A Physical-Flow-Based Approach to Allocating Transmission Losses in a Transaction Framework

George Gross, *Fellow, IEEE,* and Shu Tao

Abstract—A physical-flow-based approach to allocating transmission losses in a multiple-transaction system is presented. The allocation scheme is developed using a framework in which the transactions are explicitly represented. The proposed scheme is based on expressing losses explicitly in terms of all the transactions in the system. An important property of the allocation scheme is its effective capability to deal with counter flows that result in the presence of specific transactions. Extensive numerical testing indicates that the allocation scheme produces loss allocations that are appropriate and that behave in a physically reasonable manner. Test results on several systems are presented.

Index Terms—Transmission losses, transactions, transmission and ancillary services, unbundling, dominant flow and counter flow.

I. INTRODUCTION

THE open access transmission regime is spearheading the rapid disintegration of the well-entrenched vertically integrated structure of the electric power industry. The entry of a large number of new players and the unbundling of electricity services have pushed the industry toward the widespread use of transactions to meet customer demands. The proliferation of transactions results in the use of the existing transmission systems for purposes very different from those for which they were originally planned. These changes are bringing about the establishment of an independent transmission system operator. Such a function is provided by the National Grid Company in the England and Wales electricity supply industry or the various Independent System Operators already set up (ERCOT, California, PJM) or in formation (Midwest, NYPP, INDEGO). A key function of an independent transmission system operator is the provision of the necessary ancillary services and their allocations among the transactions in the system. Compensation for transmission losses, while not on the FERC list in its Order 888, is one such essential ancillary service. The focus of this paper is the allocation of transmission losses to the various transactions using the system.

Transmission losses represent a nontrivial cost element under the vertically integrated structure of the past. However, the limited number of third party transactions did not make loss allocation a major issue. One industry study's estimate of losses was that they represent about 4% of the total MWh generated [1]. Typically, losses were treated as an additional load in the system. Various approaches to evaluate and compensate for losses have been developed. A good survey of the schemes proposed can

be found in [2]. As the industry is moving toward a transaction-based paradigm in a competitive environment, the importance of loss allocation is critical since transacting entities need *a priori* information to evaluate impacts of various transactions under consideration. Hence, the need to allocate the total system losses on an equitable and transparent basis is critical in order to facilitate a smoothly operating competitive electricity market place. While the total losses in the system may be evaluated with desired precision once the system state is known, the allocation of losses to each transaction on the system is far from trivial. In principle, the line flows, in the presence of multiple transactions, are measurable; however, the association of flow with each particular transaction involves a good degree of arbitrariness taking into account notions of marginality and the incremental nature of flows. Moreover, in the mathematical expression for the $|I|^2 R$ losses, the total system losses are a nonseparable function of all the transactions. As such, there is not a physically meaningful measurement scheme or a theoretically based evaluation methodology to determine the losses caused by each particular transaction.

Under various assumptions and approximations, several allocation schemes have been proposed. Kirschen et al. [3] introduce a basic assumption of proportionality which they use in a proposed scheme to determine the proportion of the active power flow in a transmission line contributed by each generator. They use this proportion of line use to evaluate the losses allocated to each generator. By making a similar proportionality assumption, another topology-based allocation scheme is developed by Bialek [4]. Both methods determine the share rather than the impact of a particular generator on each line flow, using assumptions that "can be neither proved nor disproved" [3]. A comparison of topology- and circuit-theory-based methods is given in [5]. These loss allocation schemes are not developed for a system with transactions since the objective is to allocate the losses to each generator. In a similar vein, the model and methodology proposed by the California ISO [6] uses a *generator meter multiplier* based on a penalty factor calculation for each generation bus. Wu and Varaiya in [7] develop a quadratic Taylor expansion of losses in terms of transactions at a given operating point. None of the schemes cited considers the possibility of negative loss allocation arising in the presence of the so-called counter flows. The objective of this paper is to develop a loss allocation mechanism for a network with multiple simultaneously occurring transactions and to effectively deal with the issue of losses associated with counter flows.

