia constant of a Synchronous Generator ( <a href="#">SG</a> )
$\underline{I}$	A	current
$P$	W	effective power; electrical or mechanical
$Q$	var	reactive power
$R$	$\Omega$	ohmic resistance
$\underline{S}$	VA	apparent power
$\underline{V}$	V	voltage
$\underline{X}$	$\Omega$	reactance
$\underline{Y}$	$\frac{1}{\Omega} / \text{S}$	admittance
$\underline{Z}$	$\Omega$	impedance

The different symbols are used with different indices, these are semantic and explained in the surrounding context. Following notation is commonly used for mathematical and physical symbols:

- Phasors or complex quantities are underlined (e.g.  $\underline{I}$ )
- Arrows on top mark a spatial vector (e.g.  $\vec{F}$ )
- Boldface denotes matrices or vectors (e.g. **F**)
- Roman typed symbols are units (e.g. s)
- Lower case symbols denote instantaneous values (e.g.  $i$ )
- Upper case symbols denote [RMS](#) or peak values (e.g.  $I$ )
- Subscripts relating to physical quantities or numerical variables are written italic (e.g.  $\underline{I}_1$ )

In the simulations and calculations the per unit system (p.u.) is preferred, thus normalizing all values with a base value. Where necessary, absolute units are added to indicate the explicit use of the normal unit system. For more information about this per-unit system please refer to Machowski, Lubosny, Bialek, *et al.* [1], specifically Appendix A.1 provides a detailed description and explanation.



# List of Figures

2.1	Simplest Load - Source system for deriving voltage - power behaviors . . . . .	7
2.2	Nose Curves resulting from maximum power transfer equations	9
2.3	Two-Winding Transformer Circuit in the Positive Sequence . .	12
2.4	$\Pi$ -representative circuit of an idealized transformer with a tap changer . . . . .	13
2.5	Illustration of the tap ratio vector for an ideal and an asymmetric transformer . . . . .	16
3.1	Architecture of the implemented models in <i>diffpssi</i> . . . . .	20
3.2	Discrete control loop of an <b>OLTC</b> ; scheme based on Milano [12]	23
3.3	Implementation structure of the discrete OLTC controller . . .	24
3.4	Characterization of the OLTC control loops . . . . .	25
3.5	Control loop of a Fast Switching Module ( <b>FSM</b> ) . . . . .	25
3.6	Class diagram of the NoseCurve class in the package <i>diffpssi</i> .	29
3.7	Exemplary generated nose curve for a simple generator - load grid . . . . .	31
3.8	Comparison between the analytical calculation and the implemented solution . . . . .	31
4.3	Single line representation of a simple single machine load model	37
4.4	Model error comparison concerning the variation of the rated apparent power . . . . .	38
4.5	Comparison of different varied parameters between <i>diffpssi</i> and <i>DIGSILENT PowerFactory</i> . . . . .	40
4.6	Comparison of the constant impedance model for each bus . .	40
4.7	Absolute error comparison of the constant impedance model .	41
4.8	Time Domain Result of the OLTC control scheme applied on the extended <b>SMIB</b> network . . . . .	42
4.9	Bus and Error Comparison for the standard discrete <b>OLTC</b> scheme applied on the extended <b>SMIB</b> model with load . . . .	43
4.10	Bus and Error Comparison for the standard discrete <b>OLTC</b> scheme applied on the extended <b>SMIB</b> model with load . . . .	44
4.11	Internal signals of the <b>OLTC</b> control in the extended <b>SMIB</b> model	44

4.12 Discrepancy when looking at the validation of the simple load model with discrete OLTC control . . . . .	45
4.13 TDS and error comparison for a FSM control scheme based on the voltage difference applied on the extended SMIB model .	46
4.14 TDS and error comparison for a FSM control scheme based on the voltage difference applied on the extended SMIB model .	47
4.15 TDS and error comparison for a FSM control scheme based on the voltage difference applied on the extended SMIB model .	47
4.16 TDS and error comparison for a FSM control scheme based on the voltage difference applied on the simple scenario . . . . .	48
4.17 TDS and error comparison for a FSM control scheme based on the voltage difference applied on the extended SMIB model .	49
4.18 Differing TDS for a FSM control scheme preferring the FSM .	49
4.19 Illustration of the deaf band with the FSM preferring FSM control scheme . . . . .	50

# List of Tables

2.1	Voltage instability types and different time frames . . . . .	6
2.2	Voltage stability indices for the assessment in this thesis . . .	11
4.1	Simulation Setup for validation of the $\Pi$ -modeled transformer	36





