

Dynamic rating assists cost-effective expansion of wind farms by utilizing hidden capacity of transformers

Oscar David Ariza Rocha^{a,b,c}, Kateryna Morozovska^{a,*}, Tor Laneryd^b, Ola Ivarsson^c,
Claes Ahlrot^c, Patrik Hilber^a

^a*Dept. of Electromagnetic Engineering, School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, KTH
Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden*

^b*ABB Corporate Research, Västerås, Sweden*

^c*E.ON. Energidistribution AB, Malmö, Sweden*

Abstract

Dynamic rating of power transmission devices is a technology that allows better equipment utilization through real-time information about the system state. Dynamic rating of transformers is a fairly new technology if compared to dynamic rating of power lines, and has high potential for significantly improving component utilization while lowering investment costs on installing new transformers.

Dynamic transformer rating increases the rating of the transformer considering load and temperature variations without affecting safe operation. Dynamic rating is highly suitable for being used in conjunction with renewable energy generation, specifically wind power. The following work investigates how to utilize existing transformers, which are under exploitation at wind farms, for expanding wind generation capacity. Also, this paper shows improvements that dynamic rating can bring to both power grid operators and wind farm owners by exploring the economic benefits of expanding wind parks while using dynamic rating. Connecting additional wind turbines with the same transformer at sites with high wind capacity after the wind park is already in exploitation can assist in lowering electricity price and provide a possibility of less risky investment in wind power.

Five transformer locations and nine units are studied for finding the potential of dynamic transformer rating for network expansion applications. The analysis shows that the optimal expansion of wind power from a generator perspective is around 30 % to 50 %, although, it can be limited further by network restrictions. A possibility to use a large device, such as power transformer, closer to its full potential can provide material and cost savings for building new devices and decrease investment costs on manufacturing, transportation and installation of new units. Dynamic rating of power transformers can also increase the socio-economic benefits of renewable energy by lowering electricity price from renewables and incentivize an increased share of green power in electricity markets.

Keywords: dynamic transformer rating, wind energy integration, planning of power systems, reliability of power components

Nomenclature

$\Delta\theta_{hr}$	Hot-spot-to-top oil gradient at rated current, $[K]$	$E_{a,r}$	Rated activation energy, $[kJ/mol]$
θ_o	Top-oil temperature, $[^{\circ}C]$	E_a	Activation energy, $[kJ/mol]$
$\Delta\theta_{h1}$	Hot-spot temperature rise before the effect of changing oil flow past the hot-spot, $[K]$	g_r	Average-winding-to-average-oil (in tank) temperature at rated current, $[K]$
$\Delta\theta_{h2}$	is varying rate of oil flow past the hot-spot, $[K]$	G_s	New turbine generation in scenario s , $[p.u.]$
$\Delta\theta_h$	Hot-spot-to-top-oil gradient at the load considered, $[K]$	K	Load factor (load current/rated current), $[p.u.]$
$\Delta\theta_{or}$	Top-oil temperature rise at rated losses, $[K]$	k_{11}	Correction factor for top-oil time constant
τ_o	Oil time constant, $[min]$	k_{21}	Transformer specific thermal model constant
τ_w	Winding time constant, $[min]$	k_{22}	Transformer specific thermal model constant
θ	Temperature, $[^{\circ}C]$	LOL	Loss of life, $[h]$
θ_a	Ambient temperature, $[^{\circ}C]$	NPV	Net present value, $[SEK]$
$\theta_{h,r}$	Rated winding hot spot temperature, $[^{\circ}C]$	$p_{g,i}$	Probability of state i of generator g
θ_h	Winding hot spot temperature, $[^{\circ}C]$	p_s	Probability of scenario s
\tilde{F}_g	Load duration curve of generation	R	Ratio of load losses at rated load to no-load losses
A	Arrhenius equation pre-exponential factor, $[1/h]$	r	Discount rate
A_r	Rated Arrhenius equation pre-exponential factor, $[1/h]$	R_c	Ideal gas constant ($8.314 J/(kg \cdot mol)$)
B	Load increase factor	s	Indicates the type of scenario
C_i	Net cash flow in period i , $[SEK]$	t	Time in service, $[h]$
C_o	Installation cost, $[SEK]$	t_1	is the beginning of a time period, $[h]$
$conv$	Indicates convolution method	t_2	is the end of a time period, $[h]$
$D_{new,t}$	New load at time t , $[p.u.]$	V	Relative aging rate
$D_{old,t}$	Load before expansion at time t , $[p.u.]$	y	Exponential factor of winding

*Corresponding author

¹Email: kmor@kth.se

²Tel: (+46) 762552977

³Address: Teknikringen 33, 100-44, Stockholm, Sweden

1. Introduction

Optimal power grid infrastructure, more efficient utilization of materials and energy resources, as well as improved grid planning strategies, play a crucial role in providing cost-effective and sustainable power supply for years to come. While much attention is paid to developments in renewable power generation sector (e.g. wind, solar, hydro and energy storage), it is essential to remember that grid connection infrastructure requires high material and monetary investments. Significant scale power components such as power lines, underground cables, switchgears and transformers will play a crucial role in building a more sustainable power grid and allowing for renewable energy resources to be more competitive on the electricity market.

Power transformers are responsible for a large part of the investment costs and play a key role in power delivery. By using methods that can improve their performance, transformer owners can reduce investment costs when purchasing new transformers, or increase revenue by utilizing already installed transformers closer to their design limits. The maximum loading capacity of a transformer largely depends on thermal limitations, with the winding hot spot temperature (HST) and the top oil temperature (TOT) generally considered the most critical [1]. These temperatures will vary based on weather conditions, and consequently, the same goes for the maximum loading capacity.

Dynamic transformer rating (DTR) is a strategy, which allows extending capacity limits above nameplate rating by estimating the value of transformer's hot spot temperature (HST), based on real-time weather conditions without affecting projected lifetime or increasing the risk of failure [2][3][4]. The characteristics of wind power, especially its variability in time and low capacity factor, make wind generation a right candidate for DTR implementation. Power transformers that serve for connecting wind parks to the grid are specified for peak generation time and, since wind park rarely operates at its rated power, most of the time these transformers are utilized well below their nameplate capacity limit. Potentially, an implementation of DTR can benefit wind farm owners, since better utilization of this resource can allow either expansion of the existing wind park or choosing smaller transformer size at the specification stage when building new wind farms.

Connecting new wind generation to the grid has a positive influence on the power quality. By increasing number of wind turbines connected to the node, wind farm owners can supply smoother power production by reducing turbulent peaks at higher wind speeds [5][6][7]. Wind power generation in Sweden represented 10.2 % of the total electricity production in 2016, with around 6.4 *GW* installed and a production of 15.4 *TWh* [8]. Wind power share has significantly increased over the recent years, which is partly explained by fast construction time compared with traditional generation; a 50 *MW* plant can be built within six months [9]. This creates additional challenges for DSOs, which have to provide grid connection for newly installed wind farms rapidly.

