

List of Figures

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| 1.1 | Major Producer GHG | 2 |
| 1.2 | Components of virtual power plants (VPPs) | 5 |
| 1.3 | Impacts of EVs and DERs | 6 |
| 2.1 | Daily miles driven by PHEV | 31 |
| 2.2 | Charging/discharging of single PHEV | 34 |
| 2.3 | Simulated 24-Hour loading profile at 90% DR for different penetration levels of PHEVs | 35 |
| 2.4 | Simulated 24-Hour loading profiles at 62% penetration of PHEVs for dif- ferent DR levels | 35 |
| 2.5 | Percentage of vehicles versus <i>daily-distance-travelled</i> | 37 |
| 2.6 | Percentage of vehicles versus <i>start-trip-time</i> | 38 |
| 2.7 | Percentage of vehicles versus <i>last-trip-arrival-time</i> | 38 |
| 2.8 | Flow chart of stochastic simulation of PHEVs | 40 |
| 3.1 | Solution procedure of <i>MCINR</i> | 54 |
| 3.2 | The 38-bus distribution system | 56 |
| 3.3 | Average load demand | 56 |
| 3.4 | Power mismatch $max(\Delta P)$ on each iteration for <i>EVLMI</i> | 59 |
| 3.5 | Power mismatch $max(\Delta P)$ on each iteration for <i>EVLMI</i> | 60 |
| 3.6 | Power mismatch $max(\Delta P)$ on each iteration for <i>EVLMI</i> | 60 |
| 3.7 | Power mismatch $max(\Delta P)$ on each iteration for 18-Bus test systems | 62 |
| 3.8 | Power mismatch $max(\Delta P)$ on each iteration for 84-Bus test systems | 62 |
| 3.9 | Power mismatch $max(\Delta P)$ on each iteration for 140-Bus test systems | 63 |
| 3.10 | Power mismatch $max(\Delta P)$ on each iteration for 24-Bus test systems | 64 |

