

### Optimization Strategy of an Electric Energy Multi - Source Power Station

Ndjiya Ngasop<sup>1, 2 and 4</sup>, Nana Tayou<sup>4</sup>, Ernest Kiata<sup>3and 4</sup> and Haman-Djalo<sup>3and 4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Electrical Engineering, Energy and Automation, National School of Agro-Industrial Sciences (ENSAI), University of Ngaoundere, Cameroon.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Process Engineering, National School of Agro-Industrial Sciences (ENSAI), University of Ngaoundere, Cameroon.

<sup>3</sup>Department of Physics, Faculty of Sciences, University of Ngaoundere, Cameroon,

<sup>4</sup>Laboratory of Energy, Signal, Imagery and Automation (LESIA), ENSAI/University of Ngaoundere, Cameroon.

Corresponding Author: Ndjiya Ngasop (ngasop.ndjiya@univ-ndere.cm /ndjiyangasop@yahoo.fr)

**Abstract** – This study presents a strategy for economic and environmental optimization of a multi - source power station while satisfying demand and deducting the on line active losses using the algorithm method of an ant colony, implemented in a MATLAB environment version 7.6. Values of  $\mu$ , the coefficient of ponderation was in the range  $0 < \mu$ <1 and at  $\mu$ = 0.6, we obtained the optimal conditions which include, for the IEEE 30 nodes network, the cost of production was 819.996 \$/h, emissions 0.269 Ton/h and the total Cost 968.33036\$/h, on lines losses of 6.92 MW with a calculation time of 6.38 seconds. For the Algerian 114 nodes network, we obtained the cost of production as 19668.9445 \$/h, emissions of 0.673 Ton/h, the total cost of 20596.032 \$/h, on line losses of 17.1MW with a calculation time of 9.179 second. The results revealed that whatever the size of the network, ACO gave optimal values and from networks of more than 10 generators, ACOS fastest convergence time. We concluded that the strategy presents a good result compared to other Meta – heuristic methods.

Keywords: Strategies, Optimization, Electric energy, Multi - Source station, Ants Colonies of Power station.

#### Nomenclature

OPF: Optimal Power Flow ACO: Ant Colony Optimization ACS: Ant Colony System AS: Ant System ED: Economic Dispatch CEED: Combined Economic Emission Dispatch OEP: Optimisation par Essaim de Particules IPPD: Improved Pre-prepared Power Demand FACTS: Flexible Alternating Current Transmission System TSP: Travelling Salesman Problem GA: Genetic Algorithm
PSO: Particul Swam Optimization
ABC: Algorithm Bee Colony
PVC: Problème de Voyageur de Commerce
OCF: Optimisation par colonie de fourmis
RAM: Random Access Memory

#### **1. Introduction**

Energy is the faculty that possesses a system of bodies to

provide a mechanical work or its equivalent. It can be in several forms, we have among others: wind energy, hydraulic energy, thermal energy and solar energy. These forms of energy have preoccupied humanity for a long time. Indeed, the idea to exploit these sources of energy was born with man's desire to solve some domestic and industrial problems [9], [13] and [17]. These have been, continuity and the quality of electric energy supply are the first missions of an electricity dealer enterprise [6]. In spite of the stake according to new power stations, the structure of production, transportation and management of the energy in Cameroon doesn't always best satisfy its client. Indeed according to the " technical and commercial control Report by 10 000 subscribers of the AES-SONEL company" of ARSEL [1], one can note that:

- 93% of Cameroonians using electric energy are dependent on AES-SONEL;

- The duration of a monthly interruption is on average 6.9 days, practically one week of waiting before delivery;

- 67% of interruptions considered "harmful" present more than two hours of waiting before the delivery;

- the Littoral, Northwest, West, South and Southwest Regions are particularly affected by ample interruptions, which rages more in the rural and suburban environment;

- Subscribers are victims of about one interruption per day in the whole country and 4hrs/day in the city of Douala;

- 78.7 % of these subscribers undergo more than 4 interruptions in the city of Douala per week.

An interview with the Director General of ARSEL in May 2013 during a press conference organized by the Africa - France association revealed that:

- 6.5 % of the energy produced is lost at the time of transportation;

- 29 % of losses on the electric network evaporate at the level of distribution.

The duration and the frequency of these interruptions make the network of distribution in a whole less reliable. Industrial development and demographic growth contribute to a strong demand for electrical energy. This has as consequence an increase in the power to be generated by the power plants. Facilities for production, transportation, and distribution of electric energy require some heavy investments. It is important for electric energy production companies to reduce the cost of working which has as consequence an increase of their beneficiary margin. Thus, the problem of production, transportation and distribution of electrical energy led to the research and the development of alternative energy sources. On the other hand, thermal power stations use fossil resources as fuel to produce electrical energy. The combustion of these fossils causes damages on nature through the production of greenhouse gases which brings about the destruction of the ozone layer, global warming and other ecological problems. It is important to reduce the production of these gases considerably in accordance with the Kyoto protocol of 2005 on the reduction of pollutant gas emissions through their harmful characters and the depletion of fossil resource reserves with time since they are non-renewable [3]. Since several works like those of Walid et al. [18]; Peng Li et al. [24]; Courtecuisse [4], Duval [20] conducted on hybrid system modeling used conventional or classic methods that are deterministic methods like the simplex method, the gradient method, the branch and bound etc... and the stochastic or meta - heuristic methods such as networks of neurons, the genetic algorithm, algorithms of bee colonies, swarms of particles, algorithms of ant colony etc. and do not take into account the polluting emissions, it is necessary to conduct a survey on the Strategy of optimization of an Electric energy Multi Source Power station. Works carried out within the framework of the economic and environmental optimization of power plants recognized under expressions such as the problem of optimal power flow (OPF) or economic and environmental dispatching (EED), we can note that:

Slimani et *al.* [15] worked on the optimal power flow through a genetic algorithm while taking into account the economic and environmental aspects. She used the coefficient of ponderation to combine the two objective

functions. She finds a high total cost and emission cost. Bouktir et al. [5] used the algorithm of a bee colony for economic and environmental optimization and they improved the total cost and the cost of production. Krishnamurthy [21] treated the economic and environmental optimization by the PSO. It uses the penalty factor to combine the objective functions. It improves the cost of production but it finds losses of elevated in line powers. Alkhalil [2] used the Secant method combined to an IPPD picture (Improved Pre - Prepared Power Demand) to carry out a medium-term supervision of an electric energy system associated to a photovoltaic power station. Courtecuisse [4] used fuzzy logic during the supervision in real time of a multi-source power station to basis of the wind and gets a gain in time of calculation. Mouassa et al. [16] used the algorithm of the artificial bee colony while introducing the notion of FACTS (Flexible Alternating Current Transmission System) heard supple transmission system in alternating current to treat the optimization problem of power flow in the presence of wind turbine while insisting on the security of the system and while respecting variables of the control vector.

Alaya [22] while treating the multi objective optimization problems by ant colonies, particularly the case of multidimensional backpack and the quadratic backpack, build us on the different approaches of resolution and ordering of problems multi objective.

Draidi [23] worked on the economic distribution of electric energy while using neuron networks. He obtained a very fast time of convergence roughly millisecond. Missoum [12] worked on the optimal distribution of active power with the ant colony algorithm while taking into account only the economic aspect. His works did not take into account the environmental aspect. He thereafter compared his results by a deterministic method (the Newton method) and a meta-heuristic (the genetic algorithm). This reveals that the algorithm of the ant colony presents the best results than the conventional method and the meta-heuristic method. Taking into consideration all that precedes a question can be asked on how to produce electric energy at a minimum cost and at a minimum rate of greenhouse gas emissions while satisfying the demand.

The objective of this work comes to determine optimal powers for cost of production and minimal emissions and on line power losses, in other words the optimal distribution of power, the optimal flow of power, and more precisely the economic and environmental dispatching. The specific objectives assigned to this study are:

- The determination of an optimal active power for the supply of electric energy at a minimal cost of production and cost pollutant gas emission (optimization of the cost of production function and the cost of emission function) while satisfying the demand;

- The determination of on line active losses.

To conduct this study, we will initially use the method of the ant colony on the IEEE-30 nodes network (6 generators) representing part of the American electric food system (Mid-West), then on the Algerian network 114 nodes (15 generators), then on the IEEE-57 nodes network (7 generators) and finally on the Algerian network 59 nodes (10 generators). Thereafter a presentation of the tools and the method that will be used for the resolution of the problem. Finally, a presentation discussing the results obtained in relation to the results of other studies with other methods.

#### 2. Material and Methods

#### 2.1 Material

To conduct a good job, material resources and software programs were used. Also, a portable computer having the following features: Pentium 4, 2 Gigas bytes (GO) of RAM, Processor body duet 2X 1.73 Giga Hertzes (GHz) and the software MATLAB version 7.6 were used to program the algorithm of the ant colony.

#### 2.2 Methods

# 2.2.1 Optimization Applied to the Optimal Distribution of Power

The problem of optimization in a power plant consists in

finding the optimal powers at minimum cost of production and poisonous gas emission while satisfying demand. This, while minimizing the multi-objective function that represents goals to reach by taking into account constraints. Mono-objective Functions are cost of production or working function and the cost of emission or atmospheric rejection function.

#### 2.2.1.1 Cost of Production Function

It is defined by the following equation:

 $F_{Pi} = a_i + b_i P_i(t) + c_i P_i^2(t) (1) \text{ where } a_i, b_i \text{ and } c_i \text{ are coefficients of production cost and } P_i, the power delivered by the generator i.}$ 

#### **2.2.1.2 Cost of Emision Function**

It is defined by the following equation:

 $E_{mi} = \alpha_i + \beta_i P_i(t) + \gamma_i P_i^2(t)$  (2) where  $\alpha_i$ ,  $\beta_i$  and  $\gamma_i$  are coefficients of cost of emission of the generator.

### 2.2.1.3 Combination of Mono-objective Functions to Multi-objective Function

There are mainly two combination methods of monoobjective functions to multi-objective functions; the method of the equilibrated sum and the method of the penalty factor. **2.2.1.3.1 Method of the Equilibrated Sum** 

#### ------

 $F_T = \mu F_{Pi} + (1 - \mu)\omega E_{mi}$  (3) where  $F_T$ ,  $\mu$  and  $\omega$ ,  $\mu$  designate the global function, the coefficient of ponderation and the factor of the emission cost respectively.

#### 2.2.1.3.2 Method of the Penalty Factor

 $F_T = F_{Pi} + h_i E_{mi \ (4)} \text{ with } h_i = F_{Pi}/E_{mi} \text{ representing the factor of}$  penalty.

