

Assessment of Locational Marginal Pricing for Reliable Wheeling Transaction in Deregulated Power Market

Dr. S.Venkatesan¹, M.S.Ramya^{2*}

¹Professor, Electrical & Electronics Engineering, K.L.N. College of Engineering, Sivaganga, India

²PG Scholar, Electrical & Electronics Engineering, K.L.N. College of Engineering, Sivaganga, India

Abstract: This Paper presents a new methodology for the optimal placement of Independent power producer (IPP) based on Locational marginal pricing (LMP) calculation and technical challenges in alleviating transmission network congestion using LMP framework. LMP is determined as the lagrangian multiplier of the power balance equation in Optimal Power Flow (OPF) using PSO. This analysis explains how LMP calculation is performed at each node to locate the spots of congestion and how the LMP signal serves as the economic signal in deregulated electricity market. The proposed methodology is demonstrated on IEEE-30 bus system and Indian utility 69 bus system.

Keywords: Congestion, Independent power producer, Locational Marginal pricing, Market clearing price, Optimal power flow, Particle swarm optimization, Wheeling transaction

I. INTRODUCTION

Under the deregulated electricity market, a transmission network plays an essential role in supporting the transaction between producers and consumers [1]. One drawback on transmission of power flow is congestion. Congestion occurs when transmission lines operate at or above its thermal limits or violating the operating limits of the system and this prevents the system operators from dispatching additional power from a specific generator which causes the increase in cost of dispatching units [2, 3]. Congestion has the effect of increasing overall cost of power delivery in the system. There are two pricing structures that are currently being used in a competitive energy market to report congestion [4]: the uniform pricing method market clearing price (MCP) and the non-uniform pricing method (LMP). In the uniform pricing method all generators payments are equal i.e., MCP which is based on the generators bids submitted by each marginal generator dispatching in the absence of congestion. The second method (LMP) has been the basic nodal pricing approach in power markets in order to manage transmission congestion. The theory of spot pricing has been employed in the form of LMP within an OPF framework [5].

In this competitive environment the primary approach adopted for market operation and planning has been the Locational marginal pricing (LMP) methodology to determine the nodal prices and control or alleviate the congestion of transmission system. LMP is necessary in delivering market price signals and market settlements. The general formulation for LMP evaluation is proposed in [6]. The LMP at a specific location is defined as the marginal cost of supplying an additional increment of power to that location while the system security limits are not violated. LMP varies significantly from one location to another due to the effects of both transmission system losses and transmission system congestion [7].

Mathematically, LMP at a node in the system is the twin variable (called a shadow price) for the equality constraint at that node (sum of injections and withdrawals is equal to zero). Or, LMP is the change in production cost for providing one additional MW at a certain node. Buyers pay ISO based on their bid prices submitted by market participants for dispatched energy. The ISO in turn pays the sellers based on their relevant prices. The difference in LMP between two neighboring buses is the congestion cost which emerges when the energy is transferred from one location (injection) to another location (withdrawal). Marginal losses characterize incremental changes in system losses which occur due to incremental changes in demand. Thus LMP also includes the summation of the costs of marginal energy, marginal loss and congestion [8, 9]. Hence LMP is stated as,

$$\text{LMP} = \text{marginal cost of generation} + \text{congestion cost} + \text{marginal cost of losses.}$$

In a competitive restructured electricity market, the market settlement between the independent system operator (ISO) and the participants is based on locational marginal prices (LMPs). LMPs can be derived by using OPF model either ACOPF model or a DCOPF model [10]. The OPF is performed using Particle swarm optimization (PSO) which schedules the power with the objective of minimizing the total cost of generation [11-13]. Transmission management in deregulated market is significant concerning optimal power flow, price and transaction [14]. The LMP obtained from the OPF serves as a market economic signal in placing the optimal Distributed generation (DG) or IPP placement which maximizes the social welfare and profit [15]. Also different calculation models for LMP evaluation and its properties are discussed in [16].

II. LOCATIONAL MARGINAL PRICING

LMP is the effective market pricing approach in finding the cost to serve the next MW of load at a specific location using the available cheapest generation, by considering all the transmission network limits. The market uses LMPs as energy signal at specific locations and at the time it is delivered. If the lowest priced electricity can reach all locations to meet the demand, market clearing prices are same at all the spots. Energy cannot be freely flowing in certain locations in times of transmission congestion. In such conditions, more expensive generation is intended to meet that demand. Hence, the locational marginal price is higher in those locations.

