Design of RPFC for Power Quality Improvement in Railway Power System using Fuzzy logic Controller
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Abstract- This paper is to create Power Quality in electric Railway systems with the assistance of Fuzzy Logic controller. Concentrating on the cargo prepare prevailing electrical railroad power system (ERPS) blended with air conditioning dc and air conditioning dc-air conditioning trains (its power factors [0.70, 0.84]), this paper proposes a power factor situated railroad power flow controller (RPFC) for the power quality improvement of ERPS. In this paper the thorough association of the primary power factor, converter limit, and the two phase load currents are introduced. By this technique we can likewise control the power flow trade between the grid and the load, with the goal that instantaneous active and reactive power is maintain constant. Moreover, as the main commitment of this paper, the ideal remunerating procedure suited the irregular varied two phase loads is broke down and planned based on a genuine footing substation, for the reasons for fulfilling the power quality standard, improving RPFC’s control adaptability, and diminishing converter’s ability. Here we are utilizing the fuzzy controller contrasted with different controllers i.e. The fuzzy controller is the most reasonable for the human basic leadership component, giving the operation of an electronic system with choices of specialists. What's more, utilizing the fuzzy controller for a nonlinear system takes into account a decrease of indeterminate impacts in the system control and enhances the effectiveness. By utilizing simulation results we can examine the improvement of the power quality in electric railroad systems utilizing fuzzy logic controller.

Index Terms—Power factor; negative sequence; power quality; power flow controller; electrical railway power system; converter, Fuzzy logic controller

NOMENCLATURE:

| Symbol | Description |
|--------|-------------|
| PF     | Power factor |
| PQ     | Power quality |
| NSC    | Negative sequence current |
| NSV    | Negative sequence voltage |
| DC     | Direct Current |
| AC     | Alternating Current |
| RPFC   | Railway Power flow controller |
| ERPS   | Electrical railway power systems |
| SVC    | Static var compensator |
| STATCOM| Static synchronous compensator |
| OCS    | Optimal compensating strategy |
| FCM    | Fully compensation model |
| PLL    | Phase Locked Loop |
| PWM    | Pulse Width Modulation |
| PS     | Proportional Resonant Regulator |
| FLC    | Fuzzy logic controller |

I. INTRODUCTION:  
Power quality has become an increasing concern in railway systems. Poor power quality affects the performance, reliability of the railway system as well as having an effect on equipment attached to the local distribution network. The analysis of power quality on a rail system is essential, to enable the analysis of train performance and to assess the effects of a rail system on the adjacent distribution network. Railway systems are electrically complex. The loads, trains, are constantly moving and their electrical behaviour is constantly changing. Modelling is an ideal tool to analyse the power quality of such a complex system. An ideal model would be accurate yet computationally efficient.

As the popular PQ improvement rig, static var compensator (SVC) [9], [10], static synchronous compensator (STATCOM) [11]-[15], active filter [16]-[21], transformer integrated power conditioner [22]-[24], railway power flow controller (RPFC) [5], [25]-[30], and the well-designed train-mounted front end rectifier [31]-[33] are commonly used in ERPS. Considering the comprehensive performance, RPFC is concerned greatly by related departments due to its compatibility – it can, unlike the above rigs, integrate in the secondary side of almost all kinds of traction transformer. By rebalancing the two phase active power, and compensating the reactive power or harmonics in each phase independently, RPFC can deal with almost all the main PQ problems of ERPS. Additionally, the feeder voltage’s stability and the capacity utilization ratio of the main transformer can also be enhanced significantly [26], [30], which are attractive for improving ERPS’s transport capacity and cost-efficiency.

