ANALYSIS OF LOAD FREQUENCY CONTROL PROBLEM FOR TWO AREA DEREGULATED POWER SYSTEM USING GENETIC ALGORITHM
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Abstract: It is quite challenging to obtain the optimal load frequency control (LFC) of a complete system with the emergent trends of power system. Restructured power system involve multi sources and multi stakeholders therefore traditional LFC methods are not effective and efficient. The main objective of LFC in deregulated system is to restore the frequency to its nominal value as quickly as possible and minimize tie-line power flow oscillations between neighboring control areas and also monitoring the load matching contracts. Parameters of PID controller are required to be optimized in order to achieve the objectives of LFC. This paper presents a load frequency control of two-area deregulated power system using genetic algorithm taking a suitable objective function that are to minimize the frequency deviations of both the areas and to maintain tie line power exchange according to contractual conditions. A controller is designed for each area to achieve the objectives of LFC. Response of the power system simulated under MATLAB/Simulink obtained and results confirm that the controllers designed using genetic algorithm with suitable objective function are capable of keeping the frequency deviation in the specified range and maintain the tie line power exchange as per the contractual conditions. A comparative analysis of load frequency control using integral controller and GA based controller is also presented.
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I. INTRODUCTION

LFC has been considered one of the most significant services in the interconnected power system. In an interconnected power system, LFC has two important objectives: maintain the frequency of each area within specified limit and controlling the inter area tie-lines power exchanges within the scheduled values [1,4]. LFC has become more significant in recent time due to the size and complicity of whole power system network. To improve the power system operation, some major changes have been made in the structure of the power system by means of deregulating the electrical power industry and opening it for competition. The engineering aspects of planning and operation have been reformulated in a deregulated power system although essential ideas remain the same.

In a conventional power system, the power generation, transmission, distributions are owned by a single entity called vertically integrated utility (VIU). VIU supplies power to their consumers at a specified rate. After restructuring, the role of VIU is carried out by different market players like generating companies (GENCOs), transmission companies (TRANSCOs), distribution companies (DISCOs) and independent system operators (ISO).

In the deregulated power system, each control area must meet its own demand and its scheduled interchange power. Any mismatch between the generation and load can be observed by means of a deviation in frequency. This balancing between generation and load can be achieved by using Automatic Generation Control (AGC).

As there are several GENCOs and DISCOs in the deregulated structure, a DISCO has the freedom to have a contract with any GENCO for transaction of the power. A DISCO may have a contract with a GENCO in another control area. Such transactions are called “bilateral transactions.” All the transactions taken care by an impartial entity called an Independent System Operator (ISO). The ISO has to control a number of so-called “ancillary services,” one of which is AGC. One of the most profitable ancillary services is the load frequency control. The generation and load demand are controlled by market players by keeping the entire power system stable under very competitive and distributed control environment. However, the critical function of LFC is still an unending
A lot of studies have been conducted about various LFC issues in a deregulated power system to overcome these situations. To solve LFC, many of the researchers used PID controllers because of its accuracy and high speed. The performance of PID controller directly depends on its parameters tuning [4,5]. Therefore, many researchers used soft computing-based techniques like Neural Networks, Fuzzy Logic Honey Bee Algorithm, Firefly Algorithm or other methods for tuning of parameters in order to optimize the gain of controllers. In this paper Genetic Algorithm optimization technique is used to tune the parameters of PID controller to solve LFC of two area interconnected power system in deregulated environment. The superiority of the proposed approach is shown by comparing the results with Integral Controller in deregulated power system.

II. DESIGN OF LFC OF INTERCONNECTED POWER SYSTEM IN Deregulated Environment

In a deregulated power market contracts are signed between companies based on rules and relationships in order to create balance between GENCOs and DISCOS. These contracts could be bilateral, Poolco or a combination of both. In the Poolco contract, each DISCO meets its power requirement only from the generators of its own area. But in the bilateral contract, each DISCO can deal with any GENCO in any area. In the present study, two areas are considered in deregulated power system. Area-1 and area-2 consists of 2-thermal generations units in each area.

In the deregulated power system, generation companies (GENCOs) may or may not participate in the AGC task whereas, distribution companies (DISCOS) have the freedom to contract with any of the GENCOs in their own or other areas. Thus, there can be various combinations of the possible contracted scenarios between DISCOS and GENCOs. The concept of distribution participation matrix (DPM) is used here to express possible contracts in the two-area deregulated model. DPM is a matrix with the number of rows equal to the number of GENCOs and the number of columns equal to the number of DISCOS in the system. Each entry in the DPM, known as a contract participation factor (CPF), represents the fraction of a DISCO total contracted load demands being met by a GENCO [1]. Thus, the ith entry cpf ij corresponds to the fraction of the total load power contracted by DISCO j from a GENCO i. The sum of all the entries in a column in this matrix is unity.

