

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.	Figure Caption	Page No.
Figure 1.1	Simplified representation of power transmission network	2
Figure 1.2	Simplified representation of series-compensated power network	3
Figure 1.3	Modification in seen impedance due to CD in the transmission network	5
Figure 1.4	A case of current inversion due to CD in the transmission network	6
Figure 2.1	Frequency and Time resolution representation of STFT and WT	33
Figure 2.2	Haar wavelet function	35
Figure 2.3	Db wavelet function	36
Figure 2.4	Symlet wavelet function	36
Figure 2.5	Meyer wavelet function	36
Figure 2.6	Wavelet frequency decomposition tree	39
Figure 2.7	Empirical mode decomposition of post fault current signal during A-G fault in the simulated network at 50 km from sending side.	42
Figure 3.1	Work flow of the proposed events classification scheme	48
Figure 3.2	Functioning of Machine learning	50
Figure 3.3	Classification of machine learning techniques	50
Figure 3.4	Categories of machine learning algorithms	52
Figure 3.5	Two class separation using SVM	56
Figure 3.6	Architecture of PNN	57
Figure 3.7	Flow-chart of the proposed fault events classification scheme	59
Figure 3.8	Two-bus mid-point compensated network (first test system)	63
Figure 3.9	Three phase current signals during line to ground fault event at 30 km on different inception angles ((a) 30	64

	degree; (b) 60 degree; (c) 90 degree; (d) 120 degree	
Figure 3.10	Classification of different types of fault events using PNN classifier model-(a) to (j)	73
Figure 3.11	Confusion matrix during events classification using PNN classifier model	73
Figure 3.12	Simulated modified WSCC 9-Bus IEEE network (second test system)	76
Figure 3.13	Three phase current signals during line to ground fault event at 50 km on different inception angles ((a) 30 degree; (b) 60 degree; (c) 90 degree; (d) 120 degree	78
Figure 3.14	Confusion matrix during events classification using PNN classifier model	82
Figure 3.15	3-phase current samples during evolving fault in the test network	85
Figure 3.16	Confusion matrix during classification of evolving fault events	88
Figure 3.17	Fault current signals at 40 % line compensation with and without considering CTs saturation	90
Figure 4.1	Structure of EMD and ML based events classification scheme	94
Figure 4.2	Work-flow of the proposed fault events classification scheme	96
Figure 4.3	Two-bus mid-point compensated network (first test system)	100
Figure 4.4	Three phase current signals during line to ground fault event at 30 km on different inception angles	101
Figure 4.5	Post-fault phase 'A' current signal decomposition using EMD	102
Figure 4.6	FFT responses of different acquired IMFs	103
Figure 4.7	Confusion matrix during events classification using PNN classifier model	108
Figure 4.8	Simulated modified WSCC 9-Bus IEEE network (second test system)	112

Figure 4.9	Three phase current signals during line to ground fault event at 50 km on different inception angles	113
Figure 4.10	Post-fault phase 'A' current signal decomposition using EMD	114
Figure 4.11	FFT responses of different acquired IMFs	115
Figure 4.12	Confusion matrix during events classification using PNN classifier model	119
Figure 4.13	Three-phase current samples during evolving fault in the test network	122
Figure 4.14	Evolving fault (phase 'A') current signal decomposition using EMD	123
Figure 4.15	FFT responses of different acquired IMFs for phase 'A'	124
Figure 4.16	Evolving fault (phase 'B') current signal decomposition using EMD	125
Figure 4.17	FFT responses of different acquired IMFs for phase 'B'	126
Figure 4.18	Confusion matrix during classification of evolving fault events	129
Figure 5.1	Ensemble learning mechanism	133
Figure 5.2	Flow-chart of Ensemble Learning (Bagging) based event classification scheme	138
Figure 5.3	Two-bus mid-point compensated network (first test system)	142
Figure 5.4	Three phase current signals during line to ground fault event at 30 km on different inception angles	143
Figure 5.5	Simulated modified WSCC 9-Bus IEEE network (second test system)	148
Figure 5.6	Three phase current signals during line to ground fault event at 50 km on different inception angles	149
Figure 5.7	Simulated series compensated double circuit transmission (third test system) network	154
Figure 5.8	3-Phase current with respect to time (s) for different Fault events at 30 km	156
Figure 5.9	Fault current signals at 40 % line compensation with and	158

	without considering CTs saturation	
Figure 5.10	Logic diagram form simulating evolving and cross-country faults	161
Figure 5.11	3-phase post fault current samples (a) ABG at 30 km; (b) cross-country fault current	162
Figure 5.12	3-phase current samples during evolving fault in the third test network	164
Figure 5.13	Structure of RNN	167
Figure 5.14	An unfolded (in time) structure of RNN	168
Figure 5.15	Structure of RBM network	169
Figure 5.16	DBN structure	169
Figure 5.17	Architecture of autoencoder network	170
Figure 5.18	One layer structure of an autoencoder	171
Figure 5.19	Stacked autoencoder structure (with 3-hidden layer)	173
Figure 5.20	Work-flow of the proposed deep learning based events classification scheme	176
Figure 5.21	Structure of the utilized autoencoder and softmax layer based DNN	179
Figure 6.1	Single neuron structures (a) without bias (b) with bias	188
Figure 6.2	Architecture of feed-forward network	189
Figure 6.3	Activation transfer functions	190
Figure 6.4	Architecture of linear neural network	191
Figure 6.5	Architecture of CFNN	192
Figure 6.6	Architecture of GRNN	193
Figure 6.7	radbas transfer function	193
Figure 6.8	Flow-chart of the proposed fault location scheme	195
Figure 6.9	Two-bus series compensated (first test system)	198
Figure 6.10	Three phase current signals during line different fault event at 30 km, 120 degree inception angle	199
Figure 6.11	Distance estimation error percentage with respect to location of faults using FFNN	203
Figure 6.12	Distance estimation error percentage with respect to location of faults using LNN	203

Figure 6.13	Distance estimation error percentage with respect to location of faults using GRNN model	204
Figure 6.14	Distance estimation error percentage with respect to location of faults using CFNN at 35 % compensation of line on different inception angles	207
Figure 6.15	Distance estimation error percentage with respect to location of faults using CFNN at 45 % compensation of line on different inception angles	210
Figure 6.16	Simulated modified WSCC 9-Bus network	212
Figure 6.17	Three phase current signals during line to ground fault event at 50 km on different inception angles	213
Figure 6.18	Distance estimation error percentage with respect to location of faults using CFNN model	215
Figure 6.19	Simulated series compensated double circuit transmission (third test system) network	217
Figure 6.20	Logic diagram form simulating evolving and cross-country faults	218
Figure 6.21	3-Phase current with respect to time (s) for different Fault events at 30 km	219
Figure 6.22	Distance estimation error percentage with respect to location of faults using GRNN model	221
Figure 6.23	3-phase current samples during evolving fault in second test network	222
Figure 6.24	3-phase current samples during evolving fault in third test network	223
Figure 6.25	Distance estimation error percentage with respect to location of faults using CFNN model	226
Figure 6.26	Distance estimation error percentage with respect to location of faults using CFNN model	226