

Load Flow Comparison Case # 3

Comparison of ETAP Load Flow Results against a Published Example

Excerpts from Validation Cases and Comparison Results (TCS-LF-150)

Highlights

- Comparison between ETAP Load Flow (LF) results against those published in IEEE Std. 399-1997, Brown Book, pages 151-161.
- Comparison of results for the Newton Raphson Method (NR), Adaptive Newton Raphson Method (ANR), and Fast-Decoupled methods (FD) are provided.
- Forty-four bus systems with multiple loads and generators and types of branches.
- Considers line impedance and admittance.
- Comparisons are made against bus voltage magnitude and angle and power flows (MW and Mvar flows).
- The difference in the results is less than 0.001% for all bus voltages and 0.34% for all power flows (for all three LF methods).

System Description

This is a forty-four bus system that is composed of lines, cables, transformers, generators, and a utility connection. The line impedance and charging effects are considered. The schedule of generation and loading for each bus was taken as described in Figures 6-5 through 6-7 of the published example. Only the base load flow case was compared in this test case.



This document and the information within it are confidential and proprietary to ETAP/Operation Technology, Inc. and may not be modified, copied, published, disclosed, distributed, displayed or exhibited in either electronic or printed formats without the written authorization of ETAP/Operation Technology, Inc., 17 Goodyear, Irvine, CA 92618, USA. © 1986-2023 ETAP/Operation Technology, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

OPERATION TECHNOLOGY, INC. - ETAP Group of Companies



Comparison of Results

The following tables of comparison show the differences between ETAP results and those published in the standard. The difference in the results is less than 0.001 % for all bus voltages and less than 0.001 % for all power flows (for all three LF methods).

| <u>BUS</u> | REFERENCE <u>% Mag</u> , Ang. | | ETAP | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------------|------|-------------|------|---------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|--|--|--|
| | | | ANR | | | | <u>NR</u> | | FD | | | | | |
| # | | | <u>%Mag</u> | Ang | % Diff Mag | <u>% Mag</u> . | <u>Ang</u> . | % Diff Mag | <u>% Mag</u> . | <u>Ang</u> . | % Diff Mag | | | |
| 1: 69-1 | 100.02 | 0.1 | 100.02 | 0.1 | 0.00 | 100.02 | 0.1 | 0.00 | 100.02 | 0.1 | 0.00 | | | |
| 2: 69-2 | 99.93 | -0.1 | 99.93 | -0.1 | 0.00 | 99.93 | -0.1 | 0.00 | 99.93 | -0.1 | 0.00 | | | |
| 3: MILL-1 | 99.77 | 0.9 | 99.77 | 0.9 | 0.00 | 99.77 | 0.9 | 0.00 | 99.77 | 0.9 | 0.00 | | | |
| 4: MILL-2 | 100 | -1.8 | 100 | -1.8 | 0.00 | 100 | -1.8 | 0.00 | 100 | -1.8 | 0.00 | | | |
| 5: FDR F | 99.74 | 0.9 | 99.74 | 0.9 | 0.00 | 99.74 | 0.9 | 0.00 | 99.74 | 0.9 | 0.00 | | | |
| 6: FDR H | 99.72 | 0.9 | 99.72 | 0.9 | 0.00 | 99.72 | 0.9 | 0.00 | 99.72 | 0.9 | 0.00 | | | |
| 7: FDR 71/72 | 100 | -1.8 | 100 | -1.8 | 0.00 | 100 | -1.8 | 0.00 | 100 | -1.8 | 0.00 | | | |
| 8: FDR L | 99.95 | -1.8 | 99.95 | -1.8 | 0.00 | 99.95 | -1.8 | 0.00 | 99.95 | -1.8 | 0.00 | | | |

Table 1: Bus Voltage Comparison for Load Flow method against published results

| From | То | REFERENCE | | ETAP | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------|-------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------|-------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| BUS | BUS | | | ANR | | | | NR | | | | FD | | | |
| # | # | <u>MW</u> | <u>Mvar</u> | <u>MW</u> | <u>Mvar</u> | <u>% Diff</u> MW | <u>%Diff</u> Mvar | MW | <u>Mvar</u> | <u>% Diff</u> MW | <u>%Diff</u> Mvar | MW | <u>Mvar</u> | <u>% Diff</u> MW | <u>%Diff</u> Mvar |
| 1: 69-1 | 3: MILL-1 | -2.67 | 0.65 | -2.67 | 0.65 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -2.67 | 0.65 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -2.67 | 0.65 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 3: MILL-1 | 5: FDR F | 2.22 | 1.34 | 2.22 | 1.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.22 | 1.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.22 | 1.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 3: MILL-1 | 50: Gen1 | -10.50 | -4.28 | -10.50 | -4.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -10.50 | -4.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -10.50 | -4.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 4: MILL-2 | 2: 69-2 | -5.56 | 0.53 | -5.56 | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -5.56 | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -5.56 | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 4: MILL-2 | 24: FDR M | 2.45 | 1.53 | 2.45 | 1.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.45 | 1.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.45 | 1.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 5: FDR F | 39: T3 SEC | 1.25 | 0.78 | 1.25 | 0.78 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.25 | 0.78 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.25 | 0.78 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 5: FDR F | 49: RECT | 0.97 | 0.57 | 0.97 | 0.57 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.97 | 0.57 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.97 | 0.57 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 6: FDR H | 11: T4 SEC | 0.35 | 0.21 | 0.35 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.35 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.35 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 6: FDR H | 19: T7 SEC | 2.66 | 1.65 | 2.66 | 1.65 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.66 | 1.65 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.66 | 1.65 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 7: FDR71/72 | 16: T9 PRI | 0.43 | 0.30 | 0.43 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.43 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.43 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Table 2: Power Flow Comparison for Load Flow method against published results

Reference

- 1. "IEEE Recommended Practice for Industrial and Commercial Power Systems Analysis (Brown Book)," in *IEEE Std 399-1997*, vol., no., pp.1-488, 31 Aug. 1998.
- 2. ETAP Load Flow V&V Documents, Case Number TCS-LF-150

This document and the information within it are confidential and proprietary to ETAP/Operation Technology, Inc. and may not be modified, copied, published, disclosed, distributed, displayed or exhibited in either electronic or printed formats without the written authorization of ETAP/Operation Technology, Inc., 17 Goodyear, Irvine, CA 92618, USA. © 1986-2023 ETAP/Operation Technology, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

OPERATION TECHNOLOGY, INC. – ETAP Group of Companies