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ABSTRACT

In recent years, there has been growing interest of synchrophasor measurements like Phasor Measurement Units (PMUs) Power systems are now being gradually populated by PMU since they provide significant phasor information for the protection and control of power systems during normal and abnormal situations. There are several applications of PMUs, out of which state estimation is a widely used. To improve the robustness of state estimation, different approaches for placement of PMUs have been studied.

This thesis introduces an approach for deployment the PMUs considering its vulnerability. Two different analysis have been considered to solve the problem of locating PMUs in the systems. The first analysis shows that using a very limited number of PMUs, maximum bus observability can be obtained when considering the potential loss of PMUs. This analysis have been done considering with and without conventional measurements like zero injections and branch flow measurements. The second analysis is based on selection of critical buses with PMUs. The algorithm in latter is specifically used for the system which has existing PMUs and the scenario where new locations for new PMUs has to be planned. The need for implementing this study is highlighted based on attack threads on PMUs to minimize the system observability. Both the analysis are carried out using Binary Integer Programming (BIP). Detail procedure has been explained using flow charts and effectiveness of the proposed method is testified on several IEEE test systems.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Power Systems has become more and more complex due to rapid increasing demand for electricity and are mostly being operated in stressed condition [1]. This situation has been one of the most responsible cause for high cost blackouts. To overcome such problem, a real-time wide area monitoring, protection and control system (WAMS) for proper management of the resources of power system is a necessary. WAMS allows the operators to ensure system security and smooth operation. An important tool for Energy Management System (EMS) is state estimation. Based on measurements taken throughout the network, state estimation gives an estimation of the state variables of the power system while checking that these estimates are consistent with the measurements. Traditionally, input measurements have been provided by the SCADA system (Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition). A disadvantage is that the measurements are not synchronized, which means that state estimation is not very precise during dynamic phenomena in the network.

With the advent of real-time Phasor Measurement Units (PMU’s), synchronized phasor measurements are possible which allows monitoring of dynamic phenomena. Among the various application of PMUs, one of the most significantly affected area is state estimator. To enhance the state estimation, PMUs are the key users and most suitable devices for WAMS accomplishment [2]. PMU is a device which measures positive sequence voltage and current utilizing the Global Positioning System (GPS) to synchronize them to a common time frame [3].
1.1 Historical Overview

Phase angles of voltage phasors of power system buses have always been a keen interest of power engineers. According to theoretical prospective, the active (real) power flow in a distribution line is proportional to the sine of the angle difference between voltages at the two terminals of the line. Angle difference is treated as a basic parameter to measure the condition of power network.

In early 1980s, the modern equipment for direct measurement of phase angle difference was introduced [4, 5]. The method used for synchronizing the clock was via LORAN-C signal, GOES satellite transmission and HBG radio transmissions (in Europe). Later, researcher used positive going-zero crossing of a phase voltage to estimate the local phase angle with respect to the time reference. The phase angle difference between voltages at two buses was established utilizing the difference of measured angles to common reference, for both locations. However, the measurement accuracies were order of 40μs and was still insufficient to capture the harmonics in voltage waveform. Therefore, these were not preferable for wide-area phasor measurement systems. Later when GPS satellite were being deployed significantly in number, it was realized that GPS time signal can be utilized as an input to sampling clock. The GPS provides timing, ranging from 1 nanosecond to 10 nanoseconds [6]. At the same time, the GPS receiver can supply a unique pulse signal in one-second intervals, which is known as 1 pulse per second (PPS).

Hence, embedding such a high precision system in a measuring device, it was made clear that this system offered the most effective way of synchronizing power system
measurements over great distance. Eventually, PMU using GPS were built commercially and its deployment began to carry out on power systems worldwide.

1.2 Phasor Measurement Unit

PMUs were introduced in 1988 by Dr. Arun G. Phadke and Dr. James S. Thorp at Virginia Tech. A block diagram of PMU is shown in Figure 1.1. PMU can measure 50/60 Hz waveforms (voltages and currents) typically at a rate of 48 samples per cycle (2880 samples per second). At first the anti-aliasing filters are present in the input to the PMU. These anti-aliasing filters produce some delay which is the function of signal frequency. The delay occurs due to filter characteristics. So PMU has to compensate the occurred delay since the sample data are taken after anti-aliasing delay is introduced by the filter. The analog AC waveforms are digitized by an Analog to Digital converter for each phase. A phase-lock oscillator with a Global Positioning System (GPS) reference source provides the needed
high-speed synchronized sampling with 1 microsecond accuracy. The captured phasors are
to be time-tagged based on the time of the UTC Time Reference.

Compared with traditional measurements received from Supervisory Control and
Data Acquisition (SCADA) system, these synchronized PMUs are hundred times faster in
capturing data and greater in measurement accuracy. SCADA systems are based on quasi-
steady state and therefore are not capable of measuring transient phenomena. SCADA
systems usually consists of Remote Terminal Units (RTUs) and are interfaced with sensors
that can measure only magnitude not the phasors. Integration of PMUs into the system
provides faster processing for state estimation due to the relationship between PMUs and
state variables. A power system is said to be observable if the measurements deployed on it
allows to determine the bus voltage magnitude and angle at every buses of the system. The
system observability can be estimated by considering the topology of the network, the types
and location of the measurements. Installing a PMU in a bus gives direct observability
because the phasor voltage of that bus is measured by PMU directly. Also knowing the fact
that PMU gives the current phasor of the branch or line which is interconnected to the bus
where PMU is installed. This feature of PMU typically makes the adjacent bus indirectly
observable because once the current phasors are available; voltage phasors can be estimated
or calculated using line parameters.

1.3 Literature Review on PMU placement

The primary goal of state estimator is to find the optimal estimates of bus voltage
phasors based on the available measurements in the system as well as the system network
topology. Generally, the measurements are provided by Remote Terminal Units (RTUs) at
the substation and include real/reactive power flows, power injections, magnitudes of bus voltages and branch currents. Now, since commercial PMUs are widely available in the market, some of the utilities or power industries have started deploying in their network, whereas many of them intend to install in the grid/system in near future. At the end, the most concerned question lies in the cost. As the cost of PMUs and their installation are relatively very high, planning engineers are facing problem on planning the best location for PMUs’ placement. Planning can either be for initial stage or for additional new PMUs where the system network already contains some sets of PMUs.

As discussed in earlier section, observability of a system highly depends on number of installed PMUs. If there is an occurrence of any unexpected outage in a system or in a PMU itself, it will affect the system observability and may cause a serious problem \[8-10\]. Due to the critical nature of power systems, complete observability of all nodes at all times is required.

The PMUs placement in strategic locations has been the vital research topic for PMU application. Even though there are numerous applications of PMUs, this research and discussion on PMU placement are strictly limited to state estimation application only. Power engineers have introduced various methodologies all across the world \[11\]. The researchers have approached the PMUs placement problem using two methods: (i) Heuristic approach (ii) Mathematical approach.

1.3.1 Heuristic approach

Heuristic approach has been widely adopted in this area. Simulated annealing is used in \[12\] to find the placement location based on desired depth of unobservability. This thesis
discussed the impact of depth of unobservability on the number of PMUs and was based on network topology. A similar approach which utilizes the stochastic models to capture dynamic state estimation uncertainties was also introduced in [13]. A sensitivity constraint optimal PMU placement is presented in [14]. Location for placement of PMUs were identified based on the buses with higher sensitivity and buses with more outlets. The simulated annealing algorithm is used in the model to get full system observability. Reference [15] solves the PMU placement problem using recursive Tabu search. Though the algorithm used for this approach give satisfactory results for larger bus systems but no robust contingency is considered. A new parallel Tabu search method for solving PMU placement problem was presented in [16]. The model used in this literature has considered the system with and without communication constraint. However the developed process execution time is high even for lesser bus systems. An optimal deployment of PMUs using differential evolution concept was presented in [17] for normal operating condition. Literature [18] addresses on N-1 PMU failure and solves the PMU placement problem using the same differential evolution process. Genetic algorithm in [19] solves the PMU optimization problem with an objective to get full system observability with higher measurement redundancy. Immunity genetic algorithm is proposed in [20]. The approach used in [20] is relatively time consuming and is not preferable for large systems. Binary Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) is another optimization approach that is enormously used in this field. In [21], a simple PMU placement has been implemented using BPSO but the algorithm does not consider details regarding PMU vulnerability. Since all the
techniques discussed in heuristic approach, being iterative in nature, requires time for convergence and also the convergence fully depends on the initial guess.

1.3.2 Mathematical approach.

Mathematical approach has been gaining popularity from recent years. They are easy to apply in the situation where a definite solution is required. They are based on formulas derived from mathematical calculations. Integer linear programming is a common approach as presented in [22], in which a general formulation for PMU placement using conventional and without conventional measurement is taken into consideration. Conventional measurements refers to zero injection measurements and branch flow measurements. Using a similar concept, a unified approach is presented in [23] using binary integer linear programming. The mathematical formulation described in this literature considers the single PMU losses using zero injection and flow measurements separately. Contingency constrained optimal PMU placement using exhaustive search approach is proposed in [24]. This literature has taken several zero-injection buses in account for PMU placement considering single PMU loss and measurement channel limitation. Mixed Integer Linear Programming is used in [25] which considers zero injection and branch flow measurements in order to maximize the measurement redundancy and reduce the number of PMUs. However, the approach in [25] requires almost twice the amount of PMUs to obtain full system observability under contingency operation than at normal operating conditions.
1.4 Scope of the work and Objectives

To the best of my knowledge, all the literatures on PMU placement approaches mentioned so far is limited to single PMU loss. However, PMU placement based on vulnerability analysis is scant. Vulnerability can arise from various aspects like equipment failure. Although PMUs are highly accurate enough to provide reliable data, there is an unavailable possibility of PMU which may be caused by communication failures or line outages. Furthermore, the networked PMUs might be rendered out of service by natural disasters such as hurricanes or PMUs can be intentionally taken down by malicious attacks. PMUs are also prone to cyber-attack. Since PMUs rely on GPS signal, there is a threat to GPS spoofing which gradually result in false reading or loss of measurements [26]. Such practical scenarios are likely to occur which are vulnerable to PMUs. Therefore while placing the PMUs in the system for state estimation; its vulnerability should also be accounted to study its impact on system observability. Hence, our objective of work is to propose PMU placement approach considering vulnerability analysis.

