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Abstract: In order to eliminate active and reactive power losses in the power system, this paper proposes TOPSIS and DE algorithm for determining the best location and parameter settings for the Unified Power Flow Controller (UPFC). To mitigate power losses, the best UPFC allocation can be achieved by re-dispatching load flows in power systems. The cost of incorporating UPFC into the power system. As a consequence, the proposed objective feature in this paper was created to address this problem. The IEEE 14-bus and IEEE 30-bus systems were used as case studies in the MATLAB simulations. When compared to particle swarm optimization, the results show that DE is a simple to use, reliable, and efficient optimization technique than (PSO). The network’s active and reactive power losses can be significantly reduced by putting UPFC in the optimum position determined by TOPSIS ranking method.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Building new generating unit and transmission circuits becomes more tough as the demand for electricity increases due to economic and environmental concerns. As a result, electric utilities must rely on existing generation systems, causing existing transmission lines to become overburdened. Stability, on the other hand, must always be preserved. As a consequence, to operate the power system successfully without risking system security and excellence of supply, a new control plan must be implemented, also in the event of contingency conditions including transmission line and/or generating unit failures, which occur on a regular basis and will be more likely to occur at a higher frequency under deregulation. The Flexible AC Transmission System technology program was started in the late 1980s by the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) (FACTS). One of the most hopeful FACTS devices is the UPFC, which Gyugyi established in 1991[2]. The UPFC is designed to optimize power flow and device stability by properly configuring its controller. However, to achieve such UPFC functionality, the best position for this device in the power system, as well as the necessary parameter settings, must be specified.

When deciding on the best position and parameter settings for UPFC, factors like increased power transmission capacity, efficient power loss decrease, avoiding power blackouts, and increased stability margin, can all be considered.

Various methods for determining the best position and parameter settings for the UPFC system have been proposed by a number of researchers. [4] proposed using an immune algorithm (IA) to determine the best location for a centralized power flow controller (UPFC) to achieve optimal power flow (OPF) and congestion management. [5] investigates the optimal locations for parallel and series FACTS devices. In light of the restructured environment, the STATCOM is chosen as a parallel FACTS device, while the SSSC is chosen as a sequence device, and the optimization issue is reformulated with a new objective function in order to relieve congestion and provide more equitable conditions for power market participants. For determining the best FACTS place, [6–8] proposed a Genetic Algorithm.

Differential Evolution is an Evolutionary Algorithm (EA) technique that is relatively new [11–13]. It’s easy to set up, quick, and dependable. This paper proposes a TOPSIS approach for deciding the best position and parameter settings for a UPFC unit. Power systems [14] and [15] are two areas where DE has shown promise to minimize active and reactive power losses in a power system. For various parameter initializations of both techniques, the TOPSIS Method efficiency is compared to PSO.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Model of UP FC

1) Equivalent Circuit and Configuration of UPFC:

Figure 1 illustrates a UPFC basic operating principal diagram. Two switching converters based on VSC valves make up the UPFC. A common DC connection connects the two converters. A series transformer connects the transmission line to the series inverter. A shunt attached transformer connects the shunt inverter to a local bus i. To meet operating control requirements, the shunt inverter can produce or absorb controllable reactive power, as well as provide active power exchange to the series inverter.

The steady-state model [17] is developed using the UPFC equivalent circuit shown in Figure 2. Two ideal voltage sources are represented in the analogous circuit by the fundamental Fourier series portion of the switched voltage waveforms at the AC converter terminals. The power supply for the UPFC is as follows:
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where $0 \leq \theta_{sh} \leq 2\pi$, $V_{sh}$ and $\theta_{sh}$

$V_{shmax} \leq \theta_{sh} \leq 2\pi$, $V_{shmin}$

$V_{se}$ and $\theta_{se}$, $V_{shmin} \leq \theta_{sh} \leq 2\pi$, $V_{shmax}$

$0 \leq \theta_{se} \leq 2\pi$ respectively

\[ V_{se} = V_{se}(\cos \theta_{se} + j \sin \theta_{se}) \]
\[ V_{sh} = V_{sh}(\cos \theta_{sh} + j \sin \theta_{sh}) \]

where $0 \leq \theta_{sh} \leq 2\pi$, $V_{sh}$ and $\theta_{sh}$

$V_{shmax} \leq \theta_{sh} \leq 2\pi$, $V_{shmin}$

In figure 2, the equivalent circuit of the UPFC shown is:

![Figure 2: Equivalent circuit of UPFC](image)

### 2) UPFC Power Flow Constraints

For the equivalent circuit of the UPFC shown in figure 2 suppose $V_{sh} = V_{sh} < \theta_{sh}$, $V_{se} = V_{se} < \theta_{se}$, $V_{sh} = V_{t} < \theta_{i}$, $V_{i} = V_{j} < \theta_{j}$

then the load flow constraints of the UPFC shunt and series branches are:

\[ P_{sh} = V_{i}^2 G_{sh} - V_{i} V_{sh} [G_{sh} \cos (\delta_{i} - \theta_{sh}) + B_{sh} \sin (\delta_{i} - \theta_{sh})] \]
\[ Q_{sh} = V_{i}^2 B_{sh} - V_{i} V_{sh} [G_{sh} \sin (\delta_{i} - \theta_{sh}) - B_{sh} \cos (\delta_{i} - \theta_{sh})] \]

\[ P_{ij} = V_{i}^2 g_{ij} - V_{i} V_{j} [g_{ij} \cos (\theta_{ij} + b_{ij} \sin \theta_{ij})] - V_{ij} V_{se} [g_{ij} \cos (\theta_{ij} - \theta_{se}) + b_{ij} \sin (\delta_{ij} - \theta_{se})] \]
\[ Q_{ij} = -V_{i}^2 b_{ij} - V_{i} V_{j} [g_{ij} \sin (\delta_{ij} - b_{ij} \cos \theta_{ij})] - V_{ij} V_{se} [g_{ij} \sin (\delta_{ij} - \theta_{se}) - b_{ij} \sin (\delta_{ij} - \theta_{se})] \]

\[ P_{ji} = V_{j}^2 g_{ij} - V_{j} V_{i} [g_{ij} \cos (\theta_{ij} + b_{ij} \sin \theta_{ij})] + V_{ij} V_{se} [g_{ij} \cos (\delta_{ij} - \theta_{se}) + b_{ij} \sin (\delta_{ij} - \theta_{se})] \]
\[ Q_{ji} = -V_{j}^2 b_{ij} - V_{j} V_{i} [g_{ij} \sin (\delta_{ij} - b_{ij} \cos \theta_{ij})] + V_{ij} V_{se} [g_{ij} \sin (\delta_{ij} - \theta_{se}) - b_{ij} \sin (\delta_{ij} - \theta_{se})] \]

Where: $\delta_{sh} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\theta_{sh}}{\theta_{sh}}$, $g_{ij}$ and $b_{ij}$

$\delta_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\theta_{ij}}{\theta_{ij}}$

**B. Function of the Objective:**

The aim of power system planning and operation has long been to reduce active and reactive power losses in transmission networks. To minimize these losses, the UPFC unit should be placed in the best possible location and have optimal parameter settings. Installation of FACTS devices in general, and UPFC in particular, is extremely expensive. As a result, the objective function is set up such that compromise can be used to solve the problem. The problem is reduced to a single objective optimization problem, as is common with multi-criteria constrained optimization. As shown below, the goal’s function is defined as the combination of two words:

\[ \min F = \sum_{k=1}^{m} F_{Q_{klo}} + \lambda x_{100x \cdot C_{UPFC \cdot XS}} \]

The cost function for UPFC in US$/kVar$ is $C_{UPFC} = 0.0003S_{FACTS}^2 - 0.2691S_{FACTS} + 188.2$

Where $F$ is the objective’s optimization function.; $P_{Q_{klo}}$ are the active and reactive power losses in line $k$ of the transmission lines in the system; $\lambda$ is a penalty factor; $C_{UPFC}$ is the cost of UPFC device in (US$/kVar)$; and, $S$ is the operating range of UPFC.

### III. OPTIMIZATION METHOD

**A. Overview of Differential Evolution**

Storn and Price [11] suggested DE as an evolutionary computation method. In the DE technique, difference vectors are used to create perturbations in a vector population. DE algorithms have a high rate of convergence, are stable, conceptually simple, have few parameters, and are simple to implement. The use of this algorithm to solve complex optimization problems has piqued researchers’ interest.