# Bibliography

- [1] J. Machowski, Z. Lubosny, J. W. Bialek, and J. R. Bumby, *Power System Dynamics: Stability and Control*, Third edition. Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley, 2020, ISBN: 978-1-119-52636-0.
- [2] M. S. S. Danish, *Voltage Stability in Electric Power System: A Practical Introduction*. Berlin: Logos-Verl, 2015, ISBN: 978-3-8325-3878-1.
- [3] T. Cutsem and C. Vournas, *Voltage Stability of Electric Power Systems*. Boston, MA: Springer US, 1998, ISBN: 978-0-387-75535-9. DOI: [10.1007/978-0-387-75536-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-75536-6). (visited on 10/24/2024).
- [4] D. Shoup, J. Paserba, and C. Taylor, “A survey of current practices for transient voltage dip/sag criteria related to power system stability”, in *IEEE PES Power Systems Conference and Exposition, 2004.*, Oct. 2004, 1140–1147 vol.2. DOI: [10.1109/PSCE.2004.1397688](https://doi.org/10.1109/PSCE.2004.1397688). (visited on 04/15/2025).
- [5] J. L. Rueda-Torres, U. Annakage, C. Vournas, *et al.*, “Evaluation of Voltage Stability Assessment Methodologies in Modern Power Systems with Increased Penetration of Inverter-Based Resources (tr 126)”, 2024. DOI: [10.17023/SA3K-AZ76](https://doi.org/10.17023/SA3K-AZ76). (visited on 12/02/2024).
- [6] T. Van Cutsem, M. Glavic, W. Rosehart, *et al.*, “Test Systems for Voltage Stability Studies”, *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 4078–4087, Sep. 2020, ISSN: 0885-8950, 1558-0679. DOI: [10.1109/TPWRS.2020.2976834](https://doi.org/10.1109/TPWRS.2020.2976834). (visited on 11/08/2024).
- [7] P. S. Kundur and O. P. Malik, *Power System Stability and Control*, Second edition. New York Chicago San Francisco Athens London Madrid Mexico City Milan New Delhi Singapore Sydney Toronto: McGraw Hill, 2022, ISBN: 978-1-260-47354-4.
- [8] F. Milano, *Power System Modelling and Scripting (Power Systems)*, 1. ed. Heidelberg: Springer, 2010, ISBN: 978-3-642-13668-9.
- [9] C. E. Doig Cardet, “Analysis on Voltage Stability Indices”, M.S. thesis, RWTH Aachen, 2010. (visited on 02/04/2025).
- [10] I. Burlakin, E. Scheiner, G. Mehlmann, *et al.*, “Enhanced Voltage Control in Offshore Wind Farms with Fast-Tapping on-Load Tap-Changers”, in *23rd Wind & Solar Integration Workshop*, Helsinki, Finland, Oct. 2024.

- [11] J. Wang, S. Shin, M. Numair, P. Meira, and alexe15, *Ps-wiki/best-of-ps: Update: 2025.04.03*, Zenodo, Apr. 2025. DOI: [10.5281/ZENODO.15133452](https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.15133452). (visited on 04/07/2025).
- [12] F. Milano, “Hybrid Control Model of Under Load Tap Changers”, *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 2837–2844, Oct. 2011, ISSN: 0885-8977, 1937-4208. DOI: [10.1109/TPWRD.2011.2167521](https://doi.org/10.1109/TPWRD.2011.2167521). (visited on 09/02/2024).
- [13] V. Ajarapu and C. Christy, “The Continuation Power Flow: A Tool for Steady State Voltage Stability Analysis”, *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 416–423, Feb. 1992, ISSN: 08858950. DOI: [10.1109/59.141737](https://doi.org/10.1109/59.141737). (visited on 03/26/2025).
- [14] V. Ajarapu, Ed., *Computational Techniques for Voltage Stability Assessment and Control* (Power Electronics and Power Systems). Boston, MA: Springer US, 2007, ISBN: 978-0-387-26080-8. DOI: [10.1007/978-0-387-32935-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-32935-2). (visited on 03/26/2025).
- [15] E. Scheiner, I. Burlakin, N. Strunz, A. Raab, G. Mehlmann, and M. Luther, “Impact of Time Constants of Reactive Power Sources on Short-Term Voltage Stability”, in *2022 IEEE Transportation Electrification Conference & Expo (ITEC)*, Jun. 2022, pp. 161–165. DOI: [10.1109/ITEC53557.2022.9813987](https://doi.org/10.1109/ITEC53557.2022.9813987). (visited on 04/13/2025).
- [16] S. Wildenhues, J. L. Rueda, and I. Erlich, “Optimal Allocation and Sizing of Dynamic Var Sources Using Heuristic Optimization”, *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 2538–2546, Sep. 2015, ISSN: 1558-0679. DOI: [10.1109/TPWRS.2014.2361153](https://doi.org/10.1109/TPWRS.2014.2361153). (visited on 04/13/2025).
- [17] *Technische Regeln Für Den Anschluss Von Kundenanlagen an Das Höchstspannungsnetz Und Deren Betrieb (TAR Höchstspannung)*, Technische Anschlussregelung, 2018.
- [18] *Technische Regeln Für Den Anschluss Von Kundenanlagen an Das Mittelspannungsnetz Und Deren Betrieb (TAR Mittelspannung)*, 2023.
- [19] *IEEE Guide for Load Modeling and Simulations for Power Systems*, 2022. DOI: [10.1109/IEEESTD.2022.9905546](https://doi.org/10.1109/IEEESTD.2022.9905546). (visited on 11/08/2024).
- [20] G. Kordowich and J. Jaeger, *A Physics Informed Machine Learning Method for Power System Model Parameter Optimization*, Sep. 2023. arXiv: [2309.16579](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.16579) [cs, eess]. (visited on 09/02/2024).