Power Quality has to be considered from two perspectives, the railway system and the local distribution network to which it is attached. Poor power quality on the railway system affects performance limits capacity and may introduce a need for additional maintenance. Distribution network operators stipulate power quality standards. Railway systems are required to meet these standards. Power quality is divided into categories [1]. Railway systems typically suffer from poor voltage regulation and harmonic distortion. Voltage regulation affects the
performance of traction units and imposes a capacity limit on the system. Harmonic distortion can cause damage to traction units, particularly motors [2]. Rail systems can cause harmonic distortion and voltage unbalance on the local distribution network. The harmonic distortion is caused by the non linear currents drawn by the railway system and in DC systems by rectifying substations. Voltage unbalance is present in AC systems, where the rail system draws large currents from a single phase of the supply.

To additionally enhance RPFC’s ability usage capacity and control adaptability in both outlining and working stages in cargo prepare overwhelming ERPS, in this paper, we will center around the arrangement of the accompanying perspectives:

1) Establishing the connection between the primary PF with RPFC’s remunerating limit; the converter’s ability can be adaptably composed by modifying the primary PF.

2) In the commence of limiting RPFC’s ability for a given PF, considering an ideal control system to diminishing NSC and NSV in a satisfactory level.

3) The proposed control procedure ought not exclusively be connected in the basic single phase ERPS, yet in addition in the vital regular utilized two phase system (see Fig.1).

This paper is s...
Substituting (3), (4), and (8) into (7), the genuine and nonexistent piece of - Iγ, Term-I and Term-II, can be computed as
\[ I_{\text{cap}} \cos \Delta_{\alpha} + I_{\text{cap}} \sin \Delta_{\alpha} - I_{\beta} \cos \Delta_{\beta} + I_{\beta} \sin \Delta_{\beta} \]
\[ -I_{\text{cap}} \sin \Delta_{\alpha} + I_{\text{cap}} \cos \Delta_{\alpha} - I_{\beta} \sin \Delta_{\beta} + I_{\beta} \cos \Delta_{\beta} \]
(9)
Substituting (9) into (6), and considering the expressions of Iα, Iβ, Iρ, and Iϕ in (3)-(5), the relationship of ILα and ILβ can be calculated as
\[ I_{\text{cap}} = \frac{x_1}{x_1 + x_2} I_{L\alpha} - \frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2} I_{L\beta} \]
(10)
Increasing the feeder voltage Vα or Vβ in Fig. 1, RFPC’s remunerating power in phase α and β, i.e., the V/δ transformer and other sort of the adjust transformers [35], [36], μα and μβ are just dictated by PFA~PFC or ϕa~ϕc [see (10) and (2)]. Henceforth, the active and reactive power of the RPFC can be adaptably balanced by controlling the primary three phase power factors, if the PFs of the two phase loads are pre-ascertained [see φLα and φLβ in (12)], which will be talked about later on.

COMPENSATING STRATEGY DESIGN
A. The Possible Compensating Scheme:
For the consideration of planning accommodation and the necessity of PF≤0.9, we let |φα| = |φβ| = |φγ|
\[ PF^* = \cos \phi \in [0.9 , 1], k=a, b, c \]
(13)
Where PF* is the primary reference power factor. It can be observed from Fig. 2 that Iα, Iβ, and Iγ (or Iα, Iβ, and IC) may leads or slacks VA, VB, and VC, individually, which means eight (i.e., 8=23) conceivable combination models with positive or negative esteem are existed in φa, φb, and φc. In addition, Fig. 2 additionally demonstrates the reactive power of converter-α is bigger than the one created by converter-β (i.e., Icαq=Icβq), to lessen the VAlimit of converter-α, Iα must be confined slacking than VA (i.e., φα>0), so the over eight conceivable combination models of φa~φc will decline into four profitable hopefuls, which are recorded in Table I (i.e., Model-2 to -5).

