

An Evolutionary Computation Solution to Transformer Design Optimization Problem

P. S. Georgilakis¹, J. C. Olivares², M. S. Esparza-Gonzalez³

¹School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, National Technical University of Athens (NTUA), Athens, Greece

²Departamento de Energía, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Azcapotzalco, México

³Department of Electrical Engineering, Instituto Tecnológico de Aguascalientes, Aguascalientes, Mexico

Phone (52)(55)-5318-9584 Fax (52)(55)-5394-7378 E-mail: jolivare_1999@yahoo.com

Abstract — The transformer design optimization (TDO) is a complex constrained mixed-integer non-linear programming problem with discontinuous objective function. This paper proposes an innovative method combining genetic algorithm (GA) and finite element method (FEM) for the solution of TDO problem. The main contributions of the proposed method are: (i) introduction of an innovative recursive GA with a novel external elitism strategy associated with variable crossover and mutation rates resulting in an improved GA, (ii) adoption of two particular finite element models of increased accuracy and high computational speed for the validation of the optimal design by computing the no-load loss and impedance, and (iii) combination of the innovative recursive GA with the two particular finite element models resulting in a proposed GA-FEM model that finds the global optimum, as concluded after several tests on actual transformer designs, while other existing methods provided suboptimal solutions that are 3.1% to 5.8% more expensive than the optimal solution.

Keywords — Transformer design optimization (TDO), evolutionary computation, genetic algorithm (GA), finite element method (FEM), optimization.

I. INTRODUCTION

The aim of transformer design is to optimize an objective function subject to constraints imposed by international standards and transformer specifications. In the bibliography of transformer design, several objective functions are optimized [1], [2]:

1. Minimization of transformer manufacturing cost [3], [4].
2. Minimization of total owning cost [5], [6].
3. Minimization of transformer active part cost [7], [8].
4. Minimization of active part mass [9].
5. Maximization of transformer apparent power [9], [10].

Among the above-mentioned objective functions, the most commonly used functions are [1]:

1. The transformer manufacturing cost, i.e., the sum of materials cost plus the labor cost. This objective function is mainly used when designing transformers for industrial and commercial users,

since most of these users do not evaluate losses when they purchase transformers [11]. One of the challenges of this objective function is that the transformer manufacturing cost depends on the cost of materials (copper, aluminum, steel, etc) that are stock exchange commodities with fluctuating prices on the world market.

2. The transformer total owning cost, i.e., the sum of transformer purchase cost plus the cost of transformer losses. This objective function is mainly used when designing transformers for electric utilities, since utilities usually evaluate the cost of transformer losses when they purchase transformers [11], [12].

The transformer design requires knowledge of electromagnetism, magnetic circuit analysis, electric circuit analysis, loss mechanisms, and heat transfer. The transformer design problem, because of its importance and complexity, has attracted the interest of many researchers [1]-[10]. There are two different methodologies for the solution of transformer design problem: a) the multiple design method and b) the mathematical programming method. The multiple design method, [4], [5], is a heuristic technique that assigns many alternative values to the design variables so as to generate a large number of alternative designs and finally to select the design that satisfies all the problem constraints with the optimum value of the objective function; however, this technique is not able to find the global optimum. The geometric programming method is the most representative mathematical programming method for the solution of transformer design problem [9], however, it has two drawbacks: (i) it requires the development of the mathematical model for each specific transformer type and configuration in advance, and (ii) because of the large number of coefficients in polynomial approximations, the geometric programming method is lacking flexibility and can not be easily combined with more general transformer performance verification or cost estimation algorithms. Recently, another mathematical programming method, more specifically a parallel mixed integer programming-finite element method (MIP-FEM) technique [8] has been proposed performing better than the heuristic method [4], however, MIP-FEM is very sensitive to the selection of the

value range of design variables, so MIP-FEM often fails to find the global optimum.

