

EVALUATION OF DISTRIBUTION LOSS FACTORS 2009-2010

2 March 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2	SUMMARY OF RESULTS.....	3
3	RECONCILIATION OF FORECAST AND ACTUAL LOSSES	4
4	GENERAL COMMENTS ON CHANGES TO DLFS.....	4
5	APPLICATION OF THE METHODOLOGY.....	5
5.1	TREATMENT OF THEFT	5
5.2	SITE SPECIFIC DLFS	5
5.3	132kV LINES.....	5
5.4	TRANSMISSION SUBSTATIONS	6
5.5	SUB-TRANSMISSION LINES	6
5.6	ZONE SUBSTATIONS	6
5.7	MEDIUM VOLTAGE LINES (11kV, 22kV).....	6
5.8	DISTRIBUTION SUBSTATIONS	6
5.9	LOW VOLTAGE LINES.....	7

1 Introduction

The National Electricity Rules require that Distribution Network Service Providers (DNSPs) obtain the approval of the Australian Energy Regulator (AER) for Distribution Loss Factors (DLFs) for the DNSP's network. This report nominates the generic DLFs for Integral Energy's electrical distribution network for the 2009/10 financial year. It also outlines the application of the methodology and assumptions and base data used for the calculation of the loss factors.

Integral Energy's methodology for calculation of distribution loss factors is detailed in a separate document entitled "Methodology for the Determination of Distribution Loss factors" dated 30 January 2008. The methodology is based on the National Electricity Rules, as well as taking account of the Guideline issued by the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal of NSW (IPART) prior to this responsibility transferring to AER ("Assessment and Approval Process of Distribution Loss Factors proposed by DNSPs", dated November 2007).

The methodology used in this report is identical to that used in the submission for the 2008/2009 year which is different in some key areas from that used by Integral Energy in previous years.

As required by the Rules, the proposed DLFs are "forward looking" and use both demand and energy forecast data as provided by Integral Energy's Forecasting Section for the 2009/10 fiscal year.

2 Summary of Results

Table 1 - Generic Loss Factors

Network Level	2009/10		2008/09		2007/08	
	Effective Section Loss Factor %	Cumulative Loss Factor %	Effective Section Loss Factor %	Cumulative Loss Factor %	Effective Section Loss Factor %	Cumulative Loss Factor %
132 kV Network	0.32%	0.32%	0.40%	0.40%	0.59%	0.59%
Transmission Substation	0.41%	0.80%	0.42%	0.90%	0.45%	1.04%
Subtransmission Network	0.69%	1.54%	0.63%	1.56%	0.58%	1.83%
Zone Substation	0.54%	1.74%	0.52%	1.74%	0.58%	2.22%
High Voltage Distribution Network	1.26%	3.17%	0.93%	2.82%	0.98%	3.22%
Distribution Substation	2.36%	6.05%	2.60%	5.89%	2.31%	6.39%
Low Voltage Distribution Network	1.83%	8.27%	2.23%	8.55%	2.03%	8.55%

Notes:

1. All % loss factors quoted in the above table are given as the % of energy delivered at that level of the network, whether to customers at that level, or to lower levels.
2. Section loss factors do not add numerically to give cumulative loss factors due to the effects of compounding and network configuration.
3. An allowance for theft and non-technical losses of 0.5% of total sales has been made.

An examination of both the current (2008/09) and the proposed generic 2009/10 DLFs shows that there is no significant difference between the results. However, there are some small variations in the DLFs across the range. These changes are considered to be a combination of improved load flow techniques and Loss Load Factor (LLF) data, as well as the factoring in of capital works, particularly at the Transmission and Zone Substation level.

In addition, and in accordance with the National Electricity Rules, all customers with a consumption of greater than 40GWh and/or 10MW demand have had site specific Loss Factors calculated. Embedded Generators with a peak output of greater than 10MW have also had Loss Factors calculated. The methodology for the calculation of these DLFs is based on the difference in losses in the network between the conditions where the generator is operating and not operating over an annual cycle, relative to the energy sent out by the generator over the same period.

3 Reconciliation of Forecast and Actual Losses

As required by the Rules, a reconciliation of forecast and actual losses has been carried out. This involved taking the complete billing data set for 2007/08 and applying the estimated DLFs for that year to the data to determine the expected system losses. A comparison between the actual losses as calculated from the billing data and the losses calculated by using the DLFs at each tier of the network is shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2 – Reconciliation of Forecast to Actual Losses

Financial Year	Forecast Loss kWh	Actual Loss kWh	Difference kWh	Energy Distributed kWh	Forecast error as % of Energy Distributed
2005/06	1,020,888,259	974,356,957	42,329,016	17,204,938,460	0.27%
2006/07	1,062,802,864	922,867,190	139,935,674	17,457,605,133	0.802%
2007/08	944,468,857	907,912,261	36,556,596	17,410,946,298	0.21%

Note that financial year 2007/08 is the last complete set of available billing data.

4 General comments on changes to DLFs

General comments driving changes to DLFs are summarised below:

- Care has been taken to ensure that the transmission network was modelled in the configuration that is most representative of the way in which the system is generally operated in practice.
- Load flow models for the 2009/10 year were executed with the network configured according to current capital program commitments.
- Substantial effort has been put in to returning out-of-service or failed capacitors at Transmission Substations to service and to installing capacitor banks on the 11kV busbar at Zone and Transmission Substations. Consequently, a level of static reactive support has been modelled in the load flow calculations. However, the magnitude of this support is less than the maximum available. Instead, the status of each capacitor has been estimated by considering the time weighted average reactive support at each location.

