

Examination of ACOPF Solution Characteristic

University of Wisconsin - Madison

May 20, 2015

1 Examination Description

To evaluate ACOPF solution characteristic, three different ACOPF model formulations (polar power-voltage, rectangular power-voltage and rectangular current-voltage) are utilized. Each formulation has two versions to construct the problem - one uses the admittance matrix, which is known as Y_{bus} and another use a summation of transmission line power flows to calculate power balance equations at every node. For this task, thermal limits are expressed in terms of real power, but current is used for the rectangular current-voltage formulation. Objective function of problems is to minimize quadratic generator operating cost curves. In addition, two cases - with/without the D-curve constraint are examined. The selection of three solvers (KNITRO, CONOPT, IPOPTH) is based on the expert experience that those are best suited for solving the ACOPF problems. The solver SNOPT is crossed off since it is not as effective as other solvers.

2 ACOPF Solution Characteristic

2.1 Notation

1. **ic=***
Initial condition for ACOPF problems and * refers to options to choose a different starting point.
2. **Ybus**
ACOPF problems which use the admittance matrix to calculate node power balance equations.
3. **S.L.P**
ACOPF problems which use the summation of line power flows to calculate node power balance equations.
4. **Time** : CPU time to solve ACOPF problems.
 - **First** : CPU time from generating starting points to a solution
 - **Start** : CPU time from starting points to a solution
 - Section 2.2 considers only **First** time to see general results and then section 2.3 considers both CPU time (**First and Start**) for more detail.
5. **0.V**
Optimal objective value.

2.2 Optimal solution without the D-curve constraint

When it solves DCOPT problems for initial contions $ic=4,5$, CONOPT is used as a default solver. To solve the decoupled ACOPT for the initial contion $ic=6$, the same solver that ACOPT problems use is applied for consistency. For example, if KNITRO is used to examine ACOPT problem solutions, then the decoupled ACOPT problem which will be served as an initial condition also use KNITRO. Default values for each solver’s option are used for end-users unfamiliar with GAMS.

Solver : KNITRO		POLAR				RECTANGULAR				IV-REC			
		Ybus		S.L.P		Ybus		S.L.P		Ybus		S.L.P	
		Time	O.V	Time	O.V	Time	O.V	Time	O.V	Time	O.V	Time	O.V
case14	ic=1	0.5sec	8081\$	0.5sec	8081\$	0.55sec	8081\$	0.55sec	8081\$	0.7sec	8081\$	0.5sec	8081\$
	ic=2	0.4sec	8081\$	0.4sec	8081\$	0.4sec	8081\$	0.4sec	8081\$	0.5sec	8081\$	0.5sec	8081\$
	ic=3	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	0.55sec	8081\$	0.55sec	8081\$	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=4	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$
	ic=5	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$
	ic=6	2sec	8081\$	2sec	8081\$	2sec	8081\$	2sec	8081\$	2sec	8081\$	2sec	8081\$
case118	ic=1	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=2	0.65sec	129.66K\$	0.6sec	129.66K\$	0.8sec	129.66K\$	0.7sec	129.66K\$	0.8sec	129.66K\$	0.8sec	129.66K\$
	ic=3	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=4	1.4sec	129.66K\$	1.4sec	129.66K\$	1.5sec	129.66K\$	1.5sec	129.66K\$	1.6sec	129.66K\$	1.5sec	129.66K\$
	ic=5	1.4sec	129.66K\$	1.4sec	129.66K\$	1.5sec	129.66K\$	1.5sec	129.66K\$	1.5sec	129.66K\$	1.5sec	129.66K\$
	ic=6	3sec	129.66K\$	3sec	129.66K\$	3sec	129.66K\$	3sec	129.66K\$	3.5sec	129.66K\$	3.5sec	129.66K\$
case300	ic=1	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=2	1sec	719.72K\$	1sec	719.72K\$	1.3sec	719.72K\$	1.2sec	719.72K\$	2.5sec	719.72K\$	1sec	719.72K\$
	ic=3	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=4	2sec	719.72K\$	2sec	719.72K\$	3sec	719.72K\$	2.5sec	719.72K\$	2.5sec	719.72K\$	2sec	719.72K\$
	ic=5	2sec	719.72K\$	2sec	719.72K\$	2.3sec	719.72K\$	2.3sec	719.72K\$	2.5sec	719.72K\$	2sec	719.72K\$
	ic=6	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
case2737sop	ic=1	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=2	8sec	777.624K\$	7sec	777.624K\$	10sec	777.624K\$	10sec	777.624K\$	10sec	777.624K\$	7.5sec	777.624K\$
	ic=3	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=4	10sec	777.624K\$	9sec	777.624K\$	12.5sec	777.624K\$	11sec	777.624K\$	13.5sec	777.624K\$	9.5sec	777.624K\$
	ic=5	10.5sec	777.624K\$	9.5sec	777.624K\$	13sec	777.624K\$	10.5sec	777.624K\$	12.5sec	777.624K\$	9.5sec	777.624K\$
	ic=6	25.5sec	777.624K\$	23sec	777.624K\$	28sec	777.624K\$	26sec	777.624K\$	26.5sec	777.624K\$	24sec	777.624K\$
case3120sp	ic=1	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=2	10.5sec	2.1422M\$	8.5sec	2.1422M\$	15sec	2.1422M\$	11.5sec	2.1422M\$	15sec	2.14117M\$	9.5sec	2.14117M\$
	ic=3	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=4	15sec	2.1422M\$	13sec	2.1422M\$	19sec	2.1422M\$	15sec	2.1422M\$	18sec	2.14117M\$	13sec	2.14117M\$
	ic=5	15sec	2.1422M\$	13sec	2.1422M\$	19sec	2.1422M\$	15sec	2.1422M\$	20sec	2.14117M\$	13sec	2.14117M\$
	ic=6	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas

