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Abstract

One of the serious problems in HVDC transmission is that of wall bushing flashover initiated by rain, fog or wet snow. All utilities engaged in dc transmission experience such problems and have adopted countermeasures with varying degrees of success. The consensus of opinion is that there is a need to better understand the phenomena and devise effective remedial measures or an improved design.

The problem of HVDC wall bushing flashover due to uneven wetting is introduced and reviewed, with emphasis on recent progress in understanding the phenomena. The physics of discharges, particularly for flashover of an unevenly wetted HVDC wall bushing, is discussed and various processes and mechanisms responsible for discharge initiation and propagation are clarified and discussed in detail.

A numerical model is developed in order to predict flashover voltages for a wall bushing based on the results of accurate electric field computation carried out on a bushing, prior to initiating flashover. This analysis is done under a variety of practical conditions. The simulation results are in agreement with experimental data and, in general, explain well certain aspects of uneven wetting flashover.

The results of this research, particularly the proposed models are important supplements to large-scale experiments, which are costly and time consuming. The use of such model will be very helpful in selecting and designing HVDC wall bushings for future HVDC transmission schemes and to improve the performance of wall bushings in the existing HVDC transmission schemes.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to express his sincere appreciation to his advisor professor M. R. Raghuveer for his profound patience, great guidance and invaluable discussions. The author would also like to thank Mr. John Kendall from the High Voltage Lab, University of Manitoba, for his assistance during the course of this work.

Many thanks go to Mr. W. McDermid, N. Tarko, and Dr. M. Rashwan from Manitoba Hydro for their helps in data collection and invaluable discussions. The research would have been impossible without the generous financial support from Manitoba Hydro and testing equipment from Manitoba HVDC Research Center.

Last but not least, thanks also go to my family, and my parents for their understanding, support and encouragement.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS</td>
<td>viii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Flashover of HVDC Wall Bushings and Its Characteristics .......... 3
1.2 Objectives of the Dissertation ..................................... 7

## 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Uneven Wetting and Abnormal E-field Distribution .................. 9
2.2 Dominating Factors in HVDC Wall Bushing Uneven Wetting Flashover ...
  2.2.1 Dry Zone Length ........................................... 11
  2.2.2 k in Conductivity .......................................... 12
  2.2.3 Wall Bushing Configuration ................................ 14
  2.2.4 Voltage Polarity and Voltage Type ........................... 15
  2.2.5 Mitigating Measures ........................................ 16
2.3 Existing Models for Uneven Wetting Flashover for Wall Bushings ..... 18
  2.3.1 EPRI Model .................................................. 19
  2.3.2 IREQ Model ................................................ 21
2.4 Summary ..................................................................... 22

## 3. PHYSICS OF DISCHARGES AND NUMERICAL MODEL FOR UNEVEN WETTING FLASHOVER

3.1 dc Discharges in Air .................................................. 24
3.2 HVDC Wall Bushing Flashover under Uneven Wetting Conditions ..... 26
  3.2.1 Wetting Process ................................................ 26
  3.2.2 Influence of Uneven Wetting Pattern on E-field Distribution .. 28
  3.2.3 Role of Raindrops in the Flashover Process .................... 36
    Discharges Due to the Disintegration of Raindrop .................. 37
    Corona Discharges in the Vicinity of Raindrops ................... 41
    Other Factors .................................................... 42
  3.2.4 Propagation of Discharges in Uneven Wetting Caused Flashover .. 42
  3.2.5 Discharge Propagation on an Electrolytic Surface ............... 43
3.2.6 Sequence of Events for Uneven Wetting Flashover of HVDC Wall Bushing ................................................................. 47

3.3 E-field Based Numerical Model for Prediction of HVDC Wall Bushing Flashover due to Uneven Wetting .............................. 48

3.3.1 Mathematical Description of E-field ............................................. 48

3.3.2 Electric Field Modelling for HVDC Wall Bushing ............................ 49

3.3.3 HVDC Wall Bushing Uneven Wetting Flashover Criterion .............. 52

3.3.4 Prediction of the Critical Flashover Voltage under (-ve) Polarity ................................................................. 54

3.3.5 Modification in Procedure to Determine the Critical Flashover Voltage of a HVDC Wall Bushing Operating under +ve Polarity 56

3.4 Summary ..................................................................................... 58

4. SIMULATION AND DISCUSSION .................................................. 60

4.1 Description of Modelled HVDC Wall Bushing ..................................... 60

4.2 Effect of Dry Zone Length, Its Location and Critical Dry Zone Length ................................................................................ 62

4.3 Effect of Voltage Polarity .................................................................. 64

4.4 Influence of Raindrops ...................................................................... 65

4.4.1 Raindrop Size ................................................................................. 65

4.4.2 Raindrop Conductivity .................................................................... 66

4.5 Influence of Air Pressure and Altitude .................................................. 68

4.6 Effect of Bushing Configuration .......................................................... 70

4.6.1 Condenser Core .............................................................................. 70

4.6.2 Specific Length .............................................................................. 72

4.7 Effect of Booster Sheds ....................................................................... 74

4.8 Effect of RTV and Other Surface Coatings ............................................. 76

4.8.1 Influence of Surface Conditions on E-field Distribution .................. 76

4.8.2 Impact of RTV Coatings on Critical Flashover Voltage ................. 80

4.9 Comparison of Results from Proposed Model with Experimental Results Published in Literature ................................................. 82

4.10 Summary ..................................................................................... 83

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS ............................................... 85

REFERENCES .................................................................................... 90

APPENDIX

EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF THE INFLUENCE OF DIFFERENT WETTING CONDITIONS ON A FLAT INSULATING SURFACE .......................................................... 99
LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 1.1</td>
<td>500kV and 350kV dc wall bushings at the Dorsey Station, Manitoba Hydro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 1.2</td>
<td>Diagram of HVDC wall bushing related processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 2.1</td>
<td>Effect of dry zone on the flashover voltage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 2.2</td>
<td>Effect of rain conductivity on the flashover voltage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 2.3</td>
<td>Uneven wetting flashover voltage under the ac and dc voltage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 2.4</td>
<td>Simplified wall bushing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 2.5</td>
<td>Schematic diagram of IREQ model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3.1</td>
<td>Surface tensions and contact angle for water drop on a dielectric surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3.2</td>
<td>Shielding effect of hall wall under rain with wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3.3</td>
<td>E-field computation model for a 110kV wall bushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3.4</td>
<td>Impact of dry zone length on E-field contours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3.5</td>
<td>E-field intensity at shed tips under -ve unit voltage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3.6</td>
<td>E-field intensity in the air close to the bushing surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3.7</td>
<td>Influence of the dry zone length on E-field intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3.8</td>
<td>Electric field distortion due to the presence of a water drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3.9</td>
<td>Critical E-field for the disintegration of a raindrops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3.10</td>
<td>Discharge propagation with different polarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3.11</td>
<td>Illustration of propagation of discharges on an electrolytic surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3.12</td>
<td>Minimum voltage for arc propagation along wetted surface with respect to the arc length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3.13</td>
<td>Potential contours for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3.14</td>
<td>E-field contours for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3.15</td>
<td>Electric field distribution along the critical line for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3.16</td>
<td>Block diagram of predicting uneven wetting HVDC wall bushing critical flashover voltage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 4.1</td>
<td>Schematic drawing of a 600kV wall bushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 4.2</td>
<td>Influence of dry zone length on flashover stress for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing (-ve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 4.3</td>
<td>Critical flashover voltage versus the size of raindrops for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing with 30% length of dry zone located at the ground end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 4.4</td>
<td>Influence of rain conductivity on the critical flashover voltage for the 600kV HVDC wall bushing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 4.5 CFO vs. water conductivity for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing with 30% length of dry zone.................................68

Fig. 4.6 Streamer inception voltage due to photo-ionization for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing with 30% length of dry zone under various altitude ........................................................................................................69

Fig. 4.7 Influence of altitude on the relation between CFO and raindrop size.......................................................................................................................70

Fig. 4.8 E-field contours and E-fields at shed tips for housing shells ..........71

Fig. 4.9 Profile of underrib-type shed and dry strip......................................74

Fig. 4.10 Booster shed profile and dry band illustration..................................75

Fig. 4.11 E-field distribution along the critical line for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing with and without booster sheds (30% length of dry zone located at the ground end) ................................................................................76

Fig. 4.12 Dependence of E-field intensity on the length of dry zone for a 110kV bushing with various surface conditions............................................................78

Fig. 4.13 E-field intensity at shed tips for a 110kV bushing with various coatings ..........................................................................................................................78

Fig. 4.14 Comparison of E-field distributions along the critical line with and without RTV coating (30% dry zone located at the ground end) .............................................................................................................79

Fig. 4.15 CFOs versus dry zone length for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing with and without RTV coating .................................................................81

Fig. 4.16 CFOs for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing with different coatings.....82
LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1.1</td>
<td>Performance of Wall Bushings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2.1</td>
<td>Critical Flashover Stress for Uneven Wetting Flashover</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.1</td>
<td>Streamer Propagating Gradients</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.2</td>
<td>Key Dimensions of the 110kV Bushing Model</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.3</td>
<td>Conductivity of Different Materials</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.4</td>
<td>Comparison of Predicted Flashover Voltage and Standard Data</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.1</td>
<td>Critical Dimensions of the 600kV HVDC Wall Bushing</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.2</td>
<td>Predicted Flashover Voltages for the 600kV Wall Bushing with Various Dry Zone Lengths</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.3</td>
<td>Critical Flashover Stress vs. Critical Dry Zone Length (−ve polarity)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.4</td>
<td>Predicted Critical Flashover Stress vs. Specific Lengths</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.5</td>
<td>Conductivities for Surface Film with Different Coatings</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.6</td>
<td>Maximum Nominal E-fields in Different Locations (cm⁻¹)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.7</td>
<td>Comparison of CFO Stresses between the Proposed and IREQ Model</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABRREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_s$</td>
<td>Surface resistivity</td>
<td>$\Omega$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>Conductivity</td>
<td>$\mu S/cm$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>Surface tension</td>
<td>$N/m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varepsilon$</td>
<td>Permittivity</td>
<td>$F/m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_R$</td>
<td>Rayleigh charge limit</td>
<td>$C$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>Critical flashover voltage</td>
<td>$kV$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The operating experience of HVDC transmission schemes indicates that the proliferation of external flashovers in HVDC converter stations has been a source of serious concern. In a span of 7.5 years from Jan. 1983 to Jul. 1990, HVDC wall bushings had suffered the highest flashover rate among all HVDC equipment, i.e., a total of 126 flashovers had been reported in 23 stations [LaAl91]; horizontal wall bushings accounted for a majority of the reported flashover (50%). Such a flashover usually occurs in both newly constructed or upgraded converter stations, with voltage larger than 400kV, where suitable countermeasures have not been undertaken. On average, the flashover rate of HVDC wall bushings of 400kV or above is about 1.1/unit.year [Cai96]. Table 1.1 shows survey results of HVDC wall bushing performance conducted by EPRI in early 90's.

To understand the phenomena, a large amount of experimental work has been conducted on HVDC wall bushings under severe operating conditions. Results of related work at EPRI (US), IREQ, ABB, NGK, EPRI (China), CEPEL, and CESI have been reported in literature. Equivalent circuit based models of HVDC wall bushing flashover have been proposed [ScLu91], [RiKa91]. To improve the performance of HVDC wall bushings, various mitigating measures have also been suggested; polymeric booster sheds and RTV silicone rubber coatings are the most effective, although the mechanism responsible for improvement in performance is still a topic of interest.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Stress (Nominal)</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voltage (kV)</td>
<td>kV/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorsey B1</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorsey B1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorsey B2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radisson B1</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Cantons</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comerford</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celilo U</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celilo O</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylmar</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylmar</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylmar</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelanto</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelanto</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Mandarins</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this chapter, the HVDC wall bushing flashover phenomena is briefly introduced. Further, some important characteristics of wall bushing flashover are discussed in detail and the objectives of the research are outlined.

1.1 Flashover of HVDC Wall Bushings and Its Characteristics
500kV and 375kV HVDC wall bushings, equipped with booster sheds, at the Dorsey Station of Manitoba Hydro, are shown in Fig. 1.1. These HV bushings typically employ a condenser core to provide alternative-voltage grading inside the porcelain housing.

Fig. 1.1 500kV and 375kV dc wall bushings at the Dorsey Station, Manitoba Hydro

Several processes, which can finally lead to catastrophic failure of a wall bushing, are listed in Fig.1.2. The electric field inside or outside a bushing may be substantially modified due to reasons such as contamination, and wetting. Local electric field enhancement causes ionization and when sufficient, triggers either a surface flashover or internal discharges. For a dc wall
bushing, the electric field distribution is mainly determined by the resistivity of materials. Since the resistance of the internal insulation is always significantly high, the voltage distribution along the external surface is very sensitive to surface conditions such as pollution and wetting. As a result, dc wall bushings are particularly vulnerable to severe weather conditions, which often result in electric field distortion and flashover [Lau91].

Contamination is one of the major causes for abnormal low flashover voltage of external insulation in both ac and dc systems. Contamination flashover is initiated when a certain amount of pollutant together with moisture (fog or drizzle) develops a certain, critical conductivity. Once a conductive current of more than 5-10 mA has been established, dry-band arcing takes place. These current bursts, which in the case of dc may last for several seconds, increase to about 100 mA prior to a contamination flashover.

Fig. 1.2 Diagram of HVDC wall bushing related processes
External flashover can also occur due to rain alone and especially in non-uniform rain. In a rain test for insulators, the flashover stress under dc may vary from 170kV/m to 400kV/m. Therefore, for dc station insulators, a design stress lower than 100kV/m is normally used. Such a design criterion works well for insulators under rain conditions. As shown in Table 1.1, the operating stresses for wall bushings range from 50kV/m to 154kV/m. However, flashover stresses as low as 60~70kV/m have been recorded for horizontal HVDC wall bushings under rain [Lamp88]. Hence, occurrence of abnormal flashovers is likely high under certain conditions.