LMP Methods

The evaluation of LMP can be solved by either using AC optimal power flow (ACOPF) model or DC optimal power flow (DCOPF) model. DCOPF model is simple, fast and also higher satisfactory level of power flow accuracy. This model is characterized by ignoring losses as there is no well-defined rule to provide unique solution the loss distribution energy. Whereas ACOPF formulation is fully based upon power flow characteristic of the network which also takes losses in to consideration.

Hence three schemes of LMP are introduced LMP-lossless, LMP-loss, and LMP-TUT. LMP-TUT is called LMP-Transmission usage tariff which is formulated based on the LMP- loss but transmission usage also taken into consideration. Here we have considered the LMP-loss model using ACOPF model which is tested in IEEE30 bus system.

LMP at each node is based on:

- Actual energy flow
- Actual system operating conditions

A) LMP Energy component (LMP^{ref})

It is defined as the marginal cost at a reference bus or the nodal price at the reference bus. The nodal price at each bus shares this same component. This nodal price includes an implicit congestion component. That is, the nodal price at the reference bus is the least marginal cost of supplying the next increment of load at the reference bus taking into account the physical aspects (i.e., constraints) of the transmission network (i.e., potential congestion). At the reference bus both loss price and congestion price are always zero. Hence the price at the reference bus is equal to the energy component.

B) LMP Loss component (LMP^{loss})

It is defined as the marginal cost of losses from the reference bus to bus i . (LMP^{loss}) is calculated by,

$$LMP^{loss} = LMP^{ref} \times (DF_i - 1) \quad (1)$$

Where,

i = number of buses

The delivery factor (DF_i) at the i^{th} bus represents the effective MW delivered to the customers to serve the load at that bus. It is defined as,

$$DF_i = 1 - \frac{\partial P_{loss}}{\partial P_i} \quad (2)$$

C) LMP Congestion component ($LMP^{congestion}$)

It is defined as the marginal cost of transmission congestion from the reference bus to bus i .

$$LMP^{congestion} = - \sum_{k=1}^M GSF_{k-i} \times \mu_k \quad (3)$$

Where,

μ_k - Shadow price (\$/MW h) associated with a binding constraint.

GSF_{k-i} - Generation shift factor to line 'k' from bus 'i'.

M - Number of lines

Shadow price

A binding constraint, for example, is when the flow on the interface is at the limit of the interface. The value is equal to the incremental change in the system cost divided by an incremental change in the constraint limit.

$$\mu_k = \frac{\text{change in total cost}}{\text{change in constraint s flow}}$$

Generation shift factor

Generation shift factor is the ratio of incremental change in power flow of line 'k' to change in power injection at bus i .

$$GSF_{k-i} = \frac{(B_{(a,i)}^{-1} - B_{(b,i)}^{-1})}{x_k} \quad (4)$$

Where,

B^{-1} – Inverse of susceptance (B) matrix

x_k - Reactance of line k

a , b are sending and receiving end buses of line k

III OVERVIEW OF PARTICLE SWARM OPTIMIZATION

Particle swarm optimization (PSO) is an optimization tool conducts searching process using a population of particles corresponding to individuals. In this heuristic method particles usually fly around in a multidimensional search space. During flight every particle will be adjusting its position according to its own experience (which is called pbest) and also according to the neighboring particle's experience (which is called gbest). Particles are being generated by the velocity and position in N-dimensional space. The initialization of each particle's position and velocity is given by,

$$X_i = ((X_{\max} - X_{\min}) \times rand()) \quad (5)$$

$$V_i = ((V_{\max} - V_{\min}) \times rand()) \quad (6)$$

Where i refers to number of particles. The position and velocity are updated by the following equation,

$$X_i^{k+1} = X_i^k + V_i^{k+1} \quad (7)$$

X_i^k is current searching point and X_i^{k+1} is modified searching point.

$$V_i^{k+1} = wV_i^k + C_1 rand() \times (Pbest_i^k) + C_2 rand() \times (Gbest_i^k - X_i^k) \quad (8)$$

V_i^k is current velocity and V_i^{k+1} is modified velocity.

$$w(k) = w_{\max} - \left(\frac{w_{\max} - w_{\min}}{iter_{\max}} \right) \times iter \quad (9)$$

Where w is weight function or inertia weight. C_1 , C_2 acceleration constants which pulls the particles towards Pbest and Gbest. Maximum velocity is expressed as follows:

$$\frac{(X_{\max} - X_{\min})}{N} \quad (10)$$

Where,

N – Number of iterations.

