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Abstract—High impedance fault location has always been a challenge for protection engineering. On the other hand, if this task is successfully realized maintenance action could be performed in order to avoid potential injuries. For an effective protection scheme the high impedance fault location should be performed, but a lack of research on this area is noted. This paper proposes a new analytical formulation for high impedance fault location in power systems. The approach is developed in time domain, considering a high impedance fault model composed by two antiparallel diodes. Using this model, the fault distance and parameters are estimated as a minimization problem. Firstly, a linear least square based estimator is applied without consideration of line capacitance. Secondly, a steepest descent based estimator is proposed in order to consider the line capacitance. Studies were carried out with the IEEE 13 bus modeled in ATP. Encouraging test results are found indicating the method’s potential for real life applications.

Index Terms—High Impedance Fault, Fault Location, arcing faults detection and location must be done in a short window of time, a limitation that is not applied to HIF detection and location.

The detection of HIF and arcing faults presents great challenges. Many works have been realized in this subject, as [3], [6]–[11]. For this purpose, the estimation of the fault location is the next natural step after detection. Conversely, comparatively less research studies have been conducted to estimate the HIF location.

In a broad sense, some basic research lines can be identified in the technical literature. The first consists on simultaneous HIF detection and faulted point direction estimation [8]–[10]. This approach requires for accurate fault location directional-detection devices installed and synchronized on the power network. Other approaches try to estimate the fault location using remote power system measurements. These works proposed to use knowledge-based techniques to solve the HIF location problem [12], [13]. However, these techniques need a great reliable database of simulation and real cases. A third research line can be also mentioned. This consists on a hybrid approach with emphasis in primary distribution systems, classified as a contribution for the directional-detection approach with emphasis in primary distribution systems, providing fault distance estimation for detected HIF. For this purpose, studies as [3]–[5], [7] have been taken as primordial references. Still, in comparison with previous works, the proposed approach considers a more complete HIF model, line capacitance and equation derivation is made in phase-components, allowing the consideration of unbalanced operation.

The remainder of this paper is as follows. Section II describes the proposed analytical methodology. Section III describes methodology implementation aspects. A case study is presented on Section IV. Section V presents the conclusions of this work.
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II. Estimation of Fault Parameters Together with the Fault Distance

The HIF model proposed by [2] or the one presented in [15] can be represented by a mathematical model similar to the arcing fault model of [5] or [7]. In this context, the use of a Least Square Estimation (LSE) approach to estimate the HIF parameters together with the fault distance is proposed. Consider the single-phase line system illustrated in Fig. 1. This is a radial system fed at node 1. Upstream system from node 1 is modeled by a Thévenin source and its equivalent impedance. An equivalent load at node 2 represents the downstream system. Still, a phase to ground fault at point F is considered. The line model considered between node 1 and the fault point is illustrated in the same figure, where $R$, $L$ and $C$ represent the per-unit-length line resistance, inductance and shunt capacitance. To simplify the analysis it is assumed that all the capacitance of the line is concentrated at node 1. All equations are initially developed for the single-phase line model. After, they will be extended for a three-phase system, considering single-phase to ground faults. In this work, the phase domain representation is chosen instead of the symmetrical components one. This selection aims formulation generalization, as it allows unbalanced system operation consideration.

Bearing in mind the faulted line model of Fig. 1 and that voltage and current samples are measured at terminal 1, an expression that relates the measured quantities as a function of time.