Table 1: ACOPT solution characteristic with KNITRO solver

Notice that the yellow-colored backgrounds indicate formulation and initial condition that show best performance in terms of CPU time and robustness for the ACOPT problem. The red-colored backgrounds refer to an optimal solution which is a different local minimum from other solutions in the table.

• Observation

- For large test cases, S.L.P version provides an optimal solution faster than Ybus version since redundant calculations for nodal balance equations are eliminated in S.L.P version. Also, they provide an equivalent optimal solution so task 3 and 5 only focus on S.L.P version.
- It is ambiguous to make the decision which formulation is superior to other formulation with small test cases since their CPU time are all similar each other with every initial condition.
- Infeasibility occurs only with random initial condition($ic=1&3$) and decoupled ACOPT solution($ic=6$). Since voltage angles are chosen randomly bewteen $-\pi$ and π for $ic=1&3$ it could start at a strange point such that two adjacent buses have $-\pi$ and π respectively in an extreme case so possibly create infeasibility. For $ic=6$, it is due to the inherent shortcoming of the decoupled ACOPT¹, which creates infeasibility when the demand of the system is sufficiently large.
- Polar power-voltage formulation with a summation of line power flows to calculate node balance equations seems most promising for the ACOPT.

¹refer to the paper : ByungKwon Park and Christopher L. DeMarco, “Active/reactive power decomposition approaches to the AC optimal power flow problem,” North American Power Symposium (NAPS), 7-9 September 2014,

- Second initial condition, which is “Flat start”, where all initial guesses for voltage magnitude and angle are set to 1.0 and zero respectively, and power flow are set to zero, provides the best performance for the ACOPF starting point.
- Since the ACOPF is a nonlinear and nonconvex optimization problem, the global optimal solution is not guaranteed and only local solutions are obtained. Based on this fact, the rectangular current-voltage formulation obtains an optimal objective value lower than other formulations.

2.2.1 Comparison between the Polar and IV-REC formulation solution

Due to lack of more detailed information, the real power flow limit which are given us, as opposed to the current flow limit are used to impose the line limit for the rectangular current-voltage formulation. This leads us to formulate a slightly different model with the polar power-voltage and rectangular current-voltage formulation of the ACOPF problem. For this reason, the rectangular current-voltage formulation provides a different local minima for some cases.

Figure below shows differences between the polar power-voltage formulation and rectangular current-voltage formulation by calculating the l^2 -norm of optimal solution with two test cases; case 3120sp and case2737sop. The l^2 -norm for each variable is equivalent when they produce the same optimal objective value(case2737sop), whereas if they obtain a different optimal objective value(case3120sp), then the small difference of the l^2 -norm for each variable between the polar power-voltage formulation and rectangular current-voltage formulation is observed. This tells us that we find a different local solution.