Since the contamination level is light in most converter stations, with a typical Equivalent Salt Deposit Density (ESDD) value of 3~5 µg/cm², the majority of wall bushing flashovers are likely caused by uneven wetting [Lamp88]. Thus, uneven wetting is a critical condition for the performance of HVDC wall bushings. Statistical data [LaAl91] has confirmed that uneven wetting is the main cause of HVDC wall-bushing flashover, although contamination flashover might also occasionally occur. Comprehensive rain and contamination experiments in laboratories and observations in the field, has led to the conclusion that uneven wetting due to rain is the decisive triggering mechanism for most observed flashovers in horizontal HVDC wall bushings [Lamp88], [NaMI89], [Lamb90].

Uneven wetting is caused by a dry zone near the ground end of the bushing which is created due to its partial shielding by the wall of a converter building. The non-uniform voltage distribution across this “dry” zone leads to streamer breakdown of the “dry” zone followed by spark formation and complete flashover of the whole bushing. The uneven wetting caused flashover process involves a streamer-spark mechanism and differs from that for contamination flashovers.
Compared to the contamination flashover of insulators, flashover phenomena of HVDC wall bushings under uneven wetting due to rain have the following interesting and exclusive characteristics.

1. The flashover voltage value seems independent of the rain intensity. Flashovers have occurred under almost every type of precipitation, from fog to heavy rain; flashovers occur most frequently under light rain [Lamp88], [SCHN91].

2. Flashover can occur at a very light contamination level or even with a clean surface, i.e. ESDD < 10 μg/cm², which is only 1/10th of that necessary to cause a contamination flashover in a laboratory setting [Lamp88], [ScLu91], [ScHN91]. As a maintenance measure, cleaning has not always been sufficient to eliminate such flashover. Also, increasing the leakage path does not significantly improve performance. As an example, bushings with specific length as high as 6.1cm/kV [ZhSC91] still suffered flashovers during rain.

3. It appears that such a flashover is selective in polarity and system voltage. A majority of flashovers have occurred under negative polarity with system voltage of 400kV or greater [RiKa91].

4. Several parameters such as dry zone length, surface resistance, and configuration of bushings have a decisive influence on the flashover value rather than mainly ESDD as is the case with contamination caused flashovers [NaMI89], [Lamb90].

5. The characteristics of discharges are different. In a contamination flashover, slow dry banding dominates, discharges are slow to develop and last about seconds. Under uneven wetting, flashover formation is fast, has a short front time, of the order of tens microseconds [NaMI89].
6. Under non-uniform wetting, sometimes there are glow type discharges across the dry zone which later develop into streamers, and then extend along a bushing; in other cases, a few streamer type discharges are seen across the dry zone and then a flashover occurs suddenly. Sometimes, discharges are observed circumferentially around a bushing at the end of the dry zone. In the case of withstand, filamentary discharges are sometimes observed extending from the ground end to as much as 80~90% of the distance toward the high voltage terminal [EPRI90]. Unlike propagation of the arc root across the wet contaminated layer, the flashover across the wet zone proceeds by bridging the tips of the sheds.

1.2 Objectives of the Dissertation
This research work comprises the following objectives,

1. Study the mechanism of the wall bushing flashover problem due to uneven wetting and find out the criteria responsible for flashover.

2. Establish a model, which describes the criteria and sequence of flashover development.

3. Explain different aspects of the wall bushing flashover phenomena using the developed model.

4. Explain how and why RTV coating or booster sheds provide mitigating effects against the flashover.

5. Suggest new principles of designing wall bushings in order to improve their performance under unevenly wetted conditions.

Development of a comprehensive model is important because it provides a useful simulation tool in selecting, designing and evaluating HVDC wall bushings for future HVDC
transmission schemes, and improving the performance of wall bushings in existing HVDC transmission schemes. The construction of a suitable validated model will enable the simulation of the flashover process for a wall bushing of given configuration under different operating conditions. With help of the simulation, the HVDC wall bushing performance may be assessed economically without resorting to expensive testing under various critical conditions.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

For unevenly wetted HVDC wall bushings, flashover stresses were observed as low as 60-70kV/m in field and laboratory investigations [Lamp88]. This is significantly lower than that caused by contamination or a typical rain flashover. In this section, peculiarities of the phenomena as well as existing models will be reviewed in detail.

2.1 Uneven Wetting and Resulting Abnormal E-field Distribution

A typical wall bushing is installed at a 15° angle. Field observations and experimental investigations in laboratories have shown that HVDC wall bushing performance is significantly affected by the angle to the horizontal of the wall bushing axis since this affects shielding from rain and hence the surface resistance. This is because the steady state dc electric field distribution along a wall bushing is essentially determined by the prevailing conductivity. If a "dry" zone with relatively high resistance is created close to the flange end due to shielding effects of a wall, the electric field will be modified and redistributed. The perturbation leads to a significant increase in local electric fields, possible 4 times the original electric stress in some particular regions [TaRa95].

Local E-field enhancement can cause the initiation of streamer discharges. If the local fields are sufficiently high, streamer discharges will be developed, mainly dependent on streamer criterion, and propagate across the active regions. The presence of water droplets either in air or on the hydrophobic surface favors streamer facilitation and therefore further lowers the inception voltage for streamer discharges.
During the progress of a streamer, if the local electric stress in front of streamer is larger than the critical value for propagation, say, 4.55kV/cm [AlGh93], the streamer will advance. Otherwise, it will become inactive and eventually extinguish.

As a streamer approaches the opposite electrode, a streamer-spark transition will occur; if enough energy can be drawn from the surrounding electric field. The bushing type configuration favors such an occurrence, leading to a complete external flashover.

The E-field distribution along a 600kV wall bushing has been measured under different conditions in a laboratory environment. The results [LaW91] show that the field stress increases sharply when a dry zone is introduced. The shorter the dry zone, the higher the increase. The E-field enhancement can easily exceed five times the stress under a uniform rain condition. In the same experiment, the impact of hydrophobicity was also investigated. It was also found that a hydrophobic surface prevents field enhancement in the dry zone and substantially reduces the radial field stress. As a result, significant reduction in discharges and surface current was observed during the experiment.

Further investigations on voltage distribution across the critical dry zone have been conducted at IREQ and at Dorsey, Manitoba Hydro [LaBK96]. The result shows that under different weather conditions there are large variations in surface resistivity, a high degree of non-uniformity in voltage distribution, which results in discharges across the dry zone. The maximum voltage across the critical dry zone under worst case scenario is nearly 3 times the value for uniform voltage distribution. HVDC wall bushings under these conditions would have experienced flashovers, had they not been adequately protected with booster sheds.
2.2 Dominating Factors in HVDC Wall Bushing Uneven Wetting Flashover

Considerable laboratory investigations have been conducted to understand the dominating factors in HVDC wall bushing performance. The following is a brief summary of the findings.

2.2.1 Dry Zone Length

One of the conspicuous characteristics of uneven wetting flashover is the U-shaped relationship between the flashover voltage and the “dry” zone length as shown in Fig. 2.1. A drastic reduction in flashover voltage can be seen due to uneven wetting. There is no doubt that a critical “dry” zone length or range does exist corresponding to the minimum flashover voltage. In general, minimal withstand stresses in the range of 60~75kV/m can be expected for critical “dry” zone lengths of about 10~30% as shown in Table 2.1[NaMI89], [ScHN91], [Lamp88], [Lamb90].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Flashover Stress (kV/m)</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>63</th>
<th>67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry zone length (%)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17~30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>[Lamp88]</td>
<td>[ScHN91]</td>
<td>[Lamb90]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 Critical Flashover Stress for Uneven Wetting Flashover
Fig. 2.1 Effect of dry zone on the flashover voltage [Lamb90]
(Rain conductivity: 280μS/cm; Rain rate: 0.65mm/min)

Fig. 2.1 also indicates that the location of the dry zone is important. When it is located next to the HV terminal, the flashover voltage can be 100 kV greater than when the dry zone is located at the ground end. The results of Fig. 2.1 were obtained under negative polarity.

A single dry zone at the ground end, under negative polarity, yields a flashover voltage lower than that obtained when a single dry zone is located anywhere else on the bushing, at either polarity. It is likely that the above is true even if the zone were split into several distributed zones so that the total dry zone lengths are equal.

2.2.2 Rain Conductivity
The conductivity of natural rain varies from time to time. It is also likely that the rain conductivity changes during a rain fall, being higher in the initial minutes and then decreasing. Spot measurements of natural rain conductivity at BPA and EPRI show that it could be as low as 2～10 μS/cm [ScHN91].
The effect of rain conductivity in the range of 30~300μS/cm was investigated on a 600kV wall bushing with about 30% length of dry zone at the ground end [Lamb90]. Fig.2.2 shows results obtained from an uncoated bushing and a bushing with a partial kaolin coating. The consistent results suggest that with increase of rain salinity the flashover voltage decreases. A linear correlation is found between the logarithm of the minimum flashover voltage (V_{fO}) and the logarithm of the rain conductivity. In the relationship $V_{fO} \propto (\text{conductivity})^\nu$, the exponent $\nu$ falls in the range of -0.09 to -0.11. W. Lampe has also proposed a similar formula, i.e., dependence of flashover voltage on the water salinity ($\kappa$) is $V_{fO} \propto \kappa^{1/8}$ [LaW]91].

![Fig. 2.2 Effect of rain conductivity on the flashover voltage [Lamb90]](image)

In tests conducted under uneven wetting with low rain conductivity values, i.e. 5-10 μS/cm, a higher flashover voltage was observed [ScHN91], much more pronounced than the above
power law relation. It has also been observed that, the lower the rain conductivity, the more
the influence of uneven wetting on the critical flashover voltage (CFO) [SuCL91].

When the salinity of the rain is increased to a certain value, the transition of flashover
mechanism can be expected, from the uneven wetting caused flashover to a contamination
causd flashover mechanism. Such a transition could take place at rain salinity of 500-
1000μS/cm [LaW]91, [Lamp88].

Besides rain conductivity, flashover of uneven wetted wall bushings are also slightly influenced
by pre-deposited surface contaminants.

2.2.3 Wall Bushing Configuration
It has been experimentally confirmed that the flashover voltage of an unevenly wetted wall
bushing is influenced by its internal and external design.

In contrast to the observations made with a wall bushing type configuration, an investigation
[WuHÅ95] has revealed that an uneven wetting pattern has a negligible influence on the
flashover of post insulators. In other words, uneven wetting flashover is particularly dependent
on the configuration.

It is known that the flashover voltage of an empty shell is higher than that of a complete
bushing, especially during the critical non-uniform rain. The minimum withstand voltage of an
oil filled shell with protruded electrode, may be as low as 70% of the corresponding value for
an empty shell, and as low as 60% of the withstand value under uniform rain [NaMI89]. In the
discussion section of the same paper, it is also reported that the flashover stress of empty
porcelain is nearly twice of that of an actual bushing. However, the shed profiles were not
identical; the hollow shell in the test was substantially smaller than the full size bushing under the test.

Creepage length is an important parameter to improve the HV performance under severe service conditions, particularly for contamination flashover. However, increase in specific length may not be necessarily helpful in improving the HV performance of HVDC wall bushing. The efficacy of the specific length may be compromised due to the fact that the flashover occurs along the tips of sheds under a typical uneven wetting condition.

A significant improvement of wall bushing performance was reported by using additional booster sheds [Lamb90]. Also, some improvement of insulation strength under non-uniform wet condition can be expected with a wider shed spacing and water drip sheds having a larger shed diameter with an adequate interval [NaMI89]. The flashover voltages also increase with decreasing average shed diameter.

2.2.4 Voltage Polarity and Voltage Type
Field experience has shown that more flashover occurs under negative than positive polarity for HVDC wall bushings. As shown in Table 1.1, over 70% of reported HVDC wall bushing flashovers have occurred under negative polarity. This is consistent with experimental investigations, which show that critical flashover voltage is lower with negative polarity.

In [SchN91], PIU 500kV bushings flashovered in laboratory tests with (−ve) polarity at 390kV but withstood under positive polarity at 500kV under uneven wetting condition with rain conductivity of 50~70μS/cm. The results confirmed the PIU service experience at Sylmar station where flashovers have occurred only with negative polarity.
To verify the influence of voltage type, uneven wetting flashover tests under both ac and dc voltages were conducted on a bushing. As shown in Fig.2.3, uneven wetting flashover voltage is comparatively lower under the dc voltage than under the ac voltage.

![Fig. 2.3 Uneven wetting flashover voltage under the ac and (ve) dc voltage [SuCL91]](image)

2.2.5 Mitigating Measures

To improve the performance of HVDC wall bushings, the following mitigating measures have been used with different degrees of success.

- Hot-line washing or de-energized cleaning
- Periodic grease coating (both silicone and hydrocarbon)
- RTV silicone rubber coating
- Installation of polymeric booster sheds

Cleaning is helpful and has been widely used but often it fails to completely eliminate the problem. Silicone grease has been proven to be effective at some sites, although there are
failures reported even with silicone grease coating. The biggest concern arising from the use of
grease is carbonization due to local spark, which may further cause the puncture of porcelain
housing. It is also costly and time-consuming process to regularly replace the grease in order to
maintain the surface hydrophobicity.