This paper proposes a new power transformer design methodology based on a novel recursive genetic algorithm-finite element method (GA-FEM) technique. The proposed method successfully combines the optimization capabilities of an improved genetic algorithm as well as the accuracy and the computational speed of two particular finite element models that are adopted for the validation of the optimal design by computing the no-load loss and impedance. The five main contributions and features of the proposed improved genetic algorithm (GA) are: i) introduction of an innovative recursive GA with a novel external elitism strategy assuring that the solution at a current GA run is better or at least the same with the solution at the previous GA run, ii) incorporation of an internal elitism strategy assuring the copy of the best solution to the next GA generation, iii) incorporation of the optimal solution provided by MIP-FEM method [8] into the initial population of the initial GA run, which in combination with the external and internal elitism strategies assures that the proposed GA-FEM will converge to a better or at least the same solution with the MIP-FEM method, iv) adoption of variable crossover and mutation rates resulting in improved GA search, and v) optimal configuration for the parameters of the improved GA. In this paper, the minimization of transformer manufacturing cost has been considered as transformer design objective, however, the proposed recursive GA-FEM method can be also applied for all other transformer design objective functions, e.g., the minimization of transformer total owning cost. Application results confirm that the proposed GA-FEM technique finds the global optimum solution to transformer design problem in very short time, while two other methods find suboptimal solutions.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

The objective of transformer design optimization (TDO) problem is to design the transformer so as to minimize the transformer manufacturing cost, i.e., the sum of materials cost plus labor cost, subject to constraints imposed by international standards and transformer user needs. These constraints are:

1. *Induced voltage constraint*: it expresses the relation between the induced voltage in the primary winding and the magnetic induction.
2. *Turns ratio constraint*: the turns ratio is equal to the voltage ratio.
3. *No-load loss (NLL) constraint*: the designed NLL must be equal or smaller than a maximum NLL.
4. *Load loss (LL) constraint*: the designed LL is required to be equal or smaller than a maximum LL.
5. *Total loss (i.e., NLL plus LL) constraint*: the designed total loss must be equal or smaller than a maximum total loss.
6. *Impedance constraint*: the designed impedance must be between a minimum and maximum impedance.
7. *Magnetic induction constraint*: the designed magnetic induction is required to be smaller than a saturation magnetic induction (1.85 T).
8. *Heat transfer constraint*: the total heat produced by the transformer total loss (i.e., NLL plus LL) must be equal or smaller than the total heat that can be carried away by the combined effects of conduction, convection, and radiation.
9. *Temperature rise constraint*: the transformer temperature rise (due to NLL and LL) must be equal or smaller than a maximum temperature rise.
10. *Efficiency constraint*: the transformer efficiency is required to be equal or greater than a minimum efficiency.
11. *No-load current constraint*: the transformer no-load current is required to be equal or smaller than a maximum no-load current.
12. *Voltage regulation constraint*: the transformer voltage regulation is required to be smaller than a maximum voltage regulation.
13. *Thickness of layer insulation constraint*: the thickness of layer insulation must withstand the induced voltage test and the impulse voltage test. More specifically: a) the induced voltage must be smaller than a maximum induced voltage that the insulation can withstand, and b) the impulse voltage must be smaller than a maximum impulse voltage that the insulation can withstand.
14. *Tank dimensions constraints*: a) the tank length must be equal or smaller than a maximum tank length, b) the tank width must be equal or smaller than a maximum tank width, and c) the tank height must be equal or smaller than a maximum tank height.

The detailed mathematical formulation of TDO can be found in Chapter 2 of [1]. Moreover, a design example of an actual commercial transformer is worked out throughout Chapter 2 of [1] showing all the calculations that are needed to design a transformer.

The TDO is a complex constrained mixed-integer non-linear programming problem. The TDO problem is further complicated by the fact that the objective function (i.e., the manufacturing cost) is discontinuous [5].

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Evolutionary Computation

Evolutionary computation techniques and particularly genetic algorithms (GAs) are computational-intelligence-based optimization methods. They are used in several scientific fields, mainly in hard, large-scale optimization problems, where other classical analytical optimization techniques may prove inadequate. In the power engineering area, such problems include operation optimization (unit commitment, economic dispatch, optimal power flow, optimal allocation of reactive resources), parameter estimation, etc.

B. Genetic Algorithm

Genetic algorithms (GAs) are powerful optimization methods inspired by natural genetics and biological evolution. Their main advantages are:

1. GAs explore several areas of the search space simultaneously, reducing the probability of being trapped in local optimum.
2. GAs do not require any prior knowledge, space limitations, or special properties of the function to be optimized, such as smoothness, convexity, unimodality, or existence of derivatives [16].