Dynamic rating of power lines is a topical research area nowadays, and there exists a high number of various literature resources, which explore dynamic line rating models [10][11][12], their implementation [13][14][15] as well as benefits of DLR for wind energy integration [16][17][18][19]. However, a field of dynamic transformer rating is depicted in literature

significantly less than dynamic line rating and only begins to gain popularity between researchers.

Significant portion of literature resources is devoted to improving thermal models for DTR as is shown in [2][4][20][21][22] and additional methods for measurement [23] and prediction [24][25] of the transformer's state. A few articles explore the reliability impact of dynamic transformer rating [26][27][28]. In [29] and [30], studies focus on the modelling of the thermal parameters for DTR. In [31], sixteen medium voltage transformers are dynamically rated and the predictive potential of DTR is explored. The case study in [32][33] explores loading benefits of DTR and evaluates to which extent transformer can be loaded above the nameplate rating.

Since the accuracy and safety of DTR implementation is highly dependent on weather parameters, it is essential to evaluate how different methods of obtaining real-time information on transformer temperature balance can affect the rating limit. In [34], a probabilistic risk evaluation approach is used to perform a one-step-ahead prediction of dynamic transformer rating using weather forecast. The impact of additional risks and reduced transformer availability brought by application of DTR were assessed in [35] and [36], concluding that the cost impact is low. A reliability analysis and economic impact of reducing the size of the transformer for wind farm connection is evaluated in [37] [38] and [39] by performing a case study on already installed wind farm transformer. A transformer thermal behaviour under wind farm load conditions and possible economic impact of overloading the transformer above the nameplate rating are depicted in [40]. In [41], the economic benefits of combining DTR with dynamic line rating (DLR) for day-ahead dispatch optimization are shown on a case study for a network with high penetration of wind generation. Additionally, case studies for offshore wind farms are presented in [42] and [43].

Currently, literature sources explore many important areas connected to dynamic transformer rating implementation, such as transformer thermal models; implementation of DTR; DTR prediction; reliability impact of DTR; economic impact of DTR and case studies on transformers connected to onshore and offshore wind farms. However, even though there is enough information on how to increase transformer ratings, it remains unclear how to integrate DTR into old and new power grids. Partially it is possible to plan new grids with having DTR in place. However, since the lifetime of a single transformer is usually expected to be around 40 years, it would be beneficial to utilize both new and existing components in a better way.

This paper addresses a new niche in the area of dynamic transformer rating - how to use already installed transformers to their full potential. One novel area of particular interest is illustrated in this paper: the possibility of planning the expansions of wind farms with utilizing the capacity of already installed power transformers. Grid connection of wind generation with DTR is an interesting case-study to address and is opening a new area of dynamic transformer rating research.

The present study evaluates the possibility of expanding existing wind farms with additional wind turbines and using previously installed transformers for connecting these additional generators to the grid. An objective is to determine the maximum potential size of wind farm expansion depending on the rate of insulation degradation and transformer's loss of life

(LOL). The analysis continues with an estimation of HST's effect on the LOL calculation and wind power curtailment.

A final goal is to provide wind farm owners and system operators with additional knowledge on how they can potentially utilize benefits of DTR for wind farm expansion. Additionally, this study aims to promote better usage of material resources and open possibilities for reducing electricity price for renewable generation by minimizing monetary spendings associated with grid supporting infrastructure.

2. Methodology

2.1. Transformer thermal models and their implementation

The IEC 60076-7 difference equation model [1] is chosen to determine the HST during operation in the present analysis. In the investigation reported in [37], the IEEE Annex G model [44] was also used, with both models leading to similar results and conclusions, with the IEC model requiring less input.

The model is based on the following assumptions: oil temperature rises linearly from bottom to top; the temperature difference between winding and oil is constant along the winding; the winding and oil time constants are static; the oil viscosity is invariable. The model estimates the HST for a period of time based on the load, the ambient temperature, the transformer thermal parameters and the thermal behavior on the previous period of time. The main differential equation describing the top-oil temperature is presented in (1).

$$\left[\frac{1 + K^2 R}{1 + R} \right]^y \cdot (\Delta\theta_{or}) = k_{11} \tau_o \cdot \frac{d\theta_o}{dt} + [\theta_o - \theta_a], \quad [^\circ C] \quad (1)$$

where K is the load factor, $[p.u.]$; R is the ratio of load losses to no-load losses; y is the winding exponent; $\Delta\theta_{or}$ is the top oil gradient at rated losses, $[^\circ C]$; k_{11} is an empirical thermal constant; τ_o is the oil time constant, $[min]$; θ_o is the top-oil temperature, $[^\circ C]$; and θ_a is the ambient temperature, $[^\circ C]$.

The hot-spot temperature rise $\Delta\theta_h$ in (2) is obtained by subtracting the differential equation solution (3) from (4). Whereas, the final hot-spot temperature is obtained with equation (5).

$$\Delta\theta_h = \Delta\theta_{h1} - \Delta\theta_{h2}, \quad [^\circ C] \quad (2)$$

$$k_{21} \cdot K^y \cdot \Delta\theta_{hr} = k_{22} \cdot \tau_w \cdot \frac{d\Delta\theta_{h1}}{dt} + \Delta\theta_{h1}, \quad [^\circ C] \quad (3)$$

$$(k_{21} - 1) \cdot K^y \cdot \Delta\theta_{hr} = (\tau_o/k_{22}) \frac{d\Delta\theta_{h2}}{dt} + \Delta\theta_{h2}, \quad [^\circ C] \quad (4)$$

$$\theta_h = \theta_o + \Delta\theta_h, \quad [^\circ C] \quad (5)$$

where $\Delta\theta_h$ is the hot spot to top oil temperature gradient, $[K]$; $\Delta\theta_{h1}$ represents the hot-spot temperature rise before the effect of changing oil flow past the hot-spot, $[K]$; $\Delta\theta_{h2}$ represents

the reduction in hot-spot temperature rise due to the varying rate of oil flow past the hot-spot, $[K]$; k_{21} and k_{22} are thermal model constants; τ_w is the winding time constant, $[min]$; $\Delta\theta_{hr} = Hg_r$ is the hot spot to top oil temperature gradient at rated current, $[^\circ C]$; y is the winding exponent; θ_h is the hot spot temperature, $[^\circ C]$.