The objective of this research work are as follows:

1. Deploying a fixed number of PMUs in the system considering the vulnerability of PMU, in absence of conventional measurements.
2. Deploying a fixed number of PMUs in the system considering the vulnerability of PMU, in presence of conventional measurements like zero injection and branch flow measurements.
3. A strategy for placing additional PMUs in the system considering the resiliency of measurement systems.
1.5 Outline of Thesis

This thesis is composed of five chapters. Chapter 1 gives a background on PMU, their features and their importance in state estimation. Apart from that, literature reviews on PMU placement methodologies and the objectives are also presented. A detail explanation of the model used in PMU deployment approach considering with and without conventional measurements is presented in Chapter 2. Their differences are elaborated with simple examples. PMU placement considering its potential loss is also presented in chapter 3. The influence of considering conventional measurements is also discussed. A flow chart with consecutive steps for describing the approach is well presented. Cases study and results obtained from the approach are also discussed. Chapter 4 explains the need to select critical buses and the reason for prioritizing such buses when planning for PMU deployment. A strategy for placing additional PMUs in the system with pre-existing PMUs is formulated and the effectiveness of the approach is testified on IEEE test systems. Finally chapter 5 summaries the work and presents the recommendation for future research.
CHAPTER TWO

INTEGER LINEAR PROGRAMMING FORMULATION FOR OPTIMAL PMU PLACEMENT

Over the last 10 years, Integer Linear Programming (ILP) or Integer programming (IP) has been gaining a practical interest in variety of applications like planning, scheduling, telecommunication network and more. This could possibly because of the enormous grown in fast computing and improved algorithm. It is said that Integer Programming is the foundation for much of analytical decision-making problems [27]. It contains three main bodies: variables, constraints and objective function. Variables are the decision makers with integer values, constraints are used to restrict the values to a feasible region. In Integer Programming formulation, constraints must always be linear. It can be linear equality or linear inequality or both. Objective function then defines whether to maximize or minimize to get the optimal solution, depending upon the problem. The objective function should also be linear in nature.

Using ILP for finding optimal PMU placement is currently on trend since it saves the CPU computation time so greatly. This thesis work is done using Binary Integer Programming (BIP). The difference between LIP and BIP is that the decision variables are binary values (0, 1) in BIP. This chapter will give a review of general ILP formulation for optimal PMU placement and is derived from [22]. The mathematical formulation will be categorized into two different approaches: (i) Without conventional measurement (ii) With conventional measurement.
2.1 Without Conventional Measurement

The approach in this section is applicable where the conventional measurements like branch flow or any injection measurements are not considered.

2.1.1 Mathematical Formulation

The basic PMU placement problem for full observability is formulated as follows:

\[
\text{Min} \sum_{k=1}^{N} C x_k \tag{2.1.1}
\]

Subject to

\[
AX \geq B_{PMU} \tag{2.1.2}
\]

\[
C = [1 \ 1 \ \cdots \ 1]_{N \times N} \tag{2.1.3}
\]

\[
X = [x_1 \ x_2 \ \cdots \ x_N]^T \tag{2.1.4}
\]

\[
x_k \in \{0,1\} \tag{2.1.5}
\]

where

- \(x_k\) binary decision variable for PMU location;

\[
x_k = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if PMU is present at bus } k \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases} \tag{2.1.5}
\]

- \(C\) the cost function

- \(N\) number of bus nodes of the system.

- \(A\) bus connectivity matrix for \(N\) bus system and is defined as
The objective function in (2.1.1) defines the minimum PMU required to get full system observability. Since the cost function for all PMUs is unity, it means the cost for each PMUs are assumed to be equal. Inequality constraint (2.1.2) defines each bus in the system should be observed at least by one PMU. The matrix $A$ is the system admittance matrix, which is transformed into binary form. This constraint guarantees the full observability. The number of required constraints is $N \times N$. The solution of this optimization problem gives the minimum optimal number of PMUs and their corresponding locations.

**Figure 2.1 Seven bus system**
2.1.2 Example Illustration

To illustrate the above problem, a seven bus system is used as shown in Figure 2.1.

The connectivity matrix in binary form is:

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Now multiplying the connectivity matrix with the decision variables, for each bus the constraints are as follows:

\[
A_iX = \begin{cases}
A_1X = x_1 + x_2 & \geq 1 \\
A_2X = x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_6 + x_7 & \geq 1 \\
A_3X = x_2 + x_3 + x_4 & \geq 1 \\
A_4X = x_3 + x_4 + x_5 & \geq 1 \\
A_5X = x_4 + x_5 & \geq 1 \\
A_6X = x_2 + x_6 & \geq 1 \\
A_7X = x_2 + x_7 & \geq 1
\end{cases}
\]

The operator sign “+” serves as logical “OR” and all the ones at the right hand side of inequality constraint is the observability constraint. This means at least one variable of each row containing summation the variables must be one or greater. For example, the very first row indicates the bus 1 and according to constraint, PMU should be placed either at bus 1 or bus 2 to make bus 1 observable. Similarly the PMU should be placed either at bus 1, 2, 3, 6, or bus 7 in order to make bus 2 observable and so on. The resultant optimal number
of PMU for this system is two and the optimal locations are at bus 2 and bus 4. Hence the placement gives full observability of the buses.

2.2 With Conventional Measurement

The most economical way of reducing the number of optimal PMUs to place in the system is to consider conventional measurements. As mentioned earlier, conventional measurements in this thesis refers to measurements like zero-injection and branch flow measurements. Branch flow measurements are measurements between any two buses and are already available in practical existing systems. Such measurements are already there in the systems and the installation cost for branch measurements are very less compared to PMUs. Using branch flow measurement voltage angle of any one bus can be determined. Zero injection measurements are found in zero-injection buses. Any bus which does not have generation or load is considered as zero-injection nodes. These zero-injection buses need no metering and considered as accurate measurement for state estimation. They are also regarded as pseudo measurements. When the system contains zero-injection buses there are some rules associated with system observability [28].

i. *The first rule implies*: in zero-injection cluster (all the buses adjacent to zero-injection bus and itself), if the zero-injection bus is observable and its adjacent buses are all observable except one bus then the non-observable bus will eventually become observable by applying KCL equation at zero-injection bus.

ii. *The second rule is*: within the zero-injection cluster if all the buses are observable except the zero-injection bus, then that particular zero-injection bus can be identified as observable by using nodal equations.
Combining these two rules simplifies that a zero-injection cluster is observable when it has at most one unobservable bus.

2.2.1 An Observability Model

The observability model considers a sample six bus system as shown in Figure 2.2 to explain the relationship between the PMUs and conventional measurements based on bus observability. To illustrate the model let us define a vector \( G = AX \). The element \( g_i = A_{i,j} x_i \) of \( G \) indicates the measurement redundancy. Measurement redundancy means the number of bus \( i \) is reached by a PMU. \( X \) is the PMU placement column matrix and \( x_i \) is the \( i \)th element of \( X \) and also regarded as decision variable; \( A \) is the bus connectivity matrix and \( A_{i,j} \) is the \( i \)th row, \( j \)th column of \( A \). The representation of matrix \( A \) and decision variable matrix \( X \) is same as defined in earlier section 2.1.
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Figure 2.2 A sample system
To demonstrate the resultant observability criteria to be fulfilled due to the presence of conventional measurement, following three cases need to be analyzed.

i. **Branch Flow Measurement.** As seen from Figure 2.2, either bus \( i \) or \( j \) can be made observable by this measurement whereas, the other bus must be observed by the PMU.

\[
g_i + g_j \geq 1
\]  

(2.2.1.1)

ii. **Zero-injection Measurement.** Considering the zero injection measurement rules as mentioned earlier, out of five buses in zero-injection cluster, minimum four buses should be observed by PMU.

\[
g_h + g_i + g_j + g_k + g_l \geq 4
\]  

(2.2.1.2)

iii. **Hybrid Measurement.** Combination of branch flow measurement and zero-injection measurement is referred in this paper as hybrid measurement (bus \( i \) as shown in Figure 2.2). Excluding the conventional measurement buses, the remaining buses except one bus in the zero-injection cluster should be observed by PMU. That one bus takes the merit of hybrid measurement so it can be made observable.

\[
g_h + g_k + g_l \geq 2
\]  

(2.2.1.3)

The right hand side of the equation (2.2.1.1-2.2.1.3) indicates the number of buses that should be observed by PMU itself.

### 2.2.2 Mathematical Formulation

From the observability model in section 2.2.1, it is obvious that the system with presence of conventional measurement can be categorized into two different types of buses; the bus associated with conventional measurement and the bus which is not associated with any conventional measurements. Therefore while formulating the constraint for optimal
PMU placement, the categorized buses should be kept in an order such that the bus not associated with conventional measurement is in first order, then the buses with associated conventional measurement is placed.

Now, the mathematical formulation when considering conventional measurement is given below:

$$
\text{Min} \sum_{k=1}^{N} Cx_k
$$

(2.2.2.1)

Subject to

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
I_{M \times M} & 0 \\
0 & T_{\text{meas}}
\end{bmatrix} (PG) = T_{\text{con}}P(AX) \geq b_{\text{con}}
$$

(2.2.2.2)

where $T_{\text{meas}}$ and $b_{\text{con}}$ are summation of buses associated with conventional measurements and a constant number for those buses’ observability respectively. These are interpreted same as described in above three cases; mentioned in section 2.2.1. $M$ is the number of buses not associated with conventional measurements and $P$ is a permutation matrix.

2.2.3 Example Illustration

Let us consider a seven bus system considering a zero injection measurement and a branch flow measurement. In the Figure 2.3, bus 2 is zero injection bus and branch flow measurement is in between bus 2 and bus 3. According to above formulation, we have,
Bus 4 and 5 are not associated to these two conventional measurements. The two equality constraints corresponding to two conventional measurements are $g_2 + g_3 \geq 1$ and $g_1 + g_6 + g_7 \geq 2$.