B. Compensating Capacity Analysis:
The VA-capacity SRPFC of the RPFC is:
\[ S_{\text{RFPC}} = \sqrt{P_{\text{ca}}^2 + Q_{\text{ca}}^2} + \sqrt{P_{\text{cb}}^2 + Q_{\text{cb}}^2} \]
(14)
Substituting (12) into (14), the RPFC’s VAlimit in the five repaying model recorded in Table I are appeared in Fig. 3 [PLα and PLβ are the two phase loads’ active power, PF*>0.95, and the two phase loads’ PF=0.8 (from a substation’sdata)]. It can be seen from Fig. 3(a) that, the VA-limit of RPFC has a place with five unique surfaces in Model-1 to 5 individually. The maximum SRPFC happens in the single phase loaded condition, in which Model-1, 2, and 3 compare to PLα=0, PLβ=0, while the contrary circumstance has a place with Model-3 and 5. (a) (b)

OCS|_{PF*} =0.95 \quad \text{MODEL-5}, \quad 0\text{MW} \leq P_{L\alpha} < 0.55 P_{L\alpha}
\text{MODEL-4}, \quad 0.55 P_{L\alpha} \leq P_{L\beta} \leq 1.67 P_{L\alpha}
\text{MODEL-2}, \quad 1.67 P_{L\alpha} < P_{L\beta} \leq 8\text{MW}

Fig 4.2 : The surfaces of SRPFC with the two phase loads’ active power.
The relationship of SRPFC with the two phase loads’ active power in the five valuable compensating models. (a) The surfaces of SRPFC with the two phase loads’ active power. (b) The xoy-projection of the surfaces in Fig. 3(a).

C. The NSC Mitigation Ability Analysis

But of remunerating reactive power, alleviation of the NSC is another motivation behind RPFC. In other words, a satisfactory repaying technique ought to limit SRPFC, as well as has the obligation to diminish NSC inside a satisfactory level.

The NSC Mitigation Ability Analysis

Combing (7)-(8), the primary positive and negative sequence currents, $I_+$ and $I_-$, can be deduced by

$$\begin{align*}
I_+ &= \frac{1}{3N} \left( I - \frac{1}{\xi^2} \sqrt{I_1^2 + I_2^2} \cos\frac{\pi}{3} \right) \\
I_- &= \frac{1}{3N} \left( I - \frac{1}{\xi^2} \sqrt{I_1^2 + I_2^2} \cos\frac{\pi}{3} \right)
\end{align*}$$

where $\xi = \angle 120^\circ$, $N = V_sN/V_fN$ is the turn’s ratio of the main transformer ($V_sN$ and $V_fN$ are the grid and feeder normal line voltage respectively; as shown in Fig. 1).
D. Negative Sequence Standard Consideration

From (16), the primary NSC I can be calculated as:

\[ I_\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}N} \sqrt{\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2} (I_{LP\alpha} + I_{LP\beta}) \]  

(18)

\[ \xi_1 = \mu_a [\tan \delta_\beta \cos \Delta_\beta - \sin \Delta_\beta] + \mu_\beta [\cos (\Delta_\alpha + 30) + \tan \delta_\alpha \sin (\Delta_\alpha + 30)] \]

\[ \xi_2 = \mu_\beta [\tan \delta_\alpha \cos (\Delta_\alpha + 30) - \sin (\Delta_\alpha + 30)] - \mu_a [\tan \delta_\beta \sin \Delta_\beta + \cos \Delta_\beta] \]  

(19)

The negative sequence capacity S in the primary side is

\[ S_\alpha = \sqrt{3} V_{SN} I_\alpha = K (P_{LP\alpha} + P_{LP\beta}) \]  

(20)

Considering the Chinese national standard of the negative sequence component is

\[ V_{unb} = \frac{V_\alpha}{V_\beta} = \frac{S_\alpha}{S_\beta} = 2\% \]  

(21)

Where V - and V+ are the primary negative and positive voltages, S\_d is the short out limit of the footing substation.

The negative sequence prerequisite of the proposed system can be figured by joining (20) and (21), i.e.,

\[ K (P_{LP\alpha} + P_{LP\beta}) \leq S_\beta \times 2\% \]  

(22)

Fig. 7 gives the two phase loads' distribution graph of a genuine V/V transformer based footing substation (see Table II). The measurement results of Fig. 7 demonstrate that right around 95.2% of the loadpoints are situated in the rectangle zone of CEDO, where the likelihood of the points distributed in ACO and ABO (or ABO1, or ABO2) is around 85%. Besides, we can likewise locate that, surpassing half of the load points are situated at stake OC and OD (take note of: a few points are covered on these two lines), which means the V/V transformer's ability usage ratio can be additionally improved in a vast potential. Based on the above measurement results, our consideration ought to be centered around the loads situated in CEDO and its limits.