L-2 Norm of the optimal solution

	<i>Case3120sop</i> Produce a different optimal objective value		<i>Case2737sop</i> Produce the same optimal objective value	
	Polar	IV-REC	Polar	IV-REC
Voltage Angle	14.2015	14.4381	8.1233	8.1233
Voltage Magnitude	61.0426	61.1168	57.0679	57.0679
Active Power Injection	21.2463	21.2414	14.5362	14.5362
Reactive Power Injection	7.7249	7.8813	2.4746	2.4746

Figure 1: Comparison for different local minima

Solver : CONOPT		POLAR				RECTANGULAR				IV-REC			
		Ybus		S.L.P		Ybus		S.L.P		Ybus		S.L.P	
		Time	O.V	Time	O.V	Time	O.V	Time	O.V	Time	O.V	Time	O.V
case14	ic=1	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	
	ic=2	0.4sec	8081\$	0.4sec	8081\$	0.4sec	8081\$	0.4sec	8081\$	0.45sec	8081\$	0.4sec	8081\$
	ic=3	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	
	ic=4	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$
	ic=5	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$
	ic=6	2sec	8081\$	2sec	8081\$	2sec	8081\$	2sec	8081\$	2sec	8081\$	2sec	8081\$
case118	ic=1	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	
	ic=2	1.5sec	129.66K\$	1.5sec	129.66K\$	2sec	129.66K\$	2.5sec	129.66K\$	2sec	129.66K\$	1.7sec	129.66K\$
	ic=3	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	
	ic=4	2sec	129.66K\$	2sec	129.66K\$	2.5sec	129.66K\$	2.5sec	129.66K\$	2.5sec	129.66K\$	2.5sec	129.66K\$
	ic=5	2sec	129.66K\$	2.5sec	129.66K\$	2sec	129.66K\$	2.5sec	129.66K\$	2.2sec	129.66K\$	2.5sec	129.66K\$
	ic=6	3.5sec	129.66K\$	3.5sec	129.66K\$	3.5sec	129.66K\$	4.5sec	129.66K\$	3.7sec	129.66K\$	4sec	129.66K\$
case300	ic=1	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	
	ic=2	5sec	719.72K\$	10sec	719.72K\$	10sec	719.72K\$	17.5sec	719.72K\$	10sec	719.72K\$	11sec	719.72K\$
	ic=3	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	
	ic=4	6sec	719.72K\$	7.5sec	719.72K\$	6.5sec	719.72K\$	11sec	719.72K\$	7.5sec	719.72K\$	6.5sec	719.72K\$
	ic=5	4sec	719.72K\$	8sec	719.72K\$	5.5sec	719.72K\$	7sec	719.72K\$	6sec	719.72K\$	7sec	719.72K\$
	ic=6	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	
case2737sop	ic=1	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	
	ic=2	22sec	777.624K\$	23sec	777.624K\$	29sec	777.624K\$	37sec	777.624K\$	27sec	777.624K\$	31sec	777.624K\$
	ic=3	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	
	ic=4	15sec	777.624K\$	32sec	777.624K\$	28sec	777.624K\$	42sec	777.624K\$	33sec	777.624K\$	54sec	777.624K\$
	ic=5	2min33sec	777.624K\$	44sec	777.624K\$	50sec	777.624K\$	32sec	777.624K\$	33sec	777.624K\$	26sec	777.624K\$
	ic=6	38sec	777.624K\$	52sec	777.624K\$	34sec	777.624K\$	40sec	777.624K\$	41sec	777.624K\$	34sec	777.624K\$
case3120sp	ic=1	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	
	ic=2	3min10sec	2.1422M\$	45sec	2.1422M\$	3min33sec	2.1422M\$	1min23sec	2.1422M\$	6min	2.14117M\$	1min	2.1405M\$
	ic=3	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	
	ic=4	40sec	2.1422M\$	45sec	2.1422M\$	40sec	2.1422M\$	40sec	2.1422M\$	1min53sec	2.14117M\$	48sec	2.1405M\$
	ic=5	45sec	2.1422M\$	infeas	infeas	40sec	2.1422M\$	56sec	2.1422M\$	2min	2.14117M\$	1min20sec	2.1405M\$
	ic=6	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	

