International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering (IJRTE)
ISSN: 2277-3878 (Online), Volume-12 Issue-4, November 2023

Reliability Evaluation of a Radial Feeder Configurations by Replacing the Distribution Transformer with the Solid-State Transformer

G Kirankumar, E Vidya Sagar

Abstract*: *The radial feeder is the most typical power distribution system configuration for distributing power to the consumer through the distribution transformer. Distribution transformers are a key component of power distribution systems. They enable voltage transformation, improve safety, reduce energy losses, enhance network reliability, and facilitate the efficient distribution of electricity to consumers. Due to their limited role in balancing loads and integrating renewable energy sources, they must be replaced with an alternative solution to modernise and optimise distribution grids. A solid-state transformer (SST) is a power electronic device that, in many ways, may replace a typical distribution transformer (DTR). It also improves controllability and provides a direct current link, making it simple to integrate distributed energy sources on either side of medium- and low-voltage networks. However, reliability is the most critical parameter in restricting its applications. Modularity is one way to improve reliability and availability by directly rerouting power within the modular system. This work investigates the failure rate of a modular solar thermal system (SST) by determining the number of module units required in SST design based on the available Insulated Gate Bipolar Transistor (IGBT) ratings. Further, the reliability of a radial feeder is evaluated by considering the configuration of a) without AS and with DTRs, b) without AS and replacement of DTRs with SST, c) with AS and DTRs, and d) with AS and replacement of DTRs with SST.

Keywords*: *Reliability, DTR, SST, and Radial Feeder.

I. INTRODUCTION

The radial feeder is the most common configuration in power distribution systems for delivering electricity to customer premises via distribution transformers (DTRs). SSTs are smart power electronic devices that can replace DTRs due to benefits such as energy routing capabilities, lower size, fault tolerance, reactive power support, easier integration of distributed energy sources, and increased controllability [1] and [2]. However, the reliability of SST is widely concerned due to the use of a large number of power electronic devices, which has become one of the key technical bottlenecks restricting its application.

Manuscript received on 21 October 2023 | Revised Manuscript received on 28 October 2023 | Manuscript Accepted on 15 November 2023 | Manuscript published on 30 November 2023.
*Correspondence Author(s)
G. Kiran Kumar*, Department of Electrical Engineering, University College of Engineering, Osmania University, Hyderabad, (Telangana), India. E-mail: kirankumar.g@uceou.edu, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2796-5382
Dr. E. Vidya Sagar, Department of Electrical Engineering, University College of Engineering, Osmania University, Hyderabad, (Telangana), India. E-mail: vidyasagar.e@uceou.edu, ORCID ID: 0009-0006-5280-7895

© The Authors. Published by Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering and Sciences Publication (BEIESP). This is an open access article under the CC-BY-NC-ND license http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

Several SST configurations have already been disclosed from previously published studies [3][4][5][6], and [7], and the three-stage configuration (consisting of medium voltage (MV), dc/dc, and low voltage (LV)) enables dc-link connectivity while simultaneously providing voltage and current input/output decoupling, giving the system control additional degrees of freedom and making it the preferable option for an SST. For handling MV-level power conversion, modular architectures offer several advantages, including the ability to use standard LV-rated devices, low electromagnetic interference emission, and modularity, which enables the implementation of redundant strategies to increase fault tolerance and availability. As a result, modular designs are preferred for SST applications. The modular design of a three-stage SST is shown in Figure 1 [6] and [8].



Fig. 1. Modular structure of an SST

This work determines the failure rate of a three-stage modular SST based on available IGBT voltage ratings and power across the dual active bridge (DAB) unit. Further, the reliability of the radial feeder with two different configurations is evaluated by replacing the DTR with SST.

II. RELIABILITY MODELLING

The modular architecture is one way to achieve the targeted reliability and availability of SST by re-rooting the power within it. In this work, the failure rate of a modular SST is determined based on the available IGBT ratings and the power across the DAB unit.