Room temperature vulcanizing (RTV) silicone rubber was originally used to coat ceramic and
glass insulators to enhance their electrical performance in wet and contaminated environments.
The RTV coating provides water repellency (hydrophobicity), which prevents the formation of
continuous water films on the surface and thus suppresses leakage current and flashover. The
high resistance in surface layer of the coatings also diminishes the energy available for streamer
discharge, since recharging of the stray capacitance takes a lot longer. Therefore, suppression
of the flashover becomes possible. A 70% increase in the critical flashover voltage was
observed in experimental investigation [SuSu96]. Ageing of RTV coating has been a source of
concern, although the RTV coating have been generally effective in preventing wall bushing
flashover. Loss of water repellence was identified as the cause of the flashovers of two RTV
coated 400kV wall bushings at Sylmar [CEA95]. Laboratory experiments indicated the surface
resistance with new RTV coating was about 1000 times that of the bare porcelain housing
[ScLu91]. However, the surface resistance can be as low as 10 times that of the bare porcelain
housing for a field aged RTV coating.

As another alternative, booster sheds can be used to improve the performance of a wall bush-
ing. These supplementary plastic sheds may be added very easily to existing bushings and
replaced quickly if necessary. They were originally designed to counter the effects of heavy
wetting on large, near vertical, ac station posts and bushings by preventing the cascading of
water short-circuiting the gaps between sheds. On horizontal bushings, they probably intro-
duce a series of relative "dry" zones to improve the voltage distribution. Also, booster sheds may serve as barriers to the propagation of a leader. It has been verified [Lamb89] that the presence of the booster sheds prevented flashover at operating voltage, while a 600kV wall bushing without booster sheds may suffer a flashover at 400kV under uneven wetting condition. However, there is still some reluctance in the industry to the use of booster sheds [Rash91]. The use of booster sheds has been very successful in eliminating wall-bushing flashovers in Manitoba Hydro since the middle 80's. The flashover voltages may be increased by 13~20% as reported in [SuSu96].

HVDC wall bushings with silicone rubber sheds have been available since late 1980s. Manitoba Hydro has had a 500kV composite wall bushing in service for ten years with no flashovers and no need to clean it [McDe02].

It has also been reported [ScGG91] that vertical bushings were used to avoid the uneven wetting conditions. The bushings were washed using a permanently installed water spray system. The regular washing helped to minimize the potential contamination due to the proximity of the bushings to the sea.

2.3 Existing Models for Uneven Wetting Flashover for Wall Bushings

It is of practical interest to study the phenomena either by experiments or by modeling with the objective of improving the performance of wall bushings. In contrast to full-scale tests, which are very costly and time consuming, an appropriate model is an economical alternative to study the problem. There are two mathematical models available to describe the flashover of a HVDC wall bushing, both of which are based on the equivalent circuit concept.
2.3.1 EPRI Model [ScLu91]

In 1991, H. M. Schneider and A. E. Lux suggested a simple model, which can be used to determine a criterion for the dry-zone flashover of HVDC wall bushings under non-uniform rain, based on their experimental observations. The model assumes that

- A wall bushing can be approximated by a horizontal cylindrical insulator of uniform diameter along its length as shown in Fig.2.4.

![Fig. 2.4 Simplified wall bushing model [ScLu91]](image)

- The 'wet' zone of the bushing is thoroughly wet with a resistance per unit length of $R_{w}$. 

- The 'dry' zone is initially dry with a resistance per unit length of $R_{d}$. The actual length of the 'dry' zone is a function of time and linearly decreases as the rain continues.

- When the voltage $V_d$ across the instantaneous 'dry' zone reaches the value of the breakdown voltage $V_{bd}$, breakdown of the 'dry' zone occurs. Consequently, an impulse essentially equal to the entire applied voltage appears across the remaining wet region. This impulse voltage is capable of propagating toward the high voltage electrode especially
under negative polarity, which is positive streamer, and thus causes possible complete flashover of a whole bushing.

Based upon the above assumptions, conditions for flashover of the ‘dry’ zone are,

$$\frac{R_{wo}}{R_{do}} < \frac{V_s}{E_o L_o}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

$$L_o > \frac{(\frac{V_s}{E_o} - \frac{R_{wo} L_{do}}{R_{do}})}{1 - \frac{R_{wo}}{R_{do}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.2)

In other words, if the ratio of the resistance per unit length of the wet region to the resistance per unit length of the drier region is high enough, then flashover will not occur. On the other hand, a flashover will occur if the initial dry region length is less than a certain critical value. The relative values of resistance per unit length of the wet and dry region determine whether or not the dry zone flashovers.

Equations (2.1) and (2.2) yield necessary criteria for flashover of HVDC wall bushings under non-uniform rain. The above conditions are not sufficient to cause a complete bushing flashover, since the model only considers the breakdown of the dry region without considering the propagation mechanism of such a partial flashover.

The model successfully explains that either increasing wet surface resistance by a RTV coating or decreasing the dry surface resistance by a resistive glaze on the surface can improve the performance of the wall bushing significantly under critical uneven wetting conditions.
2.3.2 IREQ Model [RiKa91]

In later 1991, Farouk, A. M. Rizk and Sherif I. Kamel proposed a more intricate model, which provides the necessary and sufficient conditions for flashover a HVDC wall bushing under uneven wetting conditions.

![Schematic diagram of IREQ Model](image)

Rci: core and inter-shed surface resistance of section i
Rsi: the extreme shed surface resistance
Cgi: the stray capacitance of the section to ground
Cii: the capacitance to the HV conductor
Rii: represents the associated dielectric losses
Csi: the equivalent inter-shed capacitance
Cssi: the extreme shed self capacitance
di: accounts for the air gap length determined by the shortest distance in air between the tips of the extreme sheds of the section

**Fig. 2.5** Schematic diagram of IREQ Model [RiKa91]

As shown in Fig.2.5, a wall bushing was modeled by a complex network of resistors, representing the surface layer, shunted by spark gaps corresponding to spacing between consecutive sheds, as well as capacitors accounting for the stray capacitance of the layer to ground (wall) and the internal bushing capacitance. It is suggested that flashover is initiated by
streamer bridging of the dry zone which is enhanced by the non-uniform voltage distribution along a bushing. Any gaps within the dry zone will sparkover when the average applied voltage gradient, due to non-uniform voltage distribution, reaches the minimum streamer gradient $E_s$, which for a rod-rod configuration, under dc voltage, amounts to approximately 5.4 kV/cm. Due to energy stored in the bushing stray capacitance, fast voltage collapse across the dry zone leads to impulsive stressing of the wet part of a bushing. The non-uniform distribution of that impulse stress and the process of streamer bridging, fast voltage collapse as well as subsequent recharging of the bushing capacitors can lead to continued discharge propagation and flashover of the entire bushing.

In [RiKa91], the findings of the model have been compared with the results of field observations and experiments at IREQ. The model accounts for the following aspects of the flashover mechanism: critical dry zone length, polarity effect, specific leakage path, wet layer conductance per unit length as well as the dc system voltage.

2.4 Summary
The chapter reviews the literature dealing with HVDC wall bushing flashover. The finding of the literature review may be summarized as following:

1. An uneven wetting condition has been identified as the main cause of flashovers in HVDC wall bushing. This type of flashover is significantly different from typical HVDC insulator failure mode caused by contamination.

2. HVDC wall bushings are very susceptible to the external environment. Substantial E-field enhancement can be expected, which may lead to a flashover, once a dry zone is created.
3. There is a U-shaped relationship between flashover voltage and dry zone length. A minimal flashover stress in the range of 60-75kV/m is expected for the critical dry zone length of 10-30%.

4. Impact of rain conductivity decreases with increase of rain conductivity. Uneven wetting flashover is the predominant mechanism until rain salinity corresponds to a water conductivity 1000μS/cm, when contamination flashover mechanism may start to take over.

5. The bushing type of configuration is most susceptible to the uneven wetting flashover. An increase in the creepage length will not have any significant improvement in performance under the uneven wetting.

6. Both effect of voltage polarity and the effect of voltage type have been observed. Over 70% of reported HVDC wall bushing flashovers occurred under negative polarity. The positive polarity strength is 30% higher than the negative polarity strength under non-uniform rain [ScHN91].

7. Mitigating measures such as cleaning, greasing, RTV coating, and booster sheds have been used to prevent the uneven wetting flashovers. Among those, RTV and booster sheds offer most effective prevention.

8. There are two mathematical models available to explain the phenomena of uneven wetting flashovers. Both are based on the equivalent circuit concept. The IREQ model is presented in [RiKa91] where it is shown to explain some results of experimental and field observations, such as critical dry zone length, polarity effect, specific length.
Chapter 3

PHYSICS OF DISCHARGES AND NUMERICAL MODEL FOR UNEVEN WETTING FLASHOVER

Knowledge of the physics of discharges in air is of paramount importance in order to explain, interpret and, to some extent, predict the dielectric behavior of external insulation based on physical considerations. In this chapter, a brief review of the physics of gaseous discharges is presented followed by a proposed description of fundamental processes involved in an uneven wetting caused HVDC wall bushing flashover. Mechanisms that are responsible for the initiation of a streamer, streamer propagation, as well as the sequence of discharges are discussed. Furthermore, a numerical model is proposed to predict the flashover voltage.

3.1 dc Discharges in Air

Two types of discharges exist, namely streamer discharge and leader discharge. The transition from a streamer to leader depends upon the availability of the energy stored in the gap and current through the gap. However under dc voltage, leader propagation is not favoured [Thio79]. Soon after its formation the leader stops, the channel is cooled the potential of the leader tip decreases and the discharge is extinguished. Therefore, a dc flashover is essentially governed by streamer discharges.

There are two theories, namely the Townsend and Streamer criteria, available to account for discharge inception. While the Townsend criterion relates discharge inception to the self-sustaining ability of the primary avalanche, the Streamer criterion links the discharge inception to the transition of the primary avalanche to a secondary avalanche.
However, for non-uniform field gaps, the inception of discharges is a necessary but not sufficient condition for flashover. To flashover a gap, the electric field along a gap is required to be sufficiently high to sustain the propagation of discharges.

Practically, the streamer can be represented by a slightly conductive channel with a longitudinal gradient of 4.55kV/cm \([\text{AlGh93}]\) for +ve streamers and 11.5kV/cm \([\text{Thio79}]\) for -ve streamers. They are the critical gradients required for streamer propagation. Table 3.1 lists the measured electric gradients for streamer propagation in air by several researchers. Streamer propagation is also dependent upon the availability of photoelectrons in front of it. The critical value for electric field is about 600V/cm \([\text{NaSh69}]\); above this level the external field is strong enough to overcome random thermal motion, and photoelectrons are able to drift into the high field region around the space charge. When the space charge energy is insufficient to propagate into the low field region or the drift velocity of electrons due to the external field does not significantly exceed the thermal velocity, a streamer will terminate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Stress (kV/m)</th>
<th>Gap Type and Length (cm)</th>
<th>Humidity (g/m³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phelps &amp; Griffiths</td>
<td>451, 487</td>
<td>Parallel Plane 9</td>
<td>0, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Boutlendi (a)</td>
<td>490, 510</td>
<td>Parallel Plane 66</td>
<td>11, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Dring</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>Rod Plane 50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aalen &amp; Ghaffar</td>
<td>375, 422</td>
<td>Parallel Plane 15</td>
<td>0, 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Streamer Propagating Gradients at RAD = 1[AlGh93]
The equivalent mean velocity of streamer advancement is of the order of several tens of cm/µs. Once streamers reach the opposite electrode, the final jump will be initiated. At that moment, electrons are emitted from the electrode, the current and the propagating velocity of discharges increase exponentially, and as a result the channel becomes totally ionised and voltage inside the channel collapses.

3.2 HVDC Wall Bushing Flashover under Uneven Wetting Conditions

In general, a wet surface resulting from rain can significantly lower the surface strength of an insulator. For a dc insulator under uniform rain, the flashover stress shows a large scatter and varies between 170~400kV/m. A flashover stress of 200kV/m was obtained for a dc station post insulator in both uniform and non-uniform rain under both polarities [WuHÅ95]. Furthermore, both field and experiment results show that flashover stresses as low as 60~70kV/m can be expected for unevenly wetted wall bushings, which implies that additional mechanisms are involved in HVDC wall bushing flashovers.

The mechanisms and peculiarities of the phenomena will be discussed in this section in details.

3.2.1 Wetting Process

During the process of wetting, a water drop is initially dropped on to an insulating surface as shown in Fig. 3.1. The contact angle and surface tension are related by the Young’s Equation,

\[ \sigma_i = \sigma_w + \sigma_a \cdot \cos \theta \]  
(3.1)

Where \( \theta \) is the static contact angle and \( \sigma_i, \sigma_w, \sigma_a \) are the surface tensions of insulator, water and air respectively. The contact angle is customarily measured through the liquid. The larger the angle, the greater the hydrophobicity. For hydrophilic surfaces such as porcelain, the
contact angle is normally less than 90°, while for a hydrophobic surface such as composite material the contact angle is larger than 90°. Under rain, continuous highly conductive water layers normally 0.1 ~ 0.3 mm thick may be expected to form on a porcelain surface [Lamp88]. On the other hand, for a RTV coated porcelain surface or other composite material, continuous rain only increases the density of water drops on the surface without leading to the formation of a continuous water film. Hence, rain results in the formation of a layer of low conductivity; the layer may be covered by movable conductive droplets.

![Water Drop Diagram](image)

**Fig. 3.1** Surface tensions and contact angle for water drop on a dielectric surface

The resistance of one section of a full scale (500 kV) wall bushing under rain with conductivity of 90 μS/cm, was found to be about 1000 MΩ, initially, and then decayed to 10 MΩ [ScLu91]. The surface resistivity of wetted porcelain, can therefore be estimated by the following formula,

$$\rho_s = R \cdot \frac{\pi D}{L}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.2)

Where R is the measured surface resistance, D is the diameter of the insulator and L is the creepage length. In this case, D is 73.5 cm and L is 640 cm. Thus the surface resistivity is about $4 \times 10^8 \ \Omega$ for a dry porcelain surface and about $4 \times 10^6 \ \Omega$ for a wetted surface. For wetted
porcelain with RTV coating, the surface resistivity may be of the order of $10^7 \Omega$. If it is assumed that the conductance is mainly due to the presence of an electrolytic film on the surface, the surface resistivity and volume conductivity of rain are related by

$$\rho_s = \frac{k_i}{\gamma \cdot d} \quad (3.3)$$

Where $\gamma$ is the volume conductivity of rain, $d$ the thickness of the water film (0.01~0.03cm), and $k_i$ is a quantity accounting for both surface condition and pre-deposit contaminant level.