#### 2.2.1.3.3 Constraints

there exist two types of constraints namely those of equality defined by  $\sum_i \ ^n P_i = \ P_D \ _+ \ P_L \ _{(5)}$  with n,  $P_D$  and  $P_L$  designating the number of generators, the active power consumed by the load and the active on line losses respectively and those of inequality are defined by  $P_{gimin} \le P_{gi} \ \le P_{gimax}, i = 1, n.$ 

# 2.2.2 The Ant Colony Algorithm Method Applied to the Optimal Distribution Active Power.

A meta-heuristic ant colony is a stochastic process that

constructs a solution, while adding components to partial solutions. This process takes into account a heuristic on the instance of the problem of changing dynamically phenomena tracks to reflect the experience acquired by ants. The formalization of ACO applied to the OPF passes through the representation of the problem and the basic behavior of ants. Ants can be characterized as a stochastic construction procedure building solutions on the graph G =(C, L). In general, ants attempt to elaborate some feasible solutions, but if necessary, they can produce some impracticable solutions. These components and connections can be associated into tracks of pheromone  $\tau$  (putting in place an adaptive memory describing the state of the system) and into the visibility value  $\eta$  (representing an information a priori on the problem, or coming from another source other than that of ants; it is often the cost of the power generated by each power station of the state). Tracks of pheromone can be associated either to components, or to graph connections representing the problem to solve. Each ant has a memory used to store the course effectuated from an initial state and conditions for stop. Ants move following to the rule of probabilistic decision function of local pheromone tracks, of the state of the ant and constraints of the problem. At the time of the addition of a component to the solution ants can put up to date in progress, ants can update a track associated to a component or a corresponding connection. Once the solution is constructed, they can update the tracks pheromone of components or connections used. Finally, has a minimum capacity to construct a solution to a problem. The OPF problem is represented by a game of solutions, an objective function assigning a value to every solution and a game of constraints. The objective is to find the global optimum satisfying the constraints. The different states of the problem are characterized like a sequence of components. In this representation ants construct solutions while moving on a graph G = (C, L), where nodes are components of C that represent the powers generated by the interconnected power plant and where the L collection

connects components of C that represent the remainder of the power required to distribute on the remaining power plant. Constraints of the problem are directly implemented in the rules for ant displacement (either by preventing movements that violate constraints, or by penalizing such solutions). The algorithm of the ant colony for economic and environmental optimization is constituted of four following stages:

#### **Stage 1: Initiation**

The first stage consists of coding the variable  $P_{gi}$  (power produced by the generator i) using the real values in the authorized value space. Every  $P_{gi}$  parameter has an upper limit  $P_{gi max}$  and a limit lower  $P_{gi min}$ . Before every round, the initial point (nest) of the colony is generated randomly in the feasible region. Each ant is placed at the initial point while the initial value of the pheromone  $\tau_o$  is also given to this stage. While taking the concept of the process to several phases as a basis, the space of research of the optimization of the power out-flow can be established. All possible permutations constitute this space of research. Every phase contains several points.

#### Stage 2: Assessment of the Function-objective

In this stage the direct influence of the value of the biobjective function depends on the level of quantity of phenomena that is added to the particular directions that ants select.

#### **Stage 3: Distribution of Ants**

In this stage, ants are distributed while taking levels as a basis. The rule of displacement is the following:

$$\begin{split} p_{ij}{}^k(t) = & [((\tau_{ij}(t))^\alpha(\eta_{ij})^\beta] / \sum_{l \in j} i^k ((\tau_{il}(t))^\alpha(\eta_{il})^\beta \quad (6) \quad \text{if} \quad j \in j_i{}^k \quad \text{or} \\ p_{ij}{}^k(t) = & (7) \quad \text{if} \quad j \notin j^k \text{ where } \alpha \text{ and } \beta \text{ are two parameters} \\ & \text{controlling the relative importance of the intensity of the} \\ & \tau_{ij}(t), \text{ and of the visibility } \eta_{ij} \text{ .} \end{split}$$

According to the equation of the displacement rule given above, every ant chooses a new point towards which she moves while taking in consideration values of  $\tau$  and  $\eta$ . Now, so m is the number of ants (m>Ng), for every iteration will these m ants execute m movements then in the interval of the time (t, t+1). While constructing a solution to the problem, the phenomena of trajectories visited can be adjusted dynamically by the following equation to widen the space of research:  $\tau_{ij}(t+1)=(1-\rho)\tau_{ij}(t) +\rho\tau_0$  (8). This process is called rule of the local updating of the phenomena. After n iterations, all ants have completed a visit. The best track done by the ant is updated by a process called the rule of global regulation update using the following equation:  $\tau_{ij}(t+1)=(1-\rho)\tau_{ij}(t) + \Delta\tau_{ij}(t)$  (9) where bones (i,j) belong to the best T<sup>+</sup> tour of L<sup>+</sup> length and where  $\Delta\tau_{ij}(t)=q_0/L^+(10)$ . This process participates in intensification by selection of the best solution. This solution will also be recorded in the table of taboo for the more belated comparison with the following iteration.

#### Stage 4: Criteria of Stop

The process of the calculation continuous until the number of iterations reaches the predefined maximal value or that a solution of acceptable objective function is found.