We first develop a framework for the explicit consideration of the transactions in the system. This is a far simpler construct than the structure of the system in [8]. We formulate the power

flows explicitly in terms of the amounts of transactions in the system. Through the use of assumptions of the D.C. power flow, we develop a physical-flow-based allocation expression for each transaction and also one for the total system losses. Using sensitivity information and equity considerations, we develop a scheme that allocates losses in an appropriate way that is physically reasonable. The scheme deals effectively with counter flows resulting when certain transactions are in effect. This is borne out by the extensive testing that was performed with the proposed scheme.

The formulation of a transaction-based framework is given in the next section. Sections III presents the allocation scheme and its physical interpretation. Test results of implementation on various physical systems including the IEEE 57-, 118- and 300-bus systems are presented in Section IV. In the concluding section, we discuss directions for future work. There is an Appendix presenting some details on sensitivity information used in the development of the allocation scheme.

II. TRANSACTION FRAMEWORK FORMULATION

In this section, we formulate a framework that recasts the power flow problem in a transaction-based framework. We consider a system with $N + 1$ buses in which each load acts as a buyer to get its demands met through transactions with one or more sellers. Similarly, each generator acts as a seller and undertakes transactions with one or more buyers. Let M denote the number of system transactions. A so-called bilateral transaction is characterized by specifying the seller, the buyer and the amount of real power. We define a bilateral transaction as a set of selling buses (generators) supplying a specified amount of real power to a set of buying buses (loads). Formally, we define a transaction m by

$$\boldsymbol{T}^{(m)} = \{t^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{S}^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{B}^{(m)}\} \tag{1}$$

The elements of this triplet are $t^{(m)}$, the transaction amount in MW and $\boldsymbol{S}^{(m)}(\boldsymbol{B}^{(m)})$, the selling (buying) entities, where, $\boldsymbol{S}^{(m)}$ is the collection of 2-tuples of selling entities

$$\boldsymbol{S}^{(m)} = \left\{ (s_i^{(m)}, \sigma_i^{(m)}), i = 1, 2, \cdots N_s^{(m)} \right\} \tag{2}$$

with the selling bus $s_i^{(m)}$ supplying $\sigma_i^{(m)} t^{(m)}$MW of the transaction amount. The fraction $\sigma_i^{(m)}$ must satisfy the conditions $\sum_{i=1}^{N_s^{(m)}} \sigma_i^{(m)} = 1$ and $\sigma_i^{(m)} \in [0, 1], i = 1, 2, \cdots N_s^{(m)}$. Similarly, $\boldsymbol{B}^{(m)}$ is the collection of 2-tuples of buying entities

$$\boldsymbol{B}^{(m)} = \left\{ (b_i^{(m)}, \beta_j^{(m)}), j = 1, 2, \cdots N_b^{(m)} \right\} \tag{3}$$

where, the buying bus $b_j^{(m)}$ receives $\beta_j^{(m)} t^{(m)}$MW of the transaction amount. The fraction $\beta_j^{(m)}$ must satisfy the conditions $\sum_{j=1}^{N_b^{(m)}} \beta_j^{(m)} = 1$ and $\beta_j^{(m)} \in [0, 1], j = 1, 2, \cdots N_b^{(m)}$. In our definition of a bilateral transaction m, $t^{(m)}$MW is injected at the $N_s^{(m)}$ selling buses and $t^{(m)}$MW is withdrawn at the $N_b^{(m)}$ buying buses. We assume that the losses associated with each transaction are compensated at the system designated

slack bus.[1] In our framework, since all load demands are met through transactions, the total system losses are caused entirely by the M transactions. Bus 0 is designated as the slack bus.