$$v_1 = x(Ri_F + Li'_F) + v_F. \tag{1}$$

In (1), $x$ is the fault distance, $i_F$ is the current that flows to the fault through the series branch of the line model and $v_F$ is the fault voltage. An apostrophe is used to indicate the first derivative in function of time and two apostrophes indicate the second derivative. In order to express (1) as a function of the measured current at terminal 1, the effect of the shunt capacitance must be considered:

$$i_F = i_F' - x C v'_F. \tag{2}$$

Finally, replacing (2) into (1), an equation that relates the measured voltage and current at node 1 with the fault distance and line parameters can be derived:

$$v_1 = xR(i_F' - x C v'_F) + xL(i'_F - x C v'_F) + v_F. \tag{3}$$

Line parameters can be calculated from the line topology or can be estimated by means of measurements [16], but the voltage at point F is also needed and it is not straightforward to obtain. If both voltage and current measurements at terminal 2 are available, $v_F$ can be estimated by an equation similar to (3) [17]. On the other hand, the estimation of $v_F$ can be made indirectly by means of a fault model. In traditional one-terminal fault location methods this model consists on a linear resistor connected to ground or between faulted phases [18]. Although this assumption is widely accepted in the research community, it will produce unacceptable results if a HIF case is analyzed. For this reason, a HIF model must replace the classical linear resistor model in order to develop an adequate mathematical approach for fault location. Therefore, the anti-parallel HIF model illustrated in Fig. 2, proposed by [2] and analysed in [15] is considered. Such model yields currents and voltage-current characteristics that are similar to field test results. This can be seen when voltage and current waveforms generated by the model of Fig. 2 are compared with those presented in [17] or [18]. This model consideration provides a path to solve equation (3), aiming fault distance and parameters estimation.

Considering the HIF model illustrated in Fig. 2, the fault voltage can be expressed as a function of the fault current:

$$V_{Fp, sgp}(i_F') + V_{Fn, sgn}(i_F') - x^2 (R C v'_F + L C v'_F). \tag{7}$$

At this point it is essential to highlight that parameters $x$, $R_F$, $L_F$, $V_{Fp}$ and $V_{Fn}$ are considered to remain constant during the analyzed period. In turn, this assumption is not exactly true in the first period after the fault begins, when the buildup present when $i_F'$ is in its positive semi-cycle and, $V_{Fn}$ is the negative arc voltage, present when $i_F'$ is in its negative semi-cycle. These two arcing voltages sources cannot exist at the same moment, and they are turned on and turned off using the following functions:

$$sgp(i_F') = \begin{cases} 1, & i_F' > 0 \\ 0, & i_F' \leq 0 \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

$$sgn(i_F') = \begin{cases} 0, & i_F' \geq 0 \\ -1, & i_F' < 0 \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

By the replacement of (4) into (3), the fault voltage is embedded in the HIF model, and (3) becomes:

$$v_1 = x(R i''_F + L i''_F) + R_F i_F' + L_F i'_F + V_{Fp, sgp}(i_F') + V_{Fn, sgn}(i_F') - x^2 (R C v'_F + L C v'_F). \tag{7}$$

Fig. 1. Single-phase two-terminal line model and a fault at point F.

Fig. 2 High Impedance Fault model proposed in [2]
phenomenon occurs [20]. However, the shoulder phenomenon is characterized by temporary constant values of the HIF parameters and, after some cycles the fault tends to stabilize. For this reason, the fault parameters are assumed constant in the formulation.

Still, it is possible to rewrite (7) in matrix notation:

\[ v_i = \left[ x \: R_F \: L_F \: V_{Fp} \: V_{Fn} \: x^2 \right]^T, \]

where:

\[ v_i = (R_i + L_i \Delta t); \]

and

\[ v_{sh} = (-RCv_i - LCv_i^T). \]

Expression (8) is very elegant but shows two main difficulties to be overcome. The first is the appearance of a quadratic term of the fault distance that leads to a nonlinear relation and, the second drawback is the remaining of the fault current \( i_F \) and its derivative. If the line capacitance is neglected, the signal \( v_{sh} \) vanishes and the first difficulty is avoided. The disregard of the line capacitance is then considered as a first approximation, leaving to a linear relation in (8) and simplifying its solution. Regarding to the second drawback, there is no simply way to get around this problem, meaning that the fault current must be estimated. In turn, different ways can be conceived in order to estimate \( i_F \) and the approach used in this work is explained in section III.