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| 3.11 | Power mismatch $max(\Delta P)$ on each iteration for 118-Bus test systems | 65 |
| 3.12 | Power mismatch $max(\Delta P)$ on each iteration for 300-Bus test systems | 65 |
| 3.13 | Loading factor vs iteration for 18-Bus test system. | 67 |
| 3.14 | Loading factor vs iteration for 84-Bus test system. | 67 |
| 3.15 | Loading factor vs iteration for 140-Bus test system. | 68 |
| 3.16 | Loading factor vs iteration for 24-Bus system. | 69 |
| 3.17 | Loading factor vs iteration for 118-Bus system. | 69 |
| 3.18 | Loading factor vs iteration for 300-Bus system. | 70 |
| 3.19 | R/X ratio vs iteration for 18-Bus test system. | 71 |
| 3.20 | R/X ratio vs iteration for 84-Bus test system. | 71 |
| 3.21 | R/X ratio vs iteration for 140-Bus test system. | 72 |
| 3.22 | R/X ratio vs iteration for 24-Bus system. | 73 |
| 3.23 | R/X ratio vs iteration for 118-Bus system. | 73 |
| 3.24 | R/X ratio vs iteration for 300-Bus system. | 74 |
| 3.25 | Scheduled DGs power | 75 |
| 3.26 | Hourly $ILLP$ at 35% penetration level of EVs | 76 |
| 3.27 | Hourly $ILLP$ at 54% penetration level of EVs | 77 |
| 3.28 | Hourly $ILLP$ at 62% penetration level of EVs | 77 |
| 3.29 | Hourly ILQ at 35% penetration level of EVs | 78 |
| 3.30 | Hourly ILQ at 54% penetration level of EVs | 79 |
| 3.31 | Hourly ILQ at 62% penetration level of EVs | 79 |
| 3.32 | Voltage profile index at different penetration level of EVs | 80 |
| 3.33 | MVA capacity index at different penetration level of EVs | 81 |
| 4.1 | Flow chart of Differential Evolution | 88 |
| 4.2 | Illustration of crossover process for $D=6$ | 90 |
| 4.3 | Average load demand | 91 |
| 4.4 | Case-I: Hourly minimum voltage | 95 |
| 4.5 | Case-I: Voltage profiles during peak (20 th hour) and valley load periods (04 th hour) | 96 |
| 4.6 | Case-I: Hourly energy losses | 96 |
| 4.7 | Residential load demand at 62% penetration level | 97 |
| 4.8 | Residential load demand at 90% DR | 98 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 4.9 | Case-II: Hourly Minimum voltage at 62% penetration level | 99 |
| 4.10 | Case-II: Hourly Minimum voltage at 90% DR | 99 |
| 4.11 | Comparison of bus wise-Voltage profiles during peak (20 th hour) and valley load periods (04 th hour). | 100 |
| 4.12 | Case-II: Hourly energy losses at 90% DR. | 101 |
| 4.13 | Comparison of energy losses without DGs based on DR at 62% level. | 101 |
| 4.14 | Case-II System cost. | 102 |
| 4.15 | Case-II Energy losses. | 102 |
| 4.16 | Overall load pattern and reduced load demands due to DGs | 103 |
| 4.17 | Total scheduled power of DGs. | 104 |
| 4.18 | Comparison of hourly system minimum voltages at 62% PHEV penetration. | 104 |
| 4.19 | Case-III Comparison of voltage based on DR at 62% penetration level. | 105 |
| 4.20 | Comparison of bus wise voltage profile at 62% penetration levels and 90% DR | 106 |
| 4.21 | Hourly scheduled power of DGs (Legends show the DGs indices) | 107 |
| 4.22 | Comparison of energy losses at 90% DR | 108 |
| 4.23 | Comparison of energy losses based on DR at 62% penetration level | 108 |
| 4.24 | Case-III System cost | 109 |
| 4.25 | Case-III Energy losses | 110 |
| 5.1 | Flow chart diagram of Effective Butterfly Optimizer (EBO) | 120 |
| 5.2 | Process of patrolling and perching | 123 |
| 5.3 | Flow chart of proposed method | 127 |
| 5.4 | Case:I Overall load demand | 129 |
| 5.5 | Case:I Unscheduled PHEV power | 130 |
| 5.6 | Case:I Voltage profile during peak hours (12 th Hour) and valley hours (04 th hour) | 130 |
| 5.7 | Case:I Hourly minimum voltage | 131 |
| 5.8 | Hourly energy loss | 131 |
| 5.9 | Case:II Comparison of overall loading pattern | 132 |
| 5.10 | Case:II Hourly PHEV power scheduling | 134 |
| 5.11 | Case:II Hourly BESS power scheduling | 134 |
| 5.12 | Case:II Hourly energy losses | 135 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 5.13 | Case:II Bus wise voltage | 135 |
| 5.14 | Case:II Hourly minimum voltage | 136 |
| 5.15 | Case:III Hourly PHEV power scheduling | 138 |
| 5.16 | Case:III Hourly BESS power scheduling | 139 |
| 5.17 | Case:III Hourly DG power scheduling | 139 |
| 5.18 | Case:III Flatten load | 140 |
| 5.19 | Case:III Hourly energy losses | 140 |
| 5.20 | Case:III Hourly minimum voltage | 141 |
| 5.21 | Hourly SOC availability at departure time on residential bus | 142 |
| | | |
| 6.1 | Single-phase PHEV charger operational characteristics | 152 |
| 6.2 | Hourly current at root node | 155 |
| 6.3 | Hourly maximum and minimum PVUI with unbalance and PAR constraint | 156 |
| 6.4 | Hourly maximum and minimum PVUI without unbalance and PAR con- straint | 156 |
| 6.5 | Hourly total energy losses | 157 |
| 6.6 | Optimal G2V and V2G active power scheduling of PHEVs | 158 |
| 6.7 | Optimal G2V and V2G reactive power scheduling of PHEVs | 159 |
| 6.8 | Hourly total active power scheduling of DGs | 160 |
| 6.9 | Hourly reactive power scheduling of DGs | 161 |