For each transaction m, we construct an injection vector $\underline{p}^{(m)}$ with components

$$p_n^{(m)} = \delta_n^{(m)} t^{(m)}, n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots N. \tag{4}$$

where, the components of $\underline{\delta}^{(m)}$ are

$$\delta_n^{(m)} = \begin{cases} \sigma_i^{(m)} & \text{if } n = s_i^{(m)}, i = 1, 2 \cdots N_s^{(m)} \\ -\beta_j^{(m)} & \text{if } n = b_j^{(m)}, j = 1, 2, \cdots N_b^{(m)} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

Then, for the system, the net real power injections at bus $n = 1, 2, \cdots N$ is given by the N-dimensional vector $\underline{p}^{net}$ with

$$p_n^{net} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} p_n^{(m)} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \delta_n^{(m)} t^{(m)} \tag{6}$$

Note that in this formulation, while the slack bus 0 may be involved in transactions as a selling bus, $\underline{p}^{net}$ does not have a component at bus 0. In our transaction-based framework, the real power flow equations at each bus except bus 0 are stated explicitly in terms of $t^{(m)}, m = 1, 2, \cdots M$:

$$\sum_{m=1}^{M} \delta_n^{(m)} t^{(m)}$$
$$= V_n \sum_{k \in \mathcal{H}_n} V_k [G_{nk} \cos(\theta_n - \theta_k) + B_{nk} \sin(\theta_n - \theta_k)]$$
$$+ G_{nn} V_n^2, n = 1, 2, \cdots N \tag{7}$$

where, θ_n and V_n are the angle and voltage magnitude at bus $n, n = 1, 2, \cdots N$. At the slack bus 0, θ_0 and V_0 are set to their specified value. $\mathcal{H}_n$ is the set of buses that are directly connected to bus $n, n = 1, 2, \cdots N$ and $\underline{G} + j\underline{B}$ is the bus admittance matrix with elements $G_{ij} + B_{ij}$. The equations specifying the reactive flows remain unchanged in this framework. Under our convention, there is no need for area control since, by definition, the net physical flow on the tie lines is equal to the net interchange specified for the inter-area transactions in effect.

Special Case: The definition of the bilateral transaction reduces to a simple node pair transaction when the transaction is between a single selling bus and a single buying bus. Then, for transaction m, $\boldsymbol{S}^{(m)} = \{s^{(m)}, 1\}$ and $\boldsymbol{B}^{(m)} = \{b^{(m)}, 1\}$, and Eq. (1) is written more simply as

$$\boldsymbol{T}^{(m)} = \{t^{(m)}, s^{(m)}, b^{(m)}\} \tag{8}$$

It follows that the injection vector components $P_n^{(m)} = \delta_n^{(m)} t^{(m)}, n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots N$ are

$$\delta_n^{(m)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = s^{(m)} \\ -1 & \text{if } n = b^{(m)} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

[1]We may think of the independent transmission system operator as the entity that takes care of loss recovery and reimbursement from the transaction participants.

Whenever the seller and the buyer are at the same bus, i.e., $s^{(m)} = b^{(m)}$ the injection vector $\underline{p}^{net} = \underline{0}$. Such a transaction is assumed to cause 0 losses.

III. LOSS ALLOCATION SCHEME

We assume that a transmission line between buses i and j is represented by its line impedance $R_{ij} + jX_{ij} = (G_{ij} + jB_{ij})^{-1}$. If we neglect all shunt elements, then the real power loss l_{ij} on a line connecting buses i and j is

$$l_{ij} = \frac{R_{ij}}{R_{ij}^2 + X_{ij}^2}[V_i^2 + V_j^2 - 2V_iV_j\cos(\theta_i - \theta_j)] \quad (10)$$

Note that $l_{ij} = l_{ji}$. The total system losses are given by

$$l = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{N}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{H}_i}\frac{R_{ij}}{R_{ij}^2 + X_{ij}^2}[V_i^2 + V_j^2 - 2V_iV_j\cos(\theta_i - \theta_j)] \quad (11)$$

where, the division by 2 is introduced so as not to count the losses on each line twice. We next assume the D.C. power flow conditions hold:

   (1) Reactive power flows maintain bus voltage magnitude close to 1.0 in p.u., i.e., $V_n \approx 1.0$, $n = 1, 2, \cdots N$.
   (2) The bus voltage angle difference across any branch is very small so that $|\theta_i - \theta_j| \approx 0$