2.2. Transformer aging estimation

The thermal aging model from the main part of IEC loading guide [1] is used to determine the effect of loading on transformer technical life. The degradation of paper insulation is a complicated process affected by temperature as well as the content of moisture and oxygen. A measure commonly used to determine the quality of the paper insulation, is the degree of polymerization (DP). DP reflects the average number of glycosidic rings in a cellulose macromolecule. The aging process reduces the number of rings, thus lowering paper's mechanical and dielectric strength. In [1], it is stated that a reduction to 35% retained tensile strength, or 200 DP indicates the end of life of the paper insulation. The initial value of the transformer insulation is assumed to be 1000 DP.

The relationship between temperature and aging is modelled with the Arrhenius reaction equation. If a rated condition of aging is defined, the relative aging rate for the paper is calculated using (6).

$$V = \frac{A}{A_r} \exp \left(\frac{1}{R_c} \left(\frac{E_{a,r}}{\theta_{hr} + 273} - \frac{E_a}{\theta_h + 273} \right) \right), \quad (6)$$

where V is the relative aging rate; A is an empirical pre-exponential value, $[1/h]$; A_r is rated A , $[1/h]$; R_c is the ideal gas constant; E_a is the required activation energy, $[kJ/mol]$; E_{ar} is rated E_a , $[kJ/mol]$; θ_{hr} is rated HST, $[^\circ C]$; θ_h is actual HST, $[^\circ C]$. The main part of [1] proposes values of E_a and A without considering moisture or oxygen content. In that case, $E_a = E_{ar}$ and $A = A_r$, and equation 6 is simplified, only becoming a function of hot spot temperature. In an annex of [1], values for E_a and A for different moisture content and paper type are shown. In this investigation, rated HST is assumed to be $\theta_{hr} = 110^\circ C$.

The LOL over a period of time is calculated with equation (7).

$$LOL = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} V dt, \quad [h] \quad (7)$$

where t_1 is the beginning of the time period; $[h]$; t_2 indicates the end of time period, $[h]$; V is the relative aging rate.

To perform the aging estimation, the HST over time is required. If the transformer is fitted with fiber optic sensors, an estimate of the HST is immediately available, and the LOL can be directly obtained from 7 without further modeling. However, it should be recognized that the location of the real hot spot may be different from the sensor, and underestimate the LOL. [45] The correct location for installation of the fiber optic sensor can be obtained through detailed thermal simulation. [46]

If direct measurements are not available, the hot spot temperature has to be obtained through modeling. The dynamic thermal models described in the standards require the

transformer thermal parameters that are measured during the heat run test. For very old transformers, documentation may have been lost, or the heat run test may not have been performed. To fill the gaps in required data, a set of assumptions should be made with consideration of the standards and typical values for transformers with similar characteristics. The dynamic thermal models also require measurement of ambient temperature and load. If top oil temperature are available it can be used, otherwise it can be calculated by the models. The ambient temperature information is preferably measured on site. For the following analysis weather information is obtained from the neighbouring weather stations and interpolated to match the site conditions using a inverse distance weighted method [47]. Load and temperature data covering the full history of the transformer should preferably be used. If such extensive data is not available, a shorter time period can be used and assumed representative of the time where data is lacking, keeping in mind annual variations and other changes in loading pattern. A high sampling rate, with time intervals shorter than the winding thermal time constant, can yield more accurate results as the dynamic behavior of the load is captured to a further extent. For existing installations, the availability of data is a limiting factor, and the analysis has to be performed based on what is available. With this inputs and parameters, the IEC thermal model is used to calculate the HST of each time step. Afterwards, the equation (7) is used to determine the LOL for the period in question. The expected lifetime before expansion is calculated based on the assumption that the aging will behave in the same way for the upcoming years.

2.3. Wind farm expansion calculation

The load expansion considers two methods: the product method and the convolution method. The product method assumes that the new added generation has perfect correlation with the existing generation. Therefore, the load for the expansion scenarios is the registered load multiplied by an expansion factor, as shown in equation (8).

$$D_{new,t} = B \cdot D_{old,t}, \quad [p.u.] \quad (8)$$

where $D_{new,t}$ is the new load at time t , $[p.u.]$; B is the load increase factor; and $D_{old,t}$ is the load before expansion at time t , $[p.u.]$;

The convolution method assumes that the new wind turbine generates power without any correlation with the existing generation. The load duration curve of wind generation can be discretized in a step function, in which each step has a generation G_s and a probability p_s [48]. For this study, the load duration curve of the new generation is a fit of the historic wind speed measurements to a Class 1 wind turbine at 100 meters above curve. The load duration curve is divided into five scenarios using a forward selection method to reduce the computational burden. The generation of each scenario is simplified as

$$D_{new,t,s} = D_{old,t} + B \cdot G_s, \quad [p.u.] \quad (9)$$

where $D_{new,t,s}$ is the new load at time t for scenario s , $[p.u.]$; and G_s is the generation in scenario s , $[p.u.]$.

For each scenario, the corresponding calculations are made and the final result is calculated by multiplying the scenario result with the corresponding probability. The LOL using the convolution method is then

$$LOL_{conv} = \sum_i^{N_g} p_s \cdot LOL_s, \quad [h] \quad (10)$$

where LOL_{conv} is the LOL for the convolution method, $[h]$; p_s is the probability of scenario s ; LOL_s is the calculated LOL for the load in scenario s , $[h]$.

The validity of the assumption of no correlation between the wind power sites depends on the distance between them. For reference [49] is shown that there is correlation between wind power sites at 500 km distance or more. For intermediate distances, a superposition of the result of the product method and the convolution method can be used.

1. the minimum lifetime of the transformer is estimated;
2. the LOL is calculated for a specific year and it is assumed that during the rest of operation, the LOL will follow similar behavior;
3. since aging is an accumulative process, the amount of aging for each year is added up to the rated value of 20.5 *years* of equivalent aging.;
4. an increase of 0.05 *p.u.* of the nominal capacity of the transformer is done for four different maximum HST limits: 110 °C, 120 °C, 130 °C and 140 °C;
5. if the maximum HST is surpassed or the current in a period of time surpasses the maximum allowed value, curtailment is required.

The analysis described above yields three main results:

- the minimum load increase at which curtailment is required;
- the load at which the expected lifetime is 50 years that is the maximum monetization age for Energimarknadsinspektionen (Swedish Energy Markets Inspectorate) ;
- the curtailment at the latter result

A limit of 2.0 *p.u.* of the installed capacity is set. Furthermore, the limitation on current from [1] for Medium Power Transformers is enforced strictly so that the load never exceeds 1.5 *p.u.* This means that if the installed capacity goes beyond 1.5 *p.u.*, curtailment will occur at maximum power generation. The limitation on current reflects that there are temperature limits apart from the winding hot spot that may be exceeded at high loading, e.g. temperature limits on bushings and tap changers. If the transformer is appropriately designed for high loading performance, then this limitation on current can be increased, and further wind power expansion may be possible.