550.66 \$/Ton and 283.4 MW.

The algorithm of the ant colony has been applied to the network IEEE-30 nodes. We search for the optimal variable parameters of the colony of ants algorithm first while varying the different combinations of  $\beta$ ,  $\rho$  and  $q_0$  given by **Dorigo and Stützle** [7] in the ant colony optimization meta-heuristic for an economic optimization and got results of the following results as shown by the tables below were obtained.

**Table 1:** Results of the ACO-OPF for the ten combinations  $\beta$ ,  $\rho$  and  $q_{0}$ .

|  | β= 11        | β = 6        | β = 10       | β = 10      | β = 11                        |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------------------|
|  | $\rho = 0.4$ | $\rho = 0.3$ | $\rho = 0.8$ | ρ = 0.6     | $\rho = 0.8$                  |
|  | $q_0 = 0.4$  | $q_0 = 0.7$  | $q_0 = 0.6$  | $q_0 = 0.3$ | $\mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{o}} = 0$ |
| $\mathbf{P}_{G1}\left(\mathrm{MW} ight)$ | 180.699      | 172.0554     | 177.9946     | 166.875     | 180.9561                      |
| P <sub>G2</sub> (MW)                     | 48.067       | 51.109       | 42.130       | 55.427      | 43.605                        |
| P <sub>G5</sub> (MW)                     | 19.618       | 23.398       | 19.025       | 20.498      | 20.353                        |
| P <sub>G8</sub> (MW)                     | 14.589       | 17.355       | 21.983       | 16.656      | 15.983                        |
| $P_{G11}\left(\text{MW}\right)$          | 17.986       | 13.615       | 17.850       | 15.760      | 14.999                        |
| <b>P</b> <sub>G13</sub> (MW)             | 12.240       | 15.154       | 13.823       | 17.264      | 17.181                        |
| Active lost (MW)                         | 09.802       | 09.202       | 09.407       | 09.080      | 09.680                        |
| Production                               | 803.770      | 803.41       | 804.45       | 804.86      | 804.150                       |
| cost (\$/h)                              |              |              |              |             |                               |
|  |              |              |              |             |                               |

**Figure 1:** Algorithm of the ant colony for the optimal distribution of power.

#### 3. Results and Discussions

To program the algorithm of the ant colony, we combined two objectives functions (cost of productions and cost of emissions) by the weighted sum method expressed by the following equation:  $g(\lambda)=(x_k - \lambda.\Delta f(x_k))$  (11). The coefficient of  $\mu$  ponderation varies between 0 and 1 permits to determine the percentage of each objective optimization. For example D=0 corresponds to an optimization 100 % environmental and 0 % economic.  $\mu$ =1 corresponds to an optimization 100 % economic and 0 % environmental,  $\mu$  = 0.1 corresponds to an optimization 10 % economic and 90 % environmental. The factor of the cost of emission  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$  of gas and the power asked for this network test is respectively

**Table 1:** Results of the ACO-OPF for the ten combinations  $\beta$ ,  $\rho$  and  $q_0$  (following).

From results of the table above, we can say that the optimal variable parameters of the algorithm of the ant colony are gotten for  $\beta = 12$ ,  $\rho = 0.5$  and  $q_o = 0.3$  but it is this combination that permits to have the most reduced

|                                | β = 9                  | $\beta = 12$ | β = 9.5      | β = 11                 | $\beta = 10$                  |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
|                                | $\rho = 0.4$           | $\rho = 0.5$ | $\rho = 0.8$ | $\rho = 0.5$           | ρ = 0.6                       |
|                                | $\mathbf{q}_{o} = 0.4$ | $q_o = 0.3$  | $q_0 = 0.1$  | $\mathbf{q}_{o} = 0.1$ | $\mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{o}} = 0$ |
| $\mathbf{P}_{G1}(\mathrm{MW})$ | 177.120                | 176.233      | 175.84       | 180.666                | 174.743                       |
| P <sub>G5</sub> (MW)           | 24.928                 | 20.970       | 19.700       | 16.410                 | 23.516                        |
| <b>P</b> <sub>G8</sub> (MW)    | 17.342                 | 22.270       | 21.170       | 17.103                 | 23.697                        |
| P <sub>G11</sub> (MW)          | 11.006                 | 13.050       | 15.790       | 15.670                 | 13.747                        |
| <b>P</b> <sub>G13</sub> (MW)   | 17.207                 | 12.080       | 15.623       | 13.591                 | 12.503                        |
| Active lost (MW)               | 09.346                 | 09.434       | 09.330       | 10.120                 | 09.126                        |
| Production cost<br>(\$/ h)     | 804.24                 | 802.308      | 803.570      | 804.480                | 803.060                       |

production cost. The table below presents the decreasing values of  $\mu$  of 1 to 0 of the optimal power delivered by each of the generator P<sub>g1</sub>, P<sub>g2</sub>, P<sub>g5</sub>, P<sub>g8</sub>, P<sub>g11</sub>, P<sub>g13</sub>, the cost of production, the line active losses, the cost of emission and the total cost.