In order to obtain (11) the transpose of (8) was considered as well as the line capacitance was neglected. In equation (11) numbers after coma indicates the sample number. Still, this relation has a linear system of equations:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    v_{1,1} \\
    v_{1,2} \\
    \vdots \\
    v_{1,N}
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
    v_{s,1} & i_{F,1} & i_{F,1} & sgn(i_{F,1}) & sgn(i_{F,1}) \\
    v_{s,2} & i_{F,2} & i_{F,2} & sgn(i_{F,2}) & sgn(i_{F,2}) \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
    v_{s,N} & i_{F,N} & i_{F,N} & sgn(i_{F,N}) & sgn(i_{F,N})
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
    x \\
    R_F \\
    L_F \\
    V_{Fp} \\
    V_{Fn}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

In order to obtain (11) the transpose of (8) was considered as well as the line capacitance was neglected. In equation (11) numbers after coma indicates the sample number. Still, this relation has a linear system of equations form:

\[ y = X\hat{\theta} + \xi. \]

where \( y \) is the vector of sampled \( v_i \), \( X \) is the first matrix of (11), called regressors matrix and \( \hat{\theta} \) is the estimated vector of parameters. The vector \( \xi \) has the same dimension of \( y \) and was added in order to represent the noise.

Clearly (12) has a structure that allows the application of the classical LSE approach for parameter estimation, which consists on the minimization of the quadratic norm of the vector \( \xi \) expressed as:

\[ J_\theta = \xi^T\xi \]

The final solution of (13) is a simple algebraic relation given by:

\[ \hat{\theta} = (X^TX)^{-1}X^Ty. \]
distribution line type, as a mixed overhead line and cable, the section should be divided into the necessary number of single distribution line types. Downstream line sections are analyzed if estimated fault location is higher than section length. In order to apply the formulation on downstream line sections, initial line section node voltages and currents are necessary. Current and voltage signals should be propagated to the next node using equation (3).

III. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED APPROACH

In the previous section the theoretical development of the formulation was presented without considering computational implementation issues. Aspects related with fault current estimation, numerical signal derivatives calculation and the choice of samples to apply the LSE are described in this section.

A. Fault current estimation

The primordial difficulty with one-terminal fault location formulations is the need to estimate the fault current. In order to provide a mathematical path for fault current estimation, the superposition theorem is considered. Consider the circuit represented in the Fig. 1. At the fault period, the current leaving node 1 is composed by the load current, line capacitance current and the fault current. As a HIF produces a low current in comparison with the load current, one can assume that the load current is not significantly modified by a ground fault. It makes sense to use the difference between the fault and pre-fault residual currents as an estimation of the fault current, similar to the proposed by [4]. However, as considered signals in this work are in time domain, the subtraction must be made from the corresponding samples of different cycles. We propose the implementation of such by a cycle-by-cycle difference digital filter as illustrated in Fig. 3. Samples subtraction using three cycles before the actual fault instant shown to provide an accurate estimation and was in this work applied.

B. Numerical derivatives

The need of the first and second signal derivatives knowledge in the proposed formulation makes necessary the selection of an estimation method. Thus, several numerical derivative approaches were studied. The selected method consisted on the polynomial approximation approach [21]. This method models the signal through a polynomial formulation. Estimation of polynomial coefficients are realized considering a small sample window and applying the least square estimation method [21]. After, the analytical derivative of the estimated function is used to approximate the analyzed signal derivative.