The HST limits are set to 110 °C, 120 °C, 130 °C and 140 °C motivated by the long term emergency limits. The transformer can operate at HST up to 140 °C without any operation hinder except for an accelerated insulation aging. Given the load factor and generation profile of the wind farm, increasing maximum allowable HST can increase the efficiency of the transformer and give more flexibility for grid connection.

2.4. Single node analysis

A single node analysis is performed to determine the optimal wind farm expansion rate. The time horizon of 25 *years* is selected as the projected wind farm lifetime. The objective of optimization is to maximize the net present value (NPV) from the generator perspective using (11). A generation for every year is assumed to follow the same pattern as a base year and it is monetized using hourly electricity price. This analysis evaluates benefits of using DTR for wind farm expansion for the electricity network by evaluating the difference between the income from electricity export and the cost of electricity import. Wind power is assumed to have no variable costs and the curtailment is assumed to not be monetized. The load is considered to increase in three scenarios.

$$NPV = \sum_{i=1}^t \frac{C_i}{(1+r)^i} - C_o, \quad [SEK] \quad (11)$$

where NPV is the net present value, $[SEK]$; i is time of cash flow (number of the period); t is the total number of periods (i.e. 25 *years* in this analysis); C_i is the net cash flow during period i , $[SEK]$; r is the discount rate; C_o is the cost of installation, $[SEK]$.

2.5. Network limitations

The third stage considers the network limitations. Wind power curtailment is allowed, if the maximum transmission capacity of any component in the network is surpassed. For this study, a DC power flow is used for simplification of the analysis. Thereby, the voltage and reactive power supply are not considered in this analysis. The limits defined during stage 1 and 2 are being applied also during 3rd stage to reduce the computational time. The time horizon, demand, prices, and generation are kept same as in stage 2.

Stage 3 is done using following logic:

1. a transformer is selected;
2. if there are on-site temperature measurements, they are used for calculations. Otherwise, the information from the previous time period is used;
3. the maximum load is set using the thermal model so that the HST in the next period is below the maximum allowed HST;
4. the expected load for a given period is obtained;
5. if the expected load is larger than the maximum allowable load, wind generation curtailment is allowed;
6. a DC power flow is performed to determine, if there are power violations in any component
7. iff there are power violations in any of the components, curtailment is done until limits are not breached;
8. a new estimated aging is calculated and the values are stored for the next hour calculation;
9. this process is repeated for the number of expected years of wind farm operation;
10. an optimal wind park expansion and the benefit for society are calculated under given constraints.

3. Case Study

This study is performed for a population of nine transformers distributed around 5 locations in Sweden. The transformers are listed in Table 1. The power level of transformers under investigation ranges from 12 MVA to 100 MVA . None of the transformers were fitted with fiber optic sensors during the heat run test. The load duration curve for one transformer at each location is presented in Figure 1.

Table 1: List of investigated transformers with parameters for dynamic modeling

Unit	Location	Rated power, [MVA]	Cooling mode	R	$\Delta\theta_{or}$, [K]	g_r , [K]	H	τ_o , [min]	τ_w , [min]
T1	1	63	ONAF	11.35	55.6	12.5	1.3	146	4.2
T2	1	63	ONAF	11.35	55.6	12.5	1.3	146	4.2
T3	2	12	ONAN	6.872	52.1	10.4	1.3	210	10
T4	3	100	ONAN	6	56	20	1.3	210	10
T5	4	25	ONAN	7.22	56	20	1.3	210	10
T6	4	25	ONAN	7.22	56	20	1.3	210	10
T7	5	16	ONAN	7.27	51.6	15	1.3	210	10
T8	5	25	ONAN	5.53	51.2	12.3	1.3	210	10
T9	3	100	ONAF	7.481	52.4	15.154	1.3	150	7

The ambient temperature data is retrieved from SMHI [50]. Since there are no weather stations located directly at the transformer's location, all the active weather stations in a radius of 55 km from the transformer's geographical location are used for ambient temperature and wind speed estimation. The hourly load data for transformers is available from February of 2017 until November of 2018.

For the single node analysis and the network analysis, a 50 kV sub-transmission network in south of Sweden is analyzed. There are three additional wind parks with a total installed capacity of 36 MW . The system has an aggregate load of 92 MW and is connected to the grid with two parallel 130/50 kV transformers. The used parameters for the analysis for the upcoming 25 years are shown in Table 2.




Figure 1: Load duration curve of some relevant studied transformers

Table 2: Parameters for the single node and network analysis

Voltage level	50 kV
Additional wind power	36 MW
System installed demand	92 MW
Load shape	Nordpool SE4 price zone 2018 [51]
Low demand scenario	95 % of 2018 load by 2030 89 % of 2018 load by 2050 [52]
Base demand scenario	110 % of 2018 load by 2030 120 % of 2018 load by 2050 [52]
High demand scenario	126 % of 2018 load by 2030 151 % of 2018 load by 2050 [52]
Electricity price	Nordpool SE4 price zone 2018 [51]
Electricity price increase	1.5 % as average producer price index of the last 10 years [53]
Onshore installation cost	1800 USD/kWh [54]
Discount rate	6.75 % [55]

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Effect of the wind farm expansion or load increase on the aging of transformer

The load duration curve to be used for the convolution method is shown in Figure 2. It is obtained from fitting the calculated historic wind speed measurement from the site to the wind turbine power curve.




Figure 2: Load duration curve for the new generator in T1

In Table 3 is presented the relative aging rate of the population of transformers under the measured loading conditions. A value of 100% would indicate that the transformer insulation would reach end of life after 50 years. None of the investigated transformers are close to this limit. The difference in the expected aging of the transformer is explained by the difference in the load in the studied period. There is a direct correlation between the capacity factor and the aging of the transformer.

Three distinct groups of transformer aging performance can be recognized. The first group, corresponding to locations 1 and 3, are loaded up to the nameplate rating and has a capacity factor of about 30%. The second group, corresponding to location 4, are likewise loaded up to the nameplate rating but with a higher capacity factor of about 50%. Finally, the third group, corresponding to location 2 and 5, have a capacity factor of 30% or less, and are loaded below the nameplate rating. If a transformer has a lower load due to redundancy in the network, dynamic rating may still be applicable, but to a lesser extent than the present results indicate.