Then the total losses may be approximately represented by $\tilde{l}$, where,

$$\tilde{l} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{N}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{H}_i}\left\{\frac{R_{ij}}{R_{ij}^2 + X_{ij}^2}(\theta_i - \theta_j)(\theta_i - \theta_j)\right\} \quad (12)$$

Let us denote by $\hat{\underline{\theta}} = [\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\theta}_2, \cdots, \hat{\theta}_N]^T$ the voltage angle vector computed by the D.C. power flow and by $\hat{\underline{B}}$ the $N \times N$ submatrix of the $(N+1)$-node network susceptance matrix $\underline{B}$ [9]. Then,

$$\hat{\underline{B}}\hat{\underline{\theta}} = -\sum_{m=1}^{M}\underline{\delta}^{(m)}t^{(m)} \quad (13)$$

If $\underline{D} = [d_{ij}] = \hat{\underline{B}}^{-1}$, then,

$$\hat{\theta}_n = \sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{k=1}^{N}d_{nk}\delta_k^{(m)}t^{(m)}, \ n = 1, 2, \cdots N. \quad (14)$$

Since bus 0 is chosen as the slack bus, the value of θ_0 is specified and without any loss of generality we may assume $\theta_0 = 0$. Let us rewrite Eq. (14) as

$$\hat{\theta}_n = \sum_{m=1}^{M}\mu_n^{(m)}t^{(m)}, \ n = 1, 2, \cdots N. \quad (15)$$

where, we define for $n = 1, 2, \cdots N$,

$$\mu_n^{(m)} = \sum_{k=1}^{N}d_{nk}\delta_k^{(m)} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_s^{(m)}}d_{is_i^{(m)}}\sigma_i^{(m)} - \sum_{j=1}^{N_b^{(m)}}d_{jb_j^{(m)}}\sigma_j^{(m)} \quad (16)$$

For completeness, we define $\mu_0^{(m)} = 0, m = 1, 2, \cdots M$, $d_{n0} = 0, n = 1, 2, \cdots N$. We can, then, write

$$\hat{\theta}_i - \hat{\theta}_j = \sum_{m=1}^{M}\pi_{ij}^{(m)}t^{(m)}, \ i, j = 0, 1, 2, \cdots N, i \neq j. \quad (17)$$

with,

$$\pi_{ij}^{(m)} = \mu_i^{(m)} - \mu_j^{(m)}, m = 1, 2, \cdots M. \quad (18)$$

In order to express the approximation of the system losses explicitly in terms of the M transactions, we reformulate the approximation $\tilde{l}$ in Eq. (12) as

$$\tilde{l} \approx \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{N}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{H}_i}\left\{\frac{R_{ij}}{R_{ij}^2 + X_{ij}^2}(\theta_i - \theta_j)(\hat{\theta}_i - \hat{\theta}_j)\right\}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{N}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{H}_i}\left\{\frac{R_{ij}}{R_{ij}^2 + X_{ij}^2}(\theta_i - \theta_j)\sum_{m=1}^{M}\pi_{ij}^{(m)}t^{(m)}\right\}$$
$$= \sum_{m=1}^{M}\left\{\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{N}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{H}_i}\frac{R_{ij}}{R_{ij}^2 + X_{ij}^2}(\theta_i - \theta_j)\sum_{m=1}^{M}\pi_{ij}^{(m)}\right\}t^{(m)} \quad (19)$$

If we define for $m = 1, 2, \cdots M$,

$$\lambda^{(m)} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{N}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{H}_i}\left\{\frac{R_{ij}}{R_{ij}^2 + X_{ij}^2}(\theta_i - \theta_j)\pi_{ij}^{(m)}\right\} \quad (20)$$

then, $\tilde{l}$ is explicitly written in terms of $t^{(m)}$ as

$$\hat{l} = \sum_{m=1}^{M}\lambda^{(m)}t^{(m)} \quad (21)$$

Using the analogous development above with the assumption that the D.C. conditions (1) and (2) hold, we may approximate $\lambda_{(m)}$ by a linear function of $\hat{\underline{\theta}}$ as

$$\lambda^{(m)} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{N}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{H}_i}\frac{R_{ij}}{R_{ij}^2 + X_{ij}^2}(\hat{\theta}_i - \hat{\theta}_j)\pi_{ij}^{(m)} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{m=1}^{M}\gamma_k^{(m)}t^{(k)} \quad (22)$$

where,

$$\gamma_k^{(m)} = \sum_{i=0}^{N}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{H}_i}\frac{R_{ij}}{R_{ij}^2 + X_{ij}^2}\pi_{ij}^{(m)}\pi_{ij}^{(k)} \quad (23)$$