Table 2: ACOPF solution characteristic with CONOPT solver

Solver : IPOPETH		POLAR				RECTANGULAR				IV-REC			
		Ybus		S.L.P		Ybus		S.L.P		Ybus		S.L.P	
		Time	O.V	Time	O.V	Time	O.V	Time	O.V	Time	O.V	Time	O.V
case14	ic=1	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	0.6sec	8081\$	0.5sec	8081\$	0.5sec	8081\$	infeas	infeas
	ic=2	0.4sec	8081\$	0.4sec	8081\$	0.4sec	8081\$	0.4sec	8081\$	0.45sec	8081\$	0.4sec	8081\$
	ic=3	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	0.7sec	8081\$	0.6sec	8081\$	0.6	8081\$	0.7sec	8081\$
	ic=4	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$
	ic=5	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$	1sec	8081\$
	ic=6	2sec	8081\$	2sec	8081\$	2sec	8081\$	2sec	8081\$	2sec	8081\$	2sec	8081\$
case118	ic=1	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=2	0.8sec	129.66K\$	0.8sec	129.66K\$	1sec	129.66K\$	1sec	129.66K\$	0.9sec	129.66K\$	0.8sec	129.66K\$
	ic=3	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=4	1.5sec	129.66K\$	1.6sec	129.66K\$	1.5sec	129.66K\$	1.7sec	129.66K\$	1.7sec	129.66K\$	1.5sec	129.66K\$
	ic=5	1.5sec	129.66K\$	1.5sec	129.66K\$	1.7sec	129.66K\$	1.5sec	129.66K\$	1.7sec	129.66K\$	1.5sec	129.66K\$
	ic=6	3.3sec	129.66K\$	3sec	129.66K\$	3.2sec	129.66K\$	3sec	129.66K\$	3.5sec	129.66K\$	3sec	129.66K\$
case300	ic=1	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=2	1sec	719.72K\$	1sec	719.72K\$	1.7sec	719.72K\$	1.5sec	719.72K\$	1.8sec	719.72K\$	1.2sec	719.72K\$
	ic=3	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=4	2.2sec	719.72K\$	2sec	719.72K\$	2.5sec	719.72K\$	2.5sec	719.72K\$	2.5sec	719.72K\$	2.1sec	719.72K\$
	ic=5	2sec	719.72K\$	2sec	719.72K\$	2.25sec	719.72K\$	2.2sec	719.72K\$	2.5sec	719.72K\$	2.1sec	719.72K\$
	ic=6	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
case2737sop	ic=1	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=2	7.5sec	777.624K	7sec	777.624K	11sec	777.624K	9sec	777.624K	10sec	777.624K	7sec	777.624K
	ic=3	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=4	9sec	777.624K	8.5sec	777.624K	13sec	777.624K	10sec	777.624K	13.5sec	777.624K	9sec	777.624K
	ic=5	9.5sec	777.624K	8.5sec	777.624K	13sec	777.624K	10sec	777.624K	12.5sec	777.624K	9.5sec	777.624K
	ic=6	24sec	777.624K	23sec	777.624K	26sec	777.624K	24.5sec	777.624K	28sec	777.624K	23sec	777.624K
case3120sp	ic=1	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=2	11sec	2.1422M\$	11sec	2.1422M\$	15sec	2.1422M\$	11sec	2.1422M\$	16sec	2.14117M\$	10sec	2.1405M\$
	ic=3	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=4	14sec	2.1422M\$	12sec	2.1422M\$	18.5sec	2.1422M\$	14sec	2.1422M\$	19sec	2.14117M\$	14sec	2.1405M\$
	ic=5	13sec	2.1422M\$	14sec	2.1422M\$	20sec	2.1422M\$	16sec	2.1422M\$	2min	2.14117M\$	13sec	2.1405M\$
	ic=6	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas

Table 3: ACOPF solution characteristic with IPOPETH solver

• Observation

- Based on the Table 1,2 and 3 KNITRO and IPOPETH are better suited for solving the ACOPF problem than CONOPT.