Table 3: Estimated remaining lifetime of the population of transformers without HST correction and a maximum allowed HST of 140 °C

Unit	Location	Capacity factor, [%]	Relative aging rate, [%]	Rated power, [MVA]	Maximum load, [p.u.]	Product method load, [%]		Convolution method load, [%]	
						Without curtailment	At 50 years insulation lifetime	Without curtailment	At 50 years insulation lifetime
T1	1	33.25	0.269	63	1.0086	145	160	145	165
T2	1	33.12	0.269	63	1.0195	145	160	145	165
T3	2	16.57	0.005	12	0.5970	200	200	195	200
T4	3	29.47	0.198	100	0.9939	150	160	150	165
T5	4	47.43	5.258	25	1.0202	130	125	130	135
T6	4	47.64	4.873	25	1.0139	135	130	135	130
T7	5	22.54	0.025	16	0.8345	185	200	175	200
T8	5	24.58	0.018	25	0.7524	200	200	180	200
T9	3	27.75	0.112	100	0.9910	155	170	155	165

Figure 3 shows the curtailment of the wind generation (Figure 3(a)) and corresponding transformer loss of life (Figure 3(b)) as an hourly percentage of the nominal capacity for $T1$, which is obtained using the product method for calculating projected wind power generation. The curtailment does not occur for load increase below 1.2 $p.u.$ for any value of maximum allowable HST. The higher the limiting temperature is, the less curtailment the system will experience. Figure 3(b) shows that the lower maximum allowed HST is, the lower is the aging rate and corresponding transformer's loss of life. The marginal aging rate for new load is higher for higher HST limit. A load increase of 1.65 $p.u.$ with HST limit of 140 °C has an expected lifetime below 20.5 *years*, whereas a load of 1.6 $p.u.$ yields a lifetime of 45 *years*, which should in theory satisfy wind parks with 20-25 *years* projected lifetime. However, it is important to mention that 45 *years* projected lifetime can still possess risks to the wind farm investment, since the impact of higher HSTs on other parts of the transformer are not a part of this analysis.




Figure 3: Curtailment (a) and LOL(b) for an increase of load by a factor B for the studied period.

The results for the convolution method of wind park expansion are shown in Figure 4. Similarly to the product methods, Figure 4(a) shows that the lower the HST limit is, the higher the wind power curtailment is required. With the convolution method, there are fewer load curtailments compared to the product method; the reason for this is because the load is increasing uniformly and does not accentuate the peaks of generation as in the product method. The interval between curtailments is similar for both expansion methods. Figure 4(b) shows the loss of life for transformer after expanding wind park using the convolution method, aging rate is higher for the conservative limits compared to the product method, but is significantly lower for $HST = 140\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ compared to the product method. Convolution method allows increasing the generation by further extent compared to the product method due to the smoothing effect created by new generation units. A limit of 1.8 p.u. of load increase is set for the $HST = 130\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ case, whereas the $HST = 140\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ case limit is increased up to 1.65 p.u.




Figure 4: Curtailment (a) and aging (b) for the convolution method for the studied period

Three limits are considered for the study: the load point increase at which first curtailment occurs, the point at which the expected lifetime of the transformer is 50 years, and the curtailment in that period of time. These values are presented in Table 4 for the product method. A higher maximum allowed HST causes that the first curtailment occurs at a higher increase level. This impacts the management of the units as there is no need of in detailed monitoring and scheduling when there is no curtailment. When the limit is set to $110\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, the lifetime limit is not surpassed due to the load variability and the load ambient temperatures. As a trade back, there are higher curtailments. With an increase in the maximum allowed HST, the maximum load in the transformer is reduced. The three transformer groups can also be analyzed. The heavily loaded transformers have curtailment over 20 % when the maximum HST is $110\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ and the load at which the maximum expected lifetime is 50 years is less than the first curtailment. The second group has the first curtailment between 1.25 and 1.55 $p.u.$ and the curtailments when the curtailments when the load is doubles is between 4 and 7 % of the base capacity. The third group is lightly loaded, present little or no curtailment independent of the maximum allowed HST, and the expected lifetime is not reached when the load is doubled.

Table 4: Load at which there is the first curtailment of power, load at which the expected lifetime is around 50 years and curtailment for the latter for two maximum HST limits, for the product method

Unit	Load First Curtailment, [$p.u.$]		Load lifetime 50 years, [$p.u.$]		Curtailment lifetime 50 years, [%]	
	$110\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$	$140\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$	$110\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$	$140\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$	$110\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$	$140\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$
T1	1.25	1.5	2	1.55	6.60	0.04
T2	1.25	1.5	2	1.55	6.60	0.04
T3	2	2	2	2	0	0
T4	1.25	1.55	2	1.6	5.57	0.04
T5	1.05	1.3	2	1.2	23.59	0
T6	1.1	1.35	2	1.25	23.50	0
T7	1.55	1.85	2	2	1.15	0.20
T8	1.85	2	2	2	0.16	0
T9	1.3	1.55	2	1.7	4.59	0.22

Table 5 shows the points of interest for the convolution method. The effect of a higher maximum allowed HST is the same and the expected lifetime is greater than 50 years when it is $110\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$. With the convolution method, the curtailment is reduced but the load for reaching the expected lifetime of 50 years is less. The product method gives worse results for heavily loaded transformers, whereas set stronger limits to lightly loaded transformers. This can be explained by the normalization nature the convolution method has.

Table 5: Load at which there is the first curtailment of power, load at which the expected lifetime is around 50 years and curtailment for the latter for two maximum HST limits, for the convolution method

Unit	Load First Curtailment, [$p.u.$]		Load lifetime 50 years, [$p.u.$]		Curtailment lifetime 50 years, [%]	
	110 °C	140 °C	110 °C	140 °C	110 °C	140 °C
T1	1.25	1.5	2	1.7	4.04	0.02
T2	1.25	1.5	2	1.55	4.04	0.02
T3	1.7	1.95	2	2	0.42	0.01
T4	1.25	1.5	2	1.65	5.81	0.05
T5	1.05	1.3	2	1.3	14.33	0
T6	1.1	1.35	2	1.35	11.47	0
T7	1.5	1.75	2	2	0.97	0.23
T8	1.65	1.8	2	2	0.7	0.19
T9	1.3	1.55	2	1.7	4.68	0.21

Figure 5 has the maximum wind power that could be added to an existing wind park transformer if the expected lifetime of the transformer is above 50 *years*. When the limit is set to 110 °C, the lifetime limit is not surpassed due to the load variability and the load ambient temperatures. With an increase in the maximum allowed HST, the maximum load in the transformer is reduced.




Figure 5: Load at which the expected aging is around 50 years. RMSE represents the HST correction due to errors in ambient temperature estimation. 8 °C represents the correction due to HST model underestimation.

Similarly to the previous case, the safety correction significantly reduces additional expansion capacity of the transformer. The curtailment in Figure 6 at this level is reduced for

higher HST limit. The dispersion in lower HST is greater than in higher HST. There is a clear trade-off between curtailment and lifetime, that is explored in the following subsection.




Figure 6: Curtailment for the load in Figure 5. RMSE represents the HST correction due to errors in ambient temperature estimation. 8 °C represents the correction due to HST model underestimation.