Thus, the digital signal is approximated using a short time window by:

$$y(n) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 n + \ldots + \alpha_n n^k + \epsilon(n), \quad n_i \leq n \leq n_f.$$  (26)

Where $k$ is the polynomial degree, $\epsilon(n)$ is the regression error, and $n_i, n_f$ the index corresponding to the beginning and the end of the interval of samples where the approximation is being calculated. Therefore, in this window the following matrix relation can be written:

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
 y(n_i) \\
 \vdots \\
 y(n_f)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
 1 & n_i & \ldots & n_i^{k-1} & n_i^k \\
 \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
 1 & n_f & \ldots & n_f^{k-1} & n_f^k
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
 \alpha_0 \\
 \alpha_1 \\
 \vdots \\
 \alpha_k
\end{bmatrix} + \epsilon
$$

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
 y(n_i) \\
 \vdots \\
 y(n_f)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
 1 & n_i & \ldots & n_i^{k-1} & n_i^k \\
 \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
 1 & n_f & \ldots & n_f^{k-1} & n_f^k
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
 \alpha_0 \\
 \alpha_1 \\
 \vdots \\
 \alpha_k
\end{bmatrix} + \epsilon
$$

Therefore, parameters $\hat{\theta}$ of (28) can be estimated using (44) to obtain the polynomial that approximates the data.

Fig. 3. Illustration of the fault current estimation.
Therefore, the LSE is performed for each window as a filter and the results are automatically calculated when an HIF occurs.

Simulation tests presented unsatisfactory results when estimation of the fault current is near its zero crossing. Therefore, a function was programmed in order to select the appropriate samples of voltages and currents to apply the LSE algorithm. This function selects the samples corresponding with an estimated fault current that exceeds a predefined threshold. The procedure is initiated with the obtaining of the maximum absolute value of the estimated fault current into a moving window of 1.5 cycle. This value is finally multiplied by an empirical factor of 0.15 in order to get the threshold.

The overall process of the LSE implementation is illustrated in the Fig. 4. J1 is the window where the LSE is applied and J2 is the window where the threshold is obtained. J2 is shifted to the pair of J1 and is applied on the estimated fault current.

D. Solution Considering Line Capacitance

If the line capacitance is considered, the nonlinear relation shown in (15) reflects closer the behavior of the system illustrated in Fig. 1. The assumption of the line capacitance implies that the proposed linear LSE is no longer the correct approach to estimate the HIF parameters and the fault distance. In order to take into account the line capacitance, a suitable algorithm must be used to solve the nonlinear relation presented in (15). The selected approach used in this work was descent Newton’s method [22]. This is a nonlinear LSE approach (NLLSE), applied with the samples between 0.5 and 2.5 cycles after fault inception. The threshold used is an average of the linear LSE based method threshold.

IV. PROPOSED VALIDATION TEST

In order to validate the proposed formulation, several HIF were simulated on the modified IEEE 13 nodes test feeder illustrated in the Fig. 5 [23]. This figure shows a Disturbance Monitoring Equipment (DME) at the substation, indicating that voltage and current waveforms are acquired at this location. Dashed line arrows indicate that others DME could also be installed in different branches of the distribution system, establishing a distributed measurement configuration that can be used to improve the fault location. It should be clear however that the proposed methodology does not require such remote measurements. Modifications made on the IEEE 13 nodes test feeder were: the substitution of the voltage regulator at node 650 by a transformer; replacement of the underground cables by overhead lines and all loads were modeled as constant impedance. In order to get an idea of the simulated system load, the RMS currents as phase a, b and c are 484 A, 563.6 A and 515.5 A, respectively.

Only faults on the main section 1 were simulated using the model presented in Fig. 2. Table I presents the parameters used to simulate the HIF. Each combination of parameters was randomly chosen and identified with the number shown in the first column of the Table I. In this table one can see that fault currents are very low with relation to the actual load current.

![Fig. 4. Implementation of the linear least squares estimation approach for fault location.](image)

![Fig. 5. Diagram of the IEEE 13 nodes test feeder [23]. Principal section is drawn in thick line and is composed by sections 1, 2 and 3.](image)

### Table I: High Impedance Fault Model Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Id</th>
<th>( I_F ) (%)</th>
<th>( R_F ) (Ω)</th>
<th>( X_{L_F} ) (Ω)</th>
<th>( V_{Fp} ) (V)</th>
<th>( V_{Fb} ) (V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* Percentage in relation of 563.6 A, the RMS load current at phase b.

