BriPower

Understanding the Transformer in Your Test Path

Engineering considerations for converter-based grid emulators, voltage-disturbance testing, waveform fidelity and terminal-level verification

THE ENGINEERING QUESTION

Can the complete test system reproduce the required voltage conditions at the device terminals—under load, across repeated worst-case sequences, and with the intended protection configuration enabled?

A technical paper from BriPower

Focus: transformer-based test paths and practical procurement questions

Introduction

The transformer is not a passive voltage-scaling box. It is an electro-magnetic machine with its own physics, its own memory, and its own opinion about what your voltage waveform should look like.

None of what follows means a transformer-based test bench cannot work — recent IEEE survey literature on converter-based grid emulators treats the step-up transformer as a standard design element with well-understood designconsiderations andpublished certification campaigns confirm the architecture iscertifiable[1]. What this paper explains is**what that engineering has to fight against, where the hard limits sit, and which questions you should be asking before you commit.**

1. The Core Remembers: Flux Transients

1.1 Voltage changes leave a magnetic-state question to manage

The flux inside a transformer core is the running total of voltage over time — and it cannot jump. When voltage changes abruptly (dip onset, dip recovery, overvoltage), a transient flux offset relative to the new steady state may appear, depending on the initial magnetic state, the phase angle at which the step lands, the event duration, and the waveform shape [2].

Sometimes a step barely moves the flux. Sometimes it leaves a substantial DCoffset that decays slowly: depending on the transformer and circuit conditions, an uncompensated transient flux offset may persist for seconds or longer.**This decay time should not be confused with the achievable terminal-voltage transition time**— with appropriate design and control, the emulator's output voltage can still change on the timescale your test requires, while the magnetic state settles in the background.

1.2 Where the step lands matters — and controlling it at the terminals takes work

The same 100%-to-25% dip lands differently on the transformer depending on where in the sine wave it occurs. The WPRC inrush fundamentals paper is explicit: the outcome depends on the point on the voltage wave at which the excitation changes, on residual flux, and on the transformer's design [2].

Two problems follow:

Without point-on-wave control, part of your event severity is unmanaged.A script whose initial magnetic state and event phase angles are not fixed can stress the core differently on different runs.

Controlling the terminal angle is real engineering. Accurate terminal point-on-wave control may require terminal-voltage feedback, timing calibration, and compensation for the complete output path; demanding sequences may additionally require flux estimation or active flux control. These functions add implementation and validation complexity, and theireffect on terminal timing and waveform accuracy must be demonstrated.

1.3 The reproducibility problem

In continuous sequences — say, three dips within ten seconds — each event's starting magnetic state depends on how much of the previous event's flux offset has decayed. Event spacing, winding temperature, and any flux-control intervention all shape the next event's initial conditions.

Practical consequence: without generous flux headroom or active flux management, the same test script can produce measurably different terminal waveforms across runs. For a lab producing certification evidence, run-to-run reproducibility isn't a nice-to-have. It's the product.

One demonstrated mitigation is dedicated flux control. Published test-bench results show that it can counteract simulator-transformer saturation, but its interaction with the device's own transformer and recovery behavior must also be verified [3]. The problem doesn't disappear; it moves into your verification budget.

2. The Capacity Trap

2.1 The most expensive misconception in this market

“If the transformer struggles, buy a bigger one.” This is the easy way to spend serious money without solving the problem.

Kazemi and Labuschagne’s transformer-protection reference states the guidance plainly:

“Overexcitation can occur when the per-unit ratio of voltage to frequency (Volts/Hz) exceeds 1.05 p.u. at full load and 1.10 p.u. at no load.” [4]

These values are general overexcitation guidance, not universal instantaneous trip or saturation thresholds; short-duration capability must be established from the manufacturer’s applicable limits and transient analysis.

The core point stands: a higher MVA rating alone does not establish greater flux headroom. An HVRT event at 1.30p.u. voltage imposes the same proportional change in steady-state flux regardless of the nameplate rating — but the absolute flux density and saturation margin depend on the specific transformer design, and the nameplate alone doesn’t tell you what they are.

2.2 What headroom actually costs

A principal passive-design lever is to reduce the normal operating flux density. For fixed voltage, frequency, and turns, this requires a larger effective core cross-section, and the arithmetic is unforgiving:

1.6 T down to 1.3 T: +23% core area

1.6 T down to 1.0 T: +60% core area

Other options exist — turns and tap selection, winding design, and active flux management — and the 2023 IEEE survey of grid-emulator design treats these as interacting design choices rather than a single knob [1]. The usable flux-density limit is likewise not a universal number: it depends on the selected core material, its magnetization characteristic, and the acceptable excitation current, losses, and waveform error. It must be established for the proposed transformer, not assumed from a rule of thumb.

