DOUBLE ROULD RESCRIPTIONS FOR THE POWER GRID IN THE DIGITAL AGE

Moving Beyond Reliability Based KPIs

Presentation Date: October 30, 2018 Prepared By: Theo Laughner, PE

Presentation Outline

- Why Quality Based Metrics Are Needed?
- Enumerating The Costs Of Quality
- Standards That Outline Quality Metrics
- Future Grid Quality Metrics



Why Quality Based Metrics Are Needed

YesterGrid



CurrentGrid





Reliability And Quality

Is The Patient Alive?



Is The Patient Healthy?





Alternatively, what is the conformance to our spec?





Enumerating The Costs Of Quality

AUTOMOTIVE AND AEROSPACE MANUFACTURERS

today face a growing range of risks around supply chain complexity and quality control. Many companies turn to operational excellence to address these challenges and reduce costs, but they often fall short due to one critical error: failing to accurately define and measure the full cost of quality.

Source: Beacon Quality – Are you using the wrong quality metrics?

Does this seem familiar?

Utilities are being pushed for operational excellence and to reduce costs.

Simultaneously, there are more 3rd party generators and generator types which are all introducing entropy.



What is the cost?

According to the American Society on Quality:

"Many organizations will have true quality-related costs as high as **15 to 20 percent of sales revenue**, some going as high as **40 percent of total operations**. "





What are the risks?

COMPLEX SUPPLY CHAINS FUEL GREATER RISK – WITH LITTLE ROOM FOR ERROR



Tight competition and accelerating change has led to highly complex global supply chains, with manufacturers under pressure to deliver higher quality products at lower cost.

Automotive OEMs are increasingly focused on innovation and design, outsourcing components and assembly production to suppliers. Today, third parties produce more than 82% of automotive parts, compared to just 56% in 1985.¹ 53.2 MILLION VEHICLES RECALLED IN 2016.

BTW, THESE ARE OUR CUSTOMERS!

BUT, this is the way our industry is also beginning to look.



Consequences...

- Unplanned equipment downtime
- Resources needed for failure analysis, corrective action, and redesign.
- Slow or ineffective fixes leading to an inefficient corrective action program.
- Executive time is spent on problems rather than pursuing more strategic goals.



Investing In Quality

• 1 - 10 - 100 Rule





Power Quality Indices Standards and Documents

Grid Facing

- IEEE 1564 Guide for Voltage Sag Indices
- CIGRE TB 596 Guidelines for PQ Monitoring
- CIGRE TB 718 Benchmarking of PQ Performance
- CIGRE TB 719 PQ & EMC Issues with Future Networks

Customer Facing

- IEEE 1547 DER Interconnection Standard
- IEEE 1668 Ride-Through Capability



Future Grid Metrics

• Grid Visibility Metrics

Forecasting Exposure Metrics

Individualized Consumer Metrics

Reporting



Grid Visibility KPIs

- Number Of Sites Monitored Continuously
 - Percentage Of The System With Monitoring
 - Critical Customer Loads
 - Customer Complaint Locations
 - Locations Where Problems Are Expected

- Quantities Measured At Each Monitoring Site
 - Events: Sags, Swells, Transients
 - Steady State: Voltage, Current, Power, Frequency, Flicker, Harmonics, Voltage Unbalance, Current Unbalance.



Forecasting Exposure KPIs – Area Of Vulnerability

Before – 200 Miles



After – 600 Miles





Individualized Consumer Metrics

- Voltage Regulation
- Voltage Balance
- Voltage THD
- Flicker
- Sag Magnitude/Duration Metrics
- Express risk in terms of cost?





Reporting

- Site PQ Compliance
 - For each metric is site compliant?

- System PQ Compliance
 - For each metric how many of the total number of sites are compliant? (See next slides)

Benchmarking

• For each metric – compare like sites



System PQ Compliance

$$I_T = \frac{N_E - N_T}{N_E}$$



Source: CIGRE TB 718, Benchmarking of Power Quality Performance In Transmission Systems.



Example

- Utility has 100 sites
- Metric Flicker
- CP95 Limit -1.0
- Except for sites below, all other sites are within limit

СР95	Site A	Site B	Site C	Site D	Site E
PST	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.0	1.0
1453 Compliant	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν

Flicker Compliance Index= $\frac{Total Sites - (Non - Compliant)}{Total Sites} = \frac{100 - 5}{100} = .95$



Extending The Index To A Simple System Health Index

- 4 Compliance Indices
 - Voltage Regulation (2 Sites Non-Compliant)
 - Voltage Balance (3 Sites Non-Compliant)
 - Voltage THD (1 Site Non-Compliant)
 - Flicker (5 Sites Non-Compliant)

System Compliance Reporting = $\frac{Total Sites - (Non - Compliant)}{Total Sites} = \frac{100 - 11}{100} = .89$



Extending The Index To A Weighted System Health Index

Metric	Non-Compliant Sites	Weight	Index	Weighted Index
Voltage Regulation	2	1	.98	.98
Voltage Balance	3	2	.97	1.95
Voltage THD	1	3	.99	2.97
Voltage Flicker	5	4	.95	3.8

System Index = $\frac{\sum Weighted Index}{\sum Weights} = \frac{9.69}{10} = .969$



CIGRE C4.27 Recommended Benchmarking Quantities

- PQ Disturbances
- Harmonics
- Flicker
- Unbalance
- Sags / Swells

The system index for PQ compliance is based on the total number of non-compliant site-weeks, compared to the total number of weekly measurements at all sites across the entire system. The system compliance index is calculated as shown in Equation 4.1:

$$T_{C} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (N_{i} - W_{i})}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} N_{i}}$$

Equation 4.1

Where:

 I_c

Ni

N

The system compliance index;

W_i = The number of weeks of non-compliance conditions at Site i;

The number of all weeks of valid data gathered by measurement at Site i; and

The total number of monitored locations.

The resulting PQ index will have a value between 0 and 1, where the former means no PQ compliance at all (i.e. all weekly indices are non-compliant at all sites) and the latter means full PQ compliance at all sites (i.e. all weekly site indices are compliant at all sites).



Benchmarking

Additional information about each metric is needed:

- Voltage Class
 - LV
 - MV
 - EHV

Breaker Configuration
Automatic Reclosing
Pilot

- System Topology
 - Radial
 - Network

Event
Cause Codes



Conclusions

- The Grid Is Increasing In Complexity
- Reliability Alone Is No Longer A Sufficient Measure Of Utility Quality
- Power Quality Is Undervalued By Most Utilities
- Every \$1 Spent On Prevention Saves \$100 On Failure
- We Need Visibility Of The System Measure Your Visibility (Internally)
- Use The Visibility Of The System To Understand The System Health
- Communicate System Health To Management
- Participate In Benchmarking
- Use These Tools To Make Inform Corrective Actions



Questions?