Each column in $T_{meas}$ refers to buses 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 respectively.
The resultant optimal number of PMU is two and the strategic location of PMU is at bus 2 and bus 5. This example shows that conventional measurements are utilized in PMU placement. Since a very small system was taken into consideration, the optimal number of PMU considering with and without conventional measurement turned out to be equal. However the placement location is different. The efficiency of this model is significant for larger bus systems which will be discussed in next chapter.
CHAPTER THREE

PMU DEPLOYMENT APPROACH FOR MAXIMUM OBSERVABILITY
CONSIDERING ITS POTENTIAL LOSS

This chapter deals with the PMU placement approach which is implemented to get maximum buses observability by addressing the PMU vulnerability. It is determined by analyzing the PMU loss and their impact on system bus observability. In order to implement this method, it requires more number of PMUs than normal operating condition. Since PMUs are expensive, the approach is equally flexible even for increasing the PMU requirement to just one additional than what is required for normal operating condition for each tested systems. Unlike the above discussed literatures mentioned in chapter one, possible loss of each PMUs that were supposed to be installed in the system are taken into consideration. Loss of each PMUs are evaluated periodically in a way that only one PMU loss is taken into consideration in each period. This is because the probability of single PMU loss is more than the two PMU losses. The optimization model is further divided into two parts. This chapter first explains the methodology without using conventional measurement and secondly analyzes using conventional measurements.

3.1 Optimization Model without Conventional Measurement

3.1.1 Mathematical Formulation

The PMU deployment optimization problem proposed in this part is used to analyze the vulnerability of PMU. This problem consists of two parts. The first is the increasing of the $N_{PMUs}$ by one as illustrated in Figure 3.1. $N_{PMUs}$ refers to the optimal number of PMUs required in the system to get full observability as discussed in chapter two. Then consider the loss of ($N_{PMUs} +1$) one at a time and solve the problem in (3.1.1.1) to (3.1.1.4). The main
The objective of this problem is to locate the available number of PMUs in such a way observable buses is satisfied.

\[
\text{Max} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_{i} + \sum_{i=N+1}^{n} x'_{i} \right) \tag{3.1.1.1}
\]

Subject to

\[
\mathbf{A} \mathbf{X} \geq \mathbf{B} \tag{3.1.1.2}
\]

\[
x'_{i} \times P_{\text{min},i} \leq x_{i} \times P_{\text{max},i} \tag{3.1.1.3}
\]

\[
\sum \mathbf{X} = m \tag{3.1.1.4}
\]

\[
\mathbf{X} = [x_{1} \ x_{2} \ x_{i} \ x_{N}]^T \tag{3.1.1.5}
\]

where

\( x_{i} \) decision variable for PMU placement as described in chapter two,

\( x'_{i} \) binary decision variable which represents the buses observed by PMUs only,

\( N \) number of buses in the system,

\( n \) number of nonzero elements of connectivity matrix \( \mathbf{A} \),

\( \mathbf{A} \) bus connectivity matrix as represented in chapter two,

\( \mathbf{B} \) observability constraint, column vector with all ones

\[
\mathbf{B} = [b_{1} \ b_{2} \ \cdots \ b_{n}]_{n \times 1}
\]

\( P_{\text{min},i} \) minimum number of nonzero elements of \( i^{th} \) bus, which is chosen as 1,

\( P_{\text{max},i} \) total number of nonzero elements of connectivity matrix \( \mathbf{A} \) corresponding to \( i^{th} \) bus,

\( b'_{i} \) the product of \( \mathbf{A} \) and \( \mathbf{X} \) after removing one of the PMUs,
the number PMUs available for the system which is greater than the requirement for normal operating condition.

Equation (5) implies

$$x'_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } b'_i > 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } b'_i = 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.1.1.6)$$

Figure 3.1 Relationship of optimization under normal condition and proposed model

Before the description of above formulation, it is important to understand the term “measurement redundancy”. Theoretically, “Measurement redundancy” of a bus means the number of times the bus is being observed by PMUs. In practice, measurement redundancy of each bus can be determined from the product of matrix $A$ and $X$. Likewise, the system’s measurement redundancy can be calculated by summing the measurement redundancy of each buses.

This model tries to place the PMUs in such a way that the system’s measurement redundancy is increased. The objective function (3.1.1.1) gives the location of available number of PMUs and the maximum number of non-zero elements of $A$ matrix that are particularly being observed by PMUs respectively. The inequality constraint (3.1.1.2) indicates that each buses should be observed by at least one PMU. Another inequality
constraints in (3.1.1.3) is an important and necessary condition to judge the strategic location of PMU such that the measurement redundancy of the system is maximized even when there is a single loss of PMU. The equality constraint in (3.1.1.4) denotes the number of PMUs to be deployed in the system.

3.1.2 Deployment Approach

The flowchart for the proposed method is shown in Figure. 3.2. The algorithm is described in following steps.

Step 1: Calculate the bus connectivity matrix $A$ of the bus system in terms of binary elements (1 and 0).

Step 2: Set the available number of PMUs $m$ to be deployed in the system.

Step 3: Optimize the PMU location considering constraints (3.1.1.2) and (3.1.1.4) as the only constraint from section 3.1.1.

Step 4: Once the PMU locations are globally optimized, remove one of the installed PMUs from the system to analyze the vulnerability. This process is carried out by removing ith column from connectivity matrix which is equivalent to removing a PMU at ith bus. Follow the objective function and all the constraint presented in equation (3.1.1.1)-(3.1.1.4) from section III.

Step 5: After the optimization, the number of observed nodes (covered by PMUs) are obtained. Repeat step 4 for other remaining PMUs. In this proposed model only one PMU is removed at a time.

Step 6: Evaluate whether the inequality constraint (3.1.1.3) is satisfied or not to indicate the maximum observability.
Step 7: If maximum observability is obtained this ends the process. Else update the PMU location again and follow steps 4 to 6 until the program terminates with optimal result.

When analyzing the effect of removing a PMU from a bus $i$, only the buses that are connected to it are assessed instead of all the buses. In doing so, the number of variables and constraint equations are reduced by an enormous amount especially, when the size of the system is large. Essentially, the numbers of additional variables are $N + n$ and number of additional constraint equations is $N + 2n$.

![Flow chart of proposed algorithm](image)

Figure 3.2 Flow chart of proposed algorithm

3.1.3 Case Study

The proposed method is tested on the IEEE 14, 30, 57, 118 and 300 bus test systems [29]. The single line diagram of the test systems can be obtained from [29, 30]. The
optimization is executed in Matlab environment using the binary linear programming toolbox.

3.1.3.1 PMU Placement Locations

The optimal number of PMUs ($N_{\text{PMUs}}$) and the corresponding locations are shown in the second and third columns of Table 3.1, respectively. Whereas the PMU deployment for maximizing the number of observable buses (measurable buses by PMUs) is summarized in columns four and five of Table 3.1. The resultant PMU locations for IEEE 14-bus system are buses 2, 6, 7, 9 and 14. In this particular system, all the PMU locations are same as that of basic placement case (under normal operation). The extra PMU is located at bus 14. Though it seems that the optimization is carried out locally but it is not. Coincidently it happens to be optimal locations. In 57-bus system, only 6 buses are commonly placed by both of them. For larger systems like 118 and 300 bus systems, large number of PMUs is identically placed.

3.1.3.2 Effect on System Observability

The optimization problem tested in this work assumes the criticality of each PMU. It is not known earlier that which PMU measurement will be lost. Therefore, each installed PMU is assumed to have equal possibility of unavailability. Table 3.2 shows the detailed observability study of the 14-bus system. In this Table, the number of PMUs is 5 in total and the unobservable buses (while considering loss of each of the single assigned PMU) are presented. As expected from the proposed approach, small number of buses is unobserved. The redundancies of the respective buses are also shown for the system. As it can be seen
Table 3.1 PMU installed location for the test systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test system</th>
<th>Basic PMU placement</th>
<th>Proposed PMU deployment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimal no. of PMUs (N_{PMUs})</td>
<td>Optimal PMU locations at buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 bus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 6 7 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 bus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 7 9 10 12 18 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 bus</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1 2 6 13 19 22 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 bus</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3 7 9 11 12 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 25 28 34 37 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 bus</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1 2 3 11 12 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 37 38 43 48 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62 64 65 68 71 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79 83 85 86 88 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93 98 99 101 109 111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from Table 3.2, with the PMU at bus 14 is lost, the system still manage to get full observability. Tables 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5 summarizes the observability of the IEEE 30, 57 and 118 bus systems respectively. The redundancy of each bus is not shown but the numbers of buses which are observed by more than one PMU are clearly mentioned.

Table 3.2 Observability results for the IEEE 14 bus system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buses</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>When PMU at bus 2 is lost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy of each bus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobservable buses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When PMU at bus 6 is lost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy of each bus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobservable buses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,11,12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When PMU at bus 7 is lost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy of each bus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobservable buses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When PMU at bus 9 is lost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy of each bus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobservable buses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When PMU at bus 14 is lost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy of each bus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobservable buses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>null</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3.3 Observability results for the IEEE 30 bus system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lost PMUs</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unobservable buses</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td>10,17,21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4,12,13,14,15,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of buses observed by more than one PMU</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost PMUs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobservable buses</td>
<td>18,19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of buses observed by more than one PMU</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 Observability results for the IEEE 57 bus system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lost PMUs</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unobservable buses</td>
<td>2,16,17</td>
<td>4,5,6,7</td>
<td>9,10,12,55</td>
<td>3,14,45</td>
<td>18,19,20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of buses observed by more than one PMU</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost PMUs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobservable buses</td>
<td>24,25,26</td>
<td>27,28,29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35,36</td>
<td>37,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of buses observed by more than one PMU</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost PMUs</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobservable buses</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46,47</td>
<td>50,51</td>
<td>52,53,54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of buses observed by more than one PMU</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5 Observability results for the IEEE 118 bus system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lost PMUs</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unobservable buses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9,10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2,7,14,117</td>
<td>15,17,18,30,31,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of redundant buses</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost PMUs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobservable buses</td>
<td>20,21,22</td>
<td>23,25,26</td>
<td>28,29</td>
<td>19,36,43</td>
<td>33,35,38</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of redundant buses</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost PMUs</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobservable buses</td>
<td>44,46</td>
<td>47,48,50,51</td>
<td>52,53</td>
<td>55,56,57,58</td>
<td>60,61,62,67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of redundant buses</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost PMUs</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobservable buses</td>
<td>63,64</td>
<td>65,68,116</td>
<td>24,74</td>
<td>72,73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of redundant buses</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost PMUs</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobservable buses</td>
<td>83,84,88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93,102</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of redundant buses</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost PMUs</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobservable buses</td>
<td>105,107,108</td>
<td>109,110,111,112</td>
<td>32,114,115</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of redundant buses</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From these Tables, it can be noticed that the impact of PMU loss on the observability is more for the larger systems. Some of the PMUs are very critical, therefore losing those particular PMUs will result in greater number of unobservable buses. The most critical PMU for 118 bus system is at bus 17. When the PMU placed at bus 17 is lost, almost 6 buses become unobservable. Apart from that, the implemented algorithm locates the available PMUs in such a way that the maximum number of observable buses are obtained when any of single PMU is unavailable. For the 300 test system, the large number of uncovered buses is 8 which corresponding to missing the PMU at bus 268. This system is found fully observable if the PMU at bus 300 lost.