- [21] C. R. Sarimuthu, V. K. Ramachandaramurthy, K. Agileswari, and H. Mokhlis, “A review on voltage control methods using on-load tap changer transformers for networks with renewable energy sources”, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 62, pp. 1154–1161, Sep. 2016, ISSN: 13640321. DOI: [10.1016/j.rser.2016.05.016](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.05.016). (visited on 09/26/2024).



# Appendix

## A Fundamentals [c](#)

- A.1 Comparison of Trigonometric Functions [c](#)
- A.2 Description of the Power System Simulation process [d](#)
- A.3 Jacobian based voltage stability criteria [e](#)
- A.4 Comparison of System based and Jacobian based indices [f](#)

## B Modeling [g](#)

- B.1 Admittance Calculation of a Two-Port [g](#)
- B.2 Class Diagram of the Class Nose Curves [g](#)
- B.3 Analytical Calculation of Simple Nose Curves [g](#)
- B.4 Alternative Current Injection Model [g](#)


## C Verification [i](#)

- C.1 Additional Plots from the Pi Model Validation [i](#)
- C.2 Additional Plots from the Tap Changer Control Schemes [l](#)
  - C.2.1 OLTC validation [l](#)
  - C.2.2 FSM validation [o](#)



# A Fundamentals

## A.1 Comparison of Trigonometric Functions



**Figure A.1:** Plot comparison of trigonometric functions


**Table A.1:** Comparison of trigonometric functions dependent on the angle  $\phi$  in degree or radians

Angle in °	Angle in rad	sin	cos	tan
0	0	0	1	0
10	0.1745	0.1736	0.9848	0.1763
20	0.3490	0.3420	0.9397	0.3640
30	0.5236	0.5	0.8660	0.5774
40	0.6981	0.6428	0.7660	0.8391
50	0.8727	0.7660	0.6428	1.1918
60	1.0472	0.8660	0.5	1.7321
70	1.2217	0.9397	0.3420	2.7475
80	1.3962	0.9848	0.1736	5.6713
90	1.5708	1	0	$\nexists$
120	2.0944	0.8660	-0.5	-1.7321
150	2.6180	0.5	-0.8660	-0.5774
180	3.1416	0	-1	0

## A.2 Description of the Power System Simulation process

In this appendix section, the general process of power system simulation is described. As this thesis is aiming to understand voltage stability and processes in longer periods of time, these explanations apply to pointer-based simulations, called RMS simulations. Meaning that the considered effects are slower electromechanical nature instead of faster electromagnetic ones. The in this thesis used Python framework „*diffpssi*“ is based on this type of simulation, and due to its open-source based nature traceable.





**Figure A.2:** Power system simulation process; own illustration

Really basic: (?)

- RMS vs EMT simulation (-> meaning one cannot simulate other faults than 3ph w/o ground)
- Phasor description
- Basic formulation: Static (algebraic) and dynamic (differential) equations
- Using of solvers (Integrators) for time domain simulation
- Using of different optimization algorithms for steady state (load flow) simulation -> initial values

Less basic and more advanced:

- routines in the framework
- two types: Algebraic and Differential equations have to be solved at each time step -> What is which? Which operational equipment is typically described with which type of equation?
- per unit system applying for easier simulation (different voltage levels)
- ...

## A.3 Jacobian based voltage stability criteria

Danish [2] is showing, describing, and referencing some voltage stability indices based on the Jacobian matrix. The following table is a collection of these indices.