8. From the state of the surfaces appeared in Fig. 8, it can be reasoned that the maximum S - of Model-3, 2, and 4 happens on the point A, B, and E for any given PF, individually.

| Grid line voltage | 110KV |
|-------------------|-------|
| Transformer capacity | 20 MVA phase-\(\alpha\): 10MVA phase-\(\beta\): 10MVA |
| Sd of the traction substation | 486MVA |
| Short circuit impedance | phase-\(\alpha\) and \(\beta\): 10% |
| Turn’s ratio | 110KV:27.5kV |

The surface of S - vs. PL\_\(\alpha\) and PL\_\(\beta\) (within rectangle area of CEDO shown in Fig. 7) can be obtained based on (20) and the S\_d given in Table II, which is shown in Fig. 8. From the shape of the surfaces shown in Fig. 8, it can be concluded that the maximum S - of Model-3, 2, and 4 occurs on the point A, B, and E for any given PF, respectively.

![Fig. 8. The relationship of S- with PL\_\(\alpha\) and PL\_\(\beta\)](image)

Note: PF*=0.95

Fig. 9 gives the relationship of the S-in A, B, and E, i.e., the maximum S - , S-max, with PF* for this footing substation in Model-2~4. Clearly, the S-blocking capacity of Model-4 is greatly improved than that of Model-3 and 2, however the last's S-max diminishes when PF* turns out to be extensive. Fig. 9 additionally demonstrates that the maximum negative sequence powers controlled by OSC are not as much as the authorization esteem 9.72MVA (i.e., 486MVA×2%), which means the Chinese national standard can be fulfilled when PF* is set inside 0.9 to 0.99. It ought to be commented here is that, if the authorization line of S-crosses with other maximum Sline of Model-2 or 3 appeared in Fig. 9, the correct hand abscissa of that intersection point ought to be chosen as the important PF*, on the grounds that the left one will lead Vunb out of the utmost.
The relationship of the primary maximum negative capacity with PF* in Models 2, 3, and 4

The capacity utilization capability of RPFC should also be included in our concerning scope. From Fig. 10, the maximum SRPFC’s (i.e., SRPFCmax) reducing ratio decreases heavily when PF*>0.95 [note: the maximum SRPFC point in PLα-PLβ panel (i.e., Fig. 7) is labeled in Fig. 10]. Besides, RPFC’s designing capacity SRPFCdesign’s decreasing ratio also shows relatively large value (>23.43%) when PF* ∈ [0.9, 0.95], it increases when PF*→0.9 [note: ① SRPFCdesign=2×max{Sconverter-α, Sconverter-β}, this is because IGBT is a voltage sensitive device and the dc-link voltages of converter-α and β are the same; ② Eα in Fig.10 means the maximum converter capacity belongs to converter-α located in point E]. Considering cost-efficiency, PF* can be selected from 0.9 to 0.95 for this traction substation.

Control Strategy Realization

The control system of the RPFC is plotted in Fig. 11. A few particulars ought to be made for it: The FFT strategy or the instantaneous reactive power theory [37] can be utilized for the estimation of the load’s active and reactive power in the "PQ block", while the relative resounding controller (PS) is received as the present controller for its great following capacity in sing phase system. For the adjustment of vdc in the back-to - back system, rather than the figured Pca, the genuine Pca is produced by the dc-link voltage PI controller in converter-α. Furthermore, more consideration must be paid on the acknowledged of the “repaying power figuring” block, and the accompanying four steps can help us to get the objective:

1) According the deliberate two phase loads (e.g., Fig. 7), Sd, and the exhibited slopes of OA and OB appeared in Fig. 6, the PF*’s directing extent can be resolved for the motivations behind fulfilling the negative sequence’s standard (e.g., Fig. 9) and having generally little limit (e.g., Fig. 10).