5 Application of the Methodology

5.1 Treatment of Theft

This study has identified theft as a separate line item and has taken a value of 0.50% of total sales (as recommended by the DLF Working Group) and applied this to the calculations. It has been assumed that all theft occurs at low voltage and the overall theft apportionment is therefore allocated to the low voltage network. Consequently, this equates to 0.88% of low voltage sales.

5.2 Site Specific DLFs

Site specific DLFs for embedded generators >10MW have also been calculated. These are located at Maribeni (formerly Sithe Guildford) and Appin and Tower Collieries

Location specific loss factors were calculated for a total of 22 significant customer connection points. The factors were calculated using the same methodology as the general loss factor calculations; using forecast metering data from the 2009/10 year to determine the 15 minute average line losses using a load flow calculation.

Note that location specific loss factors were not calculated for Appin Colliery, Sydney Water at Prospect, Burrawang Pumps and Australian Paper (Bomaderry), as in previous years, as their consumption did not meet the requirement of >40GWh energy and/or 10MW demand in the 2007/08 year. The generic DLF appropriate to the voltage level of their supply point in the network has been allocated.

In most cases the major customers shared upstream network assets with other general Integral Energy Network customers. As noted previously, the energy losses for these shared assets were calculated and allocated to the loads in proportion to the energy delivered to each load by each asset through a linear estimate of the load flow solution at each metering interval. The location specific loss factors were then calculated using the total energy losses attributable to a particular load divided by the energy delivered to that load. These quantities were then subtracted from the overall network pool, which was used to calculate the general loss factors.

NMI NEEE000749 has recorded a negative DLF this year due to an increased level of generation into the local network. At times of light load on the network, the generator is providing load into a remote network via relatively lossy 66kV circuits to that network.

5.3 132kV Lines

Integral Energy's 132kV network supplies transmission substations, 132/11kV zone substations and 132kV customers. Forecast metering data from the 2009/10 year were used to determine the 15 minute average line losses using a load flow calculation. This metering data was normalised to account for both the forecast 2009/10 peak demand and the forecast energy consumption from the network.

The 132kV line losses were then accrued from the load flow calculations conducted for each 15 minute metering interval. In the case of site specific 132kV customers, the 132kV line losses attributable to that customer were calculated from a linear estimation of the load flow solution, at each time interval.

5.4 Transmission Substations

Transformer series losses were calculated by applying the forecast 2009/10 load data to the network load flow model. The transformer losses were then accrued from those obtained in each 15 minute metering interval.

Actual shunt losses were used for 60% of transmission substations. The average shunt losses for the known transformers, as a percentage of rating, were applied to the remainder.

5.5 Sub-transmission Lines

The subtransmission line series losses were also calculated by applying the forecast 2009/10 load data to the network load flow model. The line series losses were then accrued from those obtained at this level of the network in each 15 minute metering interval.

5.6 Zone Substations

As in the case of transmission substations, the transformer series losses were calculated by applying the forecast 2009/10 load data to the network load flow model. The transformer losses were then accrued from the losses in each metering interval.

Actual shunt losses were used for 67% of zone substations. The average shunt losses for the known transformers, as a percentage of rating, were applied to the remainder.

5.7 Medium Voltage Lines (11kV, 22kV)

The medium voltage peak distribution line losses for the whole distribution network were modelled by applying the forecast 2009/10 peak demands to the DINIS load flow model for each of the Zone Substation networks. The losses for each Zone Substation network were then calculated using the 2007/08 LLF for that zone substation, applied to the peak line losses of feeders supplied from the particular substation.

In cases where a site specific customer was supplied by a medium voltage distribution feeder, the losses attributable to the general tariff customers were first determined by calculating the LLF, while excluding the site specific customer from the load flow model. The calculation was then repeated using the site specific customer's own LLF and a load flow model which excluded the general tariff customers.

5.8 Distribution Substations

Losses incurred within distribution substations were assessed by using an average load and generic transformer characteristics due to the large number (28,585) of distribution transformers in the Integral Energy network. The numbers of each size of transformer were determined from Integral Energy's Asset Database (Ellipse) as at January 2009.

Transformers of 100kVA or greater are generally fitted with Maximum Demand Indicators (MDIs) and so maximum loadings can be monitored. The latest MDI reading for each individual transformer was used to determine an average utilisation for each transformer category, or rating. For those transformers with no corresponding MDI data, a lower utilisation of 50% was assumed.

Transformer full load loss values ranged from 1.5% of rating for the smallest transformers down to 0.9% for the largest. Shunt losses ranged from 0.5% of rating for smaller units down to 0.25% for the larger ones. A LLF ranging from 0.22 to 0.24 has also been used for the distribution transformers as this is representative of the average LLF for the whole of the Integral Energy network.

5.9 Low Voltage Lines

Due to the lack of load information and modelling data it is not possible to model LV network losses directly. Instead, losses were assessed using an assessment of energy purchases less energy sales, theft and other losses.

To determine LV network losses, total losses were first calculated by subtracting energy purchases from energy sales. All other calculated network losses, including theft, were then subtracted from total losses to give the LV network losses.