| u = 1    | u = 0.9   | $\mu = 0.8$   |
|----------|---|---|
| 176.233  | 171.453   | 166.727   |
| 48.230   | 53.190  | 49.140  |
| 20.970   | 22.420  | 20.100  |
| 22.270   | 20.670  | 26.010  |
| 13.050   | 11.780  | 12.630  |
| 12.080   | 13.130  | 17.650  |
| 802.308  | 802.822   | 804.092   |
| 09.433   | 09.243  | 08.857  |
| 00.363   | 00.351  | 00.338  |
| 1002.404 | 996.351   | 990.188   |
|          | 48.230<br>20.970<br>22.270<br>13.050<br>12.080<br>802.308<br>09.433<br>00.363 | 1         1           176.233         171.453           48.230         53.190           20.970         22.420           22.270         20.670           13.050         11.780           12.080         13.130           802.308         802.822           09.433         09.243           00.363         00.351 |

**Table 2:** Algorithm Results of the active ants colony for  $\mu$  from 1 to 0.8.

**Table 3:** Results of the algorithm of the colony of ants for  $\mu = 0.7$ ,  $\mu = 0.6$ ,  $\mu = 0.5$  and  $\mu = 0.4$ .

| μ = <b>0.7</b><br>150.615<br>55.450<br>21.810<br>33.470 | μ = <b>0.6</b><br>131.946<br>56.830<br>22.610 | <b>μ</b> = <b>0.5</b><br>125.555<br>52.830<br>28.970                                    | $\mu = 0.4$<br>112.373<br>62.030  |
|---|---|---|---|
| 55.450<br>21.810  | 56.830  | 52.830  | 62.030  |
| 21.810  |   |   |   |
|   | 22.610  | 28.970  | 21 210  |
| 33 470  |   |   | 31.310  |
| 55.470  | 34.370  | 30.810  | 29.970  |
| 13.090  | 20.350  | 26.500  | 18.500  |
| 16.920  | 24.220  | 25.030  | 35.160  |
| 808.274   | 819.996                                       | 828.805   | 845.905   |
| 07.955  | 06.926  | 06.296  | 05.944  |
| 00.305  | 00.269  | 00.257  | 00.242  |
| 975.962   | 966.330                                       | 970.188   | 979.382   |
|   | 808.274<br>07.955<br>00.305                   | 808.274         819.996           07.955         06.926           00.305         00.269 | 808.274         819.996         828.805           07.955         06.926         06.296           00.305         00.269         00.257 |

**Table 4:** Algorithm results of the ants colony for  $\mu$  from 0.3 to 0.

|                              | μ=0.3   | μ=0.2    | μ=0.1    | μ=0     |
|------------------------------|---------|----------|----------|---------|
| PG1(MW)                      | 99.967  | 88.180   | 79.998   | 68.195  |
| P <sub>G2</sub> (MW)         | 64.980  | 62.480   | 62.220   | 65.220  |
| $P_{G5}(MW)$                 | 30.820  | 37.070   | 43.660   | 49.220  |
| <b>P</b> <sub>G8</sub> (MW)  | 26.710  | 34.380   | 33.840   | 34.780  |
| <b>P</b> <sub>G11</sub> (MW) | 29.780  | 26.510   | 29.980   | 30.000  |
| P <sub>G13</sub> (MW)        | 36.590  | 39.580   | 38.020   | 39.580  |
| Production cost (\$/h)       | 862.713 | 882.730  | 905.566  | 938.718 |
| Line losses (MW)             | 05.447  | 04.801   | 04.319   | 03.896  |
| Emission (Ton/h)             | 00.228  | 00.217   | 00.211   | 00.206  |
| Total cost (S/h)             | 988.462 | 1002.465 | 1021.732 | 1051.94 |

From results gotten above in the tables, we can note that active powers generated are in their admissible limits and the total cost in the case of the minimization of the emission rate ( $\mu$ =0) is raised more than in the case of the minimization of the production cost ( $\mu$ =1) with a ratio of 4.94 %. On the other hand, the value of power losses corresponding to  $\mu$ =0 is reduced more than that of  $\mu$  = 1 for a time of calculation is 6.38 seconds. For the worry of poisonous gas to protect the environment, we minimized the cost of production at the same time. We can note that the optimal total cost is gotten for  $\mu$ =0.6 (60 % economic

and 40 % environment) and is equal to 968.330 \$/h with a rate of emission of 0.269 ton/h and power losses of 6.926 MW. The power tables below present the comparative results for  $\mu$ =1 (economic optimization 100 % and environmental optimization 0 %) to those of Missoum [12] in order to validate our results.

Table 5: Comparative results ACO et ACO Missoum [12].

|                                | ACO     | ACOMissoum[12] |
|--------------------------------|---------|----------------|
| PG1(MW)                        | 176.233 | 177.864        |
| P <sub>G2</sub> (MW)           | 48.23   | 48.637         |
| $\mathbf{P}_{G5}(\mathrm{MW})$ | 20.97   | 20.893         |
| <b>P</b> <sub>G8</sub> (MW)    | 22.27   | 22.123         |
| <b>P</b> <sub>G11</sub> (MW)   | 13.05   | 13.625         |
| <b>P</b> <sub>G13</sub> (MW)   | 12.08   | 12.120         |
| Production cost (\$/h)         | 802.309 | 803.123        |
| Line losses(MW)                | 09.434  | 09.462         |