4.2. Single node analysis

Since the transformers T5 and T6 behave differently from the rest of the population as they have higher load capacity, shown in Table 3, they have been selected for single node analysis; other transformers in population have significantly higher remaining lifetime and are expected to yield more promising results compared to T1 and T5. Figure 7 shows the revenue of adding more generators to an existing wind park. For T1, there is a linear increase in revenue up to 1.2 *p.u.* independently of the maximum allowed HST. After the thermal limit is surpassed, curtailment is required and an increase in the installed wind power is not reflected equally by revenue. The transformer's lifetime is also limited to be more than 50 *years*. For T1 the maximum revenue is obtained after load is increased by 50 % and a maximum allowable HST is 130 °C, and for T2 maximum revenue happens for combination of load increase up to 1.4 *p.u.* and the limiting HST equal to 120 °C. The maximum revenue for T1 is larger as it requires less curtailment. For both cases, there are no curtailment due to over-current.




Figure 7: T1 (a) and T5 (b) revenue in the single node study

The loss of life for $T1$ and $T5$ is shown in Figure 8. The loss of life is significantly increased for both transformers, but the lifetime is still limited to a minimum of 50 *years*. The transformers are utilized in a more efficient way as the monetization lifetime is lower than the expected technical lifetime. Analysing Figure 7 and 8 it is possible to conclude that the load increase up to 1.35 *p.u.* and HST limit of 130 °C give the most significant revenue increase while maintaining lower rate of LOL.




Figure 8: $T1$ and $T5$ LOL in the single node study.

If the export of energy is represented as an income and the import is represented in a form of cost, the revenue can be calculated as the difference between export and import. Figure 9 shows the imports and exports for a maximum HST of 110 °C and the three load scenarios. Low loads allow higher energy exports and reduce the energy cost. Additionally, an increase in wind power generation reduces the amount of imported energy in the same proportion. The cost of energy is reduced with the further incorporation of load.




Figure 9: Imports and exports(a), and cost of energy (b) of the single node analysis. The analysis is done for a HST of 110°C and it is assumed that the reference case is a transformer with rated installed capacity and the base load increase scenario.

4.3. Network analysis

Figure 10 shows the expected revenue and LOL for T_5 , when the wind farm expansion is also limited by the grid restrictions. The revenue starts decreasing after 1.15 p.u. compared to 1.2 p.u. for single node analysis. The effect is not exclusively due to HST limitations, compared to the single node analysis, and is explained by the network limitations. The revenue decrease occurs during time periods of low electricity demand and high generation from wind. The maximum revenue is achieved at 1.35 p.u. and is 25 % more than the original capacity. The expected lifetime is kept above the 50 year limit.




Figure 10: T5 revenue (a) and LOL (b) for the network study for the base scenario

Figure 11 shows the wind farm curtailment for scenarios of low, base and high power demand and two maximum allowed hot spot temperature levels: 110°C in Figure 11(a) and 140°C in Figure 11(b). The low demand scenario requires more curtailment since it brings more stress into the network. The base and high demand scenario have similar behavior. Additionally, the maximum allowed HST has a significant effect on amount of curtailment, which is also reflected by the total revenue. The curtailment are more common at a lower generation level compared to the single node scenario.




Figure 11: Curtailment in the network scenario and transformer T5. Maximum HST = 110°C (a) and maximum HST = 140°C (b)

Table 6 represents the cost reduction for the system compared with the installed capacity. An increase in the installed capacity has a positive impact on society, especially in the low demand scenario. The effect of increasing the maximum allowed HST is important at higher load levels and is related to the curtailment of power. The effect comes mainly from energy export rather than a reduction of energy input, as the latter occur for lower wind speeds.

Table 6: Cost of energy for the 25 year period as a percentage of the system without wind park expansion for the network analysis

Load	Low Demand				Base Demand				High Demand			
	110°C	120°C	130°C	140°C	110°C	120°C	130°C	140°C	110°C	120°C	130°C	140°C
1	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
1.05	93.9	93.9	93.9	93.9	96.4	96.4	96.4	96.4	97.4	97.4	97.4	97.4
1.1	87.7	87.7	87.7	87.7	92.7	92.7	92.7	92.7	94.8	94.8	94.8	94.8
1.15	81.7	81.7	81.7	81.7	89.2	89.1	89.1	89.1	92.2	92.2	92.2	92.2
1.2	76.2	75.9	75.9	75.9	85.8	85.6	85.6	85.6	89.8	89.6	89.6	89.6
1.25	71.2	70.4	70.4	70.4	82.7	82.2	82.1	82.1	87.6	87.1	87.1	87.1
1.3	66.8	65.5	65.2	65.2	80.0	79.1	78.9	78.9	85.6	84.8	84.7	84.7
1.35	62.9	60.9	60.3	60.2	77.7	76.3	75.8	75.7	83.9	82.8	82.4	82.3
1.4	59.4	56.8			75.6	73.8			82.5	80.9		
1.45	56.2	53.1			73.7	71.5			81.1	79.3		
1.5	53.2				72.0				79.8			

Each stage of the wind park expansion method increases the restriction on the systems,

thus reducing the allowed capacity of the network. Determining the point, at which the first curtailment occurs, is important, because it is a point where the wind power must be monitored, affecting the operation of the transformer and generation in the control center; allowing higher transformer HST reduces the need for monitoring, but increases the loss of life of transformer insulation and creates additional risks for transformer operation. Nevertheless, it is better to have on-line monitoring of the temperature in the transformer to have an accurate estimation of the aging. Moreover, the reduction of the safety margins for the HST calculations might increase the capacity of the transformers even further.

Single node analysis performed for two transformers with lowest remaining lifetime in the population still has shown increase in revenue and possibility to load transformers up to 1.2-1.4 *p.u.* of the nameplate rating, while maintaining LOL below 5 *days* per year. However, after considering network limitations maximum capacity of the transformer is reduced to 1.1-1.25 *p.u.* while maintaining low aging rate. Scenarios of increased power demand allow to increase power delivery, minimize wind power curtailment and increase the revenue.

5. Conclusion

Dynamic transformer rating has a potential to assist grid operators and wind park owners in providing faster grid connection for new wind turbines and an opportunity to use good wind sites to their full potential by installing more wind turbines where it is feasible with no extra cost for building necessary grid connection. It also allows for better utilization of large power devices such as power transformers, which can significantly reduce environmental impact of power generation and transmission. From the economic point of view, it also allows a more flexible planning of the electric network, while reducing investment costs. The implementation is more relevant in wind power applications given the intermittent nature of the load and the low capacity factor. It has been shown the possibility of expanding existing wind parks without investment in new transformers, while maintaining the expected technical lifetime of the transformer above the economic lifetime.

Five transformer locations and nine units were studied for finding the potential of dynamic transformer rating for network expansion applications. The analysis shows that the optimal expansion of wind power from a generator perspective is around 30 % to 50 %, although, that can be limited by further restrictions to the network.