2) Based on the pre-set PF* (e.g., PF*∈[0.9,0.95]), the inclines of OA and OB can be resolved from Fig. 6.

The renumerating model of OCS can be controlled by the load point’s area in the load distribution panel appeared in Fig. 5 or 7, which can be reasoned by distinguishing

IV. FUZZY LOGIC CONTROLLER:

In FLC, basic control action is determined by a set of linguistic rules. These rules are determined by the system. Since numerical variables are converted into linguistic variables, mathematical modeling of the system is not required in FC.

The FLC comprises of three parts: fuzzification, interference engine and defuzzification. The FC is characterized as i. seven fuzzy sets for each input and output. ii. Triangular membership functions for simplicity. iii. Fuzzification using continuous universe of discourse. iv. Implication using Mamdani’s, ‘min’ operator. v. Defuzzification using the height method.
Fuzzification: Membership function values are assigned to the linguistic variables, using seven fuzzy subsets: NB (Negative Big), NM (Negative Medium), NS (Negative Small), ZE (Zero), PS (Positive Small), PM (Positive Medium), and PB (Positive Big). The Partition of fuzzy subsets and the shape of membership function adapt the shape up to appropriate system. The value of input error and change in error are normalized by an input scaling factor.

Table 4.3: Rule Base Table of 7*7 Matrix[44]

|   | NB | NM | NS | ZE | PS | PM | PB |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| NB | PB | PB | PB | PM | PM | PM | ZE |
| NM | PB | PB | PB | PM | PS | ZE | ZE |
| NS | PB | PM | PS | PS | ZE | NS | NB |
| ZE | PB | PM | PS | ZE | NS | NM | NB |
| PS | PM | PS | ZE | NS | NM | NM | NB |
| PM | PS | ZE | NS | NM | NM | NB | NB |
| PB | ZE | NS | NM | NM | NB | NB | NB |

Defuzzification: As a plant usually requires a non fuzzy value of control, a defuzzification stage is needed. To compute the output of the FLC, height method is used and the FLC output modifies the control output. Further, the output of FLC controls the switch in the inverter. In UPQC, the active power, reactive power, terminal voltage of the line and capacitor voltage are required to be maintained. In order to control these parameters, they are sensed and compared with the reference values. To achieve this, the membership functions of FC are: error, change in error and output.

The set of FC rules are derived from:

\[ u = -\alpha E + (1-\alpha)C \] (24)

Where \( \alpha \) is self-adjustable factor which can regulate the whole operation. \( E \) is the error of the system, \( C \) is the change in error and \( u \) is the control variable. A large value of error \( E \) indicates that given system is not in the balanced state. If the system is unbalanced, the controller should enlarge its control variables to balance the system as early as possible. One the other hand, small value of the error \( E \) indicates that the system is near to balanced state.

V. SIMULATION RESULTS

| Parameters of the Isolation Transformer and RPFC |
|-----------------------------------------------|
| The VA-capacity of IT: 5MVA                   |
| Short circuit impedance of IT: 21%            |
| IT’s turn’s ratio: 27.5KV:27.5KV              |
| The dc-link voltage of RPFC: 51.15KV         |

**TABLE IV**

| Time | FF | Compensation model |
|------|----|--------------------|
| 0.0-0.2s | 0.00 | NaRPFC: - |
| 0.2-0.4s | 0.90 | Medium-3 |
| 0.4-0.6s | 0.95 | Medium-3 |
| 0.6-0.8s | 0.95 | Medium-3 |
| 0.8-1.0s | 1.00 | FCM |