From the table above, we can note that the differences compared to our results concerning the powers delivered by the various generators Pg1, Pg2, Pg5, Pg8, Pg11, Pg13; the on-line losses and the production cost are respectively 0.92%, 0.84%, 0.36%, 0.65%, 0.44%, 0.33%, 0.29% and 0.1% inferior 10%. It is one of the reasons which we can confirm our results true for the other values of  $\mu$ . Owing to the fact that economic and environmental optimization obtained with  $\mu$ =0.6 is optimal, the table below gives results of the comparative study of the economic and environmental control system with other methods such as the genetic algorithm, the swarms of particles and the algorithm of the colony of bee used respectively by certain authors following the example Bouktir *et al.* [5], Slimani [15] and Krishnamurthy [21].

|                              | PSOKoridak<br>[10] | GAKoridak<br>[10] | ACO       | ABCSouhil<br>[16] |
|------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| P <sub>G1</sub> (MW)         | 517.803            | 486.133           | 502.920   | 463.283           |
| P <sub>G2</sub> (MW)         | 449.251            | 452.059           | 507.417   | 454.125           |
| P <sub>G3</sub> (MW)         | 82.989             | 98.971            | 54.519    | 100.000           |
| P <sub>G4</sub> (MW)         | 160.699            | 262.000           | 217.166   | 190.570           |
| P <sub>G5</sub> (MW)         | 402.369            | 462.762           | 476.599   | 416.076           |
| P <sub>G6</sub> (MW)         | 163.967            | 175.270           | 162.539   | 212.431           |
| P <sub>G7</sub> (MW)         | 176.723            | 110.311           | 170.177   | 190.546           |
| P <sub>G8</sub> (MW)         | 257.323            | 177.142           | 169.329   | 209.482           |
| P <sub>G9</sub> (MW)         | 308.215            | 202.679           | 170.734   | 200.615           |
| P <sub>G10</sub> (MW)        | 187.234            | 237.412           | 217.616   | 191.052           |
| P <sub>G11</sub> (MW)        | 138.472            | 196.742           | 198.172   | 187.214           |
| P <sub>G12</sub> (MW)        | 595.893            | 577.398           | 585.870   | 600.000           |
| <b>P</b> <sub>G13</sub> (MW) | 198.449            | 193.592           | 197.868   | 200.000           |
| P <sub>G14</sub> (MW)        | 88.886             | 92.923            | 93.217    | 100.000           |
| P <sub>G15</sub> (MW)        | 87.967             | 89.296            | 91.963    | 100.000           |
| Production cost (\$/h)       | 19880.225          | 19707.709         | 19668.944 | 19715.345         |
| Emission (Ton/h)             | 00.705             | 00.780            | 00.673    | 00.678            |
| total cost(\$/h)             | 20850.763          | 20781.957         | 20596.032 | 20648.368         |
| Line losses (MW)             | 19.200             | 18.700            | 17.100    | 18.897            |
| Time (s)                     | 10.980             | 11.552            | 09.179    | 11.260            |

Table 6:ComparativesresultsACO,GA<sub>Slimani[15]</sub>,PSO<sub>Krishnamur-thy[21]</sub> and ABC<sub>Bouktir et al.[5]</sub>.

Table 7: Comparatives results ACO, GAKoridak [10],PSOKoridak [10] and ABCSouhil [16].

|                              | ACO      | <b>GA</b> Slimani | <b>PSO</b> <sub>Slimani</sub> | ABC Monmarche |
|------------------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
|                              |          | [15]              | [15]                          | [24]          |
| PG1(MW)                      | 242.89   | 266.850           | 270.899                       | 180.899       |
| P <sub>G2</sub> (MW)         | 95.050   | 100.000           | 87.202                        | 85.194        |
| P <sub>G3</sub> (MW)         | 138.89   | 140.000           | 172.766                       | 180.765       |
| $\mathbf{P}_{G6}(MW)$        | 97.840   | 100.000           | 98.994                        | 99.670        |
| P <sub>G8</sub> (MW)         | 311.02   | 280.438           | 255.877                       | 270.274       |
| <b>P</b> <sub>G9</sub> (MW)  | 97.840   | 100.000           | 165.046                       | 150.294       |
| <b>P</b> <sub>G12</sub> (MW) | 285.10   | 281.875           | 62.134                        | 65.008        |
| P <sub>L</sub> (MW)          | 17.960   | 18.400            | 16.200                        | 618.100       |
| Total cost(\$/h)             | 3171.785 | 3172.202          | 3210.115                      | 3208.128      |
| Time(s)                      | 6.910    | 5.820             | 4.230                         | 5.460         |

The AG presents the best cost of production of 807.200 \$/h comparative survey, we noticed a difference of 1.56 % in relation to ACO. The ACO presents the weakest rate of 0.269 ton/h emision; either a difference of the order of 0.67 % comparative to ABC. With regard to the on line losses, ABC presents the most reduced value of 6.726 MW opposite to 6.929MW for ACO, either difference of 2.9%. While being interested in the total cost, ACO presents even best total cost with a value of 968.330 \$/h.

Because the objective has been to reduce the cost of production and emission simultaneously and that ACO does a better economic and environmental optimization by AG report, PSO, and ABC we present results of programming the algorithm of the ant colony with parameters of another bigger network that the network IEEE-30 nodes like the Algerian network (15 generators).

Within sight of the results of the table above, being the emission, production costs, total emission, on-line losses and the computing time, we can say that ACO has the best results than other methods. The following table has the results of the algorithm of the colony of ants at the network IEEE-57 nodes compared with the Algerian network 59 nodes and we will compare with GA, PSO and ABC.