C. Finite Element Models

The finite element (FE) method is a powerful tool for the analysis and design of power transformers. In particular for the TDO problem of wound core type transformers, it is proposed to use two FE models, the first to compute the transformer no-load loss (NLL) and the second to evaluate the transformer impedance. In particular, a permeability tensor FE model is adopted for the computation of the NLL, since this model accurately represents the core material and the geometry of wound cores [13]. Moreover, an efficient FE model with detailed representation of winding geometry and cooling ducts is adopted for impedance evaluation [14]. Both FE models are based on a particular magnetic scalar potential formulation, [15], which is advantageous in terms of computational speed in comparison to FEM based on magnetic vector potential, as there is only one unknown at each node of the FE mesh. The accuracy and the computational speed are the main advantages of the above two FE models that make them ideal for the solution of the TDO problem.

D. Improved Genetic Algorithm for TDO

This paper introduces an improved GA for the solution of the TDO problem. This Section presents the contributions, features, and optimal parameter settings of the improved GA.

Since the GA is a stochastic optimization method, in general, it converges to different solution each time the GA is executed. That is why this paper proposes to implement a novel *recursive GA* approach, i.e., to run N times the GA and to introduce an *external elitism strategy* that copies the best solution found at the end of each GA run to the initial population of the next GA run. This innovative external elitism strategy assures that after the completion of each GA run, a solution is provided that is better or at least the same with the solution of the previous GA run. As will be shown later in this paper, after 7 to 10 GA runs, the global optimum is reached for the TDO problem.

An *internal elitism strategy* is also adopted, i.e., the best solution of every generation is copied to the next generation so that the possibility of its destruction through a genetic operator is eliminated.

The initial population of candidate solutions is created randomly. However, in the initial population of the initial GA run, the worst solution (i.e., the one with the maximum manufacturing cost) is substituted by the solution that is computed by the MIP-FEM method proposed in [8]. The incorporation of the MIP-FEM solution into the initial population of the initial GA run in combination with the external and internal elitism strategies assures that the proposed method will converge to a better or at least the same solution with MIP-FEM method.

In order to improve the GA search by assuring a good exploration at the beginning of evolution, and more and more exploitation capability while optimization goes on, *variable crossover and mutation rates* were tested. After enough experimentation, it was found that the best results were obtained with the following variable crossover and mutation probabilities:

$$P_{ck} = 0.35 + 0.45 \left[\frac{k-1}{N_g-1} \right] \quad (1)$$

$$P_{mk} = 0.055 - 0.045 \left[\frac{k-1}{N_g-1} \right] \quad (2)$$

where P_{ck} is the crossover probability at generation k , P_{mk} is the mutation probability at generation k , and N_g is the number of generations.

The first column of Table 1 presents the seven design variables that have been used for the solution of the TDO problem by the proposed GA. In Table 1 and throughout this paper, LV stands for low voltage and HV stands for high voltage. The fifth column of Table 1 shows that the first five design variables are of integer type, while the rest two design variables are of real type. The fourth column of Table 1 shows the range of possible values that each design variable can take. This range of possible values has been determined from a large database of actual transformer designs with the following main characteristics: three-phase, oil-immersed, wound core distribution transformers from 25 kVA up to 2000 kVA, with voltages up to 36 kV. Binary coding is used for chromosome representation. The last column of Table 1 presents the number of bits used for each design variable. As can be seen from the last row of Table 1, the GA chromosome has 61 bits.

After trial and error, it was found that a population size of 40 chromosomes and a number of 30 generations provide very good results for TDO.

Among the four different selection schemes tested, i.e., roulette wheel, tournament, deterministic sampling, and stochastic remainder sampling [16], the tournament selection scheme produced the best results and convergence for TDO.

TABLE I
DETERMINATION OF NUMBER OF BITS OF GA CHROMOSOME

Design variable	Symbol	Unit	Possible values	Type	Bits
Number of LV turns	x_1	-	$8 \leq x_1 \leq 1000$	Integer	10
Magnetic material type	x_2	-	$1 \leq x_2 \leq 12$	Integer	4
Magnetic induction	x_3	Gauss	$10000 \leq x_3 \leq 18500$	Integer	15
Width of core leg	x_4	mm	$80 \leq x_4 \leq 500$	Integer	9
Core window height	x_5	mm	$80 \leq x_5 \leq 500$	Integer	9
LV current density	x_6	A/mm ²	$1.5 \leq x_6 \leq 5.5$	Real	7
HV current density	x_7	A/mm ²	$1.5 \leq x_7 \leq 5.5$	Real	7
Number of bits of GA chromosome					61




Fig. 1. Flowchart of the proposed method for TDO problem.