- Polar power-voltage formulation provides best performance in terms of CPU time and rectangular current-voltage formulation obtains the same local solution achieving the lower optimal objective value in solvers, CONOPT and IPOPTH, as well.
- There are no significant differences for the behavior of the ACOPF solution with small test cases. Infeasibility happens to occur with only same initial conditions without alternating among other initial conditions. Thus next section for the examination including the D-curve constraint is conducted with only largest test cases, case2737sop and case3120sp and initial conditions(ic=1,3,6) that create infeasibility are not considered.

2.3 Optimal solution with the D-curve constraint

This section conducts the examination with the nonlinear generator D-curve constraint. All generator is applied to the D-curve constraint unless they have a failry small rectangular limit formed by P_{max} & P_{min} and Q_{max} & Q_{min} . Heuristic criterions to cross off generators are implemented so that the D-curve is not applied to generators that have $\frac{P_{max}}{P_{min}} \leq 1.1$ or $\frac{Q_{max}-Q_{min}}{Q_{max}} \leq 0.1$.

Solver :		POLAR						RECTANGULAR						IV-REC					
		Ybus			S.L.P			Ybus			S.L.P			Ybus			S.L.P		
		Time		O.V	Time		O.V	Time		O.V	Time		O.V	Time		O.V	Time		O.V
		First	Start		First	Start		First	Start		First	Start		First	Start		First	Start	
case2737sop	ic=2	8sec	8sec	777.624K\$	7sec	7sec	777.624K\$	11sec	11sec	777.624K\$	8sec	8sec	777.624K\$	10.5sec	10.5sec	777.624K\$	7.5sec	7.5sec	777.624K\$
	ic=4	10.5sec	8.5sec	777.624K\$	10sec	8sec	777.624K\$	14sec	11sec	777.624K\$	10sec	8sec	777.624K\$	13.5sec	11.5sec	777.624K\$	11sec	9sec	777.624K\$
	ic=5	10sec	8sec	777.624K\$	9.5sec	7.5sec	777.624K\$	13sec	11sec	777.624K\$	10.5sec	8.5sec	777.624K\$	13.5sec	11.5sec	777.624K\$	10sec	8sec	777.624K\$
	ic=6	35sec	10sec	777.624K\$	44sec	9sec	777.624K\$	47sec	12sec	777.624K\$	45sec	10sec	777.624K\$	46.5sec	11.5sec	777.624K\$	45sec	9sec	777.624K\$
case3120sp	ic=2	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=4	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=5	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas

Table 4: ACOPF solution characteristic including the D-curve with KNITRO solver

Solver :		POLAR						RECTANGULAR						IV-REC					
		Ybus			S.L.P			Ybus			S.L.P			Ybus			S.L.P		
		Time		O.V	Time		O.V	Time		O.V	Time		O.V	Time		O.V	Time		O.V
		First	Start		First	Start		First	Start		First	Start		First	Start		First	Start	
case2737sop	ic=2	23sec	23sec	777.624K\$	37sec	37sec	777.624K\$	32sec	32sec	777.624K\$	27sec	27sec	777.624K\$	26sec	26sec	777.624K\$	24sec	24sec	777.624K\$
	ic=4	15sec	13sec	777.624K\$	28sec	26sec	777.624K\$	26sec	24sec	777.624K\$	4min40sec	4min38sec	777.624K\$	21sec	19sec	777.624K\$	20sec	18sec	777.624K\$
	ic=5	28sec	26sec	777.624K\$	23sec	21sec	777.624K\$	32sec	30sec	777.624K\$	29sec	27sec	777.624K\$	38sec	36sec	777.624K\$	26sec	24sec	777.624K\$
	ic=6	37sec	17sec	777.624K\$	44sec	24sec	777.624K\$	45sec	24sec	777.624K\$	44sec	24sec	777.624K\$	39sec	19sec	777.624K\$	33sec	13sec	777.624K\$
case3120sp	ic=2	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=4	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas
	ic=5	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas	infeas