Consider a two-area system in which each area has two GENCOs and two DISCOs in it. Let GENCO1, GENCO2, DISCO1, and DISCO2 be in area I and GENCO3, GENCO4, DISCO3, and DISCO4 be in area II as shown in figure 1 [4].

The corresponding DPM will become

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\text{cpf} \text{11} & \text{cpf} \text{12} & \text{cpf} \text{13} & \text{cpf} \text{14} \\
\text{cpf} \text{21} & \text{cpf} \text{22} & \text{cpf} \text{23} & \text{cpf} \text{24} \\
\text{cpf} \text{31} & \text{cpf} \text{32} & \text{cpf} \text{33} & \text{cpf} \text{34} \\
\text{cpf} \text{41} & \text{cpf} \text{42} & \text{cpf} \text{43} & \text{cpf} \text{44}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

where the block diagonals of DPM correspond to local demands and the off diagonal blocks correspond to the demands of the DISCOS in one area to the GENCOs in another area.

Whenever a load demanded by a DISCO changes, it is reflected as a local load in the area to which this DISCO belongs. This corresponds to the local loads ∆PL1 and ∆PL2 and should be reflected in the deregulated AGC system block diagram at the point of input to the power system block. As there are many GENCOs in each area, ACE signal has to be distributed among them in their participation in the AGC. Coefficients that distribute ACE to several GENCOs are termed as “ACE participation factors” (CPF).

Note that \( \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{ij} = 1 \)

Where, \( a_{ij} \) = participation factor of i-th GENCO in j-th area and m = number of GENCOs in j-th area.

The scheduled steady state power flow on the tie line is given as

\[
\Delta P_{\text{tie-1,2, scheduled}} = \left( \text{demand of DISCOS in area II from GENCOs in area I} \right) - \left( \text{demand of DISCOS in area I from GENCOs in area II} \right)
\]

\[\Delta P_{\text{tie-1,2, scheduled}} = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{j=3}^{4} CPF_{ij} \Delta PL_{j} - \sum_{i=3}^{4} \sum_{j=1}^{2} CPF_{ij} \Delta PL_{j} \]

At any given time, the tie line power error \( \Delta P_{\text{tie-1,2, actual}} \) is defined as

\[\Delta P_{\text{tie-1,2, error}} = \Delta P_{\text{tie-1,2, actual}} - \Delta P_{\text{tie-1,2, scheduled}}\]

\( \Delta P_{\text{tie-1,2, error}} \) vanishes in the steady state as the actual tie line power flow reaches the scheduled power flow. This error signal is used to generate the respective ACE signals as in the traditional scenario

\[
\text{ACE}_1 = B_1 \Delta f_1 + \Delta P_{\text{tie-1,2, error}}
\]

\[
\text{ACE}_2 = B_2 \Delta f_2 + \Delta P_{\text{tie-1,2, error}}
\]

Where,

\[\Delta P_{\text{tie-2, error}} = - \left( P_{\text{P1}} / P_{\text{P2}} \right) \Delta P_{\text{tie-1,2, error}}\]

And \( P_{\text{P1}}, P_{\text{P2}} \) are the rated powers of areas I and II, respectively. Therefore
\[ ACE_2 = B_2 \Delta E_2 + \alpha_{12} \Delta P_{tie1-2, error} \] .......(7)

Where,
\[ \alpha_{12} = -\left( \frac{P_{r1}}{P_{r2}} \right) \] .......(8)

For two area system, contracted power supplied by i-th GENCO is given as
\[ \Delta P_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n_{disc}} CPF_{ij} \Delta P_{Lj} \] .......(9)

For i=1,
\[ \Delta P_1 = CPF_{11} \Delta P_{L1} + CPF_{12} \Delta P_{L2} + CPF_{13} \Delta P_{L3} + CPF_{14} \Delta P_{L4} \] .......(10)

Similarly, \( \Delta P_2, \Delta P_3 \) and \( \Delta P_3 \) can be calculated easily.

The Simulink diagram for LFC in two area (with reheat turbine) bilateral deregulated system is shown in Figure 2. Structurally it is based upon the idea of [1], [4]. Dashed lines show the demand signals. The local loads in areas I and II are denoted by \( \Delta P_{1,LOC} \) and \( \Delta P_{2,LOC} \), respectively. \( \Delta P_{uc1} \) and \( \Delta P_{uc2} \) are uncontracted power (if any).