3.2 Optimization Model with Conventional Measurement

In this section, we will only discuss the mathematical formulation and the simulated results because all other approaches are same as that of model discussed in section 3.1. The only difference lies is the consideration of conventional measurements.

3.2.1 Mathematical formulation

The objective of PMU placement problem is to analyze the vulnerability of PMUs by deploying a limited number of PMUs $m$ corresponding to the cost associated with it. For simplicity, the cost for all the PMUs is assumed as unity and all the PMUs have sufficient channels to observe adjacent buses’ current phasors. Mathematically,

$$\text{Max} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i x_i + \sum_{i=N+1}^{m} x_i \right)$$

Subject to
\[ T_{\text{con}} b_{\text{con}} \preceq b_{\text{con}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.1.2)

\[ x_i^b \cdot b_{\text{con},i} \leq x_i^b \leq x_i^b \cdot P_{\text{max},i} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.1.3)

\[ \sum X = m \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.1.4)

\[ X = [x_1 \ x_2 \ x_i \ x_N]^T \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.1.5)

where,

c is the cost function defined by row matrix containing all ones as \([1 \ 1 \ 1]_{1 \times N}\).  

Remaining all other matrix vectors, variables are described earlier in section 3.1 and 2.2.2 (chapter two). The only difference between in the above formulation between the proposed placement techniques considering conventional measurement and without conventional measurement is constraint (3.2.1.2) and (3.2.1.3). The detail explanation for (3.2.1.2) was already discussed in chapter two. When compared to mathematical formulation used in section 3.1 of this chapter when considering system without conventional measurement and here is that the observability constraint or all buses are not same or unity. Due to advantage of zero injection and flow measurement, it is not necessary that each of the buses should be observed by at least a PMU. Depending upon the buses associated with and without zero injection and flow measurement, the value of observability constraint for some buses can be 0 or 1 or 2 or so on.

3.2.2 Case Study

The proposed method is tested on IEEE test system buses 14, 30, 118 and 2383 western polish. The single line diagram of test systems can be obtained from [29]. The measurement bus specification of conventional measurements are shown in Table 3.6 for
all four test systems. Two different cases has been designed to analyze the result. Case A is for PMU placement without using conventional measurement and case B is for placement based on conventional measurements. Information given in Table 3.6 is designated only for case B. For the system with 2383 bus system, the location of zero injection is shown in appendix A.

Table 3.6 Test system specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEEE Test System</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>118</th>
<th>2383</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Zero-injection Buses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Zero-injection Buses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6, 9, 22, 25, 27, 28</td>
<td>5, 9, 30, 37, 38, 63, 64, 68, 71, 81</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Branch Flow Measurement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Flow Measurement Buses</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.7 Comparisons of PMU deployment schemes in two cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test System</th>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N_{min}$</td>
<td>$m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEEE bus 14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEEE bus 30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEEE bus 118</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2383 polish</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.3.1 PMU Placement Locations

The optimal number of PMU for the full observability of the test system, under normal operating conditions \( (N_{\text{min}}) \) is achieved. Depending upon that, an additional PMU is made available to deploy into the system. All the total number \( (m) \) PMUs globally optimized and are placed at specific locations as shown in Table 3.7. In order to maintain the measurement accuracy, the number of PMUs is considered to be greater than or equal to conventional measurements. Since conventional measurements are used in case B, the requirement for number of PMUs is decreased by enormous amount. Comparing the PMU placement location between two cases, it can be inferred that the maximum number of buses happens be to commonly placed. As seen for 14 bus system, in case A, there are 5 PMUs and out of them, the location chosen for almost three PMUs i.e. 2, 6 and 9 are at the same location in case B, as in case A. The common location is seen more as the system buses increases or for the large system like 118 bus system and 2383 bus system. For 2383 polish system, the PMU locations are shown in appendix A.

While proposing optimization process, no constraint was imposed such that the PMU will not be placed at zero injection buses. Due to this obvious reason, proposed optimized method results in deploying PMU even at zero-injection buses. For example, in IEEE 30 bus system, bus-27 is referred as zero-injection bus and one of the optimal location of PMU is bus-27 itself.

3.2.3.2 Effect of System Observability

The optimization problem tested in this work assumes the criticality of each PMU. It is not known earlier that which PMU measurement will be lost. Therefore, each installed
PMU is assumed to have equal possibility of unavailability. The result shown in Table 3.7 does not guarantee to give full observability of the system. Figure 3.4 and Figure 3.5 shows the detailed observability study of IEEE 14 and 30 bus test system respectively. Each of those two figures illustrates measurement redundancy \((A_i x_i)\) of \(i^{th}\) bus when each of the single PMU are lost. As it can be seen from the Fig. 3.4, when PMU at bus 4 is lost, all the buses have redundancy of at least one except for bus 8. Since bus 7 is zero-injection bus therefore using zero-injection rules, bus 8 can be made observable. Hence it can be said that even if the PMU at bus 4 is lost, the remaining PMUs manage to give full observability of the system. Such scenario might not be possible when other PMUs are out of service.

![Figure 3.3 Measurement redundancy of IEEE 14 bus system](image-url)
Nevertheless, the maximum number of buses will be observable. Figure 3.3 and 3.4, also illustrates the criticality of the placed PMUs. To clarify further, from the redundancy chart, it can be known that loosing which of the PMU results in greater number of unobservable buses. For example for IEEE 30 bus system, the Figure 3.4 shows that when PMU at bus 12 is unavailable, in total eight buses will be unobserved directly. PMU at bus 12 can be treated as critical one. The redundancy chart for remaining test system are not shown here but can be easily obtained with the help of PMU placed location resulted in Table 3.7.

Figure 3.4 Measurement redundancy of IEEE 30 bus system
3.3 Conclusion

This chapter discussed the PMU placement strategy with very limited amount of PMUs to maximize the system observability. All the deployed PMUs were considered to have an equal probability of failure. Therefore the obtained PMU location ensure that even if any one of the PMU falls out, the remaining deployed PMUs still makes the maximum buses observable. An additional maximum observability constraint was proposed. The proposed method is also significant to analyze which of the PMUs is more critical. Binary Integer Programming was used to obtain deterministic solution and the optimization was rather done globally. This approach can be efficiently used to study the system observability for random installation of the PMUs in sub-transmission system.
CHAPTER FOUR

A STRATEGY FOR PMU PLACEMENT CONSIDERING THE RESILIENCY OF MEASUREMENT SYSTEM

This chapter presents an approach to find strategic locations for additional Phasor Measurement Units (PMUs) installation while considering resiliency of existing PMU measurement system. Due to the critical nature of power systems, complete observability of all nodes at all times is required. However, the networked PMUs might be rendered out of service by natural disasters such as hurricanes or PMUs can be intentionally taken down by malicious attacks. Enough attention should be given to PMU vulnerability while placing PMUs in the system. The concept of economically deploying PMUs considering resiliency of existing system post attack is missing in the above literatures mentioned in chapter one. Hence, this chapter highlights a considerable interest in improving PMU redundancy at minimum cost. In order to ascertain a subset of nodes which are most likely to be attacked, a virtual attack agent is modeled. The aim of the virtual attack agent is to reduce system observability to a minimum while carrying out a coordinated attack on a subset of PMU installation nodes. This virtual attack is used by the operator agent to identify a set of critical nodes whose redundancy needs to be increased. The planner agent then finds strategic locations to place additional PMUs in order to increase redundancy of critical nodes while minimizing incurred cost.

4.1 Agent Based PMU Placement Framework

An uncertainty constraint PMU placement problem can be expressed in three different agent based stages:

- *Attacker*: A virtual attack agent is introduced whose goal is to take down a set of installed
PMUs to reduce system observability. Uncertain events like intentional attacks is an important aspect that needs to be considered while making PMU placement decision. Due to geographical span of interconnected power systems planning a coordinated attack on all of the installed PMUs is improbable. Hence, the virtual attack agent will carry out coordinated attacks on a subset of installed PMUs that are deemed critical. Here, the set of critical PMUs are the ones when taken out of service minimizes system observability. Cardinality of the critical set is assumed to vary depending on the resources available to virtual attack agent.

- **Operator:** At this stage, the operator has to take corrective measures to mitigate the possible damage caused by the attacker. The operator agent identifies a set of critical nodes based on virtual attack agents attack plan. The operator agent then relays the corrective measure, which in this case is to increase the redundancy of critical nodes, to the planner agent.

- **Planner:** The task of planner is to deploy additional PMUs to increase redundancy of critical nodes at minimum cost.

