

Screening Criterion for Transformer Thermal Impact Assessment

Project 2013-03 (Geomagnetic Disturbance Mitigation)

TPL-007-1 Transmission System Planned Performance for Geomagnetic Disturbance Events

Summary

Proposed standard TPL-007-1 – Transmission System Planned Performance for Geomagnetic Disturbance Events requires applicable entities to conduct assessments of the potential impact of benchmark GMD events on their systems. The standard requires transformer thermal impact assessments to be performed on power transformers with high side, wye-grounded windings with terminal voltage greater than 200 kV. Transformers are exempt from the thermal impact assessment requirement if the maximum effective geomagnetically-induced current (GIC) in the transformer is less than 75 A per phase as determined by GIC analysis of the system. Based on published power transformer measurement data as described below, an effective GIC of 75 A per phase is a conservative screening criterion. To provide an added measure of conservatism, the 75 A per phase threshold, although derived from measurements in single-phase units, is applicable to transformers with all core types (e.g., three-limb, three-phase).

Justification

Applicable entities are required to carry out a thermal assessment with $GIC(t)$ calculated using the benchmark GMD event geomagnetic field time series or waveshape for effective GIC values above a screening threshold. The calculated $GIC(t)$ for every transformer will be different because the length and orientation of transmission circuits connected to each transformer will be different even if the geoelectric field is assumed to be uniform. However, for a given thermal model and maximum effective GIC there are upper and lower bounds for the peak hot spot temperatures. These are shown in **Figure 1** using three available thermal models based on direct temperature measurements.

The results shown in **Figure 1** summarize the peak metallic hot spot temperatures when $GIC(t)$ is calculated using (1), and systematically varying GIC_E and GIC_N to account for all possible orientation of circuits connected to a transformer. The transformer GIC (in A/phase) for any value of $E_E(t)$ and $E_N(t)$ can be calculated using equation (1) from reference [1].

$$GIC(t) = |E(t)| \cdot \{GIC_E \sin(\varphi(t)) + GIC_N \cos(\varphi(t))\} \quad (1)$$

where


$$|E(t)| = \sqrt{E_N^2(t) + E_E^2(t)} \quad (2)$$

$$\varphi(t) = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{E_E(t)}{E_N(t)}\right) \quad (3)$$

$$GIC(t) = E_E(t) \cdot GIC_E + E_N(t) \cdot GIC_N \quad (4)$$

GIC_N is the effective GIC due to a northward geoelectric field of 1 V/km, and GIC_E is the effective GIC due to an eastward geoelectric field of 1 V/km. The units for GIC_N and GIC_E are A/phase/V/km.

It should be emphasized that with the thermal models used and the benchmark GMD event geomagnetic field waveshape, peak hot spot temperatures must lie below the envelope shown in **Figure 1**. [The x-axis in Figure 1 corresponds to the absolute value of peak GIC\(t\). Effective maximum GIC for a transformer corresponds to a worst-case geoelectric field orientation, which is network-specific. Figure 1 represents a possible range, not the specific thermal response for a given effective GIC and orientation.](#)






Figure 1: Metallic hot spot temperatures calculated using the benchmark GMD event. Red: [Screening SVC coupling transformer](#) model [2]. Blue: Fingrid model [3]. Green: [Socome Autotransformer](#) model [4].

Consequently, with the most conservative thermal models known at this point in time, the peak metallic hot spot temperature obtained with the benchmark GMD event waveshape assuming an effective GIC magnitude of 75 A per phase will result in a peak temperature between ~~104~~160°C and ~~150~~172°C when the bulk oil temperature is 80°C (full load bulk oil temperature). The upper boundary of ~~150~~172°C ~~falls~~remains well below the metallic hot spot 200°C threshold for short-time emergency loading suggested in IEEE Std C57.91-2011 [5] (see Table 1).

