Webology, Volume 18, Number 5, 2021
ISSN: 1735-188X
DOI: 10.29121/WEB/V18I5/88

The SFL Algorithm Is Used to Generate Electrical Power at A Low Cost

Ashutosh Dixit[1], Sandeep Sunori[2]

[1]Department of Electrical Engineering,Graphic Era Deemed to be University, Dehradun, Uttarakhand India, 248002
[2]Department of Electronics & Communication Engineering, Graphic Era Deemed to be University, Dehradun, Uttarakhand India, 248002

ABSTRACT
To satisfy the power demand at the lowest possible fuel cost, the optimum combination of power plants is a crucial requirement in the functioning of the power grid. In addition, unit commitment (UC) is regarded as one of the finest possible solutions for supplying electric power to clients in a safe and cost-effective way. Unit commitment (UC) is the challenge of choosing which units to link over the following T hours, where T is often a day or a week. The issue is made more challenging due to the restrictions involved and the usage of integer decision variables (a unit is either committed or it is not). In this study, the SFLA method is utilised to solve UC under all of its restrictions. Constraints on the smallest possible movement up or down are hardcoded. The SFLA algorithm was used to schedule 10 generators for a single day.

Keywords: .

INTRODUCTION
Which energy producing units should be operational during each period to meet a demand that fluctuates over time but is predictable is known as the electrical unit commitment issue. The topic is intriguing because there are often many different types of units in an electrical system that may be used to generate power, each of which has its own unique set of features and operating limitations for its generators [1]. Some key considerations include: • Ensuring that the total power produced is sufficient to fulfil the load demand and system losses.

Limitations on available energy must be met, and sufficient spinning reserve must be available to make up for any potential generation deficit.

Minimum and maximum power output ranges for each unit must be adhered to, and the uptime and downtime requirements of heat generating units must be taken into account.

When demand rises, it makes sense to fire up the more expensive to start but more efficient generators first.

Webology, Volume 18, Number 5, 2021
ISSN: 1735-188X
DOI: 10.29121/WEB/V18I5/88

Ramp rates for thermal generating units cannot exceed the allowed range.

last step: start with the least expensive option. When demand drops, we turn off machines in the opposite sequence. Taking into account system capacity needs and the quadratic programming issue of efficiently distributing the projected load among the committed units throughout each hour of the planning horizon.

It would be wasteful to always use all of the available capacity.

Unit commitment dilemma [2] refers to deciding which units should be ON for a given load.

The UC issue has been the focus of several approaches. Expert systems and neural networks are two examples of artificial intelligence techniques that have been used to search for optimum or sub-optimal solutions to the UC issue alongside traditional optimization techniques like dynamic programming (DP) and Lagrangian relaxation .

The Priority list approach [3] may generate schedules quickly, but only after adhering to a complex set of criteria that results in substantial operational costs While dynamic programming [3] may be used to effectively address a wide range of issues, it is computationally intensive and takes a long time to converge.

Evolutionary algorithms (EAs) are a kind of stochastic search strategy; examples include GAs , GAs, PSOs , and PSOs. Several studies have used GA to address the UC issue. There is no assurance of an optimum solution, and the convergence period is longer than with other approaches [4].

Time is a problem when working with genetic algorithms since binary encoding and decoding are needed to represent each unit operation state and to calculate the fitness function, respectively. It is challenging to implement on large-scale systems because of the massive computing involved.

SHUFFLED FROG LEAPING ALGORITHM, II

The shuffling frog-leaping method is an example of a memetic met heuristic, and its purpose is to do a heuristic search for a global optimum solution. Memes spread from person to person, and people all around the world share and discuss ideas with one another to drive this process [5]. Particle swarm optimization is a local search tool that, in essence, combines the advantages of this method with the notion of combining data from several local searches in order to find a global solution. After applying the SFL method to a number of different combinatorial problems, it was discovered that it effectively located global solutions. In the SFL method, the population of solutions is represented by a set of frogs (i.e., solutions), which is then subdivided into sets called memplexes . Memplexes may be compared to distinct frog societies, each of which conducts its own, insular search. Individual frogs inside each memplex have their own thoughts, which are subject to the process of memetic evolution as a result of their interaction with the ideas of other frogs [6].

Webology, Volume 18, Number 5, 2021
ISSN: 1735-188X
DOI: 10.29121/WEB/V18I5/88

There are many stages of memetic development that result in the shuffling of ideas across memplexes The iterative procedures of local search and shuffling continue until convergence requirements are met

Procedure:
First, this technique generates a random frog population, P, in the search space that may really be explored. To express the location of the ith frog, we write Xi=(Xi1, Xi2, Xi3,..., XiD), where D is the total number of variables. The frogs are then placed in a fitness hierarchy and ranked from best to worst [7].

Later, the whole population is split up into memplexes, each of which has n frogs (p=m*n) in it. This partitioning scheme consists of the following steps: In this memetic cascade, the first frog visits the first memeplex, the second the second, the mth the mth, the (m+1)th the first, and so on.