Schematic representation of the three cyclic stages is shown in Figure 4.1. The schematic is cyclic in nature because of the nature of the problem, where the virtual attack agent comes up with strategies to minimize system observability given a set of PMU locations. The operator and planner agents then mitigate the effect of virtual attack agent by placing additional PMUs at strategic locations. The virtual attack agent then starts a new cycle with the new set of PMU installation locations.
Each undesired PMU outage caused by the virtual attack agent is an optimization scenario for the operator. These undesired outages can be single, double or multiple based on virtual attack agent’s resources. Let $P$ be the number of PMUs deployed into the system and $\Psi$ be the scenario which corresponds to the number of PMUs to be attacked by the attacker. The total scenario can be represented as combinatorial number $P \binom{P}{\Psi}$ as:

$$P \binom{P}{\Psi} = \frac{P!}{\Psi!(P-\Psi)!}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.1)

Since there are hundreds of thousands of possible attack scenarios, it is impossible to enumerate all scenarios for large systems due to computational burden. Instead, by adopting the approach in (4.2) a worst case scenario can be obtained.

$$\Psi = \eta \% \times P$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.2)

where $\eta \in [0, 100]$ – representing the percentage of installed PMUs that are attacked. As a worst-case scenario, an assumption has been made that the attacker can attack up to 50% of the total deployed PMUs. Depending upon $\eta$ value, a set of attacked PMUs $\Psi = \{\Psi_1, \Psi_2, \ldots, \Psi_z\}$ is obtained from the optimization problem and this set is named as critical.
PMUs. The programming framework for the agent based PMU placement is shown in Figure 4.2.

![Image of Figure 4.2 PMU placement Framework]

Figure 4.2 PMU placement Framework
4.2 Mathematical Formulation

Development of agent models as an optimization problem is discussed in this section. The initial deployment locations for PMUs, which act as the starting point for the proposed agent based framework are obtained using optimal PMU placement algorithm from [22].

4.2.1 Virtual Attack Agent

The objective of virtual attack agent is to attack a subset of installed PMUs in the system such that the system bus observability is minimized. The attack agent is modeled using binary integer programming.

The mathematical formulations for attacker’s objective is as follows:

\[
\min \sum_{k=1}^{m} \xi_k \tag{4.2.1.1}
\]

Subject to

\[
\left( \sum_{j} A_{ij} \right) \xi_k \geq A_{ij} x_i \tag{4.2.1.2}
\]

\[
\sum_{p=1}^{l} x(p) = \left( \sum_{i} x \right) - \psi \tag{4.2.1.3}
\]

\[
\xi_k \in \{0,1\} \quad \text{and} \quad x_p, x_i \in \{0,1\} \tag{4.2.1.4}
\]

The objective function (4.2.1.1) \( \xi_k \) is the decision variable that tends to give the observability of each bus in terms of binary variable. If the bus is observable by PMUs remaining in the system after the coordinated attack by virtual attack agent then \( \xi_k \) will take the value of 1 and if the bus is not observable by any of the PMUs then \( \xi_k \) will take the value ‘0’. In general, observability of a bus can be 0 in which case the bus is not observable or
observability can be a positive number which means the bus is observable.

\[
\xi_i = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } A_i \cdot x_p > 0 \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases} \quad (4.2.1.5)
\]

Since the available PMUs were placed based on system network topology, it becomes necessary to define a network connectivity matrix \( A \).

Elements in matrix \( A \) are defined as follows:

\[
A_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } i = j \text{ or } i \text{ and } j \text{ are adjacent} \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases} \quad (4.2.1.6)
\]

In constraint (4.2.1.2), \( x_i \) is an auxiliary binary variable of PMU placement. If the PMU is present at the \( i^{th} \) bus then \( x_i \) is regarded as 1 otherwise 0. Before the attack, the observability of the \( i^{th} \) bus denoted by left-hand side of (4.2.1.2) should be equal to the product of connectivity matrix of bus \( i \) and PMU placement variable \( x_i \). Since the attacker already know the exact location of the PMUs, the attacker agent tries to enumerate all the possibilities to destroy or damage the PMU which are critical. This procedure is presented in (4.2.1.3). The word ‘critical’ defines those set of PMUs whose installation in the system increases the system observability. Post attack the variable \( x_i \) is zero for the disabled or attacked PMU. In this case, the constraint (4.2.1.2) will act as inequality constraint because the observability of the bus at left hand side will be greater than right hand side. The connectivity matrix is always fixed as long as all the transmission lines in the system are in service. The variable \( x_p \) is the PMU placement variable post attack. Depending upon the auxiliary variable \( x_p \), the attacker performs all combinatorial number and checks the observability of each bus one by one. Those combination sets where the observability of bus shows the maximum number, the attacker tries to attack on those particular sets of
PMUs. Constraint (4.2.1.2) helps the attacker to judge the most attractive set of PMUs to act on.

Computational complexity of this optimization model increases substantially when dealing with large number of system buses. From (4.2.1.2), the total number of inequality constraints is equal to the number of system buses $N$ and the equality constraint (4.2.1.3) is split into two sections, one for the set of the buses where PMUs were installed and other for the set of buses where PMUs were not installed. Therefore the total number of constraints is $N+1+1$. Similarly the total numbers of variables are twice the number of system buses $M$. This is because the first half $M/2$ denotes the auxiliary variable of PMU placement post attack and the other half $M/2$ denotes the bus observability.

4.2.2 Operator Agent

The responsibility of the operator is to identify vulnerable nodes based on the behavior of virtual attack agent. Vulnerable nodes in this context are a set of critical buses whose observability is compromised by the virtual attack agent. Critical buses are the buses include critical PMU installation buses and buses that are observable by critical PMUs.

The number of PMUs attacked by virtual attack agent is a percentage of the total number of installed PMUs. Since, larger systems have larger number of installed PMUs, the number of critical buses also tends to increase with system size. Since various sets of PMUs were obtained depending upon the availability of attacker’s resources. Now, with the concern of PMU’s and their installation cost, from those several sets of classified critical PMUs, the planner has to choose only the most repeated PMUs among all sets of critical PMUs. To obtain this, following formulation is used.
\[ R = \psi_1 \cup \psi_2 \]  
(4.2.1.1)

\[ S = R \cap \psi_3 \cap \ldots \cap \psi_N \]  
(4.2.2.2)

where \( S = [s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_w] \) denotes set of critical PMUs in (4.2.2.2).

The critical buses are those buses that are observable from the set of critical PMUs.

\[ W^B_c = \varnothing \left( A \mid s_w \right) \]  
(4.2.3.3)

\[ W^B_c = \{ w^B_{c,1}, w^B_{c,2}, \ldots, w^B_{c,f} \} \]  
(4.2.4.4)

where \( W^B_c \) is represented for set of critical buses obtained from each critical PMUs \( s_w \) and \( \theta \) is the index of buses which are adjacent to critical PMU located buses.

### 4.2.3 Planner Agent

The objective of the planner agent is to install additional PMUs in strategic locations to mitigate the vulnerability posed by virtual attack agent. The optimal PMU placement considering the critical PMUs is as follows:

\[
\min \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i x_i
\]  
(4.2.3.1)

\[
(A \mid w^B_{c,f}) x_i' \geq b_i
\]  
(4.2.3.2)

\[
(A \mid w^B_{c,f}) x_i' \geq b_i'
\]  
(4.2.3.3)

\[
A_{eq} X' = \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i
\]  
(4.2.3.4)

\[
c_i = [1 \ 1 \ \ldots \ 1]_1 \times N
\]  
(4.2.3.5)

\[
x_i' \in \{0, 1\}, \ \forall i = \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}
\]  
(4.2.3.6)
The objective function (4.2.3.1) implies that minimum number of PMU is placed in the system and \( x'_i \) is the new decision variable for PMU placement for this particular model. It is defined same as \( x_i \) as described earlier in attacker’s model. In this model, \( b_i \) is observability constraint for non-critical buses and is considered equivalent to one. Whereas for critical buses, the observability constraint \( b'_i \) is considered as two. Therefore constraints (4.2.3.2) and (4.2.3.3) describes that each non-critical bus \( w_c^B \) and critical buses \( w_c^B \) must be observable by at least one PMU and two PMUs respectively. Equality constraint (4.2.3.4) represents that original PMUs has to be placed in the same location. Thus, under any uncertain events or attacks, all the buses are still observable and with higher redundancy with additional number of PMUs in the system. There are \( N \) number of variables and \( 2N \) number of constraints. In this proposed model, the restrictions on number of additional PMUs is not implemented. However, this optimization model has the potential to optimize the fixed amount of additional PMUs just by adding a new constraint such that the summation of decision variable is equal to a constant number.

4.3 Case study

The performance of proposed model is tested on 14, 30, 57 and 118 IEEE test bus systems including large power system 2383 bus Western Polish system [29, 30]. All the testified cases are implemented on 1.70 GHz processor with 6 GB of RAM using CPLEX12.6.2 Solver. The optimization is executed in MATLAB environment.

4.3.1 Critical PMUs

The number of critical PMUs depends upon the size of the system and the system topology. The set of PMUs that poses a higher influence in increasing the system bus
observability are shown in the Table 4.1. The critical PMUs are obtained based upon the resources available to the attacker. The percentage shown in the Table 4.1 indicates that the attacker has ability to damage certain percentage of the total deployed PMUs in the system. For a small system like 14 bus system, only 4 PMUs are needed in the system for full observability before attack. 10% of 4 PMUs being a negligible number, 20% and 50% of total placed PMUs is considered for execution. $N_{min}$ is the number of attacked PMUs. Similarly, Table 4.1 demonstrates all the critical PMUs for different IEEE systems.