It follows that under the D.C. conditions (1) and (2), the total loss may be approximated by a quadratic function of $t^{(k)}$, $k = 1, 2 \cdots M$. Moreover, under these conditions, the sensitivity of the system losses with respect to a transaction $t^{(m)}$, i.e., $\frac{\partial\hat{l}}{\partial t^{(m)}}$ may be approximated by a linear function of all transactions $t^{(k)}$, $k = 1, 2, \cdots M$. This issue is discussed in more detail in the Appendix.

We return to the expression for $\hat{l}$ in Eq. (21). Let

$$\hat{l}_a^{(m)} = \lambda^{(m)}t^{(m)}, m = 1, 2, \cdots M. \quad (24)$$

so that

$$\hat{l} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \hat{l}_a^{(m)} \qquad (25)$$

and we may interpret $\hat{l}_a^{(m)}$ to be an expression for the "contribution"[2] made by transaction m to the total system losses. In certain cases, however, $\lambda^{(m)}$ may be negative so that one may conclude that transaction m has a negative loss allocation. Such a conclusion would imply, however, that by using the transmission network, transaction m may in effect "injects" additional power into the system. This implication is, of course, physically incorrect and the allocation scheme must address this issue.

Physically, whether a particular transaction increases or lowers the system losses depends on the system state and the impact of the particular transaction on the system. Through the use of the D.C. power flow assumptions, we derive an approximation to the system losses as a linear expression of the transactions of the system. Some transactions cause flow in the same direction as the net flow, while others cause flow in the opposite direction. The flow in the same direction as the net flow is called a dominant flow, while the flow in the opposite direction is a counter flow. Dominant flows increase the total system losses, while counter flows lower the total system losses as the amount of the corresponding transaction is increased.

Absent the dominant flow, the counter flow cannot exist. If the dominant flow disappears, the counter flow itself becomes the dominant flow. The counter flow helps reduce the losses only in presence of the dominant flow. Thus, the reduction in the system losses is not due to a particular transaction but is an attribute of the system state. As such it should be shared by all the transactions on the system.

Therefore, we modify the loss allocation by replacing $\lambda^{(m)}$ by its absolute value of $\left| \lambda^{(m)} \right|$. However, this modification would lead to allocating more losses than are actually incurred. Consequently, we allow all transactions to benefit from the "negative" losses and will normalize the allocations to ensure that the sum of the allocated losses equals $\hat{l}$. Thus, the loss allocated to transaction m is:

$$l_a^{(m)} = \frac{\left| \lambda^{(m)} \right| t^{(m)}}{\sum_{k=1}^{M} \left| \lambda^{(k)} \right| t^{(k)}} \hat{l} \qquad (26)$$

Consequently, a positive loss is associated with each transaction. Additional motivation for the normalization in the allocation formula is given in the Appendix. This motivation is based on sensitivity information.

An attractive property of the allocation scheme is that the allocation may be evaluated for any subset of the transactions.

[2]The expression for $\hat{l}_a^{(m)}$ may be given a straightforward physical interpretation. The $|I|^2 R$ losses in a line joining buses i and j due to the line current resulting from transaction m is $V_{R_{ij}} I_{ij}^{(m)} \approx \frac{R_{ij}}{X_{ij}} (\theta_i - \theta_j) \frac{\pi_{ij}^{(m)} t^{(m)}}{X_{ij}} \triangleq \hat{l}_{a,ij}^{(m)}$. Here, $V_{R_{ij}}$ is the voltage drop across R_{ij} that results from all the flows due to all the M transactions in the system and $I_{ij}^{(m)}$ is the current flowing between buses i and j as a result of transaction m. Since $V_{R_{ij}}$ and $I_{ij}^{(m)}$ can have different signs, $\hat{l}_{a,ij}^{(m)}$ may be negative. It follows that $\hat{l}_a^{(m)}$, the algebraic sum of all line losses due to transaction m, may also be negative.