A. Determination of SST specifications

The assumptions required to determine the specifications of SST, such as voltage across the DAB unit in a single module and the number of modules needed for the modular SST design, are a) SST rating (P_{rated_SST}), b) MV rating, and c) LV rating. The maximum input voltage to the DAB unit of a single module is determined from the available IGBT voltage rating given by [9]

$$V_{DAB1_max}=\frac{80}{105}\%\times V_{rated_IGBT} \quad \text{Volts} \quad (1)$$

The number of modules required per phase of SST is calculated using equation 2 given by

$$N_m=\frac{100\times\sqrt{2}\times V_{ph_MV}}{95\times V_{DAB1_max}} \quad (2)$$

Where V_{ph_MV} It is the per-phase AC voltage on the MV side.

The power across the DAB unit per module is given by

$$P_{DAB}=\frac{1}{3}\times\frac{1}{N_m}\times P_{rated_SST} \quad \text{kW} \quad (3)$$

To select the current rating of IGBTs for the MV and LV side of SST at more safety margins, the maximum values of V_{DAB1} and VDAB2 are considered, as V_{DAB1} and V_{DAB2} are obtained from equations 4 and 5.

$$I_{DAB1}=\frac{P_{DAB}}{V_{DAB1}} \quad \text{A} \quad (4)$$

$$I_{DAB2}=\frac{P_{DAB}}{V_{DAB2}} \quad \text{A} \quad (5)$$

B. Modelling of SST failure rate

A single module unit of an SST comprises various components, as shown in Figure 2. To perform a successful operation, all the components associated with a module must be operational [10], and the failure of any single component leads to the failure of the entire module unit; thus, the failure rate of a module unit is computed as illustrated in Figure 2.



Fig. 2. Failure rate model of an SST module unit

From the basic reliability theory, the failure rate of a module unit in time (FIT) is calculated by using equation 6.

$$\lambda_{module}=\lambda_{Fi}+\lambda_{RF1}+\lambda_{dcc1}+\lambda_{Inv1}+\lambda_{HFT}+\lambda_{RF2}+\lambda_{dcc2}+\lambda_{Inv2}+\lambda_{Fo} \quad \text{FIT} \quad (6)$$

Similarly, the failure rate of the rectifier/inverter and input/output filter is calculated by

$$\lambda_{RF} \text{ or } \lambda_{Inv} = 4\times\lambda_{IGBT_rated} \quad \text{FIT} \quad (7)$$

$$\lambda_{Fi} \text{ or } \lambda_{Fo} = \lambda_R+\lambda_L \quad \text{FIT} \quad (8)$$

C. Reliability Indices of a Radial Feeder

The primary load point indices, such as average failure rate (λ_{LP}) and average annual outage time (U_{LP}), are calculated using equations 9 and 10, respectively [11] and [12].

$$\lambda_{LP} = \sum \lambda_i \quad \text{failures/year} \quad (9)$$

$$U_{LP} = \sum \lambda_i r_i \quad \text{hours/year} \quad (10)$$

Where, λ_i and r_i The ith component average failure rate and average repair time, respectively.

The system performance indices considered in this work are the system average interruption frequency index (SAIFI), the system average interruption duration index (SAIDI), the average service availability index (ASAI), and the average service unavailability (ASUI), which are calculated using equations 11, 12, 13, and 14.

$$SAIFI = \frac{\sum \lambda_{LPm} N_{LPm}}{\sum N_{LPm}} \quad \text{Interruptions/customer-year} \quad (11)$$

$$SAIDI = \frac{\sum U_{LPm} N_{LPm}}{\sum N_{LPm}} \quad \text{Hours/customer-year} \quad (12)$$

$$ASAI = \frac{\sum N_{LPm}\times 8760 - \sum U_{LPm} N_{LPm}}{\sum N_{LPm}\times 8760} \quad (13)$$

$$ASUI = \frac{\sum U_{LPm} N_{LPm}}{\sum N_{LPm}\times 8760} \quad (14)$$

Where, λ_{LPm}, U_{LPm} and N_{LPm} What are the average failure rate, annual outage time, and number of customers connected to the mth load point?