TABLE 1: Parameters

PARAMETERS	PSO VALUES
Population Size	100
Iterations	300
No. of Generators	6
C1	2
C2	2
W_{min}	0.4
W_{max}	0.9

IV PROBLEM FORMULATION

LMP at a given node of a power system is the sensitivity of operational cost to the change in load at that node, and it is calculated based on optimal power flow (OPF) using particle swarm optimization (PSO). LMPs are used for settlement of transactions, while consumers are charged more than the average cost of production of electricity due to the nonlinear nature of the power flow and the constraints imposed by the OPF. Using OPF optimal generator dispatch is determined subject to a set of constraints representing both operational and physical limits of the power system. The generator and customer bids are assumed to be the inputs to OPF. The base case OPF based on social welfare maximizing algorithm which evaluates the generation dispatch, demands and evaluates prices at each nodes.

A) Objective function

The objective function is then to maximize the total social welfare (TSW) while meeting the load in the system and also should equals to minimize the total cost of generation. The objective function is formulated as a quadratic benefit curve submitted by the buyer (DISCO) minus quadratic bid curve supplied by seller (GENCO).

$$\max \sum_{i=1}^n B_i(P_{Di}) - \sum_{i=1}^n C_i(P_{Gi}) \quad (11)$$

Where the total production cost and the total customer benefit are given by:

$$C_i(P_{Gi}) = a_i P_{Gi}^2 + b_i P_{Gi} + c_i$$

$$B_i(P_{Di}) = d_i P_{Di}^2 + e_i P_{Di} + f_i P_{Di}$$

The main objective function used in OPF is fuel cost minimization for each generator. The objective function for fuel cost minimization can be written as the sum of the quadratic cost model at each generator.

$$F(x) = \min \left(\sum_{i \in G} C_i(P_{Gi}) \right) \quad (12)$$

Here, G is the generator set including slack bus.

P_{Gi} is the active power generated from the generator i

a_i, b_i, c_i are cost coefficients of generator buses.

B) Equality constraints

The power flow equation is the equality constraint in OPF problem. The sum of power flows, active and reactive power injected into a node minus the power flows extracted from the node has to be zero. While minimizing the fuel cost, it is necessary to make sure that generator still supplies the load demand.

$$P_{Gi} - P_{Di} = P_i \quad (13)$$

Where,

P_i is the calculated real power for the bus i .

C) Inequality constraints

The inequality constraints are generation limit, voltage limit, line flow limits and real power generation limit.

a) Generation limit:

The generating plants always have a maximum and minimum generation capacity but which is not feasible to generate due to technical and economic reasons. Generators are bound to operate between the upper and lower limits for both real and reactive power generated.

$$P_{Gi}^{\min} \leq P_{Gi} \leq P_{Gi}^{\max} \quad (14)$$

$$Q_{Gi}^{\min} \leq Q_{Gi} \leq Q_{Gi}^{\max} \quad (15)$$

Where,

P_{Gi}^{\min} , Q_{Gi}^{\min} = minimum real and reactive power generated at bus i

P_{Gi}^{\max} , Q_{Gi}^{\max} = maximum real and reactive power generated at bus i

b) Voltage limit:

The bus voltage needs to be maintained within an allowable narrow range of levels to maintain the voltage stability. The performance is improved by maintaining the stability of the system.

$$V_i^{\min} \leq V_i \leq V_i^{\max} \quad (16)$$

Where,

V_i^{\min} = minimum or lower limit of voltage profile at bus i

V_i^{\max} = maximum or upper limit of voltage profile at bus i

c) Line flow limit:

The line flow limit specifies the maximum power that can be transferred through the given transmission line under given conditions. The limit can be based on thermal or stability considerations.

$$S_{ij} \leq S_{ij}^{\max} \quad (17)$$

Where,

S_{ij} = complex power flow in the line ij

S_{ij}^{\max} = maximum power transfer capacity of the line ij

V RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The proposed methodology is demonstrated in IEEE-30 bus system and Indian utility 69 bus system.

A) IEEE 30 BUS SYSTEM

Case 1: Generator scheduling is performed using PSO based OPF for the base case load of 283.4 MW for 25 trials and best optimal cost of generator scheduling is selected. The system is free from congestion for its base case which is checked by calculating complex power flow in transmission line using Newton-Raphson load flow method. The value of LMP is calculated at each node.