TABLE 1:
Excerpt from Maximum Temperature Limits Suggested in IEEE C57.91-2011

| | Normal life expectancy loading | Planned loading beyond | Long-time emergency loading | Short-time emergency loading |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | | |

| | | nameplate rating | | |
|---|-----|------------------|-----|-----|
| Insulated conductor hottest-spot temperature °C | 120 | 130 | 140 | 180 |
| Other metallic hot-spot temperature (in contact and not in contact with insulation), °C | 140 | 150 | 160 | 200 |
| Top-oil temperature °C | 105 | 110 | 110 | 110 |

The selection of the 75 A per phase screening threshold is based on the following considerations:

- A thermal assessment using the most conservative thermal models known to date will not result in peak hot spot temperatures above [150/172°C](#). Transformer thermal assessments should not be required by Reliability Standards when results will fall well below IEEE Std C57.91-2011 limits.
- Applicable entities may choose to carry out a thermal assessment when the effective GIC is below 75 A per phase to take into account the [age or](#) condition of specific transformers where IEEE Std C57.91- 2011 limits could be assumed to be lower than 200°C.
- The models used to determine the 75 A per phase screening threshold are known to be conservative at higher values of effective GIC, especially the [screening SVC coupling transformer](#) model in [2].
- Thermal models in peer-reviewed technical literature, especially those calculated models without experimental validation, are less conservative than the models used to determine the screening threshold. Therefore, a technically-justified thermal assessment for effective GIC below 75 A per phase using the benchmark GMD event geomagnetic field waveshape will always result in a “pass” on the basis of the state of the knowledge at this point in time.
- [The Based on simulations, the 75 A per phase screening threshold was determined on the basis of will result in a maximum instantaneous peak hot spot temperature of 172°C. However, IEEE Std C57.91- 2011 limits assume short term emergency operation \(typically 30 minutes\). As illustrated in Figure 2, simulations of the 75 A per phase screening threshold result in 30-minute duration hot spot temperatures of about 155°C.](#) The threshold provides an added measure of conservatism in not taking into account the duration of hot spot temperatures.
- The models used in the determination of the threshold are conservative but technically justified.
- Winding hot spots are not the limiting factor in terms of hot spots due to half-cycle saturation, therefore the screening criterion is focused on metallic part hot spots only.

The 75 A per phase screening threshold was determined using single-phase transformers, but is applicable to all types of transformer construction. While it is known that some transformer types such as three-limb, three-phase transformers are intrinsically less susceptible to GIC, it is not known by how much, on the basis of experimentally-supported models.




Figure 2: Metallic hot spot temperatures calculated using the benchmark GMD event. Red: metallic hot spot temperature. Blue: GIC(t) that produces the maximum hot spot temperature with peak GIC(t) scaled to 75 A/phase.

Appendix

The [envelope used for thermal screening \(Figure 1\)](#) is derived from two thermal ~~model~~ models. The first is based on laboratory measurements carried out on 500/16.5 kV 400 MVA single-phase Static Var Compensator (SVC) coupling transformer [2]. Temperature measurements were carried out at relatively small values of GIC (see [Figure 2-3](#)). The asymptotic thermal response for this model is the linear extrapolation of the known measurement values. Although the near-linear behavior of the asymptotic thermal response is consistent with the measurements made on a Fingrid 400 kV 400 MVA five-leg core-type fully-wound transformer [3] (see [Figures 34 and 45](#)), the extrapolation from low values of GIC is very conservative, but reasonable for screening purposes.

The ~~third~~ second transformer model is based on a combination of measurements and modeling for a 400 kV 400 MVA single-phase core-type autotransformer [4] (see [Figures 56 and 67](#)). The asymptotic thermal behavior of this transformer shows a “down-turn” at high values of GIC as the tie plate increasingly saturates but relatively high temperatures for lower values of GIC. The hot spot temperatures are higher than for the two other models for GIC less than 125 A per phase.




Figure 23: Thermal step response of the tie plate of a 500 kV 400 MVA single-phase SVC coupling transformer to a 5 A per phase dc step.