It is important to note that LOL estimation remains to be of high importance and is combined with high uncertainty, therefore LOL brings additional restrictions on possibility of transformer loading expansion. If there is a possibility to install fiber optic sensors and obtain accurate measurements of HST, safety margins can be significantly reduced, allowing the possibility of even better transformer utilization. In order to overcome network limitations it could be of interest also to investigate possibility to remove some congestion by applying dynamic line rating.

6. Acknowledgement

Authors would like to thank SweGRIDS, Swedish Energy Agency and Energiforsk AB Wind Research Program for project sponsorship. This project is conducted under STandUP for Wind framework.

References

- [1] IEC, IEC 60076-7:2017 Power transformers - Part 7: Loading guide for oil-immersed power transformers 60076 (7).
- [2] B. D. Lahoti, D. E. Flowers, Evaluation of transformer loading above nameplate rating, IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems PAS-100 (4) (1981) 1989–1998. doi:10.1109/TPAS.1981.316554.
- [3] D. A. Douglass, A. A. Edris, Real-time monitoring and dynamic thermal rating of power transmission circuits, IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery 11 (3) (1996) 1407–1418. doi:10.1109/61.517499.
- [4] M. F. Lachman, P. J. Griffin, W. Walter, A. Wilson, Real-time dynamic loading and thermal diagnostic of power transformers, IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery 18 (1) (2003) 142–148. doi:10.1109/TPWRD.2002.803724.
- [5] L. Söder, T. Ackermann, Wind Power in Power Systems: An Introduction, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2012, Ch. 4, pp. 47–72. arXiv:<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/9781119941842.ch4>, doi:10.1002/9781119941842.ch4.
URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781119941842.ch4>
- [6] W. Sun, G. P. Harrison, Wind-solar complementarity and effective use of distribution network capacity, Applied Energy 247 (2019) 89 – 101. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.04.042>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306261919306701>
- [7] A. J. Veldhuis, M. Leach, A. Yang, The impact of increased decentralised generation on the reliability of an existing electricity network, Applied Energy 215 (2018) 479 – 502. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2018.02.009>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306261918301284>
- [8] Energy in sweden 2017 (Apr 2018).
- [9] T. E. W. E. Association, Wind energy frequently asked questions, ewea (Feb 2019).
URL <http://www.ewea.org/wind-energy-basics/faq/>
- [10] S. D. Foss, S. H. Lin, R. A. Fernandes, Dynamic thermal line ratings part i dynamic ampacity rating algorithm, IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems PAS-102 (6) (1983) 1858–1864. doi:10.1109/TPAS.1983.317795.
- [11] T. Y. Wong, J. A. Findlay, A. N. McMurtrie, An on-line method for transmission ampacity evaluation, IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems PAS-101 (2) (1982) 309–315. doi:10.1109/TPAS.1982.317108.
- [12] M. W. Davis, A new thermal rating approach: The real time thermal rating system for strategic overhead conductor transmission lines – part i: General description and justification of the real time thermal rating system, IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems 96 (3) (1977) 803–809. doi:10.1109/T-PAS.1977.32393.
- [13] C. Wallnerstrom, P. Hilber, P. Soderstrom, R. Saers, O. Hansson, Potential of dynamic rating in Sweden, in: 2014 International conference on probabilistic methods applied to power systems (PMAPS), 2014, pp. 1–6. doi:10.1109/PMAPS.2014.6960605.
- [14] S. Karimi, A. M. Knight, P. Musilek, A comparison between fuzzy and probabilistic estimation of dynamic thermal rating of transmission lines, in: 2016 IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems (FUZZ-IEEE), 2016, pp. 1740–1744. doi:10.1109/FUZZ-IEEE.2016.7737900.
- [15] A. Michiorri, H.-M. Nguyen, S. Alessandrini, J. Bremnes, S. Dierer, E. Ferrero, B. Nygaard, P. Pinson, N. Thomaidis, S. Uski, Forecasting for dynamic line rating, Renewable and sustainable energy reviews 52 (2015) 1713–1730. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.07.134>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032115007819>

- [16] E. Fernandez, I. Albizu, M. Bedialauneta, A. Mazon, P. Leite, Review of dynamic line rating systems for wind power integration, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 53 (2016) 80 – 92. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.07.149>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032115007960>
- [17] M. Simms, L. Meegahapola, Comparative analysis of dynamic line rating models and feasibility to minimise energy losses in wind rich power networks, *Energy Conversion and Management* 75 (2013) 11 – 20. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2013.06.003>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0196890413002999>
- [18] B. Banerjee, D. Jayaweera, S. Islam, Risk constrained short-term scheduling with dynamic line ratings for increased penetration of wind power, *Renewable Energy* 83 (2015) 1139 – 1146. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2015.05.053>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960148115300161>
- [19] B. Banerjee, D. Jayaweera, S. Islam, Assessment of post-contingency congestion risk of wind power with asset dynamic ratings, *International Journal of Electrical Power Energy Systems* 69 (2015) 295 – 303. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijepes.2014.12.088>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0142061515000137>
- [20] G. Swift, T. S. Molinski, W. Lehn, A fundamental approach to transformer thermal modeling. i. theory and equivalent circuit, *IEEE transactions on Power Delivery* 16 (2) (2001) 171–175.
- [21] D. Susa, M. Lehtonen, H. Nordman, Dynamic thermal modelling of power transformers, *IEEE transactions on Power Delivery* 20 (1) (2005) 197–204.
- [22] D. Susa, M. Lehtonen, Dynamic thermal modeling of power transformers: further development-part I, *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery* 21 (4) (2006) 1961–1970.
- [23] B. H. Ward, A survey of new techniques in insulation monitoring of power transformers, *IEEE Electrical Insulation Magazine* 17 (3) (2001) 16–23.
- [24] L. Ippolito, P. Siano, Identification of tagaki-sugeno-kang fuzzy model for power transformers’ predictive overload system, *IEEE Proceedings-Generation, Transmission and Distribution* 151 (5) (2004) 582–589.
- [25] L. Chittock, J. Yang, D. Strickland, C. Harrap, J. Mourik, Distribution network transformer thermal modelling parameter determination for dynamic rating applications, in: *Power Electronics, Machines and Drives (PEMD 2016)*, 8th IET International Conference on, IET, 2016, pp. 1–6.
- [26] D. J. Tylavsky, X. Mao, G. A. McCulla, Transformer thermal modeling: Improving reliability using data quality control, *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery* 21 (3) (2006) 1357–1366.
- [27] X. Mao, D. Tylavsky, G. McCulla, Assessing the reliability of linear dynamic transformer thermal modelling, *IEEE Proceedings-Generation, Transmission and Distribution* 153 (4) (2006) 414–422.
- [28] L. Jauregui-Rivera, X. Mao, D. J. Tylavsky, Improving reliability assessment of transformer thermal top oil model parameters estimated from measured data, *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery* 24 (1) (2009) 169–176.
- [29] L. Chittock, J. Yang, D. Strickland, C. Harrap, J. Mourik, Distribution network transformer thermal modelling parameter determination for dynamic rating applications, in: *8th IET International Conference on Power Electronics, Machines and Drives (PEMD 2016)*, 2016, pp. 1–6. doi:[10.1049/cp.2016.0296](https://doi.org/10.1049/cp.2016.0296).
- [30] J. Yang, D. Strickland, Thermal modelling for dynamic transformer rating in low carbon distribution network operation, in: *7th IET International Conference on Power Electronics, Machines and Drives (PEMD 2014)*, 2014, pp. 1–6. doi:[10.1049/cp.2014.0330](https://doi.org/10.1049/cp.2014.0330).
- [31] J. Yang, L. Chittock, D. Strickland, C. Harrap, Predicting practical benefits of dynamic asset ratings of 33kv distribution transformers, in: *IET International Conference on Resilience of Transmission and Distribution Networks (RTDN) 2015*, 2015, pp. 1–6. doi:[10.1049/cp.2015.0898](https://doi.org/10.1049/cp.2015.0898).
- [32] T. S. Jalal, N. Rashid, B. van Vliet, Implementation of dynamic transformer rating in a distribution network, in: *2012 IEEE International Conference on Power System Technology (POWERCON)*, 2012, pp. 1–5. doi:[10.1109/PowerCon.2012.6401328](https://doi.org/10.1109/PowerCon.2012.6401328).
- [33] T. S. Jalal, Case study: Implementation of dynamic rating for transformers in a distribution network,