**TABLE V**

| Time | Load condition | FF | Compensation model |
|------|----------------|----|--------------------|
| 0.0-0.2s | 0.035MV, Q=0.8Mvar | 0.00 | NaRPFC: - |
| 0.2-0.4s | 0.035MV, Q=0.8Mvar | 0.90 | Medium-3 |
| 0.4-0.6s | 0.035MV, Q=0.8Mvar | 0.95 | Medium-3 |
| 0.6-0.8s | 0.035MV, Q=0.8Mvar | 0.95 | Medium-3 |
| 0.8-1.0s | 0.035MV, Q=0.8Mvar | 0.95 | Medium-3 |

**Case 1: PI CONTROLLER**

The waveforms represents the primary three phase currents, power factor, voltage and current unbalance ratio, capacity of RPFC when it is driving a constant load with variable power factor. It demonstrates the three phase load changes such that the primary PF move along PF* with the satisfactory execution. Also, iA, iB, and iC have a tendency to be the adjusted three phase currents when PF* wound up bigger. The waveforms in the condition of variable PF* with constant load. Fig 5.3 represents the Primary three phase currents. Fig 5.4 represents the PF* and PF. Fig 5.5 represents the Voltage’s and current’s unbalanced ratio. Fig 5.6 represents the Capacity of RPFC.
b) The waveforms represent the primary three phase currents, power factor, voltage and current unbalance ratio, capacity of RPFC when it is driving variable load with constant power factor. It demonstrates the three phase load changes such that the primary PF move along PF* with the satisfactory execution. Also, \( iA \), \( iB \), and \( iC \) have a tendency to be the adjusted three phase currents when PF* wound up bigger.

The waveforms in the condition of variable PF* with constant load. Fig 5.7 represents the Primary three phase currents. Fig 5.8 represents the PF* and PF. Fig 5.9 represents the Voltage’s and current’s unbalanced ratio. Fig 5.10 represents the Capacity of RPFC.

Case 2 : FUZZY CONTROLLER

a) The waveforms represent such that the primary three phase currents, power factor, voltage and current unbalance ratio, capacity of RPFC when it is driving a constant load with variable power factor of a FUZZY based controller. It demonstrates the three phase load changes such that the primary PF move along PF* with the satisfactory execution. Also, \( iA \), \( iB \), and \( iC \) have a tendency to be the adjusted three phase currents when PF* wound up bigger.
The waveforms in the condition of variable PF* with constant load. Fig 5.11 represents the Primary three phase currents. Fig 5.12 represents the PF* and PF. Fig 5.13 represents the Voltage’s and current’s unbalanced ratio. Fig 5.14 represents the Capacity of RPFC.

![Fig 5.11 Primary Three Phase currents using fuzzy controller](image1)

![Fig 5.12 PF VS PF* using Fuzzy controller](image2)

![Fig 5.13 Voltage and Current unbalance ratio using Fuzzy controller](image3)

![Fig 5.14 Capacity of RPFC using fuzzy controller](image4)

b) The waveforms represents such that the primary three phase currents, power factor, voltage and current unbalance ratio, capacity of RPFC when it is driving a variable load with constant power factor of a FUZZY based controller. It demonstrates the three phase load changes such that the primary PF move along PF* with the satisfactory execution. Also, iA, iB, and iC have a tendency to be the adjusted three phase currents when PF* wound up bigger.

The waveforms in the condition of variable PF* with constant load. Fig 5.15 represents the Primary three phase currents. Fig 5.16 represents the PF* and PF. Fig 5.17 represents the Voltage’s and current’s unbalanced ratio. Fig 5.18 represents the Capacity of RPFC.

![Fig 5.15 Primary three phase currents using fuzzy controller](image5)

![Fig 5.16 PF VS PF* using fuzzy controller](image6)

![Fig 5.17 Voltage and current unbalance ratio using fuzzy controller](image7)

![Fig 5.18 Capacity of RPFC using fuzzy controller](image8)

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper proposed a power factor arranged RPFC for the power quality improvement with both PI and FUZZY controller. The mathematical model of the RPFC coordinated ERPS and the far reaching plan technique for the proposed control methodology are given in detail, based on a genuine footing substation. The simulation and the exploratory results confirm the accuracy of the proposed considers.
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