TABLE 2: LMP base case

BUS NO	LMP Ref (\$/MWh)	LMP Loss (\$/MWh)	LMP Cong (\$/MWh)	LMP (\$/MWh)	BUS NO	LMP Ref (\$/MWh)	LMP Loss (\$/MWh)	LMP Cong (\$/MWh)	LMP (\$/MWh)
1	3.3868	-	0	3.3868	16	3.3868	0.0091	0	3.3959
2	3.3868	0.5124	0	3.8992	17	3.3868	0	0	3.3868
3	3.3868	0.3645	0	3.7513	18	3.3868	0.0037	0	3.3905
4	3.3868	0.1155	0	3.5023	19	3.3868	0.0067	0	3.3935
5	3.3868	0.0021	0	3.3889	20	3.3868	0	0	3.3868
6	3.3868	-	0	3.3868	21	3.3868	0.0003	0	3.3871
7	3.3868	0	0	3.3868	22	3.3868	0	0	3.3868
8	3.3868	0.0001	0	3.3869	23	3.3868	0.1664	0	3.5532
9	3.3868	-	0	3.3868	24	3.3868	0.0227	0	3.3895
10	3.3868	0.1352	0	3.5220	25	3.3868	-	0	3.3868
11	3.3868	-	0	3.3868	26	3.3868	0	0	3.3868
12	3.3868	0.1103	0	3.4971	27	3.3868	-	0	3.3868
13	3.3868	-	0	3.3868	28	3.3868	-	0	3.3868
14	3.3868	0.0036	0	3.3904	29	3.3868	0.0349	0	3.4217
15	3.3868	0.0493	0	3.4361	30	3.3868	0	0	3.3868

Table2 shows the Base case values of LMP at each node. The LMP energy component is same for all buses. It is observed that the LMP values are nearly equal at all buses. If DCOPF is considered the losses in the lines are neglected and LMP values at each node are equal wherein here ACOPF is considered losses are also included for the calculation. This base case LMP values indicates that the system is free from congestion as the LMP congestion cost is indicated as zero. LMP congestion cost is zero because the transmission constraints are not violated.

The LMP value signals that the system is free from congestion for the base case. This LMP calculation is performed repeatedly for every five minutes or less because the load connected in the power system is dynamic. The load may increase or decrease causing the spatial difference of LMP to vary which is explained in case2.

Case 2: In this case the load is increased to 333.4MW by increasing the load at node 6. Now again generator scheduling is performed using OPF to check the line limits.

Table 3 shows the LMP values at each node during congestion. The LMP energy component is same for all nodes. As the load increases the overall system cost also increases. Hence LMP congestion value is calculated. Now the LMP values differ at every node as the generator contributions to each node varies. This change in LMP values gives the economic signal indicating

the spot of congestion. The higher value of LMP indicates that more generation is pressed by demand at that node. The negative value of LMP indicates the lower demand compared to generation is present at that node.

TABLE 3: LMP during congestion

BUS NO	LMP Ref (\$/MWh)	LMP Loss (\$/MWh)	LMP Cong (\$/MWh)	LMP (\$/MWh)	BUS NO	LMP Ref (\$/MWh)	LMP Loss (\$/MWh)	LMP Cong (\$/MWh)	LMP (\$/MWh)
1	3.4978	-	0	3.4978	16	3.4978	0.018	-15.4318	-11.916
2	3.4978	0.8618	14.4099	18.7695	17	3.4978	0	0	3.4978
3	3.4978	0.6026	-2.4643	1.6361	18	3.4978	0.0069	18.5246	22.0293
4	3.4978	0.2564	2.6923	6.4465	19	3.4978	0.0058	11.5316	15.0352
5	3.4978	0.0003	4.3831	7.8812	20	3.4978	0	0	3.4978
6	3.4978	0.0497	4.8701	8.4176	21	3.4978	0.0003	9.6628	13.1609
7	3.4978	0	0	3.4978	22	3.4978	0	2.1118	5.6096
8	3.4978	0.0004	0	3.4982	23	3.4978	0.1617	2.9706	6.6301
9	3.4978	-	0	3.4978	24	3.4978	0.0003	-7.0979	-3.5998
10	3.4978	0.1316	36.4773	40.1067	25	3.4978	-	-7.0979	-3.6001
11	3.4978	0	0	3.4978	26	3.4978	0	0	3.4978
12	3.4978	0.127	-16.5769	-12.9251	27	3.4978	-	0	3.4978
13	3.4978	0	0	3.4978	28	3.4978	-	0	3.4978
14	3.4978	0.0045	-8.0184	-4.5161	29	3.4978	0.035	0	3.5328
15	3.4978	0.0569	-5.5708	-2.0161	30	3.4978	0	0	3.4978

Table 2 indicates that the bus number 10 for the given system has higher LMP value of all the other buses which highlights the highly congested spot in the IEEE 30 bus system. This highly congested spot is well suitable for the optimal IPP placement in maximizing the social welfare in the deregulated electricity market and also relieves the congestion.