Figure 34: Step thermal response of the [Fitch platetop yoke clamp](#) of a 400 kV 400 MVA five-leg core-type fully-wound transformer to a [1016.67 A](#) per phase dc step.




Figure 45: Asymptotic thermal response of the [Fitch platetop yoke clamp](#) of a 400 kV 400 MVA five-leg core-type fully-wound transformer.




Figure 56: Step thermal response of the tie plate of a 400 kV 400 MVA single-phase core-type autotransformer to a 10 A per phase dc step.




Figure 67: Asymptotic thermal response of the tie plate of a 400 kV 400 MVA single-phase core-type autotransformer.

The [composite](#) envelope in **Figure 1** can be used as a conservative thermal assessment for effective GIC values of 75 A per phase and greater (see Table 2).

| Effective GIC (A/phase) | Metallic hot spot Temperature (°C) | Effective GIC(A/phase) | Metallic hot spot Temperature (°C) |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 0 | 80 | 140100 | 172182 |
| 10 | 106107 | 150110 | 180186 |
| 20 | 116128 | 160120 | 187190 |
| 30 | 125139 | 170130 | 194193 |
| 40 | 132148 | 180140 | 200204 |
| 50 | 138157 | 190150 | 208213 |
| 60 | 143169 | 200160 | 214221 |
| 70 | 147170 | 210170 | 221230 |
| 75 | 150172 | 220180 | 224234 |
| 80 | 152175 | 230190 | 228241 |
| 90 | 156179 | 240200 | 233247 |
| 100 | 159 | 250 | 239 |
| 110 | 163 | 260 | 245 |
| 120 | 165 | 270 | 251 |
| 130 | 168 | 280 | 257 |

For instance, if effective GIC is [150130](#) A per phase and oil temperature is assumed to be 80°C, peak hot spot temperature is [180193](#)°C. This value is below the 200°C IEEE Std C57.91-2011 threshold for short time emergency loading and this transformer will have passed the thermal assessment. If the full heat run oil temperature is [5967](#)°C at maximum ambient temperature, then [210150](#) A per phase of effective GIC translates [into](#) a peak hot spot temperature of 200°C and the transformer will have passed. If the limit is lowered to 180°C to account for the condition of the transformer, then this would be an indication to “sharpen the pencil” and perform a detailed assessment. Some methods are described in Reference [1].

The temperature envelope in Figure 1 corresponds to the values of [GIC_E and GIC_N](#) effective GIC that result in the highest temperature for the benchmark GMD event. Different values of effective GIC could result in lower temperatures using the same [screening](#) model. For instance, the [difference in upper and lower bounds](#) of peak temperatures for the [screening SVC coupling transformer](#) model for [210150](#) A per phase is [165](#) [approximately 30](#)°C. In this case, GIC(t) should be generated to calculate the peak temperatures for the actual configuration of the transformer within the system as described in Reference [1]. Alternatively, a more precise thermal assessment could be carried out with a thermal model that more closely represents the thermal behavior of the transformer under consideration.

References

- [1] Transformer Thermal Impact Assessment white paper. Developed by the Project 2013-03 (Geomagnetic Disturbance) standard drafting team. Available at:
<http://www.nerc.com/pa/Stand/Pages/Project-2013-03-Geomagnetic-Disturbance-Mitigation.aspx>
- [2] Marti, L., Rezaei-Zare, A., Narang, A., "Simulation of Transformer Hotspot Heating due to Geomagnetically Induced Currents," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol.28, no.1, pp.320-327, Jan. 2013.
- [3] Lahtinen, Matti. Jarmo Elovaara. "GIC occurrences and GIC test for 400 kV system transformer". *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, Vol. 17, No. 2. April 2002.
- [4] J. Raith, S. Ausserhofer: "GIC Strength verification of Power Transformers in a High Voltage Laboratory", GIC Workshop, Cape Town, April 2014
- [5] "IEEE Guide for loading mineral-oil-immersed transformers and step-voltage regulators." IEEE Std C57.91-2011 (Revision of IEEE Std C57.91-1995).