Fig. 1. Comparison of the total system losses computed by A.C. power flow and the approximation formula in Eq. (19).


Fig. 2. Loss allocation with no counter flow.

$\lambda^{(m)}$ is evaluated using Eq. (24) for each transaction m in the specified subset. For the unspecified transactions, an equivalent transaction representing the effect of all the unspecified transactions is constructed. Its corresponding $t^{(eq)}$ term is determined by subtracting from the total system load the sum of the specified transactions. Its $\lambda^{(eq)}$ term is evaluated by subtracting from $\hat{l}$ the sum of the loss allocations to the specified transactions. The allocation scheme allows the computation of the allocation for as few transactions as desired without requiring information on all the unspecified transactions. An application of this useful property is discussed below.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We have tested the proposed loss allocation scheme extensively on a number of different systems including the IEEE 57-, 118-, 300-bus systems. Our numerical work indicates that the scheme is not only effective in providing an allocation of the losses and but also that the allocation behaves in a physically meaningful and appropriate manner in all cases studied.

To start with, we investigated the overall performance of the estimate given by the approximation formula in Eq. (19) of the total system losses under different operating conditions. For each system, we use the generation/load data of the system to specify the base case for the transactions. We vary uniformly and simultaneously the amount of each transaction using a scaling factor $0.75 \leq \eta \leq 1.25$, where, $\eta = 1$ corresponds to the

TABLE I
TRANSACTION PROFILE AND ALLOCATION RESULTS IN MW

m	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
$t^{(m)}$	2130	1850	2271	1142	1973	1000	623	1200	983	925	4935	3353	862
$\hat{l}_a^{(m)}$	10.69	43.72	121.62	2.74	89.75	-49.15	7.35	90.38	62.11	17.25	-111.10	57.93	23.38
$l_a^{(m)}$	5.70	23.33	64.89	1.46	47.89	26.23	3.92	48.23	33.14	9.20	59.28	30.91	12.47

base case. The performance of the $\hat{l}$ approximation on the IEEE 118-bus system is shown in Fig. 1. For the selected range of η, the error magnitude of the approximation is under 16%. It is interesting to note that in this range of η, the total system losses l may be approximated by a linear function of the total volume of the transactions. The approximation $\hat{l}$ tracks closely l over the range. Such close tracking was observed in all cases studied for the various systems.

We first illustrate how the allocation scheme evaluates losses associated with specified transactions. We give as an example the IEEE 57-bus system with four specified transactions. We consider the case where no counter flow results from the four specified transactions in the system. The allocation mechanism produces allocations that behave in a physically meaningful way. As the amount of each transaction increases with all other transactions remaining fixed, the corresponding loss allocation also increases. Fig. 2 provides a plot of the behavior of the total system losses approximation and the loss allocation as a function of the amount of one of the four transactions. The amount of transaction 3 is varied around its base case value within the range of ±25% of the base case value. The base case corresponds to the value 0. The result shown in Fig. 2 is representative of the behavior of the allocation mechanism on systems where transactions produce no counter flows.

We next illustrate the capability of the allocation scheme to evaluate losses associated with transactions in the presence of counter flow. Consider the IEEE 300-bus system that has been partitioned into six areas with thirteen specified transactions. Each area has its own generation and loads and represents an entity that may undertake transactions with one or more other areas. Each transaction may involve multiple generation sources and multiple load centers. Table I summarizes the transaction profiles and the loss allocation results. The total amount of the thirteen transactions is 23 247MW. The total system losses evaluated by A.C. power flow are 411MW, and the approximation $\hat{l}$ gives a value of 367MW.