In the subsequent analyses, the perceptual estimation errors were calculated as:

\[
\text{error} = \frac{(\text{estimated fault distance}) - (\text{fault distance})}{\text{(line length)}} \times 100\% \quad (31)
\]

for the fault distance and:

\[
\text{error} = \frac{(\text{estimated parameter}) - (\text{parameter})}{\text{(parameter)}} \times 100\% \quad (32)
\]

for the others parameters. Equations (31) and (32) are not
A. HIF at section 1: a particular case of the linear LSE

The first analysis consisted on applying HIF characteristics presented in Table I, in the first section of the test system represented in Fig. 5. One of the results of the application of the proposed LSE using voltages and currents signals recorded at node 650 are shown in Fig. 6. One can notice that all estimated parameters pass through an abrupt change when the HIF occurs. Before the inception of HIF, equation (14) has not a defined solution because matrix X is almost always singular. This characteristic shows that the proposed formulation can also be used to detect the HIF occurrence. However, it should be clear that no further studies on the distinguishing between such faults and other switching phenomena where made.

B. HIF at section 1: global behavior of the linear LSE

The proposed approach produces various HIF distances and parameters estimations, as explained in subsection C of the section III and exemplified in Fig. 6. In order to obtain unique parameters estimation, an average calculation operation was performed using an estimation set. As observed in Fig. 6, all estimations tend to stabilize when the moving windows (see J1 and J2 in Fig. 4) are completely filled with samples of the fault period. In view of this characteristic, the average was calculated using results within one cycle after 1.5 cycles of fault inception. This average is the final result considered in the linear LSE proposed approach.

As previously mentioned the test set consisted of 10 HIF, presented in Table I, applied in ten distances along the considered section I. Each fault occurrence was selected at three time instants corresponding with the maximum positive, zero crossing and maximum negative of the faulted-phase voltage. These inception angles were respectively named as 0°, 90° and 180°. Results of the distance estimations are presented in Fig. 7 and results of the HIF parameters estimation are presented in Fig. 8. These figures present the average value of the estimation errors.

Fig. 7 presents an important characteristic, which is that the proposed approach has not shown an appreciable effect in relation to the fault inception angle. The same can be said regarding to the HIF parameters estimation, as presented in Fig. 8.

The average of the distance estimation error presented in Fig. 7 maintains a negative trend, showing that the proposed method tends to under-estimate the fault distance. The error also tends to increase with the fault distance.

As shown in Fig. 8, the average estimations of $R_F$, $V_{Fp}$ and $V_{Fn}$ are significantly better than the average estimation of distance. In addition, Fig. 8 also shows that the average estimation errors present a slight increase with the fault distance. The average estimation error of $L_F$ is not as good as the others HIF parameters and the increase of errors in function of the fault distance are more significant.

One should note that the considered faults present a nonlinear behavior. Some produce fault currents less than 10% of the actual load current. A classical fault location method that considers the fault as a pure resistance will not produce results at all. Despite of the obtained errors on fault distance estimation, the proposed approach generates most useful estimates.

C. HIF at section 1: consideration of line capacitance

Results obtained with the linear LSE and presented in the
previous subsection indicate that the system of equations shown in (15) presents a poorly-conditioned behavior regarding to the estimation of $x$ and $L_F$. In the linear approach the line capacitance was neglected. Therefore, the proposal of the present subsection is to evaluate if the consideration of the line capacitance can produce a significant improvement of results. This is done by applying the approach presented in the subsection $D$ of the section III.