Also note that
\[ \Delta P_{1,LOC} = \Delta P_{L1} + \Delta P_{L2} \] .......(11)
\[ \Delta P_{2,LOC} = \Delta P_{L3} + \Delta P_{L4} \] .......(12)

Figure 2: Block diagram of Two-Area power system in deregulated environment

III. PID CONTROLLER

The PID control scheme is named after its three correcting terms, whose sum constitutes the manipulated variable (MV). The proportional, integral, and derivative terms are summed to calculate the output of the PID controller. Defining \( U(t) \) as the controller output, the final form of the PID controller is given in equation (13).

\[ U(t) = MV(t) = K_p e(t) + K_i \int_0^t e(t) \ dt + K_d \frac{d}{dt} e(t) \] .......(13)
A. Proportional Term
The proportional term produces an output value that is proportional to the current error value. The proportional response can be adjusted by multiplying the error by a constant $K_p$, called the proportional gain constant. The proportional term is given in equation (14).

$$\text{Output} = P_{out} = K_p \cdot e(t) \quad \ldots \ldots (14)$$

B. Integral Term
The contribution from the integral term is proportional to both the magnitude of the error and the duration of the error. The integral in a PID controller is the sum of the instantaneous error over time and gives the accumulated offset that should have been corrected previously. The accumulated error is then multiplied by the integral gain $K_i$ and added to the controller output. The integral term is given by equation (15).

$$I_{out} = K_i \int_0^t e(t) \, dt \quad \ldots \ldots (15)$$

The integral term accelerates the movement of the process towards set point and eliminates the residual steady-state error that occurs with a pure proportional controller. However, since the integral term responds to accumulated errors from the past, it can cause the present value to overshoot the set point value.

C. Derivative Term
The derivative of the process error is calculated by determining the slope of the error over time and multiplying this rate of change by the derivative gain $K_d$. The magnitude of the contribution of the derivative term to the overall control action is termed the derivative gain, $K_d$. The derivative term is given by equation (16).

$$D_{out} = K_d \frac{de(t)}{dt} \quad \ldots \ldots (16)$$

Derivative action predicts system behaviour and thus improves settling time and stability of the system. An ideal derivative is not causal, so that implementations of PID controllers include an additional low pass filtering for the derivative term to limit the high frequency gain and noise. Derivative action is seldom used in practice because of its variable impact on system stability in real-world applications.

In the early history of automatic process control the PID controller was implemented as a mechanical device. These mechanical controllers used a lever, spring and a mass were often energized by compressed air. These pneumatic controllers were the industry standard at that time.

After development of mechanical controller researchers were working on the new controllers. As a result of their research, they have developed the electronic analog controller. Electronic analog controllers can be made from a solid-state or tube amplifier or from a capacitor and a resistor. Electronic analog PID control loops were often found within more complex electronic systems, for example, the head positioning of a disk drive, the power conditioning of a power supply or even the movement detection circuit of a modern seismometer. Nowadays, electronic controllers have largely been replaced by digital controllers.

It is necessary to adjust the parameters of PID controller to obtain the desired response. This is called tuning of PID controller.

IV. TUNING OF PID CONTROLLER
Tuning a control loop is the adjustment of its control parameters (proportional gain, integral gain and derivative gain) to the optimum values for the desired control response. Stability (no unbounded oscillation) is a basic requirement, but beyond that, different systems have different behaviour, different applications have different requirements and requirements may conflict with each other. [4, 6]

PID tuning is a difficult problem even though there are only three parameters and its principle is simple to describe, because it must satisfy complex criteria within the limitations of PID control.

Designing and tuning a PID controller appears to be conceptually intuitive, but can be hard in practice, if multiple and often conflicting objectives such as short transient and high stability are to be achieved. PID controllers often provide acceptable control using default tunings, but performance can generally be improved by careful tuning and performance may be unacceptable with poor tuning. Usually, initial designs need to be adjusted repeatedly through computer simulations until the closed loop system performs as desired.

There are accordingly various methods for tuning. Z-N method and IMC methods are used by [5, 6]. Recent development shows the use of soft computing techniques in PID controller parameter tuning. These methods are very effective methods for finding proper values of $K_p$, $K_i$ and $K_d$. That is why, here genetic algorithm has been used for tuning.

V. GENETIC ALGORITHM
Genetic Algorithms (GAs) is a soft computing approach. GAs are general-purpose search algorithms, which use principles inspired by natural genetics to evolve solutions to problems. As one can guess, genetic algorithms are inspired by Darwin's theory about evolution. They have been successfully applied to a large number of scientific and engineering problems, such as optimization, machine learning, automatic programming, transportation problems, adaptive control etc.