In this case, $k_i$ is 3.6, since $\gamma$ is 90$\mu$S/cm and $d$ is 0.01cm.

### 3.2.2 Influence of Uneven Wetting Pattern on E-field Distribution

Due to the shielding effect of a wall on a horizontally mounted HVDC wall bushing, an uneven wetting pattern is created, particularly when rain is accompanied by wind having the direction shown in Fig.3.2 [Forr88], [McDe88]. The existence of an uneven wetting pattern has been confirmed by field investigations. The wetting pattern is strongly influenced by wind direction, rain intensity, and also the time duration of rain. The rain intensity at the HV and ground ends may differ by a factor of 10 -100, which could lead to a much more significant difference in surface conductance.

Hence, an uneven wetting pattern can substantially change the potential distribution and electric fields. With a critical length of dry zone, both internal and external electric fields could be several times higher than those under dry conditions [TaRa95] and therefore render a favourable condition to initiate and sustain discharges.
The influence of an uneven wetting pattern on the dc electric field distribution is investigated [TaRa95] with a 110kV dc bushing model shown in Fig.3.3 and Table 3.2. In the computation model, actual profile of bushing sheds has been taken into consideration. The edge of the condenser core is treated as known boundary with a linear potential distribution. The E-field distributions are calculated using the ANSYS program with 8000 elements and over 10000 nodes. The results in Fig. 3.4-3.7 were obtained with the dry zone located at the ground end. Fig.3.4 shows E-field contours of bushing models with different lengths of dry zones. The normalized E-fields at shed tips and those in air close to the bushing surface are shown in Figs.3.5 and 3.6 respectively. Fig. 3.7 shows the influence of the length of the dry zone on the electric field.

Fig. 3.2 Shielding effect of hall wall under rain with wind
Fig. 3.3 E-field computation model for a 11kV wall bushing

Table 3.2 Key Dimensions of the 110kV Bushing Model

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Shed Pairs</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shed Overhand/spacing</strong></td>
<td>45/50mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inner Diameter of the Porcelain Housing</strong></td>
<td>200mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outer Diameter of the Porcelain Housing</strong></td>
<td>260mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 3.4 Impact of dry zone length on E-field contours [TaRa95]
Fig. 3.5 E-field intensity at shed tips under -ve unit voltage [TaRa95]
(Sheds are numbered from the ground end)
Fig. 3.6 E-field intensity in the air close to the bushing surface [TaRa95] 
(along a line 2.5 cm from shed tips)
Fig. 3.7 Influence of the dry zone length on E-field intensity [TaRa95]
For a dry bushing, the highest electric field region is around the top cap of the bushing, while the electric field along the external surface, such as electric field at shed tips or in air close to the bushing surface are relatively low. Therefore, the chance of external flashover for a dry bushing is low, although corona may occur at the bushing top.

As the dry zone length decreases, it is noticed that both the internal and external electric fields increase significantly, especially when the dry zone length is 30% or less. The location of the maximum electric field in oil shifts from the final HV-end foil of the condenser core to the oil gap between the earth-end foil of the condenser core and porcelain housing, while the maximum electric fields in porcelain and on the external surface move to the region near the first dry shed which is closest to the wet zone. Evidently, the E-field distribution of a dc wall bushing is very sensitive to external surface condition. With a length of 10% dry zone, the maximum value of E-field in oil is as high as 4~5 times that of a dry bushing and the maximum value of E-field in porcelain is 10 times that of a dry bushing. However, since the electric strength in air is comparatively low, the effect of drastically increased E-fields along the external surface is more predominant. Relatively high electric field regions near the bushing surface are observed which cover more of the bushing surface as the dry zone length decreases as shown in Fig.3.4. An external flashover can be triggered if the local E-field is sufficiently high and the high field region is large enough to sustain streamer growth and form a spark. Therefore, uneven wetting can cause extremely severe operating conditions for external and internal insulation. External flashover, radial puncture of the porcelain housing and discharges in the oil can occur even at operating voltage. External flashover, presence of acetylene dissolved in oil up to the level of 200~700ppm and erosion of the inner surface of porcelain housing have been reported [RaMc89-2].
Interestingly, the external electric field improves dramatically with decrease of the dry zone length to zero (i.e. a completely wetted bushing). The reason is that the completely wetted external surface provides a relatively uniform voltage distribution along the bushing surface, thus linearizing the external E-field distribution, however at the expense of increasing the internal electric field.

The impact of uneven wetting pattern on E-field distribution can be summarized as following.

1. Uneven wetting can cause a redistribution of the electric field in both internal and external insulation. With the dry zone length in a critical range, insulation integrity can be compromised significantly in both internal and external insulation.

2. External coatings, especially RTV coatings, result in some improvement in the electric field distribution. Therefore, the performance of a coated bushing is superior to that of an uncoated one.

3. The configuration of a wall bushing has an influence on both the internal and external electric field distributions; hollow shells exhibit relative low electric field, while a complete bushing has relative high electric field and high radial component of electric field.

4. To understand the mechanism of flashover initiation, E-field simulation prior to flashover is essential and important.

**3.2.3 Role of Raindrops in the Flashover Process**

When a water drop is present in an ambient electric field, interaction occurs between the electric field and the drop. A drop will be polarized, and then in turn the bound charges due to the polarization will distort the nearby electric field. For a spherical raindrop with radius of \( a \), Fig. 3.8, the ambient electric field \( E_o \) is distorted and becomes \([Xieg62]\),
\[ E_r = \left[ 1 + \frac{2a^3}{r^3} \cdot \left( \frac{\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1}{\varepsilon_2 + 2\varepsilon_1} \right) \right] E_o \cdot \cos \theta \]

\[ E_\theta = \left[ 1 - \frac{a^3}{r^3} \cdot \left( \frac{\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1}{\varepsilon_2 + 2\varepsilon_1} \right) \right] E_o \cdot \sin \theta \]  

(3.4)

Which, in turn, yields the maximum electric field near the raindrop,

\[ E_{\text{max}} = \left[ 1 + \frac{2a^3}{a^3} \cdot \left( \frac{81 - 1}{81 + 2} \right) \right] E_o \approx 3 \cdot E_o \]  

(3.5)

![Diagram](image)

**(a) Ambient electric field**

**(b) Resultant electric field**

Fig. 3.8 Electric field distortion due to the presence of a water drop

Therefore, the local electric fields close to water drops are significantly enhanced. Considering the elongating effect of water drops, further increase of the local electric field may be expected.

Due to the interaction between the electric field and water drops, following additional dominating mechanisms are responsible for the initiation of discharges.

**Discharges Due to the Disintegration of Raindrop**

When raindrops fall into high electric field regions, they get polarized, and elongate in the direction of electric field. If the electric field is sufficiently divergent, they will experience a force directed towards the region of highest field.
The total potential energy, \( W_{\text{total}} \), of a raindrop mainly consists of the surface tension energy, \( W_s \), and the electrostatic potential energy, \( W_e \).

\[
W_s = s \cdot \sigma = 4\pi \sigma r^2 \quad (3.6)
\]

\[
W_e = \frac{1}{2} (\varepsilon - \varepsilon_i) \int \langle E_i E_o \rangle dV = -\frac{2}{3} \pi \cdot (\varepsilon - \varepsilon_i) \varepsilon_i E_o^2 r^3 \quad (3.7)
\]

\[
W_{\text{total}} = W_s + W_e = f(\varepsilon, \sigma, E_o, r) \quad (3.8)
\]

where: \( W_s \), \( W_e \), and \( W_{\text{total}} \) are energies for surface tension, electrostatic potential and the total potential;

\( S \) is the surface area, roughly equals to \( 4\pi r^2 \), while \( r \) is the radius of a raindrop;

\( \sigma \) is the surface tension (for water in air: \( \sigma = 0.0728 \text{ N/m} \));

\( \varepsilon \) and \( \varepsilon_i \) are permittivity of air and a raindrop respectively, in \( \text{F/m} \);

\( E_i \) and \( E_o \) are the electric fields inside a raindrop and the ambient electric field respectively;

\( V \) is the volume of a raindrop.

During the process of raindrop deformation, the electrostatic force causes the elongation of a drop, while the surface tension prevents its elongation and tries to keep the surface area as small as possible. As a result, it is expected that there is a local minimal point for the total potential energy, at which the equilibrium condition is no longer satisfied and the electrostatic force becomes greater than the surface tension of a drop and leads to instability of a raindrop. Namely, a water drop starts to be mechanically unstable and ejects water filaments from its tips or coalesces with other drops.
The elongation of a water drop increases exponentially with the electric field. The degree of elongation and the point of instability are dependent on the drop size and the electric field. The critical ambient electric field, which causes the disintegration of a water drop, in free space as well as on a hydrophobic surface, can be found at the local minimal of total potential energy. Hence,

\[ \frac{dW_{\text{total}}}{dE_0} \bigg|_{E_0=E_{cr}} = 0 \]  

(3.9)

Which, together with equations (3.6)-(3.8), yield following formula.

\[ E_{cr} = C \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\sigma}{\varepsilon r}} \]  

(3.10)

Where C can be derived either experimentally or theoretically, and is usually in the range of 0.4-0.5 [Tayl64], [Sher88]]. At a critical electric field value the drop becomes unstable and small droplets are ejected from the drop tip. As shown in Fig.3.9, it is expected that a raindrop with 1mm radius will be disintegrated under an electric field of 14.3kV/cm, while a field of 10.1kV/cm is required to cause disintegration of a raindrop with 2mm radius and only about 5.1kV/cm for a 8mm drop. However, further increase in the size of raindrops does not necessarily result in a significantly decrease in the critical electric field value which causes its disintegration.
Fig. 3.9 Critical E-field for the disintegration of a raindrops (as per Eqn. 3.10 with C=0.5)

For charged drops, Eqn (3.10) can be modified to

$$E_{cr} = C \cdot (1 - \frac{Q}{Q_R}) \sqrt{\frac{\sigma}{r \cdot \varepsilon}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.11)$$

Where Q is the charge on a drop, and $Q_R$ is the Rayleigh charge limit, which is the maximum charge on a water drop without becoming unstable [Rayl82].
\[ Q_r = 8\pi \sqrt{\varepsilon \cdot r^3} \] (3.12)

The naturally accumulated charge on most raindrops is of the order of \(10^{12}\) C [Chal57], which normally has a negligible influence on values of \(E_{cr}\). However, there are a few drops with charges up to \(10^{10}\) C, which could lead to a 15\% reduction of \(E_{cr}\) for a drop with diameter of 2mm. Moreover, consideration of the charging process as a raindrop approaches an energized insulator, may result in a further reduction of the \(E_{cr}\).

The disintegration of water drops may result in the onset of a streamer due to the ejected fine droplets causing a sudden increase in electric field nearby, thus triggering discharges along the surface. By considering the behavior of a single water drop on an insulating surface in a dc field, it has been reported [WiSL93], [SuSN95] that such unstable conditions can induce flashover at voltages lower than that obtained under dry conditions.

For HVDC wall bushing uneven wetting flashover, the above instability criterion is a one of the most important mechanisms for initiation of discharges. As indicated in [LaWJ91], the first detectable discharges took place on large drops leaving the low part of larger sheds, when a 600kV wall bushing was under the uneven wetting tests.

**Corona Discharges in the Vicinity of Raindrops**

According to Eqn (3.5), the electric stress in the vicinity of water drops can be as high as 3 times the ambient electric field. Such an enhancement can cause a significant increase in the ionization of air surrounding the raindrops, thus leading to the initiation of corona discharges. Previous studies [Engl48] have revealed that corona onset is dependent on the radius of the raindrop, air pressure, temperature and relatively humidity. With a sufficient reduction in air pressure this mechanism could become dominant in the initiation of discharges.
Other Factors

Water drops on a hydrophobic surface may move under the influence of electric field. Hence, the motion of a fine filament of water could trigger sparks.

Other process such as photo emission, field emission, release of charged ions and charge neutralization due to recombination of ambient ions of opposite sign may result in a charged drop losing its charge to the surrounding air, and thus may also contribute to initiation of discharges. Relatively high ionization and attachment coefficients are also expected compared with dry conditions.

3.2.4 Propagation of Discharges in Uneven Wetting Caused Flashover

The propagation of a streamer is mainly determined by the local electric field, a resultant field due to the external dc field and space charges. However, in the case of an unevenly wetted bushing, the presence of a wetted surface causes some peculiarities. As shown in Fig. 3.10(a) for a -ve HVDC wall bushing, +ve streamer growth originates from the ground end and heads towards the HV end; while under +ve polarity voltage, Fig. 3.10(b), the polarity of such a streamer is -ve. Besides the large difference between the propagating properties of +ve and -ve streamers, the following peculiarities also have an influence. For a HVDC wall bushing under -ve polarity, the head of the secondary avalanche experiences forces which tend to repel it from the bushing surface and attract it to the propagating streamer and finally to the ground electrode, hence in favor of advancement of streamer and surmount the blocking effect of sheds. Also, electrons emitted from a wetted surface render a favorable condition for the formation of secondary avalanche. Thus the electric field for streamer propagation is lower. Under +ve polarity, the propagating streamer is a negative streamer. The electrons of the secondary avalanche are attracted by the surface and repelled by the streamer. In addition, the
wetted surface behaves like a sink for electrons. As a result the -ve streamer is easier to be contained, and terminated, which in turn leads to a higher flashover voltage for HVDC wall bushing under +ve polarity.