 Table 8: Comparatives results ACO, GA<sub>Slimani[15]</sub>, PSO<sub>Slimani[15]</sub>

 and ABC Monmarche [24].

|                              | АСО     | GA <sub>Slimani</sub> [15] | PSOKrishna<br>murthy[21] | ABC <sub>Boukti</sub><br>r <i>et al[5]</i> |
|------------------------------|---------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| PG1(MW)                      | 131.946 | 155.602                    | 139.135                  | 130.331                                    |
| PG2(MW)                      | 56.830  | 49.929                     | 55.552                   | 58.234                                     |
| P <sub>G5</sub> (MW)         | 22.610  | 21.667                     | 24.169                   | 26.249                                     |
| <b>P</b> <sub>G8</sub> (MW)  | 34.370  | 29.986                     | 35.000                   | 35.000                                     |
| <b>P</b> <sub>G11</sub> (MW) | 20.350  | 14.085                     | 19.636                   | 21.380                                     |
| <b>P</b> <sub>G13</sub> (MW) | 24.220  | 20.255                     | 17.104                   | 18.929                                     |
| Production cost (\$/h)       | 819.996 | 807.200                    | 813.899                  | 820.166                                    |
| Line losses(MW)              | 06.9269 | 06.9269                    | 07.1953                  | 06.726                                     |
| Emission (Ton/h)             | 00.269  | 00.312                     | 00.282                   | 00.271                                     |
| Total cost(\$/h)             | 968.330 | 979.079                    | 978.185                  | 978.511                                    |
| Time (s)                     | 06.368  | 05.128                     | 03.589                   | 04.630                                     |

In view of this table, the algorithm of the ant colony presents the weakest total cost of production with a longer calculation time.

 Table 9:
 Comparative results
 ACO,
 GA<sub>Slimani[15]</sub>,

 PSO<sub>Mancer[11]</sub> and ABC<sub>Slimani[15]</sub>.

|                             | ACO    | GASlimani | <b>PSO</b> Mancer | <b>ABC</b> Slimani |
|-----------------------------|--------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|
|                             |        | [15]      | [11]              | [15]               |
| P <sub>G1</sub> (MW)        | 64.010 | 70.573    | 51.114            | 27.312             |
| P <sub>G2</sub> (MW)        | 22.750 | 56.570    | 64.726            | 19.546             |
| P <sub>G3</sub> (MW)        | 82.370 | 89.270    | 266.120           | 255.592            |
| P <sub>G4</sub> (MW)        | 46.210 | 78.220    | 397.877           | 63.550             |
| <b>P</b> <sub>G5</sub> (MW) | 10.010 | 11.060    | 70.985            | 88.822             |
| $P_{G6}(MW)$                | 47.050 | 57.930    | 58.693            | 39.759             |

| <b>P</b> <sub>G7</sub> (MW)            | 65.560 | 39.550   | 75.909     | 25.047     |
|--|--------|----------|------------|------------|
| <b>P</b> <sub>G8</sub> (MW)            | 39.550 | 46.400   | 31.980     | 15.924     |
| <b>P</b> <sub>G9</sub> (MW)            | 154.23 | 63.580   | 152.952    | 63.873     |
| <b>P</b> <sub>G10</sub> (MW)           | 202.36 | 211.580  | 191.677    | 35.062     |
| $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathbf{MW})$ | 12.980 | 17.580   | 13.620     | 19.650     |
| Total cost(\$/h)                       | 1815.7 | 1937.100 | 4372460.33 | 3740686.34 |
| Time(s)                                | 09.830 | 09.380   | 09.210     | 09.350     |

From this table, it is found that the algorithm of the present ant colony is the most optimal results on all parameters. In fact, the algorithm of the ant colony proves to be more efficient for the electrical networks of big sizes in relation to electrical networks of small sizes.



**Figure 2:** Cost according to the size of the network for ACO, GA, PSO and ABC.

From figure 2 which represents total cost according to the size of the network for ACO, GA, PSO and ABC; we can say that either the size of the network, the method of the ant colony presents best economic and environmental optimization.



**Figure 3:** Time of convergence according to the size of the network for ACO, GA, PSO and ABC.

The figure above which represents the calculation time according to the size of the network for ACO, GA, PSO and ABC shows us that it is from the ten units of production that the algorithm of the ant colony begins to have the best time of convergence in relation to the other methods.

#### 4. Conclusion

This study that was based on the strategy of optimization of a multi-electric energy power station source had as objectives the optimal power calculation for costs of production, minimal emission and the calculation of online power losses. To do this, we limited the study to the thermal generators and first applied it to network IEE-30 nodes, then to the network IEE-57 nodes (7 generators) and finally to Algerian networks 59 nodes (10 generators) and 114 nodes. We used the software MATLAB to program the algorithm of the ant colony in order to minimize the multi objective function to know costs of production and emission while taking account the different constraints of equality and inequality. We obtained for the IEE network 30 nodes, the cost of production, emissions, total and on line losses of 819.996 \$/h, 0.269 ton/h and 968.330\$/h respectively as results. For the Algerian network 114 nodes, we got costs of production, of emissions, total and online losses of 19668.944\$/h, 0.673 ton/h, 20596.032 \$/h respectively and 17.1 MW with a time of 9.18 seconds. These results were compared to results gotten by other

methods as the genetic algorithm, swarms of particle, and the algorithm of the bee colony. It resorts that no matter the size of the network, ACO does the best economic and environmental optimization on the one hand from networks of 10 generators and on the other hand the best time of convergence. We can say that ACO is a very efficient optimization method for networks of large size. The algorithm of the ant colony converges towards a minimum. To improve this work, it would be interesting to lead studies on the hybridization of the algorithm of the ant colony with a local research method in order to reduce the time of calculation and to apply the algorithm of the ant colony on the interconnected networks of Cameroon in order to optimize these.