**B. Finding the Weakest Bus Based on TOPSIS Method**

**The TOPSIS Procedure or Steps**

**STEP 1:** Establish TOPSIS performance matrix as in figure below

**Figure 1: UPFC operating principle**

**Figure 2:** Equivalent circuit of UPFC

**Retrieval Number:** 100.1/jrte.A57020510121

**DOI:** 10.35940/jrte.A5702.0510121

**Published By:** Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering and Sciences Publication

© Copyright: All rights reserved.
The active and reactive power losses in the network are minimized by optimizing these variables. The following is a summary of how the DE algorithm is implemented.

**Step 1:** Set up power flow data and DE-related parameters like: The size of population (N P), the maximum number of iteration or generation (Gmax), the number of variables to be optimized (D), and the DE control parameters CR, and F.

\[
X_i(G_0) = X_{i,min} + r\text{and}[0,1](X_{i,max} - X_{i,min})
\]

**Step 2:** Evaluate the fitness for each individual in the population according to the objective function in equation (9).

**Step 3:** A new population create by:

Mutation: Three different vectors randomly choose from the current population and generate a trial vector by:

\[
U_{ij}(G) = X_{ij}(G) + F(X_{ij2}(G) - X_{ij3}(G))
\]

Crossover: From each entity X, (G), and the corresponding trial vector ui, Equation (27) is used to generate a new offspring X(G) (G).

\[
X_{ij}(G) = \begin{cases} U_{ij}(G) & \text{if } j \in J \\ X_{ij}(G) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

Selection: Using equation (28) to pick vectors for the next generation for each, Xij(G) and corresponding Xij(G), and G = G + 1.

\[
X_{ij}(G + 1) = \begin{cases} U_{ij}(G + 1) & \text{if } f \left( X(G + 1) \leq f(X(G)) \right) \\ X_{ij}(G) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

**Step 4:** If the stopping criterion is met, stop the method and print the best person (optimal position and UPFC parameter setting); otherwise, return to Step 4.

### IV. SIMULATION RESULTS

![Figure 4: IEEE 30 Bus test system](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: DE initial parameter values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Parameter values of DE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population size (NP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum number of variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of variables (NV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of individual L_i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE step size F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossover probability constant CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. 14-Bus Test System

There are five generators, twenty transmission cables, fourteen buses, and eleven loads in this technique. The following are the outcomes of the simulation: There are five generators, twenty transmission cables, fourteen buses, and eleven loads in this technique. There are five generators, twenty transmission cables, fourteen buses, and eleven loads in this technique. The following are the outcomes of the simulation: There are five generators, twenty transmission cables, fourteen buses, and eleven loads in this technique. The following are the outcomes of the simulation: Line three (from bus 2 to bus 3) is the best location for UPFC in this situation, with an installation cost of 0.22986 x 10^6 (US $). According to PSO info, line three (from bus 2 to bus 3) is the best location for UPFC, with an installation cost of 0.25001 x 10^6 (US $). Both methods yielded similar findings after ten trials. Figure 5 shows the ideal UPFC array, as well as the magnitude and phase angles of the shunt voltage source obtained with both techniques, after ten trials. After 10 trials, the convergence characteristics of the objective function are shown in Figure 5. The objective function's worst, average, and best values for various DE and PSO parameter settings are shown in Table IV after ten trials.