E. Overview of the Proposed Method

The flowchart of the proposed optimization model for the solution of TDO problem, shown in Fig. 1, is composed of two submodels:

1. *MIP-FEM submodel*. Initially, a MIP-FEM deterministic optimization method, [8], is used to solve the TDO problem. Let S_0 be the solution provided by that method.
2. *Recursive GA-FEM submodel* (N GA-FEM runs). After the execution of MIP-FEM submodel, N runs of the proposed recursive GA-FEM submodel are executed. Each run of GA-FEM submodel requires two internal runs:
 - a. *GA run*. The recursive GA based optimization model is executed to solve the TDO problem. The solution S_0 provided by the MIP-FEM submodel is

included in the initial population of the initial GA run. In all the other GA runs, the best solution S_i provided by the previous GA-FEM run is included at the initial population of the next GA run. This approach assures that the solution S_i is better or at least the same with the solution S_{i-1} .

- b. *FEM run.* The two FE models are used for the computation of transformer NLL and impedance (unlike the analytical formulas used in the GA run) in order to provide more accurate results and better convergence to the optimal solution.

IV. RESULTS

A. Design of a 1600 kVA Transformer

The proposed GA-FEM method has been used for the solution of the TDO problem of an actual 1600 kVA transformer design with the following main specifications: rated frequency 50 Hz, rated HV 20 kV, rated LV 0.4 kV, prescribed NLL 1700 W, prescribed LL 20000 W, prescribed impedance 6%. The NLL, LL, and impedance tolerances are according to IEC 60076-1 international standard, i.e., the maximum NLL is 1955 W, the maximum LL is 23000 W, the maximum total loss is 23870 W, the minimum impedance is 5.4%, and the maximum impedance is 6.6%. Table 2 compares the results of the proposed method with a heuristic [4] and a MIP-FEM method [8]. As can be seen from Table 2, the three techniques converged to three different solutions. In particular, the proposed recursive GA-FEM method, after 7 GA-FEM runs that are implemented into 3.42 minutes, provides the best result, since it converges to the global minimum manufacturing cost (MC) of \$23271.

Fig. 2 compares the minimum manufacturing cost computed by the above three techniques for the solution of the 1600 kVA TDO problem. Since the heuristic and the MIP-FEM are both deterministic optimization techniques, they always converge to the same minimum MC, i.e., \$24814 for the heuristic and \$24446 for the MIP-FEM. On the other hand, the proposed recursive GA-FEM, because of its special design, manages to progressively reduce the MC, as the number of GA-FEM algorithm runs increases. In particular, after 7 GA-FEM runs, the global minimum MC is achieved, which is 4.8% cheaper than the MC computed by a MIP-FEM method [8] and 6.2% cheaper than the MC computed by a heuristic method [4]. As can be seen from Fig. 2, after the 7th GA-FEM run, the MC is not further decreased, which means that 7 GA-FEM runs are enough to obtain the global optimum solution to TDO problem.

TABLE II
COMPARISON OF PROPOSED GA-FEM METHOD WITH TWO EXISTING TRANSFORMER DESIGN METHODS FOR AN 1600 kVA TRANSFORMER

Parameter	Heuristic	MIP-FEM	GA-FEM
Number of LV turns	10	10	11
Magnetic material type	1 (i.e., HiB)	2 (i.e., M4)	1 (HiB)
Magnetic induction (Gauss)	16012	16991	18000
Width of core leg (mm)	290	322	325
Core window height (mm)	338	322	354
LV current density (A/mm ²)	4.3	4.6	4.3
HV current density (A/mm ²)	4.0	3.8	4.6
No-load loss (W)	1581	1952	1791
Load loss (W)	19035	18767	21151
Total loss (W)	20616	20719	22942
Impedance (%)	5.89	6.41	6.20
Manufacturing cost (\$)	24814	24446	23271
Number of algorithm runs	1	1	7
Total execution time (minutes)	0.45	0.79	3.42




Fig. 2. Comparative results for an 1600 kVA transformer design.