A) Indian utility 69 bus system

Similarly the LMP is evaluated with 69 bus system for the base case and during congestion. The LMP values for Indian utility 69 bus system are tabulated in table4. The bus number 3 indicates that it has the higher LMP signal where optimal IPP can be placed.

- Number of Generator Bus = 13
- Number of Load Bus = 56
- Number of Transmission lines = 99
- Base Case Load =4742MW
- Incremental Load =4842MW

Table 4: LMP during congestion – Indian utility 69 bus system

BUS NO	LMP REF (\$/MWh)	LMP LOSS (\$/MWh)	LMP CONG (\$/MWh)	LMP (\$/MWh)	BUS NO	LMP REF (\$/MWh)	LMP LOSS (\$/MWh)	LMP CONG (\$/MWh)	LMP (\$/MWh)
1	21.0406	0.3819	0	21.4225	36	21.0406	0.0025	0.4242	21.4672
2	21.0406	0.0875	0	21.1280	37	21.0406	0.0028	0.0998	21.1432
3	21.0406	0.1099	13.5196	34.6701	38	21.0406	0	0.3243	21.3649
4	21.0406	-	-0.0187	-	39	21.0406	0	-7.1785	13.8621
5	21.0406	0.0839	-3.5906	17.5339	40	21.0406	0	-0.8047	20.2358
6	21.0406	0.0074	0.3738	21.4217	41	21.0406	0.1016	-5.2396	15.9025
7	21.0406	0.0019	-3.5522	17.4903	42	21.0406	0	0	21.0406
8	21.0406	0.0364	0.3322	21.4092	43	21.0406	0.0027	4.5393	25.5826
9	21.0406	0.1020	0.0031	21.1457	44	21.0406	0.3305	-1.8615	19.5095
10	21.0406	0	-0.5937	20.4468	45	21.0406	0	0	21.0406
11	21.0406	0.0241	-0.0218	21.0429	46	21.0406	0	0	21.0406
12	21.0406	0.1668	-0.0454	21.1619	47	21.0406	0.1752	-5.2396	15.9762
13	21.0406	0.1215	2.4340	23.5960	48	21.0406	0.1554	-0.7953	20.4007
14	21.0406	0	-6.8863	14.1542	49	21.0406	0	0	21.0406
15	21.0406	0.1745	-19.3312	1.8838	50	21.0406	0	0	21.0406
16	21.0406	0	-10.0387	11.0018	51	21.0406	0.2528	0.0049	21.2983
17	21.0406	0.0718	10.0999	31.2122	52	21.0406	0.5969	0.0047	21.6422
18	21.0406	0.1466	5.4201	26.6072	53	21.0406	-	-0.0002	-
19	21.0406	0	-0.5937	20.4468	54	21.0406	0	0	21.0406
20	21.0406	0.2064	-6.2431	15.0039	55	21.0406	0.4126	0.0049	21.4581
21	21.0406	0.0358	-0.0050	21.0713	56	21.0406	0.0056	0	21.0462
22	21.0406	0	-7.2584	13.7822	57	21.0406	-	0	-
23	21.0406	0	-0.5937	20.4468	58	21.0406	-	0	-
24	21.0406	-	2.7291	-	59	21.0406	0	0	21.0406
25	21.0406	-	-0.0108	-	60	21.0406	-	-0.0107	-
26	21.0406	0	0	21.0406	61	21.0406	0.2288	-0.0051	21.2642
27	21.0406	0.4031	-5.2396	16.2040	62	21.0406	0	0	21.0406
28	21.0406	0.0612	-3.1592	17.9426	63	21.0406	0	0	21.0406
29	21.0406	0.3030	0.4873	21.8308	64	21.0406	0	-0.0107	21.0298
30	21.0406	0.0004	-1.4613	19.5797	65	21.0406	-	0.4753	-
31	21.0406	0.2341	-1.8563	19.4184	66	21.0406	0.0073	0.0003	21.0481
32	21.0406	0.0067	5.5935	26.6408	67	21.0406	-	0	-
33	21.0406	0.0045	4.5393	25.5844	68	21.0406	0.0001	6.2540	27.2947
34	21.0406	0.0414	10.1756	31.2576	69	21.0406	0	0	21.0406
35	21.0406	0.3932	-16.1827	5.2511					