To further analyze strictly critical PMUs, only one set of PMUs per system is evaluated. The PMUs that happens to be critical for more than twice among the differentiated level of resources availability are only considered as most critical PMUs. Figure 4.1 shows all such single set of most critical PMUs for 14, 30, 57 and 118 IEEE bus systems only. The model was further tested for larger power systems like IEEE 300 and 2383 Western Polish system. For the larger system, the most critical PMU buses are shown in Table 4.2. The critical PMUs for larger systems are selected based on 10% of total installed PMUs. Since the numbers of PMUs installed in IEEE 300 and 2383 Western Polish system outnumbered to smaller system, PMU installed buses are not shown in the described Table 4.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEEE System Location</th>
<th>Resources available to the attacker</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N_{min}$</td>
<td>$\psi_1$</td>
<td>$N_{min}$</td>
<td>$\psi_2$</td>
<td>$N_{min}$</td>
<td>$\psi_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 2, 7, 10, 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 1, 2, 6, 10, 11, 12, 15, 19, 25, 29</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>2 6, 10</td>
<td>3 6, 10, 25</td>
<td>4 6, 10, 12, 15</td>
<td>5 6, 10, 12, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 2, 6, 12, 19, 22, 25, 27, 32, 36, 39, 41, 45, 46, 49, 51, 52, 55</td>
<td>2 4, 6, 32, 41</td>
<td>3 6, 32, 41</td>
<td>5 6, 32, 41, 46</td>
<td>7 6, 32, 41, 46, 55</td>
<td>9 6, 32, 41, 46, 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 1, 5, 9, 12, 15, 17, 21, 25, 28, 34, 37, 40, 45, 49, 52, 56, 62, 64, 68, 70, 71, 76, 77, 80, 85, 87, 91, 94, 101, 105, 110, 114</td>
<td>3 5, 6, 10</td>
<td>6 49, 56, 80, 85, 10</td>
<td>10 5, 10, 51, 10</td>
<td>13 5, 10, 51, 10, 5</td>
<td>16 5, 10, 51, 10, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.3 Critical PMUs in different test systems

Table 4.2 Critical buses with PMUs on larger systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEEE Test System</th>
<th>Total installed PMUs</th>
<th>Selected critical PMU buses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300 bus system</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3  15  109  112  190  268  269  270  272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2383 polish</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>6  18  29  133  246  309  310  321  322  353  354  361  365  366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>374  425  456  494  511  525  526  527  546  556  613  644  645  679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>694  717  750  754  755  796  797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>870  923  944  978  979  1050 1096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1120  1138  1190  1201  1212  1213  1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1217  1245  1483  1504  1524  1647  1664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1669  1680  1761  1822  1882  1883  1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1919  1920  2112  2113  2166  2195  2196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2235  2258  2261  2274  2323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2 Planning Scheme for PMU Placement

The PMU placement planning scheme is presented in this section. The goal of the planning scheme is to place additional PMUs in order to mitigate the loss of observability in the event of an attack. From the previous section, the set of critical buses with respect to loss of observability was obtained. The planner agent uses this information to obtain PMU placement scheme for installing additional PMUs with least cost to increase redundancy of critical nodes. For the most critical buses as shown in Table 4.3, the measurement redundancy was set to 2 i.e. the most critical buses must be observable by at least 2 PMUs. The resultant optimal numbers of PMUs are shown in Table 4.4. For IEEE 14 bus system, two additional PMUs are required to increase redundancy of five critical buses. Similarly for IEEE 30 bus system four additional PMUs are required to increase redundancy of 12 critical buses. Since the original PMU deployment was shown in Table 4.1, the following Table 4.4 shows PMU locations only for additional PMUs. Due to space limitation, location of additional PMUs for larger systems are not tabulated but are rather summarized as follows. For IEEE 300 bus system, 30 additional PMUs are required. While the 2383 bus polish system required 252 PMUs in addition to the originally placed 746 PMUs to obtain full bus system observability and increased redundancy at critical buses.
Table 4.3 Critical buses for different test systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEEE Test System</th>
<th>Critical Buses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2 4 6 7 8 9 10 17 20 21 22 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>4 5 6 7 8 11 21 22 23 31 32 33 34 38 41 42 43 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7 8 11 12 14 15 16 17 18 30 31 42 45 47 48 49 50 51 54 55 56 57 58 59 66 69 77 79 80 81 83 84 85 86 88 89 96 97 98 99 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 Comparison of No. of optimal PMUs under normal and abnormal condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEEE Test System</th>
<th>No. of Optimal PMUs</th>
<th>More weightage to critical PMUs</th>
<th>% of Additional PMUs compared with original placement</th>
<th>Additional PMU Placement Location considering critical buses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal Operating Condition</td>
<td>Normal Operating Condition</td>
<td>More weightage to critical PMUs</td>
<td>% of Additional PMUs compared with original placement</td>
<td>Additional PMU Placement Location considering critical buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5 8 12 16 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4 7 11 21 23 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>4 6 8 18 32 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54 57 58 78 83 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96 100 106 108 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112 117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Conclusion

This chapter proposes a planning approach for optimal PMU placement making the system more resilient to PMU failure. The likelihood of undesired events are analyzed by creating a virtual attack agent which intends to damage some of the critical PMUs in the system. Operator agent is used to obtain a subset of buses that are critical based on the attack pattern of virtual attack agent. Simulation results illustrate the ability of the planner agent to place additional PMUs at strategic locations to increase the redundancy of critical buses. The developed framework was tested on several test systems including a 2383 bus western polish system and optimal results were obtained in all cases.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

2383 Western Polish System

The following tables are exclusively for 2383 polish system

Table A 1 2383 Polish system bus specification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Zero- injection Buses</th>
<th>Location of Zero- injection Buses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td>565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777</td>
<td>778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td>808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>833</td>
<td>834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>864</td>
<td>865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>898</td>
<td>899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>928</td>
<td>929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>977</td>
<td>978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td>1004 1005 1006 1007 1008 1009 1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1023</td>
<td>1024 1025 1026 1027 1028 1029 1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1051 1052 1053 1054 1055 1056 1057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1085</td>
<td>1086 1087 1088 1089 1090 1091 1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1112</td>
<td>1113 1114 1115 1116 1117 1118 1119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the Table A 1, it can be noticed that there are altogether 552 buses which are indicated as zero injection buses. The above mentioned buses do not have generation or the load. Since these buses are large in quantity it is probable that the requirement of PMUs will significantly decrease. To prove this statement, the below Table A 2 shows the effectiveness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case A PMU Location</th>
<th>Case B PMU Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6   22   23   28</td>
<td>12   15   18   29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42   55   58</td>
<td>41   50   61   69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64   73    76</td>
<td>86   88   105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90   106   119</td>
<td>133  150  154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126  136   143</td>
<td>162  172  178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152  168   176</td>
<td>190  192  199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187  189   192</td>
<td>213  214  217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200  213   217</td>
<td>222  229  235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224  230   236</td>
<td>246  247  259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246  249   257</td>
<td>281  282  287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263  275   281</td>
<td>299  307  309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284  287   299</td>
<td>316  319  324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307  310   319</td>
<td>341  347  352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322  330   335</td>
<td>356  360  363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338  347   352</td>
<td>369  371  372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354  360   365</td>
<td>389  393  394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368  373   377</td>
<td>418  425  428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379  383   391</td>
<td>456  460  464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409  417   438</td>
<td>476  481  485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444  448   459</td>
<td>502  511  512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468  479   481</td>
<td>525  526  527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493  498   500</td>
<td>542  545  550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511  515   517</td>
<td>568  575  579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522  525   527</td>
<td>591  592  601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535  545   548</td>
<td>615  618  622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551  556   560</td>
<td>649  650  651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565  569   582</td>
<td>660  663  675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584  591   594</td>
<td>687  689  690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603  615   622</td>
<td>698  703  705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635  644   646</td>
<td>714  716  717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651  662   679</td>
<td>740  750  754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>682  690   694</td>
<td>769  771  773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703  709   710</td>
<td>794  796  797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715  717   722</td>
<td>815  817  821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726  735   741</td>
<td>834  838  839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>748  754   763</td>
<td>859  861  870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>768  784   796</td>
<td>892  895  899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798  806   817</td>
<td>912  914  918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>821  824   829</td>
<td>947  961  967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>834  854   858</td>
<td>979  981  985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A 2 Comparisons of PMU deployment schemes for 2383 polish system
<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>885</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>1069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>915</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>1097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>932</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>1138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>966</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>981</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>1195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1051</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>1269</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>1283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1069</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td>1311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>1342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>1123</td>
<td>1351</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>1365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1127</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>1415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1151</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>1427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1164</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>1483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1184</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>1506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1198</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>1524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1209</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1221</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>1226</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>1564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1231</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>1594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>1254</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1258</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>1273</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>1625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>1285</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>1655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1297</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>1668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1317</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>1686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>1701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>1729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>1752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>1392</td>
<td>1393</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1407</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1421</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1434</td>
<td>1438</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1439</td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>1449</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1457</td>
<td>1460</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1469</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1494</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1507</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>1514</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1532</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>1569</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>2052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>2065</td>
<td>2087</td>
<td>2088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td>2105</td>
<td>2107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>2122</td>
<td>2124</td>
<td>2127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>2145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56
| 1664 | 1667 | 1669 | 1673 | 1674 | 1680 | 2161 | 2167 | 2168 | 2170 | 2172 | 2173 |
| 1681 | 1682 | 1684 | 1686 | 1687 | 1690 | 2174 | 2175 | 2190 | 2191 | 2194 | 2195 |
| 1692 | 1694 | 1696 | 1712 | 1716 | 1717 | 2196 | 2202 | 2203 | 2209 | 2210 | 2217 |
| 1722 | 1723 | 1728 | 1729 | 1734 | 1735 | 2218 | 2221 | 2223 | 2224 | 2229 | 2232 |
| 1740 | 1745 | 1747 | 1748 | 1751 | 1755 | 2233 | 2235 | 2236 | 2244 | 2245 | 2247 |
| 1756 | 1757 | 1760 | 1761 | 1766 | 1771 | 2251 | 2255 | 2260 | 2261 | 2265 | 2270 |
| 1772 | 1774 | 1776 | 1783 | 1793 | 1795 | 2274 | 2279 | 2281 | 2283 | 2286 | 2289 |
| 1797 | 1802 | 1806 | 1811 | 1812 | 1814 | 2291 | 2300 | 2306 | 2309 | 2311 | 2313 |
| 1822 | 1825 | 1829 | 1840 | 1845 | 1858 | 2323 | 2330 | 2342 | 2345 | 2350 | 2360 |
| 1859 | 1862 | 1864 | 1866 | 1867 | 1871 | 2372 | 2374 | 2379 | 2380 |          |          |
| 1873 | 1874 | 1875 | 1882 | 1883 | 1884 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 1885 | 1889 | 1892 | 1895 | 1898 | 1901 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 1902 | 1903 | 1905 | 1906 | 1907 | 1910 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 1912 | 1914 | 1916 | 1918 | 1919 | 1920 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 1926 | 1932 | 1933 | 1937 | 1939 | 1940 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 1943 | 1944 | 1947 | 1951 | 1955 | 1957 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2024 | 2025 | 2027 | 2031 | 2032 | 2034 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2035 | 2039 | 2040 | 2044 | 2047 | 2052 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2053 | 2054 | 2056 | 2059 | 2060 | 2061 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2062 | 2063 | 2067 | 2068 | 2069 | 2071 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2074 | 2076 | 2078 | 2079 | 2080 | 2085 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2086 | 2087 | 2090 | 2091 | 2092 | 2093 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2098 | 2102 | 2105 | 2106 | 2108 | 2112 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2113 | 2121 | 2122 | 2128 | 2133 | 2134 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2135 | 2137 | 2140 | 2144 | 2146 | 2157 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2159 | 2166 | 2167 | 2168 | 2169 | 2170 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2172 | 2173 | 2174 | 2176 | 2184 | 2185 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2187 | 2191 | 2193 | 2194 | 2195 | 2196 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2202 | 2203 | 2204 | 2209 | 2217 | 2218 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2223 | 2224 | 2229 | 2235 | 2236 | 2244 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2245 | 2249 | 2251 | 2252 | 2255 | 2258 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2259 | 2261 | 2264 | 2265 | 2274 | 2277 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2280 | 2281 | 2283 | 2285 | 2289 | 2290 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2292 | 2293 | 2298 | 2300 | 2303 | 2305 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2306 | 2309 | 2313 | 2323 | 2336 | 2339 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2340 | 2342 | 2345 | 2350 | 2352 | 2360 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2361 | 2364 | 2369 | 2373 | 2374 | 2379 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 2380 | 2381 | 2383 |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
In Table A 2, case A indicates the simulation result for PMU placement approach without considering conventional measurements and case B is designated for PMU placement approach when conventional measurements are considered in the optimization model. Both the cases are solved for the potential loss of one PMU in order to get maximum observability of the buses with limited number of PMUs. From the Table A 2, it can be observed that the PMU requirement is relatively less in case B than in case A with the difference of 185 number of PMUs. Economically, this number makes a huge difference in the budget. Therefore keeping this in mind, the planning engineers always prefers to consider conventional measurements when analyzing the PMU placement. The western polish system is a large system, therefore the most of the buses selected for PMU placement happens to be common on both cases.
MATLAB Code for PMU placement under normal condition

```matlab
function res=pmu_placement(casename)

% get bus connectivity matrix in binary form (Ybus)
ps=runpf(casename);
Ybus=abs(ps.Ybus);
Ybus(Ybus>0)=1;
Ybus(Ybus<0)=1;

% inequality constraint for PMU observability
A=Ybus;
nBus=size(Ybus,1);
f=ones(nBus,1);
b=ones(nBus,1);

% get optimal number of PMUs and their locations
tic
res.x=cplexbilkp(f,-A,-b);
res.Aineq.x=A;
toc
```

