

MULTI CRITERION DECISION MAKING BASED ON TECHNO-ECONOMICAL OPTIMIZATION OF STAND- ALONE HYBRID ENERGY SYSTEMS

Amarasinghage Tharindu Dasun Perera

(118017G)



University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka
Electronic Theses & Dissertations
www.lib.mrt.ac.lk

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of
Science

Department of Mechanical Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

June 2012

DECLARATION

I declare that this is my own work and this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text.

Also, I hereby grant to University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my thesis/dissertation, in whole or in part in print, electronic or other medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

Signature:

Date:



University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka.
Electronic Theses & Dissertations

The above candidate has carried out research for the Masters/MPhil/PhD thesis under my supervision.

Signature of the supervisor:

Date:

Prof. R.A. Attalage

Signature of the supervisor:

Date:

Prof. K.K.C.K Perera

Signature of the supervisor:

Date:

Dr. V.P.C Dassanayake

ABSTRACT

Hybrid Energy System (HES)s are increasingly becoming popular for standalone electrification due to global concerns on GHG emissions and higher depletion of fossil fuel resources. Simultaneously research work on optimal design of HESs has also made much progress based on progress with numerous optimization techniques while giving special focus to Pareto optimization considering conflicting objectives.

This study comes up with a novel evolutionary algorithm to optimize HESs based on ϵ -dominance technique. Mathematical modeling of energy flows, cash flows, GHG emissions were carried out in order to support the optimization. Pareto analysis was conducted for two different cases where former analyzes a novel design of a HES and latter analyzes a conversion of existing Internal Combustion Generator (ICG) into a HES in the expansion process. The Levelized Energy Cost (LEC), annual fuel consumption and Initial Capital Cost (ICC) were considered to be objective functions in the first analysis. A sensitivity analysis was followed the mathematical optimization in order to evaluate the impact of power supply reliability on the Pareto front. Furthermore, sensitivity of fuel cost and renewable energy component cost on Pareto front was also investigated considering the present dynamic condition of energy market. LEC, power supply reliability and added renewable energy capacity were taken as objectives to be optimized in the second case. Sensitivity of ICG capacity on the Pareto front was also taken into discussion. Pareto analysis clearly elements such as LEC, power supply reliability and fuel consumption are conflicting to each other. Therefore it is essential to perform multi criterion analysis in order to assist decision making.

In order to assist decision making, Fuzzy-TOPSIS (a multi criterion decision making technique) was combined with Pareto optimization. For that, multi objective optimization was carried out considering Levelized Energy Cost (LEC), unmet load fraction, Wasted Renewable Energy (WRE) and fuel consumption as elements in the objective functions to generate non-dominant set of alternative solutions. Pareto front obtained from the optimization was ranked using Fuzzy-TOPSIS technique and Level Diagrams were used to support this process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisors Prof R.A. Attalage, Prof K.K.C.K. Perera and Dr. V.P.C. Dassanayake for guiding me throughout my research in order to make it a success. Further, I would like to acknowledge Senate Research Committee, University of Moratuwa for providing the financial support. The support given by Academic and non academic staff of the Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Moratuwa was really helpful to make this project a success.

This project was an extension of my undergraduate research project which was conducted as a group work with Mr D.M.I.J. Wickremasinghe and D. Mahindarathna. I would like to acknowledge them for their support given during both undergraduate and postgraduate period to make this research a success. I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to Prof Ajith de Alwis, Department of Chemical and Process Engineering, University of Moratuwa for being my academic mentor for last few years and helping this research in various ways to make it success. My warm thanks are due to Prof. K Deb IIT Kanpur, for his support given when developing the optimization algorithm.

I wish to thank Mr. Nadeesh Madusanka, University of Cambridge for encouraging me in number of challenging instances and Mrs Anusha Wijewardena, University of Loughborough for continuous support given to find out important references. At last but not least I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to my family members and colleagues in the department and outside for their support in various stages in the research.

A.T.D. Perera
Department of Mechanical Engineering,
University of Moratuwa.

Email:atdasun@lankamail.com

CONTENTS

Declaration	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgement	iv
Contents	v
List of Figures.....	vii
List of Tables.....	x
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Comparison of SPV-Battery, wind Battery, ICG and HESs	3
2 Literature Review on HESs	6
2.1 Optimization of the operation procedure	7
2.2 System configuration optimization.....	9
3 Hybrid Energy System Component Modeling	23
3.1 Modeling of solar PV panels.....	23
3.2 Modeling of Wind Turbines.....	27
3.3 Modeling of Battery Bank	29
3.4 Modeling of ICG	32
3.5 Modeling of Inverters	33
3.6 Economic Model.....	33
3.7 Emission model.....	35

4 Simulation of Hybrid Energy Systems	38
4.1 Meteorological data selected for the case study	38
4.2 ELD taken for the case study	38
4.3 Dispatch Strategy	40
4.4 Formulation of objective functions	42
5 Hybrid Energy System Optimization	44
5.1 Mono objective optimization using GA	44
5.2 Multi objective optimization	45
5.3 Operators and optimization algorithm	48
5.4 Decision space variables and objective functions	50
5.5 Optimization Algorithm.....	50
6 Techno-economical analysis of HESs using multi objective optimization	53
6.1 Pareto analysis for a novel design of HES	53
6.2 Pareto analysis for a conversion of ICG system to HES	61
7 Multi-criterion decision making technique	66
7.1 Fuzzy TOPSIS	67
7.2 Level Diagrams	70
7.3 Results and Discussion	70
Conclusion	76



LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 1.1 Schematic representation of a HES	1
Fig. 1.2 (a) HES systems designed and implemented by Dialog Telekom PLC	2
Fig. 1.2 (b) HES systems designed and implemented by Dialog Telekom PLC	3
Fig. 1.3 (a) standalone wind and SPV energy systems used in Ambewela, Sri Lanka	4
Fig. 1.3 (b) standalone wind and SPV energy systems used in Ambewela, Sri Lanka	4
Fig. 1.3 (c) standalone wind and SPV energy systems used in Ambewela, Sri Lanka	4
Fig. 2.1 Impact of number of generations on final results	13
Fig. 2.2 Impact of Mutation rate on optimized results	14
Fig. 2.3 Impact of Crossover rate on optimized results	14
Fig. 2.4 Impact of Population Size on optimized results	15
Fig. 2.5 Hierarchical optimization algorithm proposed by Lopez et al	16
Fig. 2.6 Vector used for primary algorithm	17
Fig. 2.7 Vector used for secondary algorithm	17
Fig. 2.8 Vector used for optimization by Yang et al	17
Fig. 2.9 Flow chart of the algorithm by Yang et al	18
Fig. 3.1: Schematic system configurations	23
Fig. 3.2: Variation of battery cycle life (cycles to failure) with Depth of Discharge (DOD)	32
Fig. 4.1(a): Hourly variation of solar irradiation	38

Fig. 4.1(b): Hourly variation of wind speed for a period of one year	39
Fig. 4.2: Hourly variation of demand for a period of one week	39
Fig. 4.3: Basic flow of the Dispatch Strategy	42
Fig. 5.1 Schematic representation main components in the optimization	44
Fig. 5.2 Main steps of GA	45
Fig. 5.3 Concept of Pareto dominance	46
Fig. 5.4: Vector representing Decision Space variables	51
Fig. 5.5: Flow chart of algorithm	52
Fig. 6.1(a) Pareto fronts of the optimization with 10% unmet fraction	54
Fig. 6.1 (b) Pareto fronts of the optimization with 5% unmet fraction	54
Fig. 6.1 (c) Pareto fronts of the optimization with 0% unmet fraction	55
Fig. 6.2 (a) Contour plots of the Pareto members with 10% unmet fraction	56
Fig. 6.2 (b) Contour plots of the Pareto members with 5% unmet fraction	56
Fig. 6.2(c) Contour plots of the Pareto members with 0% unmet fraction	57
Fig. 6.3 Sensitivity of unmet load fraction to the fuel consumption- ICC Pareto front	58
Fig. 6.4(a) Sensitivity of fuel cost on LEC-ICC Pareto front (with 2% unmet load fraction)	58
Fig. 6.4(b) Sensitivity of renewable energy component cost on LEC-ICC Pareto front (with 2% unmet load fraction)	59
Fig. 6.5. Schematic representation of the two expansions	60

Fig. 6.6(a). Pareto front of Case A	60
Fig. 6.6(b). Pareto front of Case B	61
Fig. 6.7. Variation of unmet load fraction for different WTCs in Case A	62
Fig. 6.8. Variation of unmet load fraction and LEC for Case A systems with 20kW WTC	62
Fig. 6.9 impact of WTC on REC	63
Fig. 6.10. Impact of WTC on fuel consumption in Case A	64
Fig. 6.11. Impact of WTC on fuel consumption in Case B	64
Fig. 7.1 Complete designing process from modeling to MCDM	66
Fig. 7.2. Comparison of Level Diagrams for Case 1-Case 3	74
Fig. 7.3 Comparison of Level Diagrams for Case 1 and Case 2	75



University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka
Electronic Theses & Dissertations
www.lib.mrt.ac.lk

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Combined dispatch strategy	8
--	---

Table 2.2 Decision Space variables	12
Table 2.3 Range of the parameters selected for the optimization	13
Table 2.4 Comparison of homer and novel method based on enumerative technique	13
Table 3.1 Parameters for the efficiency model for different solar modules	27
Table 3.2: Basic parameters of cost model.....	35
Table 3.3: Acquisition cost of components	36
Table 3.4: Average emission rates of various exhaust gases under different generator load conditions.....	36
Table 3.5 Equivalent carbon dioxide values for various exhaust gases	37
Table 5.1 Range of decision space variables.....	51
Table 6.1 Configurations having minimum LEC, ICC, and fuel consumption.....	56
Table 7.1. Minimum and maximum objective function values used to normalize ...	69
Table 7.2: Linguistic rating and weights assigned	69
Table 7.3: Weight matrix for three cases.....	72
Table 7.4: Top six alternatives for the weight matrix of Case 1	73
Table 7.5: Top six alternatives for the weight matrix of Case 2	73
Table 7.6: Top six alternatives for the weight matrix of Case 2	74