VI CONCLUSION

The transition from monopolistic to a competitive deregulated market though found to be more advantageous, encountered certain drawbacks, such as congestion and difficulty in pricing. In this work, the Locational marginal pricing (LMP) proved to be an effective solution in overcoming the above said barriers of deregulation. Generator scheduling using PSO based OPF technique has been tested in IEEE30 bus system and Indian utility 69 bus system in order to minimize fuel cost which in turn maximizes the social welfare. The LMP values are also calculated for IEEE30 bus system and

Indian utility 69 bus system under normal and congested condition. Increase in LMP holds to be a good signal for identifying the congested locations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors are grateful to the management, principal and HOD of K.L.N. College of engineering, Madurai for providing all facilities for Proceeding the research work.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Ethical statement: The authors declare that they have followed ethical responsibilities

REFERENCES

- [1] Maghouli P, Hosseini SH, Buygi MO, Shahidehpour M. “A multi-objective framework for transmission expansion planning in deregulated environments” *IEEE Trans. Power Syst*, vol.24, no.2 pp.1051-1061, 2009.
- [2] Krause T, Anderson G (2006). Evaluating congestion management schemes in liberalized electricity markets using an agent-based simulator, *IEEE Power Engineering Society General Meeting*.pp.8.
- [3] J.D.Finney, H.A.Othman and W.L.Rutz (1997) Evaluating transmission congestion in system planning, *IEEE Trans. Power syst.*, vol.12,pp 1143-1150.
- [4] M.Murali, M.Sailaja kumar, M.Sydulu (2014) ,“Optimal spot pricing in electricity market with inelastic load using constrained bat algorithm” *ELSEVIER on Electrical Power and Energy Systems* Vol.62,pp. 897-911.
- [5] Cheng Xu , Overbye Thomas J. (2006) An energy reference bus independent LMP decomposition algorithm, *IEEE Trans. Power syst.*, vol.21,no.3
- [6] Tina Orfanogianni, George gross (2007), A General formulation for LMP evaluation, *IEEE Trans. Power syst.*, vol.22,no.3
- [7] Mohammad shahidehpour , Hatim Yamin Zuyi Li “Market operations electric power systems: Forecasting scheduling and risk management” Newyork :Wiley 2002.
- [8] Qin Wang, Guangyuan Zhang, James D. McCalley, Tongxin Zheng, and Eugene Litvinov (2014) Risk-Based Locational Marginal Pricing and Congestion Management”, *IEEE Trans. Power syst.*, vol. 29, No. 5,pp. 2518 - 2528 .
- [9] G. Hamoud and I. Bradley (2004), Assessment of transmission congestion cost and Locational marginal pricing in a competitive electricity market, *IEEE Trans. Power syst.*, vol. 19(2),pp. 769 - 775
- [10] V.Sarkar , S.A.Khparde (2011) Optimal LMP decomposition for the ACOPF calculation, *IEEE Trans. on power systems*,vol.26,No.3.
- [11] Abido, M.A.,(2002),Optimal power flow using particle swarm optimization, *ELSEVIER on Electrical Power and Energy Systems*, Vol. 24, pp. 563-571.
- [12] Belgin Emre , Rengin Idil ,“Optimal Power Flow Solution Using Particle Swarm Optimization Algorithm”, *IEEE* 2013.
- [13] Sudipta Dutta , S.P.Singh (2008) Optimal Rescheduling of Generators for Congestion Management Based on Particle Swarm Optimization, *IEEE Trans. Power syst.*, vol.23, no. 4,
- [14] Richard d. christie, Bruce f. wollenberg, Ivar wangensteen (2000),Transmission Management in the Deregulated Environment, *proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 88,No.2
- [15] Durga Gautam , Nadarajah Mithulananthan (2007) Optimal DG placement in deregulated electricity marke, *ELSEVIER on Electrical Power systems research* vol.77,pp.1627-1636.
- [16] Yong Fu, Zuyi Li, “Different Models and Properties on LMP Calculations” IEEE conference Power Engineering Society General Meeting_on 2006.