B. Generalization

The proposed GA-FEM method has been tested on 200 actual transformer designs, of 8 power ratings and various loss categories and voltage ratings. As can be seen from Table 3, the proposed GA-FEM method finds the global optimum solution that is, on average, a) 5.8% cheaper than the solution of a heuristic technique [4], and b) 3.1% cheaper than the solution of a MIP-FEM method [8].

TABLE III
COMPARISON OF AVERAGE MANUFACTURING COST SAVING (%) OF
PROPOSED GA-FEM VERSUS HEURISTIC [4] AND MIP-FEM [8]

Rated power (kVA)	Number of designs	Cost saving of Proposed versus Heuristic	Cost saving of Proposed versus MIP-FEM
100	25	5.3	1.8
160	25	4.9	2.6
250	25	8.0	4.4
400	25	6.5	3.0
630	25	6.0	2.8
800	25	5.9	2.0
1000	25	3.7	3.2
1600	25	6.3	4.9
Average		5.8	3.1

V. CONCLUSION

This paper has proposed an innovative recursive GA-FEM method for the solution of the complex constrained mixed-integer non-linear TDO problem. When tested on 200 actual transformer designs, the proposed GA-FEM technique converged to the global optimum, thus GA-FEM provides significant manufacturing cost savings ranging from 3.1% to 5.8%, in comparison with two deterministic optimization methods that converged to local optimum solutions. The proposed recursive GA approach can be also very useful for the solution of other optimization problems in electric machines and power systems.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. S. Georgilakis, *Spotlight on modern transformer design*. London, UK: Springer, 2009.
- [2] E. I. Amoiralis, M. A. Tsili, P. S. Georgilakis, "The state of the art in engineering methods for transformer design and optimization: a survey," *Journal of Optoelectronics and Advanced Materials*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 1149-1158, 2008.
- [3] P. H. Odessey, "Transformer design by computer," *IEEE Transactions on Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1-17, 1974.
- [4] P. S. Georgilakis, M. A. Tsili, A. T. Souflaris, "A heuristic solution to the transformer manufacturing cost optimization problem," *Journal of Materials Processing Technology*, vol. 181, no. 1-3, pp. 260-266, 2007.
- [5] O. W. Andersen, "Optimized design of electric power equipment," *IEEE Computer Applications in Power*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 11-15, 1991.
- [6] R. M. Del Vecchio, B. Poulin, P. T. Feghali, D. M. Shah, R. Ahuja, *Transformer design principles with applications to core-form power transformers*. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press, 2002.
- [7] A. Rubaai, "Computer aided instruction of power transformer design in the undergraduate power engineering class," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 1174-1181, 1994.
- [8] E. I. Amoiralis, M. A. Tsili, P. S. Georgilakis, A. G. Kladas, A. T. Souflaris, "A parallel mixed integer programming-finite element method technique for global design optimization of

- power transformers," *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 1022-1025, 2008.
- [9] R. A. Jabr, "Application of geometric programming to transformer design," *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics*, vol. 41, no. 11, pp. 4261-4269, 2005.
- [10] F. F. Judd, D. R. Kressler, "Design optimization of small low-frequency power transformers," *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 1058-1069, 1977.
- [11] B. W. Kennedy, *Energy efficient transformers*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1998.
- [12] SEEDT: 'Selecting energy efficient distribution transformers: a guide for achieving least-cost solutions', Report of European Commission Project No EIE/05/056/S12.419632, June 2008, <http://www.leonardo-energy.org/drupal/>, accessed June 2010.
- [13] T. D. Kefalas, P. S. Georgilakis, A. G. Kladas, A. T. Souflaris, D. G. Paparigas, "Multiple grade lamination wound core: a novel technique for transformer iron loss minimization using simulated annealing with restarts and an anisotropy model," *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 1082-1085, 2008.
- [14] M. A. Tsili, A. G. Kladas, P. S. Georgilakis, A. T. Souflaris, D. G. Paparigas, "Advanced design methodology for single and dual voltage wound core power transformers based on a particular finite element model," *Electric Power Systems Research*, vol. 76, pp. 729-741, 2006.
- [15] A. Kladas, J. Tegopoulos, "A new scalar potential formulation for 3D magnetostatics necessitating no prior source field calculation," *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 1103-1106, 1992.
- [16] D. E. Goldberg, *Genetic algorithms in search, optimization and machine learning*. MA: Addison-Wesley, 1989.