We focus on transactions 8 and 6 to illustrate the allocation mechanism when a particular transaction results in counter flow. The amount of transaction 8 is changed around its base value with all the other transactions being kept fixed. We investigate the impact on the total system losses. Fig. 3a shows that as the amount of transaction 8 increases, the total system losses also increase. The same is true for $l_a^{(8)}$, the losses allocated to transaction 8. If, on the other hand, we vary the amount of transaction 6 as all other transactions are kept fixed, we obtain the


Fig. 3. Variation of the total system losses and loss allocation as a function of the transaction amount.

plots in Fig. 3b. These plots show that both the system losses and $l_a^{(6)}$, the losses allocated to transaction 6, actually decrease as the amount of transaction 6 increases. The results indicate that transaction 8 produces a dominant flow while transaction 6 results in a counter flow. The plots in Fig. 3 show that while the total system losses move in the opposite direction as the amounts of transactions 6 and 8 increase, the losses allocated to each transaction capture appropriately the impacts of the transactions on the system. In both cases, the scheme gives a physically reasonable loss allocation.

Moreover, let us consider the case when transaction 8 is canceled. With the absence of transaction 8, we vary the amount of transaction 6. Fig. 4 shows that in the absence of the dominant flow created by transaction 8, the previous counter flow caused by transaction 6 becomes a dominant flow. Correspondingly, the system losses increase as transaction 6 increases The allocation

Fig. 4. Plots of the total system losses and loss allocation as a function of the amount of transaction 6.

scheme once again captures the appropriate movement of the system losses as a function of the amount of the transaction and gives an appropriate loss allocation to transaction 6.

Finally, we discuss the property of the allocation scheme that allows the evaluation of loss allocation for a specific subset of transactions. Suppose that in the example of the IEEE 300-bus system discussed above, we are interested in the evaluation of loss allocation for the transactions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. The use of Eq. (19) and (24) provides the identical results to those in Table I without the use of information on the unspecified transactions.

V. Conclusion

The issue of allocating losses in a multiple-transaction network is of concern as the number of transactions is steadily escalating. Given that there is a good degree of arbitrariness in the evaluation and measurement of losses and, consequently, in their allocation, the need is critical for an effective scheme for reasonably allocating losses that is acceptable to the players in the competitive marketplace. his paper has presented a scheme that uses physical flows to allocate losses to all the transactions in a system. The scheme provides allocations that are appropriate and behave in a physically reasonable manner and produce *a priori* information to enable transacting entities to undertake various transactions. The scheme is particularly effective in dealing with the situation of counter flows.

There are several extensions of the work presented here. A natural question to address is the issue of direct compensation by each transaction for the allocated losses. Rather than using the centrally managed loss compensation service of the independent grid operator, each transaction may be able to inject additional generation at a designated bus. On a more general basis, the development of allocation mechanisms for other ancillary services is a topic of active interest. The adaptation and extension of the transaction framework presented here to other network based ancillary services such as reactive power and voltage control is one specific area. Allocation of the reactive power services remains a major challenge.

Appendix
Sensitivity Information

The loss allocation formula of Eq. (24) uses the absolute values of $\lambda^{(m)}$ defined in Eq. (20) so as to assign nonnegative

TABLE II
THE SENSITIVITY RESULTS FOR TRANSACTION 6 AND 8

m	$\gamma_m^{(m)} t^{(m)}$	$\sum_{k \neq m} \gamma_k^{(m)} t^{(k)}$
6	0.1643	-0.2206
8	0.3081	-0.2217

losses to all transactions. This appendix provides additional motivation for associating nonnegative losses with each transaction.

We examine the sensitivity information in the unnormalized allocation $\hat{l}_a^{(m)}$ of Eq. (22). From Eq. (23) it follows that $\gamma_m^{(m)} \geq 0$. However, $\gamma_k^{(m)}$ may be either positive or negative for $k \neq m$. Consider the evaluation of the change $\Delta \hat{l}$ in the total system losses corresponding to a change $\Delta t^{(m)}$ in the value of transaction m with the values of all other transactions $k \neq m$ remaining unchanged. Using a first order approximation

$$\Delta \hat{l} \approx \frac{\partial \hat{l}}{\partial t^{(m)}} \Delta t^{(m)} = \left[\gamma_m^{(m)} t^{(m)} + \sum_{k \neq m} \gamma_k^{(m)} t^{(k)} \right] \Delta t^{(m)} \tag{27}$$