Results are presented in Fig. 9 and Fig. 10, in the same way as for the linear LSE. The behavior of the NLLSE was very similar to those obtained with the linear approach. This results shows that the consideration of the line capacitance does not affect significantly the results in the considered test system.

$$\begin{align*}
\text{Fig. 9. Distance estimation perceptual error of the non-linear least squares estimator approach. Mean value.}
\end{align*}$$

$$\begin{align*}
\text{Fig. 10. HIF parameters estimation perceptual error of the nonlinear least squares estimator approach. Mean value.}
\end{align*}$$

$D$. Comparative analysis

This subsection presents a simple comparative analysis in order to highlight the contribution that the present work makes to the state of the art. Hence, the proposed approach is compared with [3]. Two fault scenarios are analyzed.

In the first case, a fault composed only by an arc and an arc resistance is simulated. This is equivalent to the fault model considered in [3] and means that $V_{Fp} = V_{Fn}$ and $L_F = 0$. The $R_F$ parameter was set 20 $\Omega$ and the fault distance at 300 m from the bus number 650 of Fig. 5. Test results of the fault distance estimation are presented in Fig. 11. In this case, both methods presented a reasonable estimation of the fault distance. As the lines of the test system are unbalanced, the method proposed in [3] presents a slightly worse estimative. This is true because [3] is conceived using an symmetrical components approach, assuming a balanced system.

In the second case, the fault was set with $V_{Fp} = 700$ V, $V_{Fn} = 1000$ V, $L_F = 0.0265$ H and $R_F = 20$ $\Omega$. The comparative test results of the fault distance estimation are presented in Fig. 12. In this case, the method presented in [3] does not present an accurate estimation of the fault distance. On the other hand, the proposed approach presents a good estimation in this case. Comparative tests considering fault parameters estimation were not included since [3] does not provide such.

$$\begin{align*}
\text{Fig. 11. Results of fault distance estimation using: (a) the proposed approach and; (b) approach presented in [3]. The fault is at 300 m from the substation (node 650), value showed in bold horizontal lines. The HIF parameters are $R_F = 20$ $\Omega$, $L_F = 0.0265$ H, $V_{Fp} = 700$ V, $V_{Fn} = 1000$ V.}
\end{align*}$$

$$\begin{align*}
\text{Fig. 12. Results of fault distance estimation using: (a) the proposed approach and; (b) approach presented in [3]. The fault is at 300 m from the substation (node 650), value showed in bold horizontal lines. The HIF parameters are $R_F = 20$ $\Omega$, $L_F = 0.0265$ H, $V_{Fp} = 700$ V, $V_{Fn} = 1000$ V.}
\end{align*}$$

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, a HIF location analytical methodology is proposed. The method uses a parameter estimation based approach for fault distance and parameters calculation. In the proposed formulation, only one terminal voltage and current signals are used and the fault location and parameters can be estimated within the first cycles after the fault inception. The technique allows consideration or not of line capacitance. If line capacitance is not considered, a linear set of equations is solved with a LSE based approach. If line capacitance is
considered, a nonlinear set of equation must be solved. For such, the proposed method is implemented in two steps. Firstly, the line capacitance is neglected and the LSE is calculated with a moving window on the signals, resulting in parameter estimation for each sample. In turn, as estimated parameters pass through an abrupt change at the fault inception instant, the proposed approach can also be used to detect the HIF occurrence. The second step was developed in order to consider the line capacitance. It consists on an iterative search technique to estimate the parameters that minimize a residual function. This is carried out with the values estimated in the linear LSE as a starting point. Test results on the study system indicate that the consideration of line capacitance resulted in similar accuracy.

A comparative analysis was made with a state-of-the-art method. Results show that when a more complete HIF model is considered, the state-of-the-art method cannot give an accurate estimation of the fault distance. On the other hand, the proposed approach gives a more accurate estimation of the fault distance providing as well the fault parameters estimation.

The analytical formulation presented in this work considers a HIF model in equation derivation. As a result, this allows the location of the fault using one terminal signals, which clearly represents a contribution to the state of the art. In view of the test results, the method is insensitive to the fault inception instant.

monitoring devices can be conceived to monitor different branches of the distribution system. The combination of this scheme with the proposed HIF location approach would considerably increase the reliability and accuracy of the fault detection and location.
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