Cost indices, such as expected energy not supplied (EENS) and expected customer interruption cost (ECOST), are obtained from Equations 15 and 16. [13]

$$EENS_{LPmj} = Ld_{avgm} \times r_{LPmj} \times \lambda_{LPmj} \quad \text{MWh/yr} \quad (15)$$

$$ECOST_{LPmj} = CIC_{LPmj} Ld_{avgm} \lambda_{LPmj} \quad \text{k\$/yr} \quad (16)$$

Where, CIC_{LPmj}, λ_{LPmj}, and r_{LPmj} Are the customer interruption cost, average failure rate, and average repair time at the mth load point due to the failure of the jth element? Ld_{avgm} Is the average load of the mth load point.

The cost indices of an overall feeder ($ECOST_T$ & $EENS_T$) are given by

$$EENS_T = \sum EENS_{LPm} \quad \text{MWh/yr} \quad (17)$$

$$ECOST_T = \sum ECOST_{LPm} \quad \text{k\$/yr} \quad (18)$$

The following section presents the feeder, available IGBTs, and other component data considered for the evaluation of a radial feeder's reliability.

III. DATA AND ASSUMPTIONS

The first feeder data of the standard Roy Billinton Test System-2 is considered for radial feeder evaluation and shown in Figure 3 [14]. N/O represents a normally open disconnecting switch.



Fig. 3. Radial feeder with an alternate source

The feeder section length data, load data, and customer damage function data of a radial feeder are given in Table I, Table II, and Table III.

Retrieval Number: 100.1/ijrte.D79521112423
DOI: 10.35940/ijrte.D7952.1112423
Journal Website: www.ijrte.org

Published By:
Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering and Sciences Publication (BEIESP)
© Copyright: All rights reserved.

TABLE I. Feeder Sections Length Data

Feeder Sections	Length in km
S4, S5, S8	0.60
S1, S2,S3, S10	0.75
S6, S7, S9, S11	0.80

TABLE II. Load Data

Load Point	Average Load of each customer. (MW)	No. of Cust.	Type of Cust.
LP1,LP2,LP3	0.535	210	Residential
LP4,LP5	0.566	1	Govt. /Institution
LP6,LP7	0.454	10	Commercial

TABLE III. Customer Damage Function Data [13]

Type of User	Interruption Duration & interruption Cost ($/kW)		
	1 hr	4 hr	8 hr
Residential	0.482	4.914	15.69
Govt. /Institution	1.492	6.558	26.04
Commercial	8.552	31.317	83.008

The failure rate of a feeder section and DTR are taken as 0.065 failures per km-year and 0.015 failures per year, respectively. The repair time of feeder sections and the replacement of DTR are considered as 5 hrs and 10 hrs, respectively [13] and [14]. The failure rate of available IGBTs and other components data are shown in Tables IV and V [1], [10] and [15].

TABLE IV. IGBT Failure Rate Data

Available IGBT Rating		Failure rate λ (FIT)
Voltage (kV)	Current (A)	
1.2	100	20
1.7	75	25
3.3	100	50
4.5	400	100
6.5	150	150

TABLE V. Other Component Failure Rate

Components	λ (FIT)
Resistor	12
Inductor	50
Capacitor	40
Medium frequency transformer	500
Control Unit (CU)	5910

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In this work, most of the DTRs involved in the radial feeder are rated near the average load of 1 MW, so the SST rating is assumed to be 1 MW, the line-to-line MV side rms voltage is 11 kV, and the line-to-line LV side rms voltage is 415 V. The corresponding SST specifications are determined and shown in Table VI. To get load side voltage as 415 V, the V_{DAB2} is taken as 720 V, and the LV side IGBT voltage rating is considered as 1200 V [4], [6] and [9]. The failure rate of a modular SST design with the available IGBT ratings is determined by following subsection B of section II, and the results are shown in Table VII.