We interpret the expression for the sensitivity of $\hat{l}$ to $t^{(m)}$ as the sum of two distinct terms: a "self contribution" $\gamma_m^{(m)} t^{(m)}$ and a "contribution" of all the other transactions. The first term is only dependent on transaction m and is always nonnegative. In fact, if $t^{(k)} = 0$ for all $k \neq m$, the total system losses increase as $t^{(m)}$ increases. However, if any $k \neq m$, $t^{(k)} \neq 0$, the change in the total system losses due to $\Delta t^{(m)}$ may be nonpositive. The magnitude of the second term may be greater or equal or lesser than, that of the first term. It is not possible to analytically determine the relative contribution of the two terms. However, good insight may be obtained from numerical studies.

We studied the sensitivity for the various systems discussed in Section IV. We examine the results obtained on the IEEE 300-bus system for the case with the transaction profile given in Table I. The terms corresponding to transactions 6 and 8 are given in Table II. As discussed in Section IV, transaction 8 corresponds to the dominant flow with transaction 6 being the counter flow. As Table II shows, for the dominant flow the "self contribution" term outweighs the negative contribution of the other transactions. However, for the counter flow situation of transaction 6, the opposite is the case. For transaction 6, the term representing the effect of all other transactions is negative with magnitude greater than that of the "self contribution" term. Note that the negative value of sensitivity, however, is not due to the transaction itself, but to its interaction with all the other transactions. This situation for transaction 6 is true in general, whenever a counter flow arises in a network. It is not appropriate to associate "negative" losses with a counter flow producing transaction. Rather, the decrease in the losses is due to the impact of all the other transactions in the system. Consequently, the re-

duction in the total system losses should be shared equitably by all the transactions. Hence we have the motivation for the normalized allocation used in Eq. (24).

REFERENCES

[1] R. Nadira *et al.*, "Bulk Transmission System Loss Analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 405–417, May 1993.
[2] ——, "Bulk Transmission System Loss Analysis," EPRI Report, EL-6814, May 1990.
[3] D. Kirschen, R. Allan, and G. Strbac, "Contributions of Individual Generators to Loads and Flow," *IEEE Transactions Power Systems*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 52–60, February 1997.
[4] J. Bialek, "Topological Generation and Load Distribution Factors for Supplement Charge Allocation in Transmission Open Access," *IEEE Transaction on Power Systems*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 1185–1194, August 1997.
[5] R. Shoults and L. D. Swift, "Methods for Evaluating Flows Attributable to Each Generator," in *Proceedings of the Workshop on Available Transfer Capability*, G. Gross, Ed., 1997, pp. 166–197.
[6] The Phase II Filing of the California Independent System Operator Corporation, March 31, 1997.
[7] F. F. Wu and P. Varaiya, "Coordinated Multilateral Trades for Electric Power Networks: Theory and Implementation," Power Report PWP-031, June 1995.
[8] J. W. M. Cheng, F. D. Galiana, and D. T. McGillis, "Studies Of Bilateral Contracts With Respect To Steady-State Security In A Deregulated Environment," in *Proceedings of the 20th PICA*, May 11–16, 1997, pp. 31–36.
[9] A. J. Wood and B. F. Wollenberg, *Power Generation Operation & Control*: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 1984, pp. 75–77.

George Gross (F'88) is the Grainger Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering and Professor, Institute of Government and Public Affairs, at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. His current research and teaching activities are in the areas of power system analysis, planning, economics and operations, utility regulatory policy and industry restructuring. His undergraduate work was completed at McGill University, and he earned his graduate degrees from the University of California, Berkeley. He was previously employed with Pacific Gas and Electric Company.

Shu Tao received his B.S. and M.S. degrees from Tsinghua University, China, in 1992 and 1995 respectively, both in Electrical Engineering. Since August, 1995, he has been a Ph.D. student and a research assistant at University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. His research interests are power systems operation and control, optimization and economics.