![Fig. 3.10 Discharge propagation with different polarity](image)

3.2.5 Discharge Propagation on an Electrolytic Surface

The presence of an electrolytic layer on the surface of a wall bushing can cause considerable amount of conductive current, thus leading to flashover. As long as the discharges can draw sufficient energy from this conductive current, it is expected that discharges will sustain, advance, and eventually spark over a gap.

A schematic illustration of a representative model is shown in Fig. 3.11. The representative equations are given as following.
\[ V_s = V_d + V_r \]  \hspace{2cm} (3.13)

Where:  
\( V_s \) is the source voltage;  
\( V_d \) is the potential across the discharge;  
\( V_r \) is the voltage drop across the remaining electrolytic surface;

\[ V_d = A \cdot I^{-n} x \]  \hspace{2cm} (3.14)

Where:  
\( I \) is the arc current;  
\( x \) is the length of a propagating discharge;  
\( A, n \) are the characteristic constant of discharge, (for dc  \( A=138, n=-0.69 \) [GuZh90])

\[ V_r = RI = \rho \cdot \frac{(L - x)}{\pi D} \]  \hspace{2cm} (3.15)

Where:  
\( L \) is the total length of the electrolytic surface;  
\( R \) is the surface resistance on the electrolytic surface;  
\( D \) is the diameter of a bushing;  
\( \rho_s \) is the surface resistivity of the electrolytic surface.

As shown in Fig. 3.11 (obtained from equations 3.13 to 3.15), when dashed line (actual voltage across discharges) and solid line (voltage to sustain discharge) intersect, discharges are able to draw a sufficient current, thus can sustain and propagate. However, with progress of discharge, there is a critical point at which the discharges may be extinguished when the length of discharges exceeds \( x_m \), since the current is no longer sufficient to sustain the discharge as required in Eqn. 3.14. Hence the propagation of discharges will be terminated. For a given configuration, surface resistivity and source voltage, the maximum propagating distance is \( x_c \).
and can be estimated. It is also possible to determine the minimum source voltage for
sparkover for a given configuration.

![Discharge Circuit Diagram]

**Fig.3.11** Illustration of propagation of discharges on an electrolytic surface

Fig. 3.12 is obtained by changing the arc length and finding the minimum voltage required for
propagation of the arc across an electrolytic surface. Part of a bushing with average diameter
64cm and creepage length 800cm is considered, which corresponds to the case of a bushing
with 30% length of dry zone. With a 0.01cm thick water film, low rain conductivity of
10μS/cm and $k_i = 3.6$, (equivalent to a surface resistivity of $3.6 \times 10^7 \Omega$), the minimum voltage
for driving an arc across the wetted surface is 2050kV. This value is too high to be responsible
for flashover under an operating voltage. However, with an increase in rain conductivity, or a decrease in surface resistivity, the minimum voltage for propagation across an electrolytic surface decreases significantly. With a rain conductivity of 500μS/cm, the minimum voltage is only 420 kV. This implies that discharge propagation on an electrolytic surface may become a predominant process. The mechanism of discharge propagation along the electrolytic surface could become a competing mechanism for flashover when the rain conductivity is high enough when a thick layer of rain is deposited. The above calculations are consistent with experimental observations [LaWJ91].

Fig. 3.12 Minimum voltage for arc propagation along wetted surface with respect to the arc length (with 64 cm in average diameter and 800 cm in creepage length)

- - - - surface resistivity of 7.2 x 10^6 Ω
- - - - surface resistivity of 3.6 x 10^6 Ω
- - - - surface resistivity of 3.6 x 10^7 Ω
The suggested model can be used for prediction of flashover voltage, when a HVDC wall bushing is impacted by conductive rain or when rain occurs in combination with heavy contamination.

3.2.6 Sequence of Events for Uneven Wetting Flashover of HVDC Wall Bushing

Based on the above discussed mechanisms and processes, the following sequence of events is suggested as being representative of the whole process of HVDC wall bushing flashover due to uneven wetting,

**Uneven Wetting:** In a rain with wind as shown in Fig. 3.2, a “dry” zone (with relative high resistance) is created at the ground end due to shielding effects of a wall.

**Enhancement of E-field:** Electric fields, particularly those around the region where the dry and wet zones meet, are greatly increased, due to the fact that the steady state dc distribution is determined by the prevailing resistivity. Uneven wetting leads to a HVDC wall bushing operating under a severe condition.

**Initiation of Discharges:** Discharges are initiated due to the abnormal enhancement of electric field. The critical volume is around the region between the dry and wetted zone with high electric fields. Effects of disintegration of raindrops, E-field distortion due to raindrops further account for the inception of discharges. A lower inception voltage of discharge initiation can be expected.
Propagation of Discharge: Discharges propagate across the whole bushing, if enough energy is available from the gap, space charges, or leakage current on the electrolytic surface.

Sparkover: Once discharges approach the high voltage electrode, external flashover will be established.

3.3 E-field Based Numerical Model for Prediction of HVDC Wall Bushing Flashover due to Uneven Wetting
A numerical model, based on the E-field distribution, is proposed to predict the flashover voltage of an unevenly wetted HVDC wall bushing. The conditions for streamer initiation and propagation discussed in the previous sections are incorporated into the model as the criteria for flashover.

3.3.1 Mathematical Description of E-field
For a HVDC wall bushing, the E-field distribution is governed by the following equation,

\[
\left( \varepsilon(x, y, z) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \gamma(x, y, z) \right) \left( \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial z^2} \right) = \rho(x, y, z)
\]

\[
\varphi|_{c} = \varphi_c(t) \quad \text{Boundary condition}
\]

\[
\varphi|_{r=0} = \varphi(0) \quad \text{Initial condition}
\]

Where, \( \varphi(x,y,z) \) is the electrical potential;
\( \varepsilon(x,y,z) \) is the permittivity of the material involved;
\( \gamma(x,y,z) \) is the conductivity of the material involved;
\( \rho(x,y,z) \) is the volume charge density.
Prior to flashover and ignoring the influence of space charges, Eqn. 3.16 reduces to the Laplacian equation, satisfies boundary conditions at interfaces of different materials, and yields the steady-state dc E-field distribution. This simplification is supported by the results of E-field measurements in the laboratory. Thus, the E-field distribution pattern of a HVDC wall bushing prior to flashover is mainly determined by the conductivity of the different materials and geometry.

3.3.2 Electric Field Modelling for HVDC Wall Bushing

To model the dc E-field distribution of a wall bushing under different surface conditions, several assumptions were made as following,

1. Considering the rotational symmetrical characteristics of wall bushing prior to a flashover, a 2-dimensional axial symmetric model was used.

2. Different materials (bushing oil, porcelain, water film and air) were assigned conductivities shown in Table 3.2 to simulate typical operating conditions.

3. To simulate the surface condition of an unevenly wetted wall bushing, a thin layer of water film with various conductivities were used.

4. Since the bushing grading system was optimised in design and the relatively large conductance between two adjacent grading foils ensures the potential distribution along the grading core to be unaffected by stray leakage outside the core, the edge of the grading core can be treated as known boundary with a linear potential distribution.

The electric field distributions of a HVDC wall bushing under different wetting conditions were investigated with the assistance of ANSYS finite element analysis software.
Fig. 3.13 Potential contours for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing

Fig. 3.14 E-field contours for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing
The investigation of the electric field distribution was conducted with a 600kV HVDC wall bushing using the ANSYS finite element analysis program with 8000 elements and 10000 nodes. Figures 3.13 and 3.14 illustrate potential and electric field contours respectively under a completely dry surface and an unevenly wetted surface with 30% length of dry zone located at ground end. A typical electric field distribution along the shed tips is shown in Fig. 3.15. This distribution was obtained with 30% dry zone length and rain conductivity of 100μS/cm. The E-field analysis shows that uneven wetting causes a redistribution of the electric field, and hence causes a severe operating condition for a HVDC wall bushing.

![Fig. 3.15 Electric field distribution along the critical line that links tips of sheds for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing](image)
Table 3.3 Conductivity of Different Materials [ScLu91], [Hart94]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Oil</th>
<th>Porcelain</th>
<th>Surface Film</th>
<th>Surface Film</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\gamma$ (S/m)</td>
<td>$3\times10^{13}$</td>
<td>$10^2$</td>
<td>$10^{12}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.3 HVDC Wall Bushing Uneven Wetting Flashover Criterion

Most HVDC wall bushings operate under very lightly contaminated conditions, low conductivity rain, or both. The streamer process is therefore primarily responsible for flashover. In the case of negative polarity wall bushings, it is essential that positive streamers be initiated near the ground end and propagate towards the high voltage terminal. The following model is proposed to determine the critical flashover voltage of an unevenly wetted wall bushing.

Experimental observations have confirmed that the flashover paths for a majority of uneven wetting caused flashovers are more or less directed along shed tips rather than completely along and close to the bushing surface [NaMI89]. Hence, in this model, the critical line is defined as the shortest line that links all shed tips and both HV and ground electrodes. For flashover to occur, the following three conditions must be satisfied.

**Condition for streamer initiation:** To facilitate a streamer, either the secondary avalanche due to photo-ionisation or disintegration of water drop has to occur. In case of secondary avalanche, the number of electrons in the active region must reach a critical level. In other words, the integration of the effective ionisation coefficient in the active region along the critical line is required to reach a certain level, usually 9.15-11.5 [PeZa95]. This leads to a transition of the primary avalanche to a secondary avalanche. On other hand if streamer
initiation is due to disintegration of water drops, the maximum electric field along the critical line has to be greater than $E_{cr}$, where $E_{cr}$ is defined in Eqn. 3.10.

The production of free electrons by ionisation processes is related to the un-ionised electric field through the primary net ionisation coefficient, governed by following equation [PeZa95],

$$\frac{\alpha - \eta}{p} = C \left[ \frac{E}{p} - \left( \frac{E}{p} \right)_{m} \right]^{2} - A \quad (3.17)$$

Where: $\alpha =$ ionization coefficient;
$\eta =$ attachment coefficient;
$p =$ air pressure [bar];
$C \text{ [bar-mm/kV$^2$]}, A \text{ [1/(mm-bar)]} \text{ and } \left( \frac{E}{p} \right)_{m} \text{ [kV/(mm-bar)]}$ are constants, which are determined by the type of gas.

For synthetic air ($O_2 \text{ 20\%}, N_2 \text{ 80\%}$), $C=1.6053$, $A=0.2873$, $\left( \frac{E}{p} \right)_{m} =2.165$. Hence, at the critical value $(E/p)_{cr}$ of 2.588 kV/(mm.bar), the effective ionisation coefficient is zero. The integration of the effective ionisation coefficient in the active region along the critical line can be estimated by using following formula.

$$K = \int_{0}^{x_{c}} (\alpha - \eta)dx \quad (3.18)$$

**Condition for streamer propagation:** The average electric field along the gap has to be greater than the gradient for streamer propagation, namely 4.55kV/cm for +ve streamers and 11.5kV/cm for -ve streamers as discussed in the section 3.1.

**Condition for streamer sustenance:** The minimum electric field in the expected flashover path must be larger than 600V/cm as discussed in section the 3.1.
The above criteria relate the electric field to the flashover via various constants, thus enabling the critical flashover voltage to be estimated.

3.3.4 Prediction of the Critical Flashover Voltage under -ve Polarity

To determine the critical flashover voltage for a HVDC Wall Bushing, the following procedure is proposed.

1. A normalized electric field distribution along the critical line, i.e. along the expected flashover path bridging shed tips, is obtained by E-field computation.
2. An initial voltage value is selected, and the electric fields throughout the calculation region are obtained by multiplication of the normalized electric field values by the selected voltage value for the initial iteration.
3. The active region is determined where the effective ionisation coefficient is larger than zero according to Eqn. 3.17, or where \((E/p)\) is larger than 2.588 kV/(mm.bar).
4. The number of electrons in the active region is estimated by using Eqn. 3.17 and Eqn. 3.18.
5. The maximum, minimum and average electric fields along the critical line are estimated.
6. The electron number and the minimum & average electric fields in the gap are compared with the flashover criterion. If the criteria are satisfied, a flashover may be expected along the shed tips and the selected applied voltage is the critical flashover voltage. If the criteria are not satisfied the selected voltage is increased by a suitable amount and the procedure is repeated starting from step 2 until the critical flashover voltage is determined.

Fig. 3.16 shows the flow chart of a typical procedure to predict the critical flashover voltage of an unevenly wetted HVDC wall bushing.
Build geometry model and apply boundary conditions

Calculate the normalized E-field distribution along the critical line

Obtained E-field distribution

Determine the active region as per Eqn 3.17 and calculate the number of electron within the active region

Identify the maximum electric field

Streamcr initiation? (photoionization or disintegration of water drons)

Yes

Determine average and minimum electric fields

Streamcr propagation?
$E_{vac} > 4.5kV/cm$ (+ve) or $E_{vac} > 11.5kV/cm$ (-ve)

Yes

Streamcr sustenance?
$E_{min} > 600V/cm$

Yes

Stop

Fig. 3.16 Flowchart of predicting uneven wetting HVDC wall bushing critical flashover voltage

1 The flowchart for CFO prediction is essentially identical for HVDC wall bushings under +ve polarity and -ve polarity with exception that -ve streamer propagation is considered for busing under +ve polarity.
Table 3.4 shows the breakdown voltage, using the above procedure, of a 50cm diameter spheres with various spacing in the range 5-25cm. The efficacy of the model is confirmed by the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spacing(cm)</th>
<th>- ve polarity Flashover Voltage (kV)</th>
<th>IEC values[KuZa84]</th>
<th>Deviation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>136.7</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>200.2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>259.4</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>314.9</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>366.9</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>415.7</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>461.5</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>544.8</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.5 Modification in Procedure to Determine the Critical Flashover Voltage of a HVDC Wall Bushing Operating under +ve Polarity

Although the electric field distribution for an unevenly wetted bushing under different polarities are essentially the same, the flashover processes involved under +ve polarity is different from that of a HVDC wall bushing under -ve polarity. In the latter case, positive
streamers are initiated at the ground end where the electric field is higher and propagate towards the HV end. For a wall bushing under +ve polarity, -ve streamers start from the ground end and if electric fields around the HV electrode are sufficiently high, positive streamers may also launch from the HV terminal towards the negative streamer. Therefore, modifications in the model are necessary to account for the physics involved in +ve polarity. Following is the modified procedure for a +ve HVDC wall bushing.