TABLE VI. SST Specifications

IGBT Rating (kV)		No. of modules per phase	Per module Specifications			
MV Side	LV Side		VDAB1 (V)	DAB (kW)	IDAB1 (A)	IDAB2 (A)
1.2	1.2	10	914	33.33	36.46	57.08
1.7	1.2	8	1295	41.6	31.73	57.08
3.3	1.2	4	2514	83.3	16.34	57.08
4.5	1.2	3	3428	111.11	11.98	57.08
6.5	1.2	2	4952	166.66	8.29	57.08

TABLE VII. Failure Rate of SST for Various IGBT Ratings

IGBT Voltage in kV	Failure Rate			
	per module (FIT)	SST/Phase (FIT)	SST/3-Ph (FIT)	SST/3-Ph (f/yr)
1.2	1024	10240	36630	0.32088
1.7	1064	8512	31446	0.27547
3.3	1264	5056	21078	0.18464
4.5	1464	4392	19086	0.16719
6.5	1664	3328	15894	0.13923

The selection of an IGBT switch with a high voltage rating yields a lower failure rate compared to other available IGBT ratings for the specified modular SST design. This failure rate is further used in evaluating the reliability of a radial feeder with the replacement of DTR by SST.

The radial feeder reliability is evaluated for four different case studies those are a) Case A: the radial feeder with the presents of conventional DTR and without alternate source (AS), b) Case B: the radial feeder with the replacement of DTRs by SST and without AS, c) Case C: the radial feeder with the presents of conventional DTR and with AS, b) Case D: the radial feeder with the replacement of DTRs by SST and with AS. The load point and system performance indices of a radial feeder are calculated using subsection C, and the results are provided case by case.

A. Case A

The radial feeder configuration is considered to be without AS and with the presence of DTRs. The load point indices are calculated using Equations 9, 10, 15, and 16, as shown in Table XI.

Table IX. Load Point Indices of Case A

Load Points	λ	U	EENS	ECOST
1	0.239	0.725	0.39	0.553
2	0.252	0.790	0.42	0.603
3	0.252	0.985	0.53	0.777
4	0.239	0.920	0.52	1.214
5	0.252	1.180	0.67	1.530
6	0.249	1.164	0.53	4.749
7	0.252	1.336	0.61	5.420

The system performance indices, calculated using Equations 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, and 18, are shown in Table XII.

Table X. System Performance Indices of Case A

Feeders	SAIFI	SAIDI	EENS	ECOST	ASAI	ASUI
F1	0.248	0.847	3.662	14.847	0.99990	0.000097

B. Case B

The radial feeder configuration is analysed without AS, and DTRs are replaced with SST. The load point indices of each load are calculated and shown in Table XI.

Table XI. Load Point Indices of Case B

Load Points	λ	U	EENS	ECOST
Lp1	0.363	1.97	1.052	2.069
LP2	0.376	2.03	1.087	2.118
Lp3	0.376	2.23	1.192	2.292
Lp4	0.363	2.16	1.224	4.112
Lp5	0.376	2.42	1.371	4.429
Lp6	0.373	2.41	1.092	11.403
Lp7	0.376	2.58	1.171	12.074

Retrieval Number: 100.1/ijrte.D79521112423
DOI: 10.35940/ijrte.D7952.1112423
Journal Website: www.ijrte.org

Published By:
Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering and Sciences Publication (BEIESP)
© Copyright: All rights reserved.

The percentage increase in load point indices compared to case A are shown in Figure 4, and system performance indices are shown in Table XI.



Fig. 4. Percentage increase in load point indices of case B compared to case A

Table XI. System Performance Indices of Case B

Feeders	SAIFI	SAIDI	EENS	ECOST	ASAI	ASUI
F1	0.372	2.089	8.189	38.496	0.99976	0.000238

C. Case C

The radial feeder configuration is considered with AS and DTRs. The load point indices of each load are shown in Table XII.

Table XII. Load Point Indices of Case C

Load Points	λ	U	EENS	ECOST
1	0.239	0.725	0.39	0.553
2	0.252	0.79	0.42	0.603
3	0.252	0.79	0.42	0.777
4	0.239	0.725	0.41	0.973
5	0.252	0.79	0.45	1.048
6	0.249	0.774	0.35	3.231
7	0.252	0.751	0.34	3.142

The percentage decrease in load point indices compared to case A is shown in Figure 5, and the system performance indices of case C are shown in Table XII.