Table 2: parameter values of PSO(NP) Number of swarm beings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSO Technique Parameter</th>
<th>Number of swarm beings (NP)</th>
<th>G_{max}, Maximum number of flights</th>
<th>(NV), Number of variables</th>
<th>L_{i}, Length of individual</th>
<th>C_{1}, C_{2}</th>
<th>w_{max}, w_{min}</th>
<th>Termination criteria</th>
<th>Original velocities' deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9, 0.4</td>
<td>1e^{-6} or G_{max}</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: optimal parameter setting UPFC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Techniques of Evolution</th>
<th>V_{sh}(pu)</th>
<th>\theta_{sh}(rad)</th>
<th>V_{se}(pu)</th>
<th>\theta_{se}(rad)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>0.9961</td>
<td>0.06961</td>
<td>0.12171</td>
<td>1.45511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSO</td>
<td>1.0671</td>
<td>-0.22141</td>
<td>0.13871</td>
<td>1.46191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: the objective function's worst, average, and best values for different DE and PSO parameter settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computational intelligence (CI) Techniques</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>PSO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technique of Evolution</td>
<td>Technique of Swarm intelligence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=0.5 CR=0. 5</td>
<td>F=0.8 CR=0. 5</td>
<td>F=0.8 CR=0. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective function value</td>
<td>312.458</td>
<td>312.597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Optimal parameter setting of UPFC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evolutionary Techniques</th>
<th>V_{sh}(pu)</th>
<th>\theta_{sh}(rad)</th>
<th>V_{se}(pu)</th>
<th>\theta_{se}(rad)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>-0.2070</td>
<td>0.1552</td>
<td>-2.1184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSO</td>
<td>1.0792</td>
<td>-0.2520</td>
<td>0.1627</td>
<td>1.0794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: The objective function’s convergence characteristics after ten trials

B. Test System for IEEE 30-Bus

There are six generators, forty-one transmission lines, thirty buses, and twenty-one loads in this facility. The following are the results of the simulation: This system includes six generators, forty-one transmission lines, thirty buses, and twenty-one loads. The simulation results are as follows:

The results of using the DE technique show that the best position for the UPFC in this case is line 7 (from bus 6 to bus 4) with the lowest installation cost of 0.21148 x 10^6 (US $).

The results of using the PSO technique also show that the best position for a UPFC is line 7 (from bus 6 to bus 4) with the lowest installation cost of 0.23324 x 10^6 (US $).

The results of using the PSO technique also show that the best position for a UPFC is line 7 (from bus 6 to bus 4) with the lowest installation cost of 0.23324 x 10^6 (US $) for installation. The PSO technique also reveals that line 7 (from bus 6 to bus 4) is the best place for the UPFC in this situation, with a cost of 0.21148 x 10^6 (US $) for installation. After ten trials, the results of both methods are obtained. Table 5 shows the ideal UPFC array, as well as the magnitude and phase angles of the shunt voltage source obtained using both techniques, after ten trials. The trial results are shown in Table 5.
The objective function's worst, average, and best values for various DE and PSO parameter settings are shown in Table 6 after ten trials. The best value for \( c_i = 1 \), 2 in the PSO technique is 1.5, while the best values for W-min. and W-max. are 0.4001 and 0.9001, respectively, according to the findings. F in the DE methodology has a best value of 0.5, and CR has a best value of 0.5. The results in Table 7 show that PSO performs the optimization faster than DE because DE uses mutation, crossover, and selection operations to process the optimization while PSO does not.

Figure 6: Objective Function Convergence Characteristics

Table 6: With different DE and PSO parameter settings, the objective function's worst, average, and best values are calculated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Techniques of Computational Intelligence (CI)</th>
<th>Objective function</th>
<th>PSO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The EAS (Evolutionary Algorithm) technique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swarm intelligence (SI) Technique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>F=0.5, CR=0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSO</td>
<td>F=0.5, CR=0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F=0.8, CR=0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR=0.8, CR=0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( w_{min} = 0.9, w_{max} = 0.4 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 for proposed techniques simulation time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Tested</th>
<th>Simulation time (sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Bus</td>
<td>76.48721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30_Bus</td>
<td>178.54231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. CONCLUSION

The first and most critical step in implementing UPFC in power systems is determining the proper position and parameters for the UPFC unit. This computer has the ability to rapidly and easily adjust system parameters. As a result, the UPFC device clearly provides benefits such as increased system reliability, increased system performance, and lower operating and transmitting investment costs.

In order to eliminate active and reactive power losses in a power system, this paper attempted to determine the best location and parameters for a UPFC unit. DE was successfully applied to the problem at hand, which is one of the most current computational intelligence approaches. This paper contains two case studies, one involving an IEEE 14-bus system and the other involving an IEEE 30-bus system. The findings show that the DE method has a number of advantages, including high-quality solutions, stable convergence, and fast computation speed. Finally, our findings show that active and reactive power losses in a system can be significantly reduced by using the proper parameter settings and installing UPFC in the most optimal position.
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