1. A normalized electric field distribution along the critical line, namely along the expected flashover path bridging the shed tips, is obtained by accurate E-field computation. An initial voltage value is selected that equals either (a) \[
\frac{E}{E_{\text{max(normalised)}}} \cdot \frac{p}{p_{cr}}
\] or (b) \[
\frac{E_{cr}}{E_{\text{max(normalised)}}}
\] for triggering a discharge due to water droplets, whichever is smaller.

2. The electric field is scaled accordingly.

3. The active region, where facilitates negative streamer growth, is determined. In other words, a region is identified where the effective ionisation coefficient is larger than zero according to Eqn. 3.17, or where \((E/p)\) is larger than 2.588 kV/(mm.bar).

4. The factor K is estimated in the active region for negative streamers by using Eqn (3.17)

5. The maximum, average and minimum values of electric field along the critical line are obtained.

6. It is also determined whether or not an active region is present immediately close to the HV terminal along the critical line; this is the region in which a positive streamer growth is facilitated. K is estimated in this region, if there is one.
7. If active regions along the critical line are absent or the values of K in both active regions are less than 9.15, the applied voltage is incremented and the procedure repeated from step 2.

8. If K in the active region for negative streamer is greater than 9.15, average electric field is larger than 11.5kV/cm, and the minimum electric field along the critical line is no less than 600V/cm, then a flashover due to complete negative streamers occurs. The applied voltage is the critical flashover voltage and iterations are stopped. If not, the procedure continues as described below.

9. If K in the active region for positive streamer is greater than 9.15, and the average electric field is larger than 4.55kV/cm, and the minimal electric field along the critical line is no less than 600V/cm, then a flashover due to +ve streamers occurs. The applied voltage is the critical flashover voltage and iterations are stopped.

10. If K in the active region for positive streamer is greater than 9.15, and the average electric field over 2/3 of the critical line is larger than 11.5kV/cm, and the minimal electric field along the critical line is no less than 600V/cm, and K in the active region for positive is also greater than 9.15 then a flashover due to both -ve and +ve streamers occurs. The applied voltage is the critical flashover voltage and iterations are stopped.

11. The applied voltage is incremented and the procedure repeated starting with step 2 until the critical flashover voltage is determined.

3.4 Summary
In this chapter, fundamental processes that occur in uneven wetting caused flashover are discussed in detail, which suggests that:
The uneven wetting flashover of HVDC wall bushing is a streamer-discharge predominant process. Initiation and progress of streamer discharges under uneven wetting condition for a bushing type configuration is of particular interest to understand the phenomena.

Initiation of discharges is due to several competing mechanisms. The enhancement of local electric field due to uneven wetting of a bushing, corona due to raindrops and disintegration of raindrops play important roles in this stage.

A numerical model is proposed to assess the performance of HVDC wall bushings and predict the critical flashover voltage. The model utilizes the physics of discharges and accurate numerical evaluation of electric fields.
Chapter 4

SIMULATION AND DISCUSSION

In the previous chapter the E-field distribution of a wall bushing has been computed under various conditions and a model developed to predict the flashover voltage of an unevenly wetted HVDC wall bushing. This model includes conditions for streamer initiation and propagation as the criteria for flashover. Furthermore, various processes behind the phenomena have been taken into consideration fully.

In this chapter, the developed model is used to investigate various aspects associated with flashover of an unevenly wetted bushing. Among the factors considered are (1) dry zone length; (2) dry zone location; (3) water drop size; (4) rain conductivity; (5) altitude; (6) bushing configuration; (7) polarity. The efficacy of RTV coating and booster sheds to improve the performance of HVDC wall bushing has been verified through simulations. All the results of simulation reported in this chapter were obtained with the negatively energized bushing, unless otherwise mentioned.

It is shown that the numerical model offers an effective tool to assess the unevenly wetted HVDC wall bushings.

4.1 Description of Modelled HVDC Wall Bushing
The 600kV HVDC wall bushing shown in Fig. 4.1 is investigated in the simulation. The bushing is of the conventional condenser type with 77 foils. The earth end foil extends 355mm beyond the earth flange, and the final HV foil ends 1555mm from the HV end. The main
dimensions of the wall bushing are shown in Table 4.1. The actual profile of bushing sheds, as well as the condenser core, is taken into consideration in the simulation.

![Diagram of a complete bushing horizontally mounted with 15° inclination](image)

(b) Shed Profile

**Fig. 4.1** Schematic drawing of a 600kV wall bushing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1 Critical Dimensions of the 600kV HVDC Wall Bushing [LaBK96]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insulation Length, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2. Effect of Dry Zone Length, Its Location and Critical Dry Zone Length

The influence of uneven wetting, particularly the length of dry zone was investigated using the suggested model. The critical flashover voltages for the 600kV HVDC wall bushing with various dry zone lengths located at the ground end were predicted and are shown in Table 4.2.

Typical rain conductivity, 100µS/cm is used in the simulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dry Zone Length (%)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFO w/o Raindrops (kV)</td>
<td>946.2</td>
<td>342.4</td>
<td>507.7</td>
<td>737.3</td>
<td>936.0</td>
<td>1423.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO with Raindrops(kV)</td>
<td>536.8</td>
<td>342.4</td>
<td>375.8</td>
<td>432.1</td>
<td>442.5</td>
<td>1423.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results are presented in Fig. 4.2 which illustrates the influence of dry zone length on the flashover stress which is defined as the critical flashover voltage divided by the striking distance. The solid curve represents the results obtained when the effect of waterdrops are not considered; the dotted curve represents the results obtained by consideration of waterdrops. For comparison purposes, experimental results from literature [Lamb89], [ScHN91] are also presented. As shown in Fig.4.2, all the experimental points fall within the range defined by the solid and dotted curves. The model, in essence, predicts that all flashovers lie within the region enclosed by the solid and dotted curves. The four anomalous experimental points, which lie outside the range, correspond to cases where a flashover was not observed i.e. withstand voltage. This finding reinforces the validity of the proposed model. Furthermore, it is seen that simulation including the effect of water drops yields a better prediction in the majority of cases. Hence, it is suggested that disintegration of water drops is an important process in modelling the uneven wetting flashover problem.
Fig. 4.2 Influence of dry zone length on flashover stress for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing (-ve)

Water conductivity: 100μS/cm; Radius: 2mm

--- simulation results without considering waterdrops;

----- simulation results including effect of waterdrops;

○ experimental results from [Lamb90], ▲ withstand voltage;

+ experimental result from [SchN91].

Table 4.3 Critical Flashover Stress vs. Critical Dry Zone Length (-ve polarity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFO stress (kV/m)</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>68</th>
<th>63</th>
<th>75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Dry Zone (%)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17~30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Results obtained from the proposed model</td>
<td>Experimental data [Lamb90]</td>
<td>Experimental data [SchN91]</td>
<td>Experimental data Lamp88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Bushing used by [Lamb90] is identical to that considered in the simulation in this thesis.
The unique U-shaped characteristics of the curve of flashover stress versus dry zone length is also reproduced by the simulation. As shown in Fig. 4.2, a critical range of 10% to 40% can be found in dry zone length, where flashover stresses fall below 80kV/m. This confirms the existence of a critical dry zone length.

The critical flashover stress for the model was found to be 65kV/m when 20% of the dry zone length is located at the ground end. This value is substantially lower compared to typical operating stresses of HVDC wall bushing as shown in Table 1.1. A high stress level adversely affects the performance of wall bushings. To ultimately improve the HVDC wall bushing performance, one has to either reduce the operating stress to an acceptable level or increase the critical flashover stress well above the operating stress.

Table 4.3 compares the estimated critical flashover stress and critical dry zone length with those obtained from experimental investigations. The results agree with each other to within reasonable engineering accuracy. The deviations are likely caused by the differences in the definition of dry zone length and by the fact that the shed profiles in each case are different.

The influence of dry zone location on the critical flashover voltage was also investigated. The estimated critical flashover voltage is found to be 418kV when a dry zone of 30% length is located at the HV end. This is equivalent to the flashover stress of 80kV/m, 11% higher than that obtained when a dry zone of the same length is located at the ground end and 22.5% higher than the CFO of a HVDC with dry zone located at the ground end. A dry zone at the ground end is more critical than that at the HV end under the negative polarity.
4.3 Effect of Voltage Polarity
Uneven wetting flashover voltage for a (+ve) 600 kV bushing was estimated using the modified
model. For comparison purposes, simulation was done with 30% dry zone located at the
ground end. The estimated flashover stress is 92 kV/m, which is about 28% higher than that of
the negatively energized bushing. The result agrees well with the fact that a positively energized
HVDC wall bushing has superior performance.

As pointed out earlier, in chapter 1, field experience indicates that less than 30% of the total
reported wall bushing flashovers occur under +ve polarity.

4.4 Influence of Raindrops
The influence of raindrops was investigated in more detail for a 600 kV wall-bushing model under 30%
length of dry zone located at the ground end.

4.4.1 Raindrop Size
Fig.4.3 shows the dependence of the estimated flashover voltages of a 600 kV wall bushing on the size
of raindrops. In general, the critical flashover voltage decreases with increase in raindrop size,
particularly in the range of r = 0.25 mm ~ 0.4 mm for the considered configuration. Under rain with
radius of drops 0.25 mm or less, flashover is probably initiated due to photo-ionization process, while
flashovers are more likely caused by disintegration of raindrops under rain with larger size raindrops. A
further increase in drop size beyond 0.4 mm in radius does not result in a decrease in the flashover
voltage, since the critical flashover voltages are mainly limited by the propagation field, although a much
severer corona may be observed. The pattern of Fig. 4.3 is configuration dependent.

From Fig.4.3, it is evident that the critical flashover voltage has a significant dependence on the size of
raindrops. This observation is consistent with current experimental knowledge. Practically, since there is
a wide range of raindrop sizes, the critical flashover voltage may be more likely to be determined by the
large sized raindrops. Hence the influence of raindrop size may not as pronounced as in Fig.4.3, particularly in terms of rain intensity.

![Graph showing critical flashover voltage versus radius of raindrops](image)

**Fig. 4.3** Critical flashover voltage versus the size of raindrops for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing with 30% length of dry zone located at the ground end
Rain conductivity: 100μS/cm

### 4.4.2 Raindrop Conductivity

Fig. 4.4 reveals the effect of rain conductivity on the critical flashover voltage. In Fig.4.4, data points corresponding to the upper bound were obtained without consideration of raindrops. The data points corresponding to the lower bound were obtained by consideration of raindrops of size 4mm in diameter. It is found that rain conductivity in the range of 1μS/cm to 30μS/cm has a limited influence for the 600kV wall bushing with 30% length of dry zone at the ground end. The lower the rain conductivity, the higher the critical flashover voltage (CFO) will be. The critical flashover voltage is related to rain conductivity by a power law with exponent of -0.122 as
estimated from Fig. 4.4. i.e. CFO(kV) = \kappa^{0.122}. This result is comparable to experimental data [Lamb89], in which the exponent is -0.11.

![Diagram](image)

**Fig. 4.4** Influence of rain conductivity on the critical flashover voltage for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing with 30% length of dry zone

Further increase in the rain conductivity does not necessarily decrease the critical flashover voltage until the flashover propagation mechanism is dominated by electrolytic discharge as discussed in the previous chapter. Fig. 4.5 shows the transition from uneven wetting flashover to an electrolytic discharge mechanism, once the water conductivity reaches a certain value. As shown in the figure, the transition point is at 500\mu S/cm, and electrolytic discharges becomes a leading mechanism once the water conductivity is beyond 1000\mu S/cm. This is very close to what was found in experimental investigations [Lamp88], [LaW91].
4.5 Influence of Air Pressure and Altitude

The air pressure at sea level is about 101.3kPa. As altitude increases the air pressure decreases at the rate of approximately 1kPa/100m. From field experience it is known that the reduction of the strength of external insulation in transmission systems at high altitudes is of concern.

The influence of altitude on the streamer inception voltage due to ionisation processes for a 600 kV HVDC wall bushing with 30% length of dry zone located at the ground end is shown in Fig.4.6. As altitude increases the streamer inception voltage due to photo-ionization
decreases. Therefore at higher altitude the flashover of a wall bushing is less dependent on raindrop disintegration. In contrast, at sea level where the streamer inception voltage is high, raindrop disintegration plays a vital role in causing flashover.

![Fig. 4.6 Streamer inception voltage due to photo-ionization for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing with 30% length of dry zone under various altitudes. Rain conductivity: 100μS/cm; radius of raindrop: 2mm.](image)

Fig. 4.7 shows the effects of air pressure and raindrop size on the CFOV. With increase in altitude the critical flashover voltage more or less decreases for small sizes of raindrops. The critical size for transition from a photo-ionization triggered process to a raindrop disintegration triggered process is shifted to the right. The influence of raindrop size diminishes with increase in altitude.
Fig. 4.7 Influence of altitude on the relation between CFO and raindrop size
Rain conductivity: 100mS/cm
curve (1): sea level or air pressure = 101.3kPa
curve (2): 1000m altitude or air pressure = 91.3kPa
curve (3): 2000m altitude or air pressure = 81.3kPa

4.6 Effect of Bushing Configuration

4.6.1 Impact of Condenser Core
Simulation of electric fields of a 110kV hollow bushing was conducted. Fig. 4.8 shows E-field contours and E-field at the shed tips. It is found that the E-field distribution is quite different from that of complete bushings. Generally speaking, the distribution of E-field of a hollow shell is characterised by a relatively low radial E-field. A complete bushing, on the other hand, has relatively high radial E-field and the voltage distribution at the surface of the porcelain shell is influenced by the grading system. As shown in Fig. 4.8, the E-field of a hollow shell is comparatively uniform and low. The normalized average E-field at shed tips for a 110kV
hollow shell with 30% length of dry zone is about 78% of that for a complete bushing with the same length of dry zone.