Table 5: ACOPF solution characteristic including the D-curve with CONOPT solver

Solver : IPOPTH		POLAR						RECTANGULAR						IV-REC					
		Ybus			S.L.P			Ybus			S.L.P			Ybus			S.L.P		
		Time		O.V	Time		O.V	Time		O.V	Time		O.V	Time		O.V	Time		O.V
		First	Start		First	Start		First	Start		First	Start		First	Start		First	Start	
case2737sop	ic=2	8sec	8sec	777.624K\$	10sec	10sec	777.624K\$	11sec	11sec	777.624K\$	11sec	11sec	777.624K\$	11sec	11sec	777.624K\$	8sec	8sec	777.624K\$
	ic=4	9sec	7sec	777.624K\$	10sec	8sec	777.624K\$	12sec	10sec	777.624K\$	13sec	11sec	777.624K\$	14sec	12sec	777.624K\$	10sec	8sec	777.624K\$
	ic=5	9.5sec	7.5sec	777.624K\$	10sec	8sec	777.624K\$	12.5sec	10.5sec	777.624K\$	11sec	9sec	777.624K\$	13.5sec	11.5sec	777.624K\$	10sec	8sec	777.624K\$
	ic=6	26sec	7sec	777.624K\$	25sec	6sec	777.624K\$	33sec	11sec	777.624K\$	31sec	9sec	777.624K\$	29sec	9sec	777.624K\$	27sec	7sec	777.624K\$
case3120sp	ic=2	10.5sec	10.5sec	2.1425M\$	10sec	10sec	2.1425M\$	20sec	20sec	2.1425M\$	12.5sec	12.5sec	2.1425M\$	18sec	18sec	2.1414M\$	10sec	10sec	2.1408M\$
	ic=4	14sec	10.5sec	2.1425M\$	13sec	8sec	2.1425M\$	19sec	15.5sec	2.1425M\$	17.5sec	14sec	2.1425M\$	33sec	30sec	2.1414M\$	16sec	12.5sec	2.1408M\$
	ic=5	14sec	10.5sec	2.1425M\$	13sec	8sec	2.1425M\$	19sec	15.5sec	2.1425M\$	15sec	11.5sec	2.1425M\$	50sec	47sec	2.1414M\$	14.5sec	11sec	2.1408M\$

Table 6: ACOF solution characteristic including the D-curve with IPOPTH solver

- **Observation**

- It is checked that all test case with the D-curve constraint works properly, which implies it does not create infeasibility. The CPU time to obtain an optimal solution is increased slightly for almost all case due to the D-curve constraint.
- By imposing the D-curve constraint, we could recognize that an optimal objective value for some test cases are increased slightly. This is since the original rectangular generator limit is replaced with the D-curve, which is smaller than the original rectangular generator limit in size. This leads us to the reduction of our original feasible region.
- IPOPTH solver shows better performance for the ACOF problems than CONOPT and KNITRO in every portion. IPOPTH is faster and more robust, whereas CONOPT takes longer time to find an optimal solution. Moreover, CONOPT and KNITRO fail to find feasible points for some cases with the D-curve constraint.
- Decoupled ACOF as an initial condition first seems to be an unattractive choice to start the ACOF in terms of CPU time, which is **First** calculating time from generating initial guesses to an optimal solution. However, in terms of **Start** calculating time from starting points to an optimal solution, the decoupled ACOF serves as a great initial condition.
- In most cases, the polar power-voltage formulation with S.L.P version converges to an optimal solution faster than any other formulation. However, as discussed above the rectangular current-voltage formulation provides a different local minimum for some cases and converging time is slower than the polar power-voltage formulatin slightly.

3 Conclusion

- **Model**

- Polar power-voltage formulation with the S.L.P version shows the best performance in terms of the convergent speed.
- Rectangular current-voltage formulation tends to find a different local solution for some cases, but converges to an optimal solution slightly slower than the polar power-voltage formulation.

- **Initial guess**

- Flat start provides the fastest convergence for the ACOF when we calculate the CPU time from generating those initial guesses to an optimal solution.

- Decoupled ACOPF provides the fastest convergence for the ACOPF with case2737sop when we calculate the CPU time from those initial guesses to an optimal solution. However, there exists the drawback that it happens to fail to find an initial points for some cases.
- **Solver**
 - IPOPTH serves as the most promising solver for ACOPF problems.
 - CONOPT and KNITRO has difficulties to find a feasible point for some cases when the D-curve constraint is applied to ACOPF problems.