### 5. References

[1] ARSEL, 2012. Rapport de contrôle technique et commercial auprès de 10 000 abonnés de la société AES-SONEL, 74p.

[2] Alkhalil Firas, 2011. Supervision économie et impact sur l'environnement d'un système d'énergie électrique associé à une centrale photovoltaïque, thèse de Doctorat, Ecole Nationale Supérieure d'Arts et Métiers.

[3] Berro A., 2001. Optimisation multi objectif et stratégie d'évolution en environnement dynamique, Thèse de doctorat, université des sciences sociales de Toulouse I, France.

[4] Courtecuisse V., 2008. Supervision d'une centrale multi source à base d'éoliennes et de stockage d'énergie connectée au réseau électrique, thèse de doctorat, Ecole Nationale Supérieure d'Arts et Métiers, France.

**[5] Bouktir T. and Slimani L., 2008.** Economic Power Dispatch of Power System with Pollution Control using Multi-objective Artificial Bee Colony Optimization with FACTS devices, Leonardo Journal of Sciences, 223-234

[6] Deepak Kumar et S. R, 2014. Design of an advanced electrical power distribution system using seeker optimisation Algorithm, Electrical power and energy

systems, Vol.4, pp 196-217

[7] Dorigo M. and Stützle T., 2003. The ant colony optimization meta-heuristic: Algorithms, applications, and advances, Kluwer Academic Publishers pp 251-285.

[8] **Dréo J., 2009.** Adaptation de la méthode de colonie de fourmis pour l'optimisation en variable continues : Application en génie biomédical, thèse de doctorat, université de Toulouse I, France.

[9] Global Village Cameroon, 2012. Etat des lieux du cadre règlementaire du secteur des énergies renouvelables au Cameroun. Rapport d'analyse.

[10] Koridak A., Rahli M. et Younes M., 2008.Hybrid Optimization of the Emission and Economic Dispatch by the Genetic Algorithm, Leonardo Journal of Sciences, Vol. 4, 193-203.

[11] Mancer N., 2012. Contribution à l'optimisation de la puissance réactive en présence de dispositifs de compensation dynamique (FACTS), Mémoire de magister, Département génie électrique, Université Mohamed Khider-Biska, Algérie.

**[12] Missoum R., 2008.** Etude d'un dispatching économique des puissances actives par l'algorithme de la colonie de fourmis, thèse de doctorat, département d'électrotechnique, Université Hassiba Ben Bouali Chlef Algérie.

[13] Obsev'ER, 2013. La production d'électricité d'origine renouvelable: détails par région et par pays. Quinzième inventaire.

**[14] Peng Li, 2009.** Formalisme pour la supervision des systèmes hybrides multi-sources à générateurs d'énergie repartie: Application à la gestion d'un micro réseau, Ecole centrale de Lille.

**[15] Slimani L., 2009.** Contribution à l'application de l'optimisation par des méthodes méta-heuristiques à l'écoulement de puissance optimal dans un environnement de l'électricité dérégulé. Thèse de Doctorat, Université de Batna.

[16] Souhil Mouassa, 2012. Optimisation de l'écoulement

## **IJRD**

de puissance par une méthode méta-heuristique (technique des abeilles) en présence d'une source renouvelable (éolienne) et des dispositifs FACTS, Thèse de Doctorat, Université Ferhatabbassetif, Algérie.

**[17] Tchouate Héteu P. M., 2003**. Contribution des énergies renouvelables au développement durable du secteur électrique: Le cas du Cameroun. Thèse de Doctorat de FSA/MECA ; Université Catholique de Louvain.

**[18] Walid T., 2007.** Conception d'un algorithme de colonie de fourmis pour l'optimisation continue dynamique, Thèse de Doctorat, Université PARIS 12 VAL DE MARNE, France.

**[19] Peng Li, 2009.** Formalisme pour la supervision des systèmes hybrides multi-sources à générateurs d'énergie repartie: Application à la gestion d'un micro réseau, Ecole centrale de Lille.

**[20] Duval J. 2010.** Systèmes d'Energie Hybrides, Masson-Paris, France, pp106-135.

[21] Krishnamurthy S., 2013. Development of decomposition methods for solution of a multi area power dispatch optimization problem, Thèse de Doctorat, Cape Peninsula University of technology.

[22] Alaya I., 2009. Optimisation multi-objectif par colonies de fourmis Cas des problèmes de sac à dos, Thèse de Doctorat, Université Claude Bernard Lyon1.

**[23]** Draidi A., 2010. Répartition économique de l'énergie électrique utilisant les techniques de l'intelligence artificielle, mémoire de magister, Université Mentouri de Constantine.

[24] Monmarché N., 2000. Algorithmes de fourmis artificielles: applications à la classification et à l'optimisation, Thèse de Doctorat, Université François Rabelais Tours.