Fig. 4.8 E-field contours and E-fields at shed tips for housing shells (Sheds are numbered from the ground end)

The critical flashover voltage for a 600kV bushing shell with 30% dry zone located at the ground end was predicted using the proposed model. In the simulation, all parameters were remained the same, but the condenser core was removed from the model. The estimated minimal CFO is 572kV. The value is about 52% higher than 376kV, the CFO of a full HVDC wall bushing with same dimensions.
It has been experimentally confirmed that a hollow shell has a superior performance compared to a complete bushing. The performance of hollow shells does not represent that of a complete bushing. Therefore, one should use a complete bushing in experimental or simulation studies.

4.6.2 Impact of Specific Length

For the 600kV wall bushing model with specific length of 3.3cm/kV, the model predicts a critical flashover voltage of 65kV/m. To confirm the effect of shed shape and creepage length on the CFO, the shed shape was modified from alternate-type to underrib-type sheds. As a result, the specific length is increased to 4.3cm/kV, which is a 31% increase in creepage length. As shown in Table 4.6, the critical flashover stress is essentially the same. Further increase in the specific length up to 6.1cm/kV by increasing the overhang distance, results in only a marginal increase in the predicted critical flashover stress. With 6.1cm/cm specific length, the bushing is still likely to experience uneven wetting flashovers well below 400kV under the worst case scenario.

The above observation is consistent with field experience in several HVDC schemes. In the Pacific Intertie Upgrade project, the specific length was increased from 2.5cm/kV to 4.0cm/kV when the operating voltage was increased from 400kV to 500kV. In the Nelson River HVDC Line project, the specific length was increased from 3.29cm/kV to 4.36cm/kV when the 2nd bi-pole (500kV) was commissioned. However, flashovers were reported in both stations when HVDC wall bushings were subjected to rain, particularly under uneven wetting conditions.

It is clear that high specific length by itself only offers limited improvement in the critical flashover voltage under uneven wetting conditions, although it may help to substantially
improve, temporarily, the contamination flashover hold-off capability under heavy ESDD environments. Higher specific length alone does not solve the abnormal flashover problem of a HVDC wall bushing.

Table 4.4 Predicted Critical Flashover Stress vs. Specific Lengths 
(20% dry zone length located at the ground end)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific length (cm/kV)</th>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>4.3</th>
<th>6.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical flashover stress (kV/m)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By altering the profile it may be possible to create additional dry area in the wet zone next to the large sheds as shown Fig. 4.9. To study this effect in the simulation, a small dry strip (15mm in width) was introduced in each of 10 wet zone sheds located next to the dry zone. Simulation with the configuration of 6.1cm/kV specific length was re-evaluated. Interestingly the critical flashover stress increases by almost 20%, up to 82kV/m. It implies that the insulator shed profile may potentially have some impact on the CFO of a unevenly wetted HVDC wall bushing. Certain types of shed profiles may inherently create dry strips next to large sheds or underribs due to the shadow effect. Based on the simulation results, this may help to improve the performance significantly.
4.7 Effect of Booster Sheds

Booster sheds were originally developed in England to prevent the flashover of vertically mounted ac substation insulator under heavy rain [ELIL78]. The sheds are usually made of silicone rubber material. However, Manitoba Hydro has found that booster sheds can be fabricated from NEMA GPO-3 sheet material to which a RTV coating can be applied, if desired. This is a less expensive alternative to silicone rubber [McDe02]. The effectiveness of booster sheds is due to a combination of water shedding, discharge inhibition and arc suppression. For a horizontally mounted HVDC wall bushing, the water shedding effect may not be that dominant. However, as may be seen from Fig.3.11, booster sheds not only provide a significant improvement in the electric field distribution along the critical line that links shed tips but also substantially extend its length. For a 600kV bushing with 12 booster sheds, the flashover path along the critical line can be increased by more than 60% due to additional
250mm overhang. These effects are unfavourable for inception and propagation of discharges, and therefore ultimately lead to an increase in the critical flashover voltage.

![Booster shed profile and dry band illustration](image)

**Fig. 4.10** Booster shed profile and dry band illustration

For a 600kV wall bushing with 12 booster sheds, the model predicts the critical flashover voltage to be 854kV when the dry zone is 30% in length and located at the ground end and shadow effect of booster shed is considered. The shadow effect was taken into account in the simulation by creating additional dry stripes underneath the booster sheds as shown in Fig.4.11. As a result, the flashover stress is increased from 72kV/m to 163kV/m. Without considering the shadow effect, the estimated flashover stress value drops to 124kV/m. This value is still sufficiently high to avoid the occurrence of flashover during operation according to Table 1.1. The result is consistent with operational experience in Manitoba Hydro and other utilities.
4.8 Effect of RTV and Other Surface Coatings

4.8.1 Influence of Surface Conditions on E-field Distribution

To improve the performance of HVDC wall bushings, periodic greasing or RTV coating is usually used. The use of a resistive glaze on a bushing surface to improve the surface voltage distribution has also been proposed. The influence of surface treatment on the E-field
distribution can be investigated by either increasing the conductivity of the wet film or decreasing the conductivity of the dry surface. The values of conductivity for the different coatings are selected as shown in Table 4.4. Results of E-field simulation on a 110kV model are shown in Figs. 4.12 and 4.13.

As shown in Figs 4.12 and 4.13, it is evident that with a coated surface, generally, the E-field improves. It appears that bushings with coatings are less sensitive to uneven wetting. Thus, the risk of external flashover can be reduced with different degrees of success.

Fig. 4.14 shows the normalized electric field distribution along the critical line for the 600kV wall bushing model, with and without RTV coating when a 30% length of dry zone is located at the ground. It is seen that the RTV coating significantly reduces the surface electric fields, which leads to a better operating condition even under the worst case scenario of non-uniform wetting.

The maximum electric fields both inside and outside a 600kV HVDC bushing with 30% dry zone located at the ground end were evaluated and presented in Table 4.6.

| Table 4.5 Conductivities for Surface Film with Different Coatings [ScLu91], [HaKu91] |
|-----------------|------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| \( \gamma_{\text{wet}} \, (S/m) \) | RTV \( 5 \times 10^{-10} \) | Greasing \( 10^9 \) | Glaze 1 \( 5 \times 10^4 \) | Glaze 2 \( 5 \times 10^4 \) |
| \( \gamma_{\text{dry}} \, (S/m) \) | \( 10^{12} \) | \( 10^{12} \) | \( 10^{10} \) | \( 10^6 \) |
Fig. 4.12 Dependence of E-field intensity on the length of dry zone for a 110kV bushing with various surface conditions

Fig. 4.13 E-field intensity at shed tips for a 110kV bushing with various coatings (30% length of dry zone, sheds are numbered from the ground end)
Fig. 4.14 Comparison of E-field distributions along the critical line with and without RTV coating (30% dry zone located at the ground end)

Table 4.6 Maximal Normalized E-fields in Different Locations (cm⁻¹)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oil</th>
<th>Porcelain</th>
<th>External Air</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W/o coating</td>
<td>0.006782</td>
<td>0.133144</td>
<td>0.102640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTV</td>
<td>0.004719</td>
<td>0.004932</td>
<td>0.031422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaze 1</td>
<td>0.005801</td>
<td>0.097294</td>
<td>0.075265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaze 2</td>
<td>0.005906</td>
<td>0.087121</td>
<td>0.044256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.6, the maximal E-field in the ceramic under worst case of scenario is well above the typical ceramic dielectric strength of 12kV/mm. As a result of substantial local discharges, ceramic puncture is likely possible. Field failures due to ceramic puncture have been reported in [LaBK97].

Among these, the RTV coating provides the best improvement in E-field distribution, since both internal and external electric fields are relatively low. Although a resistive glaze does provide a relatively uniform voltage distribution along the external surface, it might also
increase the electric field in the oil. Prolonged operation under these conditions may prove to be a concern for internal insulation.

4.8.2 Impact of RTV Coatings on Uneven Wetting Flashover Voltage

As discussed above, the RTV coating significantly reduces the surface electric fields, which leads to a better operating condition even under the worst case scenario of non-uniform wetting. Further, simulation results show that a RTV coated 600kV wall bushing with 30% length of dry zone at the ground end has a flashover voltage in excess of 1000kV. On the other hand, the flashover voltage can be only between 376kV and 508kV when the coating is absent.

Fig. 4.15 compares the estimated critical flashover voltages for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing with and without RTV coating under different dry zone lengths. With RTV coating, the dry zone length is no longer critical to CFO. In other words, uneven wetting is no longer a prominent factor in facilitating a flashover. As a result, RTV coating is very successful in desensitizing the impact of uneven wetting and eliminating flashovers of HVDC wall bushing due to uneven wetting.

As observed from both field experience and laboratory tests, surface conductivity of RTV coating can be compromised due to ageing, which may only exhibit several times of resistivity compared to the uncoated one. Surface conductivity of wetted RTV coating was increased 100 times to reflect the aged RTV surface in the simulation. The predicted critical flashover voltage decreases to 680kV, reflecting the influence of ageing.
The critical flashover voltages for a 600kV HVDC wall bushing with resistive glazed coatings are also investigated through simulation. The results are presented in Fig. 4.16. In general, it appears that bushings with coatings are less sensitive to uneven wetting. Thus, the risk of external flashover can be reduced with different degrees of success.

The coatings may degrade over the time. As a result, the efficacy of the eliminating flashover may be compromised and the critical flashover voltage with an aged coating may be lower compared to the simulation results.
4.9 Comparison of Results from Proposed Model with Experimental Results Published in Literature

Such comparisons have been made in Fig. 4.2 and Table 4.3. Figure 4.2 shows that the flashover stresses lie in-between the model-predicted values obtained by neglect and inclusion of the effect of raindrops. The experimental results in Table 4.3 (column 3) and in Fig. 4.2 (indicated by blank circles) were obtained using a bushing identical to that considered in this work.

Table 4.7 shows predicted values of CFO stresses obtained by using the proposed and IREQ models. Also shown are experimental results published by Schneider [ScHN91]. It must be pointed out that the bushings used in the present simulation and that in [RiKa91] and [ScHN91] are all different. Comparison can therefore be only made with reference to the CFO...
stresses. Table 4.7 shows that under -ve polarity, all the results are close while under +ve polarity the proposed model yields results much close to experimental results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed model</th>
<th>-ve</th>
<th>+ve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IREQ model [RiKa91]</td>
<td>68kV/m</td>
<td>10% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental data [ScHN91]</td>
<td>63kV/m</td>
<td>&gt;30% increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.10 Summary

The proposed model has been used to evaluate the performance of HVDC wall bushings. By consideration of the mechanisms responsible for both initiation and propagation of streamers, the simulation yields encouraging results in terms of values and trend of results.

The model has been used to account for the following effects or interesting aspects of experimental and field observations for HVDC wall bushing flashovers.

- CFO vs. dry zone length, location, and critical range of dry zone length

- Polarity effect
- CFO vs. raindrop size and conductivities
- CFO vs. air pressure and altitude
- Impact of condenser core and specific length
- Efficacy of booster shed
- Effects of RTV and other coatings

Since the proposed model yields results of acceptable engineering accuracy, it offers an attractive alternative to time consuming and expensive full scale field-testing.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The problem of HVDC wall bushing flashover due to uneven wetting is introduced and reviewed, with emphasis on recent progress in understanding the phenomena.

The physics of discharges, particularly for flashover of an unevenly wetted HVDC wall bushing, is discussed and various processes and mechanisms responsible for discharge initiation and propagation are clarified and discussed in detail. The uneven wetting flashover phenomenon of HVDC wall bushings is discussed, from fundamental concepts to mechanisms responsible for various processes in each stage. The influence of uneven wetting patterns on E-field and flashover voltage are verified.

A numerical model is developed in order to predict flashover voltages for a wall bushing, based on the results of electric field computation carried out on a bushing prior to initiation of flashovers. This analysis is carried out under a variety of practical conditions. By considering the mechanisms responsible for both initiation and propagation of discharges, the simulation yields encouraging results in terms of numerical values and trends.

The following conclusions are derived from the simulation results using a 600kV wall bushing with condenser core. The obtained results may be considered to be typical for porcelain clad HVDC wall bushings. The main conclusions are:
1. General Remarks

Uneven wetting is verified as one of most severe operational conditions for a HVDC wall bushing. The non-uniform pattern of E-field distribution caused by uneven wetting results in a significant reduction in flashover stress. Model prediction shows the critical flashover stress can be as low as 65kV/m under negative polarity, substantially lower than a typical operational design limit of 100kV/m.

The unique U-shaped characteristic of the curve of flashover stress versus dry zone length is reproduced by the numerical simulation. It is verified that the flashover voltage becomes the most critical when there is a 20% dry zone length located at the ground end for the -ve 600kV HVDC wall bushing considered in this study. The predicted critical flashover stress is very close to experimental data, i.e. 63kV/m~75kV/m.

2. Effect of Configuration

Wall bushing flashover under uneven wetting conditions is very susceptible to type of configuration. For example, the predicted CFO of the 600kV wall bushing shell is about 52% higher than that of the same bushing with a condenser core when 30% dry zone length is located at the ground end.

3. Effect of Polarity

(a) It is verified that the dry zone location also plays a role in the critical flashover. Dry zone at HV terminal seems to be more benign. For a given bushing model, the predicted CFO is 11% higher when the 30% length of dry zone located next to the HV terminal for a negatively energized HVDC wall bushing.