Fig. 5. The percentage decrease in load point indices of case C compared to case A

Table XIII. System Performance Indices of Case C

Feeders	SAIFI	SAIDI	EENS	ECOST	ASAI	ASUI
F1	0.248	0.768	2.784	10.328	0.99991	0.000088

D. Case D

The radial feeder configuration is considered, with AS and DTRs replaced with SST. The load point indices of each load are shown in Table XIV.

Table XIV. Load Point Indices of Case D

Load Points	λ	U	EENS	ECOST
1	0.363	1.97	1.052	2.069
2	0.376	2.03	1.087	2.118
3	0.376	2.03	1.087	2.292
4	0.363	1.97	1.113	3.871
5	0.376	2.03	1.150	3.947
6	0.373	2.02	0.915	9.885
7	0.376	1.99	0.905	9.796

The percentage increase in load point indices of case D compared to case C is shown in Figure 6, and the system performance indices are shown in Table XV.



Fig. 6. The percentage increase in load point indices of case D compared to case C

Table XV. System Performance Indices of Case D

Feeders	SAIFI	SAIDI	EENS	ECOST	ASAI	ASUI
F1	0.372	2.01	7.31	33.98	0.99977	0.00022

The percentage reduction in the system performance indices of case D compared to case B is shown in Figure 6.



Fig. 7. The percentage reduction in the system performance indices of case D compared to case B

V. CONCLUSION

According to the preceding findings, the radial feeder configuration with an alternate source is more reliable than the configuration without an alternate source, and replacing DTR with SST reduces overall system reliability due to its high failure rate. In case B, the RDS is more unreliable due to the presence of SST and the absence of AS. The percentage increases in SAIFI, SAIDI, EENS, ECOST, and ASUI are 50%, 146%, 123%, 159%, and 145%, respectively. In Case D, the presence of an alternate source results in better radial feeder reliability, as the DTRs are replaced with the SSTs. Compared to Case B, the percentage reductions in SAIDI, EENS, ECOST, and ASUI are 3.93%, 12%, 13.3%, and 3.93%, respectively. However, the radial feeder reliability can be improved by implementing the redundancy in SST design and by considering the failure rate of feeder sections due to the integration of an SST impact on the feeder section currents, which are not discussed in this work.

Retrieval Number: 100.1/ijrte.D79521112423
DOI: 10.35940/ijrte.D7952.1112423
Journal Website: www.ijrte.org

Published By:
Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering and Sciences Publication (BEIESP)
© Copyright: All rights reserved.

DECLARATION STATEMENT

Funding	No, I did not receive.
Conflicts of Interest/ Competing Interests	No conflicts of interest to the best of our knowledge.
Ethical Approval and Consent to Participate	No, the article does not require ethical approval or consent to participate, as it presents evidence.
Availability of Data and Materials	Not relevant.
Authors Contributions	All authors have equal participation in this article.