2.3 The envelope is set at manufacture

Here is the strategic consideration.**How deep a dip, how dense an event sequence, and what overvoltage level the transformer can handle are decided by the core and winding design — and that design leaves the factory fixed.**As grid-code and customer test requirements evolve — deeper dips, more consecutive events, new modes like zero-voltage ride-through — each escalation is a fresh question about whether a transformer designed for the *previous* standard still fits inside its demonstrated operating envelope. If new requirements exceed that envelope, the system may require derating, revised control or tap settings, additional validation, or hardware modification.

3. The Waveform You Didn’t Order

3.1 The steady-state truth

The magnetizing current of any iron-core transformer is inherently non-sinusoidal. Grady presents a measured example of a 25 kVA distribution transformer with 76.1% total harmonic distortion in its magnetizing current — and the same example emphasizes that this current is small relative to rated full-load current [5]. A high magnetizing-current distortion does not, by itself, establish significant terminal-voltage distortion.

This current-side distortion does not automatically translate into terminal voltage distortion. A delta winding circulates the characteristic harmonic components internally, closed-loop voltage control corrects within its bandwidth, and filtering is part of the design. Well-engineered transformer benches hold terminal distortion at certification-grade levels in steady state.

3.2 The recovery instant — where the risk actually lives

The danger window is the moment of dip recovery, when transient overfluxing or saturation can produce distorted excitation current and, depending on the system response, terminal-voltage distortion. The IEEE Power System Relaying Committee working group report states:

“For protection relays, rapidly changing harmonics have the worst effect… high levels of harmonics in extreme cases can cause relay maloperation, mainly a consequence of measurement error of the peak value and/or the angle of the waveform.” [6]

The report documents a concrete mechanism: a digital relay computing RMS by the mean-square method “does not eliminate harmonics” — and under harmonic influence, “a fault located in zone 2 is seen in zone 1,” producing an incorrect trip [6]. This example illustrates a general measurement-and-protection vulnerability; it does not establish that a particular grid simulator or device under test will misoperate during recovery.

The honest claim is one of *risk, not certainty*: rapidly changing harmonics during recovery transients can increase the likelihood of nuisance trips — in the test chain’s protection, and in the device’s own protection. Whether it trips in *your* case depends on your protection algorithms, the actual harmonic spectrum, and the settings. What it means for your acceptance testing is clear either way:**repeated worst-case recovery events, with the intended protection configuration enabled, belong in your test plan**. If the vendor’s demo only shows clean no-load recovery, that’s not the evidence you need.

3.3 The frequency-response question

Harmonicinjectionand waveform playback must be assessed against the frequency response of the**complete output path**— including transformer leakage andparasitics, filters, converter control, and the connected device. The transformer’s leakage inductance interacts with filter capacitances and other elements to form system resonances; the 2023 IEEE survey treats these equivalent LC, LCL, and RLC networks as an integrated design problem, not a single cutoff frequency belonging to “the magnetic path” [1]. Both magnitude and phase accuracy matter. If your test program includes harmonicinjectionor low-frequency modulation of the fundamental waveform, this complete-path response belongs in your spec sheet whether it’s listed there or not.

4. The Winding-Connection Puzzle

4.1 Sequence relationships must be mapped to the device terminals

An asymmetric dip is defined by the three terminal voltage waveforms — or equivalently, by the relevant positive-, negative-, and zero-sequence magnitudes and angles. Transformers have an immutable property here: per SEL’s symmetrical-components reference, a transformer that shifts the positive sequence by n·30° shifts the negative sequence by exactly –n·30°, and a delta or ungrounded-wye winding appears as an open circuit to zero-sequence line current [7].

Without appropriate compensation, a waveform specified on the converter side will not, in general, reproduce the same phase relationships at the device terminals after a phase-shifting transformer. Command-side pre-compensation is possible — the shifts are exactly known — but it is real engineering: per-sequence compensation, calculation, and calibration that must be configured for the actual vector group and verified over the intended operating range. Changes to the connection require reconfiguration; new test conditions may require additional validation.

4.2 Zero-sequence: solvable, but never free

Ground-fault ride-through testing requires the specified terminal voltage conditions and, where applicable, the zero-sequence network behavior of the intended connection.**Whether zero-sequence current must flow at the device terminals depends on the device topology, grounding arrangement, and test specification.**A delta port blocks zero-sequence line-current transfer;a grounded-wye winding can provide a zero-sequence current path, depending on the complete network. A grounded-wye / grounded-wye transformer with a delta tertiary winding can, in fact, satisfy no-phase-shift, zero-sequence path, and harmonic-sink requirements simultaneously [8].