Step 3 is a localised search. Best and worst fitness frogs are located at Xb and Xw inside each memeplex. In the same way, Xg is used to denote where the fittest frog may be found all over the world. Next, a procedure similar to the PSO algorithm is used to enhance just the frog with the weakest fitness (rather than all frogs) in each cycle inside each memeplex. Since this is the case, the least fit frog quickly advances to the top spot, as seen below:

Randomly calculating (Xb-Xw)*1, Xwnew=Xwcurrent+Di (Dimin-Dimax)
If this procedure yields a superior solution Xw new, it is substituted for the worst frog position; otherwise, the calculations in equations 1 and 2 are performed again with regard to the world's best frog position (i.e. replaces). If there is no improvement, a new solution will be created at random from the feasible space and used to replace worst frog.

Fourth, the computations will proceed for a certain number of iterations. Because of this, SFLA uses a technique similar to the PSO algorithm to conduct a local search independently in each memplex at the same time. The primary goal is to serve the load demand and spinning reserve at minimum total production cost (fuel cost, startup cost, shut down cost), while meeting all unit, and system constraints, by preparing on/off schedule of the generating units in each sub period (typically 1h) of the given planning period (typically 1 day or 1 week). Expenses like these are taken into account:

To approximate the cost of fuel, researchers often utilise the quadratic approximation, which is a convex function. A quadratic input-output curve is used as a mathematical model for the cost of fuel for operation.

The cost to get going varies according on the ambient temperature, thus that's point B. The function of time is often written as a linear or exponential. In this study, we use a stair-like function to represent this phenomenon. In most normal setups, the expense of shutting down has little benefit, which brings us to point C. Considered a constant expense, this sum is standard operating procedure. During optimization, the following system and unit constraints must be met: • Unit initial status +/- either up or down.

Webology, Volume 18, Number 5, 2021
ISSN: 1735-188X
DOI: 10.29121/WEB/V18I5/88

The SFLA Approach to the UC Problem

The frog position (X) in this approach is an integer sequence that represents the ON/OFF cycle durations of each unit across the UC horizon. Continuous unit operation (ON state) is represented by a positive integer X in the, whereas continuous reservation (OFF status) is represented by a negative number.

The number of "ON/OFF" cycles experienced by a unit across the UC horizon is proportional to the sum of the minimum up and down periods of the unit and the number of load maxima that occur over the UC horizon. A daily load profile with two load peaks is shown in Fig. 3 and is used to calculate the number of ON/OFF cycles of the units. Base load, medium load, and peak load units have ON/OFF cycles of 2, 3, and 5 times, respectively. Therefore, the number of times a generator is turned on and off each day is typically low (between 1 and 5). Reducing the cycles of base and medium units might limit the search space of the optimization problem, thereby leading to a less-than-ideal solution. The suggested technique solves this issue by making the number of scheduling cycles for units equal to the number of peak load units each cycle (i.e.,5). With Y-day schedules, C=Y*5. In this case, the operating schedule of N units over Y*24 hours is presented, and each solution comprises of N*Y*5 variables for Y-day scheduling.

The SFLA's Original Residents

In this part, we'll talk about how the first batch of SFLA was created. The first cycle time of the unit's operations, T c, is set to be at least as long as is needed to meet the minimum up/down-time limits, based on the previous day's scheduling.

If T 1>0 7 then T 1 = +Rand(max (0,MUi –T 0),T).

Each unit's minimum up and down timings must be respected.

Once the unit has been started, it should not be switched off immediately; there is a required waiting period before the unit may be recommitted after being de-committed. If Tic 0 4 then these restrictions may be written as Tic MUi.

if T 10 then = -Random(max(0,MUi +T0),T)

Where T 0 is the length of the previous day's final cycle. Taking into account the minimum up and down-time (C-1) limitations of the unit, the UC horizon, and the length of the past cycles of operation, the duration of the th cycle of unit i's operation is estimated as T c for, c C.

The ON time for the cycle at T c-10 is calculated as follows:

If (RT c-1>MD)8 = +RT c-1, then T c = +Rand(MD,RT c-1), and if not, T c = -Rand(MD,RT

Limiting the Worst Solution to a Value in C

Each memeplex incorporates a random adjustment to the solution with the lowest fitness, Xw, by appending a vector (Di=Rand*(Xb- Xw)). With this method, the aggregate value of all units is greater than the time horizon for scheduling. Therefore, it's necessary to adjust the individual operating cycles of each new Xw unit [8].