REFERENCES

1. Xu She, A. Q. Huang, and R. Burgos, "Review of Solid-State Transformer Technologies and Their Application in Power Distribution Systems," IEEE J. Emerg. Sel. Top. Power Electron., vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 186–198, Sep. 2013, doi: 10.1109/JESTPE.2013.2277917. https://doi.org/10.1109/JESTPE.2013.2277917
2. I. Syed, V. Khadkikar, and H. H. Zeineldin, "Loss Reduction in Radial Distribution Networks Using a Solid-State Transformer," IEEE Trans. Ind. Appl., vol. 54, no. 5, pp. 5474–5482, Sep. 2018, doi: 10.1109/TIA.2018.2840533. https://doi.org/10.1109/TIA.2018.2840533
3. X. Wang, J. Liu, T. Xu, and X. Wang, "Comparisons of different three-stage three-phase cascaded modular topologies for Power Electronic Transformer," in 2012 IEEE Energy Conversion Congress and Exposition (ECCE), IEEE, Sep. 2012, pp. 1420–1425. doi: 10.1109/ECCE.2012.6342648. https://doi.org/10.1109/ECCE.2012.6342648
4. J. S. Lai, A. Maitra, A. Mansoor, and F. Goodman, "Multilevel intelligent universal transformer for medium voltage applications," in Conference Record - IAS Annual Meeting (IEEE Industry Applications Society), IEEE, 2005, pp. 1893–1899. doi: 10.1109/IAS.2005.1518705. https://doi.org/10.1109/IAS.2005.1518705
5. A. Hyde, "Advanced power converters for universal and flexible power management in future electricity networks: The UNIFLEX-PM project," 2009. doi: 10.1080/09398368.2009.11463731. https://doi.org/10.1080/09398368.2009.11463731
6. L. Ferreira Costa, G. De Carne, G. Buticchi, and M. Liserre, "The Smart Transformer: A solid-state transformer tailored to provide ancillary services to the distribution grid," IEEE Power Electron. Mag., vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 56–67, Jun. 2017, doi: 10.1109/MPEL.2017.2692381. https://doi.org/10.1109/MPEL.2017.2692381
7. M. Liserre, G. Buticchi, M. Andresen, G. De Carne, L. F. Costa, and Z.-X. Zou, "The Smart Transformer: Impact on the Electric Grid and Technology Challenges," IEEE Ind. Electron. Mag., vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 46–58, Jun. 2016, doi: 10.1109/MIE.2016.2551418. https://doi.org/10.1109/MIE.2016.2551418
8. J. Li, Yang; Yan, Zhang; Rui, Cao; Liu, Xue; Lv, Chunlin ; Liu, "Redundancy Design of Modular DC Solid-State Transformer Based on Reliability and Efficiency Evaluation," CPSS Trans. Power Electron. Appl., vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 115–126, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.24295/cpsstpea. 2021.00010. https://doi.org/10.24295/CPSSTPEA.2021.00010
9. A. Shri, "A solid-state transformer for interconnection between the medium and the low voltage grid," Delft University of Technology, 2013. [Online]. Available: http://repository.tudelft.nl/view/ir/uuid:3bb366d5-6f87-4636-a4a3-0245269125f5/
10. K. Wang, Q. Lei, and C. Liu, "Methodology of reliability and power density analysis of SST topologies," in 2017 IEEE Applied Power Electronics Conference and Exposition (APEC), IEEE, Mar. 2017, pp. 1851–1856. doi: 10.1109/APEC.2017.7930950. https://doi.org/10.1109/APEC.2017.7930950
11. R. Billinton and R. N. Allan, "Reliability Evaluation of Power Systems," Reliab. Eval. Power Syst., 1996, doi: 10.1007/978-1-4899-1860-4. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-1860-4
12. R. E. Brown, "Electric Power Distribution Reliability," Electr. Power Distrib. Reliab., Mar. 2002, doi: 10.1201/9780824744281. https://doi.org/10.1201/9780824744281
13. R. Billinton and P. Wang, "Distribution system reliability cost/worth analysis using analytical and sequential simulation techniques," IEEE Trans. Power Syst., vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 1245–1250, 1998, doi: 10.1109/59.736248. https://doi.org/10.1109/59.736248
14. R. N. Allan, R. Billinton, I. Sjarief, L. Goel, and K. S. So, "A Reliability Test System For Educational Purposes - Basic Distribution System Data and Results," IEEE Trans. Power Syst., vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 813–820, 1991, doi: 10.1109/59.76730. https://doi.org/10.1109/59.76730
15. M. C. Magro and S. Savio, "Reliability and availability performances of a universal and flexible power management system," IEEE Int. Symp. Ind. Electron., pp. 2461–2468, 2010, doi: 10.1109/ISIE.2010.5637723. https://doi.org/10.1109/ISIE.2010.5637723

AUTHORS PROFILE

G Kirankumar is currently working as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Electrical Engineering, University College of Engineering (A), Osmania University, Telangana, India. He has more than 13 years of experience in teaching. His research area is Smart Grid, Distribution Automation, and Power System Reliability.

Dr. E. Vidya Sagar, currently working as Professor in the Department of Electrical Engineering, University College of Engineering (A), Osmania University, Telangana, India. He has more than 26 years of experience in teaching. His research area is Smart Grid, Reliability Engineering, and Smart Power Distribution Systems.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering and Sciences Publication (BEIESP)/ journal and/or the editor(s). The Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering and Sciences Publication (BEIESP) and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright: All rights reserved.