But read what that solution requires:**grounded neutrals, a stabilizing tertiary winding, and explicit zero-sequence network design — followed by verification that the terminal behavior matches what your testactually needs.**[8] Some choices are fixed in the transformer construction; others can be reconfigured within the installed system. Their available configurations and limits should be documented before purchase.

4.3 The compounding picture

Step back and look at what the transformer route asks you to carry: flux management, point-on-wave control, sequence-component pre-compensation, zero-sequence network design, tertiary winding decisions, complete-path frequency-response management — and a verification program covering all of the above, because they interact (flux control affects recovery transients; transients affect harmonics; harmonics affect compensation accuracy). None of these items is individually prohibitive. Together, they form a permanent engineering surface that grows with every escalation in your test requirements.

5. Key Points for Procurement

Terminal waveforms. Require measured waveforms at the device terminals,under load, for your worst-case sequence. No-load data does not represent loaded performance [3].

Repeatability. How much deviation across repeated runs of the same script? Require quantified metrics.

Flux management. How is flux offset handled between closely spaced events? What is the verified minimum event spacing at full dip depth [3]?

Operating envelope. Obtain written confirmation of the guaranteed dip depths, event counts, and overvoltage range — and system behavior beyond those boundaries.

Response to current injection. When the device under test injects current, the terminal-voltage response depends on the emulator's grid-impedance behavior — if your test requires it, verify that dynamic, not just the no-load voltage curve.

Frequency response. Harmonicinjectionand waveformplaybackare limited by the complete output path [1]. These functions require measured data for the full path.

Winding and grounding. Sequence relationships in asymmetric tests and zero-sequence behavior are determined by the connection — and some choices are fixed at purchase. Confirm coverage, adjustable ranges, and terminal-level verification [7], [8].

Recovery instants. The highest-risk window of the test. Recovery evidence must cover worst-case conditions: loaded, with protection enabled [6].

Conclusion

A line-frequency output transformer introduces additional magnetic-state, winding-connection, and frequency-response considerations into a grid simulator's stimulus path. These are manageable engineering issues, not proof that the architecture is unsuitable — the 2023 IEEE survey of grid-emulator design and the published CertBench certification campaign both treat these constraints as design-and-verify tasks that competent systems handle [1], [3]. Their practical significance depends on the transformer design, converter capability, control strategy, grounding arrangement, and required test sequence.

For theuser, the decisive question is whether the complete system can reproduce the specified terminal voltage conditions — and, where required, the intended grid-impedance response to device current injection — under load, across repeated worst-case sequences, and without unintended protection operation.

References

[1] Z. Li et al., “Power-Hardware Design and Topologies of Converter-Based Grid Emulators for Wind Turbines,” *IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 5001–5017, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://vbn.aau.dk/ws/portalfiles/portal/641798499/Power-Hardware_Design_and_Topologies_of_Converter-Based_Grid_Emulators_for_Wind_Turbines.pdf

[2] S. P. Patel, “Fundamentals of Transformer Inrush,” Western Protective Relay Conference (WPRC), 2010. [Online]. Available: https://wprcarchives.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/Patel_Suhag_Fundamentals-of-Transformer-Inrush_2010.pdf

[3] U. Jassmann, A. Frehn, H. Röttgers, F. Santjer, C. Mehler, T. Beißel, L. Kaven, D. von den Hoff, R. Frühmann, S. Azarian, M. Neshati, G. Quistorf, A. Zuga, M. Brennecke, T. Jersch, and R. Schelenz, “CertBench: conclusions from the comparison of certification results derived on system test benches and in the field,” *Forschung im Ingenieurwesen / Engineering Research*, vol. 85, no. 2, pp. 353–371, 2021. [Online]. Available: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10010-021-00470-1

[4] A. Kazemi and C. Labuschagne, “Protecting Power Transformers From Common Adverse Conditions,” Schweitzer Engineering Laboratories (SEL). [Online]. Available: https://selinc.com/api/download/3193

[5] M. F. McGrady, “Understanding Power System Harmonics,” tutorial material. [Online]. Available: https://web.ecs.baylor.edu/faculty/grady/understanding_power_system_harmonics_grady_april_2012.pdf

[6] IEEE Power System Relaying Committee (PSRC) Working Group, “Protective Relaying and Power Quality,” PSRC Technical Report. [Online]. Available: https://www.pes-psrc.org/kb/report/101.pdf

[7] SEL, “Tutorial on Symmetrical Components.” [Online]. Available: https://selinc.com/api/download/122622/

[8] S. Gooding, Georgia Power / Western Protective Relay Conference (WPRC) — wye-wye transformers with delta tertiary windings.