## **A.4 Comparison of System based and Jacobian based indices**

# B Modeling

## B.1 Admittance Calculation of a Two-Port

Follwing part shall just give a short, but complete and clear overview, how the admittance matrix of a two-port system is calculated. Therefore the main focus of this thesis, a two-port with variable translation ratio, is kept.

## B.2 Class Diagram of the Class Nose Curves

NoseCurve	
+ results:	dict[DataFrame]
+ ps_sim:	diffpssi.PowerSystemSimulation
- p_vector:	list
- phi_vector:	list
- loadmodel:	callable
+ run_calculation(bus: list[str]):	dict[pd.DataFrame]
+ reset_sim_parameters():	None
+ plot_nose_curve(busses: list[str], size: tuple = (12, 6), title: bool = True, save_path: str = None):	None
+ get_max_loadings(busses: list[str]):	dict[dict[DataFrame]]

**Figure B.1:** Complete class diagram of the class Nose Curves; including all attributes and methods with data types, returns, and inputs

## B.3 Analytical Calculation of Simple Nose Curves

Some blibla and equations about the analytical calculation of simple nose curves.

## B.4 Alternative Current Injection Model

Machowski, Lubosny, Bialek, *et al.* [1] describes another way of modeling a OLTC transformer with variable ratio. This model is looking at the shunt brnaches as current injections, which are added to the individual busses.

Beneficial, the system admittance matrix is staying symmetrical, while the different transformer state(s) are represented by the different current injections. This can be mathematically expressed by following set of equations:


$$\begin{bmatrix} \underline{I}_1 \\ -\underline{I}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \underline{Y}_T & -\underline{Y}_T \\ -\underline{Y}_T & \underline{Y}_T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \underline{U}_1 \\ \underline{U}_2 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \Delta \underline{I}_1 \\ \Delta \underline{I}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ where}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta \underline{I}_1 \\ \Delta \underline{I}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \underline{0} & (\underline{\vartheta} - 1)\underline{Y}_T \\ -(\underline{\vartheta}^* + 1)\underline{Y}_T & (\underline{\vartheta}^* \underline{\vartheta} + 1)\underline{Y}_T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \underline{U}_1 \\ \underline{U}_2 \end{bmatrix} \text{ leading to}$$


$$\underline{\mathbf{Y}}_{\Pi, T, \text{Current Injection}} = \begin{bmatrix} \underline{Y}_T & -\underline{Y}_T \\ -\underline{Y}_T & \underline{Y}_T \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \underline{0} & (\underline{\vartheta} - 1)\underline{Y}_T \\ -(\underline{\vartheta}^* + 1)\underline{Y}_T & (\underline{\vartheta}^* \underline{\vartheta} + 1)\underline{Y}_T \end{bmatrix}$$

# C Verification


## C.1 Additional Plots from the Pi Model Validation




**Figure C.1:** Voltage results of the  $\Pi$ -modeled transformer in the [SMIB](#) model between PowerFactory and the Python framework; Variation of the rated apparent power  $S_n$ ; Left column is showing the data for the Pathon module *diffpssi*, on the right the comparative tool *DigSILENT PowerFactory*



**Figure C.2:** Comparison of one variation parameter between *diffpssi* and *DIgSILENT PowerFactory*; each plot focussing on one bus in the variation of the rated apparent power  $S_n$



**Figure C.3:** Comparison of the  $\Pi$ -modeled transformer in the [SMIB](#) model between PowerFactory and the Python framework




**Figure C.4:** Comparison of one variation parameter between *diffpssi* and *DIgSILENT PowerFactory*; each plot focussing on one bus in the variation of the longitudinal transformer ratio  $\vartheta$

## C.2 Additional Plots from the Tap Changer Control Schemes


### C.2.1 OLTC validation

For simple load:






**Figure C.5:** Time Domain Solution (TDS) for standard discrete OLTC control scheme applied to the simple load network




**Figure C.6:** Discrepancy when looking at the validation of the simple load model with discrete OLTC control

For SMIB with load:




**Figure C.7:** Time Domain Solution (TDS) of the standard discrete OLTC control scheme; Result of the extended or modified SMIB model with additional load



**Figure C.8:** Internal signal of the standard discrete OLTC control: The integrator signal, representing the time constant for enabling the switching operation


### C.2.2 FSM validation

For simple load:



**Figure C.9:** Signal evolution for the voltage difference dependent **FSM** control scheme; Plot of the deadband filtered voltage difference  $v_{\text{dead}}$  for the simple load validation case

For SMIB with load:



**Figure C.10:** **TDS** for a **FSM** control scheme switching based on the voltage difference