MATLAB code for PMU placement considering vulnerability analysis

```matlab
function res=pmu_vulnerability(casename)
clc

% get optimal placement
res_optimal=pmu_placement(casename);

% get Ybus
ps=runpf(casename);
Ybus=abs(ps.Ybus);
Ybus(Ybus>0)=1;
Ybus(Ybus<0)=1;
```
nBus=size(Ybus,1);

% find connectivity
count=0;
for n=1:nBus
    [ind]=find(Ybus(:,n));  % locates all nonzero elements of Ybus, and returns the linear
    % indices of those elements in vector ind.
    Ind{n}=ind;  % gives nodes numbers in column form which are connected to n
    bus
    count=count+length(ind);
end

ind_place=1:nBus;
ind_beta=length(ind_place)+1:length(ind_place)+count;
NVars=length(ind_place)+length(ind_beta);

ind_cons_place=1:nBus;
ind_cons_vul_ub=length(ind_cons_place)+1:length(ind_cons_place)+count;
ind_cons_vul_lb=length(ind_cons_vul_ub)+1:length(ind_cons_vul_ub)+count;

NCons=length(ind_cons_place)+length(ind_cons_vul_ub)+length(ind_cons_vul_lb);

A=sparse(NCons,NVars);  % squeezing out any zero element
b=sparse(NCons,1);

% constraints
A(ind_cons_place,ind_place) = -Ybus;
b(ind_cons_place) = -1;  % ax>=1 i.e. -ax<=-1
b(ind_cons_vul_ub) = 0;  % b'-beta*Pmax
b(ind_cons_vul_lb) = 0;  % beta*Pmin-b'
P_max = sum(Ybus,2);  %Compute the sum of the elements in each column.
P_min = 1;

count=0;
for n=1:nBus
    for m=1:length(Ind{n})
        temp = Ind{n};
        count = count + 1;
        A(ind_cons_vul_ub(m),ind_place) = Ybus(temp(m),:);  % b'
        A(ind_cons_vul_lb(m),ind_place) = -Ybus(temp(m),:);  % -b'
        A(ind_cons_vul_ub(m),ind_beta(count)) = -P_max(n);  % b'=-beta*Pmax
    end
end
\[ A(\text{ind}_\text{cons}_\text{vul}_\text{lb}(m),\text{ind}_\text{beta}(\text{count})) = P_{\text{min}}; \quad \% \text{beta} \cdot P_{\text{min}} - b' \]

\[ A(\text{ind}_\text{cons}_\text{vul}_\text{ub}((\text{count}-\text{length}(\text{temp})+1:\text{count}),n) = 0; \quad \% \text{remove nth column i.e. remove pmu at nth bus} \]

end

Aeq=sparse(1,nVars);
Aeq(1,\text{ind}_\text{place})=1;
beq(1)=\text{nnz}(\text{res}\_\text{optimal}.x)+1; \quad \% \text{change the extra number of pmus here as +n, where n is the excess number of pmus} \quad ; \text{nnz= number of non zero element}

f=zeros(nVars,1);
f(\text{ind}_\text{beta})=-1; \quad \% \text{max beta}

\% \text{optimal result}
tic
[\text{res}.\text{vul}.x,\text{res}.\text{vul}.\text{fmax},\text{res}.\text{vul}.\text{status}] = \text{cplexbilkp}(f,A,b,Aeq,beq);
toc

\text{res}.\text{opt}.x = \text{res}\_\text{optimal}.x;

---

**With Conventional Measurements**

**MATLAB Code for PMU placement under normal condition**

**Main program:**

\textbf{function} \text{resc}=\text{BIP}\_\text{convmeasurement}(\text{casename})

\text{clc}
\% get Tcon and permutation matrix
\text{conn}\_\text{matrix}=\text{T}\_\text{conventional}(\text{casename});
P=\text{permutation}(\text{casename});
\text{meas}\_\text{obs}=\text{observability}\_\text{constraint}(\text{casename});
b\_c=\text{meas}\_\text{obs}.b\_c;
\% lower bound
\text{lb}=\text{zeros}(\text{size}(P,G,1),1);

\% upper bound
\text{ub}=\text{ones}(\text{size}(P,G,1),1);
\text{T}=(\text{conn}\_\text{matrix}\_\text{conn}\_\text{matrix}\_\text{PM}\_\text{PM}\_\text{G});
% define observability constraints
T=sparse(T);
b_no_m=ones(length(conm_matrix.NCB),1);
b=[b_no_m;b_c];

% define objective function
f=ones(size(P.G,1),1);

% get optimal result
[resc.x,resc.fval]=cplexbilp(f,T,b,[],[],lb,ub);
resc.T=T;
resc.conm_matrix.NCB=conm_matrix.NCB;

function b_obs=observability_constraint(case name)

%-------- code for observability constraint 'b'--------
clc
FM_index=[1 2 3 5 6 7 8 12]; % flow measurement buses for 14 bus system
FM_index=[2 6]; % flow measurement buses for 30 bus system
FM_index=[49 50 52 53]; % flow measurement buses for 57 bus system
FM_index=[15 33]; % flow measurement buses for 118 bus system
FM_index=[8 18]; % flow measurement bus for 2383 bus system
P=permutation(case name);
Tbus=1:length(P.G);
NCB=setdiff(Tbus,P.TCM); % buses those are not connected to any kind of measurements
b_c=zeros(size(P.WT,1),1);
for i=1:length(P.WT)
    if P.WT(i)==2
        b_c(i)=1;
    else if P.WT(i)==1
        if ismember(P.WT(i,2),FM_index)==1
            X=P.G(P.WT(i,2),:); % adjacent buses to each nodes
            X(:,union(NCB,FM_index))=[]; % gives adjacent buses which are associated with conventional measurement buses
            X_new=sum(X)-1;
            b_c(i)=X_new;
        else
            X=P.G(P.WT(i,2),:);
            X(:,union(NCB,FM_index))=[];
            X_new=sum(X)-1;
            b_c(i)=X_new;
        end
    end
    else
        if P.WT(i)==2
            b_c(i)=1;
        else if P.WT(i)==1
            if ismember(P.WT(i,2),FM_index)==1
                X=P.G(P.WT(i,2),:); % adjacent buses to each nodes
                X(:,union(NCB,FM_index))=[]; % gives adjacent buses which are associated with conventional measurement buses
                X_new=sum(X)-1;
                b_c(i)=X_new;
            else
                X=P.G(P.WT(i,2),:);
                X(:,union(NCB,FM_index))=[];
                X_new=sum(X)-1;
                b_c(i)=X_new;
            end
        end
    end
% Permutation

function conm=permutation(casename)

% get Ybus
ps=runpf(casename);
Ybus=abs(ps.Ybus);
Ybus(Ybus>0)=1;
Ybus(Ybus<0)=1;
G= full(Ybus);

%----data for 14 bus system-----------------------------
M=5;
Type 1= injection
Type 2= flow
WT=[2 1 5;
    2 2 3;
    2 6 12;
    2 7 8;
    1 7 0];  % Type; Node from bus; Node to bus

%----data for 30 bus system-----------------------------
M=7;
WT=[2 2 6;
    2 9 11;
    2 10 17;
    2 14 12;
    2 24 22;
    1 6 0;
    1 9 0;
    1 22 0;
    1 25 0;
    1 27 0;
    1 28 0];

%----data for 57 bus system-----------------------------
M=17;
WT=[2 49 50
    2 52 53
    1 4 0}
170
1110
1210
1220
1240
1260
1340
1360
1370
1390
1400
1450
1460
1480];

%------data for 118 bus system-----------------------------------
M=11;
WT=[2 15 33
150
190
1300
1370
1380
1630
1640
1680
1710
1810];