Genetic algorithms (GAs) are one of adaptive systems that basically aim at learning, adopting and functioning biological or natural beings. In order to find an alternative optimization method, GAs was proposed by utilizing mathematical tools to extract, generate and describe several key factors, behaviors, and mechanisms of biological processes and adaptation. The fundamental mechanism is described in the flowchart shown in figure 3.
VI. DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

Tuning of the PID controller has been done using GA by minimizing the time multiplied absolute error [3]. The various steps in finding the parameters of a PID controller are:

Step 1: Define the Plant transfer function.
Step 2: Initialize $K_P$, $K_I$, and $K_D$, and calculate ITAE.
Step 3: Obtain $p_{best}$ and $g_{best}$ values.
Step 4: Calculate new population using mutation.
Step 5: Obtain $p_{best1}$ and $g_{best1}$.
Step 6: Compare $p_{best}$ and $p_{best1}$.
Step 7: Compare $g_{best}$ and $g_{best1}$.
Step 8: Obtain the new values of $K_P$, $K_I$, and $K_D$, and find out the response for the system.

VI. SIMULATION & RESULTS

6.1 Case-I: It is the base case. All the DISCOs have a total load demand of 0.005 pu MW. Dynamic responses using GA Based Controller are shown in figures from 4 to 8 and dynamic responses using integral controller are shown in figures from 14 to 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GA Based PID Controller</th>
<th>Integral Controller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4: Change in frequency of Area-1 (Delta F-1)</td>
<td>Figure 14: Change in frequency of Area-1 (Delta F-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5: Change in frequency of Area-2 (Delta F-2)</td>
<td>Figure 15: Change in frequency of Area-2 (Delta F-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6: Actual Tie Line power and change in Tie Line power</td>
<td>Figure 16: Actual Tie Line power and change in Tie Line power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2 Case-II: Additional load demand of 0.005 pu-MW is raised by Area-1 at t=25 Sec. and it is supplied by only genco-1 of area-1. Dynamic responses of the system using GA Based Controller are shown in figures from 9 to 13 and dynamic responses using integral controller are shown in figures from 19 to 23.

**GA Based PID Controller**

**Integral Controller**
6.3 Comparison with respect to Time response specifications

| Table 7-1: Time response specifications for Δf1 (Case-I) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S. No | Controller | Peak Overshoot Mp | Peak Time Tp (Seconds) | Rise Time Tr (Seconds) | Settling Time Ts (Seconds) | Comment |
| 1 | Integral | -4.1 * 10^-4 | 2.4s | 2.04s | 8.82s | Stable |
| 2 | GA | -0.72 * 10^-4 | 0.27s | 0.22 | 7.82s | Stable |

| Table 7-2: Time response specifications for Δf2 (Case-I) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S. No | Controller | Peak Overshoot Mp | Peak Time Tp (Seconds) | Rise Time Tr (Seconds) | Settling Time Ts (Seconds) | Comment |
| 1 | Integral | -4.7 * 10^-4 | 2.0s | 1.57s | 13.15s | Stable |
| 2 | GA | -0.725 * 10^-4 | 0.28s | 0.23s | 6.95s | Stable |

| Table 7-3: Time response specifications for Δf1 (Case-II) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S. No | Controller | Peak Overshoot Mp | Peak Time Tp (Seconds) | Rise Time Tr (Seconds) | Settling Time Ts (Seconds) | Comment |
| 1 | Integral | -4.12 * 10^-4 | 2.4s | 1.91s | 16.93s | Stable |
| 2 | GA | -0.72 * 10^-4 | 0.27s | 0.23s | 7.5s | Stable |

| Table 7-4: Time response specifications for Δf2 (Case-II) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S. No | Controller | Peak Overshoot Mp | Peak Time Tp (Seconds) | Rise Time Tr (Seconds) | Settling Time Ts (Seconds) | Comment |
| 1 | Integral | -4.7 * 10^-4 | 2.0s | 1.57s | 12.48s | Stable |
| 2 | GA | -0.725 * 10^-4 | 0.27s | 0.23s | 6.95s | Stable |

CONCLUSION

It is very important to keep the power system frequency and the inter area tie line power exchange as close as possible to the scheduled values in interconnected deregulated power system. It is possible if proper control technique is used. Here in this paper the simulation model of a two-area interconnected power system in deregulated environment has been developed. The conventional integral controller and genetic algorithm based controller are applied to the system and dynamic responses have been obtained for different contractual conditions. PID controller parameter are optimized using the genetic algorithm in this work and it has been shown that the use of properly tuned PID controller can improve the dynamic performance of the system. It has also been seen that the GA based PID controller has given the better dynamic responses as compared to conventional integral controller. Comparison of Integral controller and GA based controller has also done using the time response specifications. It is seen that GA based controller gives better response with respect to conventional integral controller in all respect.
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