(b) Critical flashover voltage of the +ve HVDC wall bushing is predicted to be approximately 92kV/cm, when 30% length of dry zone located at the ground end. This is a 28% increase
compared to the value obtained with the same bushing under negative polarity. This explains well why more than 70% of all reported HVDC wall bushing flashovers occur under negative polarity.

4. Effect of Rain Drop Size and Rain Conductivity

(a) The predicted range of CFO is between 376kV and 508kV for the negatively energized 600kV HVDC wall bushing with 30% dry zone length located at ground end. The lower limit is obtained when the influence of water drops is taken into account. This value is closer to the experimental results. It is evident that the critical flashover voltage has a strong dependence on the size of raindrops.

(b) Correlation between the CFO vs. rain conductivity is verified. Again there is a close agreement between the predicted values, trends and experimental results.

5. Effect of Air Pressure and Altitude

Air pressure and altitude have a second order impact on the critical flashover voltage. With increase in altitude, the critical flashover voltage caused by disintegration of small size raindrop decreases. The impact of rain size starts to diminish when a certain altitude is reached.

6. Effect of Specific Length and Shed Profile

(a) It is also shown that the specific length will not offer any significant improvement in uneven wetting flashover. In the simulation, the increase in the critical stress is marginal, from 65kV/m to 69kV/m, when the specific length is almost doubled from 3.3cm/kV to 6.1cm/kV.
(b) The simulation shows relative dry strips created by shedding effect help to improve the flashover voltage. It is possible to improve the critical flashover stress by 20% by just selecting more wetting-friendly insulator profiles. Since the critical flashover voltage is shed profile dependent, it is important to review the details of the tested bushings when comparing simulation and experimental results.

7. Effect of Booster Sheds
Uneven wetting flashovers can be substantially improved by using booster sheds. For a 600kV HVDC wall bushing with 30% length of dry zone located at the ground end, the flashover stress can be increased from 72kV/m to 124kV/m. When the shedding effect is considered the estimated flashover stress can be as high as 163kV/m.

8. Effect of Coatings
(a) RTV coating significantly reduces the surface electric fields. With RTV coating, uneven wetting pattern is no longer critical to the HV performance. Simulation results show that a RTV coated 600kV-wall bushing, with 30% length of dry zone located at the ground end, has a flashover voltage in excess of 1000kV. On the other hand the flashover lies between 376kV and 508kV when the coating is absent. However, for aged RTV coating, the above flashover voltage can be compromised to 680kV as per the simulation.

(b) Other coatings can also offer some electric field relief on the HVDC wall bushing surface, and therefore improve the HV performance under uneven wetting conditions. However, among all coatings, the RTV coating provides the best improvement in E-field distribution, since both internal and external E-fields are comparably lower. Although a resistive glaze can also render a relative uniform voltage distribution along the external
surface, it will also increase the electric fields in oil inside housing. Prolonged operation under these conditions may prove to be a concern for internal insulation.

The proposed numeric model has been validated through comprehensive simulations and their comparison to the experimental results available in literature. The simulation results are in good agreement with experimental data and, in general, explain very well many aspects of uneven wetting flashover. The simulation results provide insight not only to the vulnerability of wall bushings to different weather conditions, but also attempt to give at least some insight as to whether certain insulator profiles are more vulnerable than others, and other factors which affect performance. The simulation has also enabled the assessment of the effectiveness of different profiles for improving the HV performance of wall bushings.

The results of this research, particularly the proposed models are important supplements to large-scale experiments, which are costly and time consuming. The use of such a model will be very helpful in selecting and designing HVDC wall bushings for future HVDC transmission schemes and to improve the performance of wall bushings in the existing HVDC transmission schemes.
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EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF THE INFLUENCE OF DIFFERENT WETTING CONDITIONS ON A FLAT INSULATING SURFACE

The purpose of this experimental study is to investigate the influence of an uneven wetting pattern on the electric field distribution and surface discharges. Factors, which may contribute to flashover such as configuration, dry zone length, water conductivity, voltage polarity, and space charges, are studied experimentally.

A.1 Test Arrangement
In order to ensure that the test data is realistic, it is necessary to use a powerful voltage source of sufficient capacity. In this work, a HV capacitor of 0.1\(\mu\text{F}\) was used in parallel with the output of dc source.

To simulate the surface strength of porcelain, a glass plate system, which was made from Neoceram glass, was used. Two basic configurations were considered, i.e. a bushing-type configuration in which both longitudinal and normal electric field components exist and an insulator-type configuration in which the longitudinal component of E-field is dominant. The bushing type configuration was simulated by provision of a third electrode (aluminium foil) used beneath the glass plate as shown in Fig.A.1
A.1.1 Wetting Pattern

A spray gun was used to spray water on to the glass surface, and an uneven wetting pattern was created by using a plastic sheet to cover a part of glass surface. The nozzle of the spray gun was adjusted to produce fine water droplets in order to create a completely wet condition in the wetted portion of the surface. After each measurement or flashover, the wetting pattern was re-created. Two different types of water were used, i.e. tap water with conductivity of 150μS/cm and distilled water with conductivity of 2.5μS/cm. Each spray resulted in the depletion of 1ml of water and a water film with mean thickness of 0.1 mm was obtained by controlling the total amount of water sprayed onto the surface.

Before wetting, the glass surface was carefully cleaned by methanol alcohol, in order to improve its wettability and remove surface charges created by the previous test.
A.1.2 Conductivity of Water

Water conductivity was measured using a conductivity cell in conjunction with a Wheatstone bridge.

Conductivity Cell

The conductivity cell is made with stainless steel cylindrical electrodes of diameter of 31.8mm in a perlex cylinder of diameter of 43.8mm. The cell volume is 200ml and the distance between electrodes is 50mm. The dimensions of the cell are shown in Fig.A.2.

Fig. A.2 Sketch of the conductivity cell
**Wheatstone Bridge**

A Wheatstone bridge circuit was assembled using low inductive, 0.05% grade shielded decade resistors and a null detector. The bridge was powered through a 3V-peak 1kHz sine wave generator. The resistance of the cell \((R_c)\) can be estimated by \(R_s = \frac{R_1 \times R_d}{R_2}\).

![Wheatstone Bridge Diagram](image)

*Fig.A.3 Schematic diagram of the Wheatstone bridge*

**Computation of Water Conductivity**

The E-field and potential distributions inside the cell are shown in Fig. A.4. Based on the E-field computation, the conductivity \((\gamma)\) is determined by following formula.

\[
\gamma = \frac{U}{\left(\frac{R_s}{s} \cdot E \cdot dS\right)} \tag{A.1}
\]

Where, \(U\) is the applied voltage;
- \(E\) is the electric field;
- \(dS\) is the surface element on the closed surface.
For this given configuration, \( \frac{U}{\int (E \cdot dS)} \) is about 0.4006 [cm\(^{-1}\)]. Therefore, EqA.1 becomes

\[
\gamma = \frac{0.4006}{R_x}
\]  

(A.2)

**Fig. A.4** E-field and potential distribution inside the conductivity cell

**Conductivity of Tap and Distilled water**

Based on above measuring and formula, Conductivities of tap and distilled water were estimated.

**Table A.1 Measured Resistance and Conductivity (20°C)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Water</th>
<th>Resistance (kΩ)</th>
<th>Conductivity (µS/cm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tap water</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>160.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distilled water</td>
<td>156.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.2 E-field Measurements above Glass Plate under dc Voltage

A portable miniaturized electric dc field meter was borrowed from the Manitoba HVDC Research Center and used to measure the E-field above the glass surface. The meter measures fields ranging from 30V/m to about 500kV/m in space, and is unaffected by the presence of ions [JoKi89]. The meter consists of a rotating probe and a receiver. A rotating probe, at the end of a fibreglass pole, senses the field and communicates recordings of its direction and magnitude to a remote read-out device. Fire Optic cable is used to minimize the field perturbation due to the presence of the miniature field probe.

All E-field data were obtained at locations 5cm above the glass plate and 5 minutes after voltage application. The E-field data fluctuated by about ±5% during the tests, especially in the presence of corona.

A.2.1 Influence of Dry Zone

The electric field distributions under different lengths of dry zone are shown in Fig.A.5. It is observed that electric fields were redistributed and substantially increased when an uneven wetted pattern is created. With decrease of dry zone length, the overall electric field increases and becomes more non-uniform along the surface. Close to the dry zone the horizontal component is overwhelmingly strong, which is essential to initiate a streamer. The vertical component is dominant close to the wet zone. The measured E-field at a location near the ground electrode with 30% length of dry zone is twice that for a completely dry surface.
Fig. A.5 E-field distribution under different lengths of dry zone (Insulator type, -80kV)

Fig. A.6 Influence of dry zone location on the E-field distribution (30% length of dry zone, -80kV)
Fig.A.6 shows the effect of position of the dry zone on E-field distribution. For -ve applied voltage, the E-field values are relatively higher when the dry zone is located at the ground end. This shows that the E-field distribution has a strong dependence on the location and length of the dry zone. A dry zone length of 30% located next to the ground end does produce a favourable condition for flashover.

A.2.2 Influence of Configuration
The influence of configuration on the E-field distribution is shown in Fig.A.7. Generally the electric field in the insulator-type arrangement is quasi-uniform, while the electric field in the bushing-type arrangement has a much more non-uniform characteristic along or close to the surface. During preliminary flashover tests, no visible discharges were observed with the insulator-type configuration even up to a voltage of 80kV. In contrast, visible streamers are occasionally initiated from the ground electrode at a voltage of 40kV in the bushing-type configuration due to the extreme local electric field. With additional effects due to uneven wetting, further exaggeration in the non-uniformity of E-field distribution along the surface can be expected with this configuration.

A.2.3 Influence of a Simulated Partial Arc
A bare wire of diameter 3mm and length 50mm was placed at the ground end perpendicularly to the electrode to simulate a partial arc. Its influence on the E-field distribution is shown in Fig.A.8. It is evident that the electric field in front of the partial arc is enhanced, and therefore favours its progress.
Fig. A.7 Measured E-field distributions 5cm from the surface for two types of configurations (completely dry surface, -25kV, dimensions of configurations shown in Fig. A.1)

Fig. A.8 Comparison of E-fields for I-type of configuration with and without a simulated partial arc (30% length of dry zone, -40kV)
A.2.4 Influence of Other Factors

**Voltage Polarity**
E-field measurements were also conducted under different polarities and the results are shown in Fig.A.9. The influence of voltage polarity on the E-field distribution prior to flashover is almost negligible. The voltage polarity selective nature of flashover due to uneven wetting [LaAl91] might be mainly caused by the differences between the propagation characteristics of the -ve and +ve streamers.

![Fig.A.9](image)

**Fig.A.9** Comparison of E-field distribution under voltage of different polarities
(30% length of dry zone, I-type configuration, 80kV)

**Water Conductivity**
The influence of water conductivity on the E-field distribution was investigated by using tap and distilled water. It is found that the conductivity of the water has little influence on the electric field distribution prior to flashover.
**Wind Effect**

E-field measurements of a complete dry surface with and without presence of strong wind (~30km/h) for the insulator-type configuration were also conducted at 80kV. It is assumed that the space charges will be blown off by the strong wind. Therefore, the E-field distributions obtained under strong wind can be considered the same as that in the absence of space charges. The results indicate that the presence of strong wind, i.e. space charge, has a negligible influence on the overall electric field distribution.

**A.3 Flashover Tests**

For the flashover tests, the voltage was increased in 5kV steps and held at each level for a period of 5 minutes. The average flashover voltage (FOV) was obtained from the results of 5 tests.

Since the puncture voltage of the glass plate is about 60kV, the gap spacing was reduced to 25cm to avoid unwanted puncture. Flashover tests were conducted under different conditions for both types of configurations. The results are summarized in Table A.2.

The dependence of FOV on the dry zone length is shown in Fig. A.10. The FOV decreases with decrease of dry zone length in certain range for both configurations. However after a certain critical length (15%~20%), further decrease of dry zone length may not lower the FOV. With 10% length of dry zone a partial arc bridged the dry zone in both configurations without leading to a complete flashover. This might be either due to insufficient energy in the process or due to source weakness. Also, when the dry zone is located next to the -ve HV electrode a higher FOV is recorded compared to the one obtained with dry zone located at the
ground end. This is because the latter arrangement has a relative higher overall electric field as shown in Fig.A.6.

Table A.2. Summary of Flashover Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dry Zone</th>
<th>Water Type</th>
<th>FOV (kV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pol.: Polarity
I: Insulator
B: Bushing
G: Ground end
H: High voltage end
T: Tap water
D: Distilled water
Also as shown in Fig.A.10, the configuration has a significant influence on the FOV, especially for a longer dry zone length. The FOV of the surface with distilled water is 5~10% higher than the one with tap water, although there is not much influence of water conductivity on the E-field distribution. For both configurations, the FOVs are lower for negative polarity. This polarity selective nature of FOV might be due to the difference between the propagation of the -ve and +ve streamers.

![Graph showing FOV dependence on dry zone length](image)

**Fig.A.10** Dependence of FOV on the dry zone length (-ve voltage)

### A.4 Summary

The investigation of E-field measurements and flashover under different conditions for two different configurations leads to following conclusions:
1. Uneven wetting can cause a redistribution and substantial increase of the E-field. Both the length and location of the dry zone influence the E-field distribution, and therefore, the flashover voltage.

2. Non-uniformity of E-field distribution and its relative higher electric field value along the surface cause the initiation of a streamer at a lower voltage in the bushing-type configuration. The FOV is considerable lower compared to that of the insulator-type configuration.

3. Existence of a partial arc can enhance the E-field in front of it, and therefore, favors progress of the arc.

4. Factors such as voltage polarity, water conductivity do not have a significant influence on the E-field distribution prior to flashover, but they do affect the progress of flashover, and therefore the FOV value.