%------data for 2383 bus system-------
M=553;
result=matrixforzeroinsertion;
ww=result.ww;
WT=[2 8 18;
ww];

j=0;
u=0;
N=size(G,1);
PM=zeros(N,N);
for i=1:1:size(WT,1)
    if WT(i,1)==1  % injection measurement
        XT=G(WT(i,2),:);  % XT will give the ith row of G bus
        % to distinguish the connected bus and not connected bus with the
% ith node measurement (1 means connected, 0 means not connected bus)
for kk=1:length(XT)
    if XT(kk) == 1
        CB1(j+1) = kk; % CB1 gives the injection measurement connected bus node number
        j = j + 1;
    end
end
elseif WT(i,1) == 2 % flow measurement
    CB2(1,u+1:u+2) = WT(i,2:3); % CB2 gives the flow measurement connected bus
    u = u + 2;
end
end
TCM = union(CB1,CB2); % This gives the total measurement connected bus node

L = length(TCM);
z = 0;

for dd=1:N
    X = find(dd==TCM);
    T = isempty(X);
    if T == 1
        PM(z+1,dd) = 1; % Permutation matrix for not connected bus with measurements
        z = z + 1;
    end
end

Q = N - L;
for dd=1:N
    X = find(dd==TCM);
    T = isempty(X);
    if T == 1
        PM(Q+1,dd) = 1; % Permutation matrix for not connected bus with measurements
        Q = Q + 1;
    end
end
P = PM; % Permutation matrix for 14-by-14 bus system

[a1,b1] = size(CB2);
[c1,d1] = size(TCM);
[e1,f1] = size(WT);
[g1,h1] = size(G);
[i1,j1] = size(PM);
field1 = 'P'; value1 = zeros(N,N);
field2 = 'CB2'; value2 = zeros(a1,b1);
field3 = 'M'; value3 = 0;
field4 = 'TCM'; value4 = zeros(c1,d1);
field5 = 'WT'; value5 = zeros(e1,f1);
field6 = 'G'; value6 = zeros(g1,h1);
field7 = 'PM'; value7 = zeros(i1,j1);

conm =
struct(field1,value1,field2,value2,field3,value3,field4,value4,field5,value5,field6,value6,field7,value7);
conm.P=P;
conm.CB2=CB2;
conm.M=M;
conm.TCM=TCM;
conm.WT=WT;
conm.G=G;
conm.PM=PM;

%--------------------------Tconventional--------------------------

function conm=Tconventional(case name)
clc
% Code for Tcon matrix, i.e. Tcon=[I 0;0 Tmeas]
% get permutation
P=permutation(case name);
P.PM;
Tmeas=zeros(P.M,length(P.TCM));
B=length(P.TCM);  % total number of measurement connected buses
I=eye(length(P.G)-length(P.TCM));  % Identity matrix with diagonal= no. of measurement not associated with conventional measurement
O1 =zeros(size(I,1),size(Tmeas,2));
O2 =zeros(P.M,size(I,2));

k=0;
for i=1:size(P.WT,1)
    if P.WT(i)==2
        for j=2:3
            for v=1:B
                if P.WT(i,j)==P.TCM(:,v)
Tmeas(k+1,v)=1;
end
end
end

k=k+1;
end

end

TBus=1:length(P.G);  % total number of buses
P.TCM;                % total measurement connected buses
NCB=setdiff(TBus,P.TCM);  % buses those are not connected to any kind of measurements

for y=1:size(Tmeas,1)
    if P.WT(y)==1
        ZGnew=P.WT(y,2);
        ROZ=P.G(ZGnew,:);
        ROZ(:,NCB)=[ ];
        ROZ;
        if Tmeas(y,:)==0
            Tmeas(y,:)=ROZ;
            Tmeas(y,:)=Tmeas(y,:)-Tmeas(k,:);
            Tmeas(Tmeas<0)=0;
        end
    end
end

conm.Tconn=[I O1;O2 Tmeas];
conm_matrix=conm.Tconn;
[a1,b1]=size(NCB);
[c1,d1]=size(conm_matrix);

field1 = 'NCB';  value1 = zeros(a1,b1);
field2 = 'conm_matrix';  value2 = zeros(c1,d1);
conm = struct(field1,value1,field2,value2);
conm.NCB=NCB;
conm.conm_matrix=conm_matrix;
MATLAB Code for PMU placement considering vulnerability analysis

meas_obs=observability_constraint(casename);
b_c=meas_obs.b_c;
resc_optimal=BIP_convmeasurement(casename);
T=resc_optimal.T;
conm_matrix.NCB=resc_optimal.conm_matrix.NCB;
T=sparse(T);
count=0;
for n=1:size(-T,2)
    [ind]=find(T(:,n)); % locates all nonzero elements of T, and returns the linear indices
    Ind{n}=ind; % gives nodes numbers in column form which are connected to n
    bus
    count=count+length(ind);
end

ind_place=1:size(-T,2);
ind_beta=length(ind_place)+1:length(ind_place)+count;
nVars=length(ind_place)+length(ind_beta);

ind_cons_place=1:size(-T,1);
ind_cons_vul_ub=length(ind_cons_place)+1:length(ind_cons_place)+count;
ind_cons_vul_lb=length(ind_cons_place)+length(ind_cons_vul_ub)+1:length(ind_cons_place)+length(ind_cons_vul_ub)+1:length(ind_cons_place)+length(ind_cons_vul_ub)+length(ind_cons_vul_ub)+count;

nCons=length(ind_cons_place)+length(ind_cons_vul_ub)+length(ind_cons_vul_lb);

A=sparse(nCons,nVars); % squeezing out any zero element
b=sparse(nCons,1);

% define constraints
A(ind_cons_place,ind_place)=T;
b_no_m=ones(length(conm_matrix.NCB),1);
b(ind_cons_place)=[b_no_m;b_c];
b(ind_cons_vul_ub)=0; % b'*beta*Pmax
b(ind_cons_vul_lb)=0; % beta*Pmin-b'
P_max=sum(-T,2); %Compute the sum of the elements in each row.
P_min=[b_no_m;b_c];

count=0;
k=0;
for n=1:size(-T,2)
for m=1:length(Ind{n})
    temp=Ind{n};
    count=count+1;
    A(ind_cons_vul_ub(m),ind_place)=-T(temp(m,:)); % b'
    A(ind_cons_vul_lb(m),ind_place)=T(temp(m,:)); % -b'

    A(ind_cons_vul_ub(m),ind_beta(count))=-P_max(temp(m)); % b'-beta*Pmax
    A(ind_cons_vul_lb(m),ind_beta(count))=P_min(temp(m)); % beta*Pmin-b'
end
A(ind_cons_vul_ub(count-length(temp)+1:count),n)=0; % remove nth column i.e. remove pmu at nth bus
end

Aeq=sparse(1,nVars);
Aeq(1,ind_place)=1;
beq(1)=nnz(resc_optimal.x)+1; % change the extra number of pmus here as +n, where n is the excess number of pmus ; nnz= number of non zero element

f=zeros(nVars,1);
f(ind_beta)=-1; % max beta

tic
[resc.vul.x,resc.vul.fmax,res.vul.status]=cplexbulp(f,A,b,Aeq,beq);
toc
resc.opt.x=resc_optimal.x;
MATLAB code for PMU placement considering the resiliency of measurement system

clc
close all
clear all

% Main Attack Agent Code

Run=1;
while Run > 0
casename=input('casename=');

res_basicopt=pmu_placement(casename);
PMUplaced=find(res_basicopt.x)
howmanyPMUs=length(PMUplaced)
attack_resources=round([0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5]*howmanyPMUs);
for i=1:length(attack_resources)
    nAttack=input('nAttack=');
    nAttack(i)=attack_resources(i)
    res_attack(i)=pmu_attack(casename,nAttack(i));
    AttackPMUs =res_attack(i).attackNodes
    howmanyattack(i)=length(AttackPMUs)
end
% planners prospective

nBus=res_basicopt.nBus;  % get the row size of connectivity matrix from basic optimal placement problem
if nBus< 300
    temp1=union(res_attack(1).attackNodes,res_attack(2).attackNodes);
    temp2=union(temp1,res_attack(3).attackNodes);
    temp3=intersect(temp2,res_attack(4).attackNodes);
    critical_PMU=intersect(temp3,res_attack(5).attackNodes)';  % most critical PMU bus
else
    critical_PMU1=intersect(res_attack(1).attackNodes,res_attack(2).attackNodes);
    critical_PMU2=intersect(critical_PMU1,res_attack(3).attackNodes);
    critical_PMU=intersect(critical_PMU2,res_attack(5).attackNodes)';
end

% PMU placement inequality constraint

Aineq=res_basicopt.Aineq;  % get a part of the constraint matrix from basic optimal placement problem
nBus= res_basicopt.nBus;  % get the row size of connectivity matrix from basic optimal placement problem

sizeofCP = length(critical_PMU)  % length of critical PMUs
A_in = [0];
for i = 1: sizeofCP
    A_in = [A_in find(Aineq(critical_PMU(i),:))];
end
critical_bus = A_in(2:end)
critical_bus_unique = unique(critical_bus);  % critical buses are obtained

for k=1:nBus
    if ismember(k,[critical_bus_unique]) == 1
        B(k,1)=2;  % observability for critical buses only
    else
        B(k,1)=1;  % observability for non-critical buses only
    end
end

% PMU placement equality constraint

% to restrict PMUs in the same pre-located buses
pre_PMU_loc = find(res_basicopt.x==1);  % find pre-located PMUs in the system before attack
Aeq_new=zeros(1,size(Aineq,2));  % because number of variables is the same as Aineq
Aeq_new(1,pre_PMU_loc)=1;
Beq_new(1,1)=length(pre_PMU_loc);

% optimization function
func=ones(nBus,1);
tic
[x,fval,exitflag,output] = cplexbip( func, -Aineq, -B, Aeq_new, Beq_new)
toc
disp('Do you want to run another case?     ')
Run = input('Press "Any Number" for Yes and "0 or Enter" for No.:  ');
end
Figure B 1 General Flow chart for PMU placement approach executed in MATLAB

The above Figure B 1 is a general procedure followed while coding the program for PMU placement. The detail approach depending upon the objectives of this thesis is already shown in respective chapters.
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