- in: ISGT 2014, 2014, pp. 1–5. doi:10.1109/ISGT.2014.6816414.
- [34] A. Bracale, G. Carpinelli, P. D. Falco, Probabilistic risk-based management of distribution transformers by dynamic transformer rating, *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems* 113 (2019) 229 – 243. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijepes.2019.05.048>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0142061519308063>
 - [35] A. V. Turnell, A. Linnet, N. Tamadon, K. Morozovska, P. Hilber, T. Laneryd, M. Wihlen, E. Ab, Risk and economic analysis of utilizing dynamic thermal rated transformer for wind farm connection, in: 2018 IEEE International Conference on Probabilistic Methods Applied to Power Systems (PMAPS), 2018, pp. 1–6. doi:10.1109/PMAPS.2018.8440479.
 - [36] R. Karlsson, Power system performance when implementing dynamic rating on a wind farm connected transformer, Master’s thesis, KTH, Electromagnetic Engineering (2017).
 - [37] T. Zarei, K. Morozovska, T. Laneryd, P. Hilber, M. Wihlén, O. Hansson, Reliability considerations and economic benefits of dynamic transformer rating for wind energy integration, *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems* 106 (2019) 598 – 606. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijepes.2018.09.038>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0142061517333033>
 - [38] T. Zarei, Analysis of reliability improvements of transformers after application of dynamic rating, Master’s thesis, School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (2017).
 - [39] K. Morozovska, Dynamic rating of power lines and transformers for wind energy integration, no. 2018:37 in TRITA-EECS-AVL, KTH, Electromagnetic Engineering, Stockholm, Sweden, 2018, QC 20180423.
 - [40] J. McCarthy, Analysis of transformer ratings in a wind farm environment, Masters Dissertation.
 - [41] N. Viafora, K. Morozovska, S. H. H. Kazmi, T. Laneryd, P. Hilber, J. Holbøll, Day-ahead dispatch optimization with dynamic thermal rating of transformers and overhead lines, *Electric Power Systems Research* 171 (2019) 194 – 208. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsr.2019.02.026>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378779619300902>
 - [42] S. H. H. Kazmi, J. Holbøll, T. H. Olesen, T. S. Sørensen, Dynamic thermoelectric modelling of oil-filled power transformers for optimization of offshore windfarm export systems, in: Cigre Symposium, 2019, pp. 4–7.
 - [43] S. H. H. Kazmi, J. Holbøll, T. H. Olesen, T. S. Sørensen, Dynamic thermoelectric modelling of oil-filled transformers for optimized integration of wind power in distribution networks, in: 25th International Conference on Electricity Distribution, CIRED 2019, 2019, pp. 3–6.
 - [44] Ieee guide for loading mineral-oil-immersed transformers and step-voltage regulators, *IEEE Std C57.91-2011 (Revision of IEEE Std C57.91-1995)* (2012) 1–123doi:10.1109/IEEESTD.2012.6166928.
 - [45] T. Laneryd, A. Gustafsson, S. Travancic, Understanding the location of hot spots in transformer windings, in: International Heat Transfer Conference, IHTC 16, 2018.
 - [46] A. Gustafsson, Y. Jiao, J. Kranenborg, T. Laneryd, B. Samuelsson, Transformer winding oil flow rate & hot spot temperature: A straightforward relationship?, in: Conference of the Electric Power Supply Industry, CEPSI, 2016.
 - [47] K. G. Hubbard, J. You, Sensitivity analysis of quality assurance using the spatial regression approach—a case study of the maximum/minimum air temperature, *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology* 22 (10) (2005) 1520–1530. arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH1790.1>, doi:10.1175/JTECH1790.1.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH1790.1>
 - [48] L. Söder, M. Amelin, Efficient operation and planning of power systems, qC 20111219. Course compendium (2011).
 - [49] C. M. S. Martin, J. K. Lundquist, M. A. Handschy, Variability of interconnected wind plants: correlation length and its dependence on variability time scale, *Environmental Research Letters* 10 (4) (2015) 044004.
 - [50] Vader vaderprognoser klimat och vadertjanster i sverige (15 Mar 2017).
URL <https://www.smhi.se/>
 - [51] Nordpool, Historical market data (May 2019).
URL <https://www.nordpoolgroup.com/historical-market-data/>

- [52] B. Rydén, H. Sköldberg, T. Unger, A. Göransson, J. Linnarsson, A. Badano, S. Montin, Scenarier för den framtida elanvändningen: En underlagsstudie (2015).
- [53] SCB, Producer and import price index (May 2019).
URL <https://www.scb.se/en/finding-statistics/statistics-by-subject-area/prices-and-consumption/producer-and-import-price-index/producer-and-import-price-index/>
- [54] I. R. E. Agency, Renewable power generation costs in 2017, IRENA (2018).
- [55] G. Thornton, Renewable energy discount rate survey results – 2017. a grant thornton and clean energy pipeline initiative (Jan 2018).
URL <http://www.cleanenergypipeline.com/Resources/CE/ResearchReports/renewable-energy-discount-rate-survey-2017.pdf>