In computing, the function Rand produces a random integer between 0 and 1. This means that all parameters of the new Xw must be integers. Thus, we must round the parameters of new to integer values as follows:

Each solution's fitness in the UC issue is computed using the power of its corresponding Pi as estimated from ED. To determine the expenses associated with launching and closing, we use the

Webology, Volume 18, Number 5, 2021
ISSN: 1735-188X
DOI: 10.29121/WEB/V18I5/88

formula below:

The start-up fee is conditional on how long the unit has been off before being turned on.
Confirming Minimum Up-and-Down Times Are Met: Following the creation of the new solution, the minimum up-and-down times are verified without resorting to a penalty function. The cycle unit has been in use for a shorter amount of time than the minimum up/down periods. The minimum up/down time limitation of cycle c+1 must first be considered [9]. If the minimum up/down time is met, then the cycle will continue for that long. The cycle's operation must then be modified so that the total of T 1 for the I unit equals the scheduling horizon. Minimum up- and down-time limitations of unit I as well as the length of the initial cycle of operation, are compared to the duration of the last cycle on the preceding scheduled day. If T c>0 and T cmax (0,MU -T 0), then cycle times are
To put it simply, SFLA aims to minimise the following fitness function within a set of system and unit restrictions.
fitness=TC 20

OUTCOMES OF THE MODELING

In each hour of scheduling horizon, ON-state units should perform an economic dispatch (ED) after avoiding the worst solution and meeting time restrictions. After that, we'll determine the fitness function.

Fitness function determination

SFLA's objective function is bi-term. The first term represents the overall operating expense throughout the planning horizon, while the second represents the penalty function that penalises going against the predetermined rules of the system. It is believed that all the power plants feed into a single bus that meets the needs of the whole system. Thus, restrictions posed by the underlying network are ignored. The first thing to do is to run an ED on the planning horizon. It's a crucial component of what makes UC what it is. As such, it seeks to minimise the hourly cost of generating electricity for a power system subject to certain limitations. Fuel cost function of the production of Pi power in the t th hour FCi(P t) = A + B P t + C(P t)2 15 is solved using ED for the scheduling horizon by including the penalty functions of reserve and generation limitation relationship between iterations and overall operation cost demonstrates that the best solution is reached after 10-16 iterations.

Consistent Planning Over a Week
The seven-day scheduling functionality of the algorithm is also examined. The load factors for seven days are taken from table V to create the test data for seven days of load demand. The weekly running costs are shown in table VIII.
The seven-day load factors are shown in Table V below.
Load factors

SUMMARY

Using the SFL algorithm, electrical power may be produced affordably by lowering the overall operating cost of producing units. Ten generators have had this method applied, and it will run for between one and seven days. By facilitating group-to-group information sharing in addition to local

Webology, Volume 18, Number 5, 2021
ISSN: 1735-188X
DOI: 10.29121/WEB/V18I5/88

search, SFLA is able to get better results. TABLEAU XIX Total Operational Expenses Compared to Other Methods Number of BFA, PSO(DPSO), and SFLA Units (without using penalty function) Cost-effectiveness of generating is highest at 10 570781 565804 431820

REFERENCES

1. Waleed, J., Abduldaim, A. M., Alyas, H. H., & Mohammed, A. Q. (2019, February). An Optimized Zero-Watermarking Technique Based on SFL Algorithm. In *2019 2nd International Conference on Electrical, Communication, Computer, Power and Control Engineering (ICECCPCE)* (pp. 171-175). IEEE.
2. Li, P., Wang, J., Wu, F., & Li, H. (2019). Nonlinear controller based on state feedback linearization for series-compensated DFIG-based wind power plants to mitigate sub-synchronous control interaction. *International Transactions on Electrical Energy Systems*, *29*(1), e2682.
3. Liu, J., Chen, X., Cao, S., & Yang, H. (2019). Overview on hybrid solar photovoltaic-electrical energy storage technologies for power supply to buildings. *Energy conversion and management*, *187*, 103-121.
4. Suresh, M. C. V., & Belwin Edward, J. (2017). Optimal placement of distributed generation in distribution systems by using shuffled frog leaping algorithm. *ARPN J Eng Appl Sci*, *12*(3), 863-868.
5. Alinia Ahandani, M., & Kharrati, H. (2018). Chaotic shuffled frog leaping algorithms for parameter identification of fractional-order chaotic systems. *Journal of Experimental & Theoretical Artificial Intelligence*, *30*(5), 561-581.
6. Chatterjee, S., Shiva, C. K., & Mukherjee, V. (2019, October). Automatic Generation Control of Multi-Area Hydro Power System using Moth Flame Optimization Technique. In *2019 3rd International Conference on Recent Developments in Control, Automation & Power Engineering (RDCAPE)* (pp. 395-403). IEEE.
7. Azizivahed, A., Ghavidel, S., Ghadi, M. J., Li, L., & Zhang, J. (2019, February). Multi-Objective Energy Management Approach Considering Energy Storages in Distribution Networks with Respect to Voltage Security. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Technology (ICIT)* (pp. 661-666). IEEE.
8. Ghoflghari, P., & Nasiraghdam, H. (2018). Electrical Energy Storage on the Hybrid Grid of Renewable Energy System Using Fuzzy Controller Optimization Algorithm. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Electrical Engineering*, *6*(24), 17-28.
9. Chansareewittaya, S. (2018, July). Hybrid differential evolutionary/tabu search for economic dispatch and environmental dispatch. In *2018 15th International Conference on Electrical Engineering/Electronics, Computer, Telecommunications and Information Technology (ECTI-CON)* (pp. 9-12). IEEE.
10. Liu, X., Song, Y., & Li, Z. (2019). Dummy data attacks in power systems. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, *11*(2), 1792-1795.