EXPERIMENTAL BASED INVESTIGATION OF INDUCTION MOTOR IDENTIFICATION AND CLASSIFICATION

N. GASSARA, W. BAHLOUL  
Unité de Commande de Machines et Réseaux de Puissance (CMERP), ENIS  
nader_enis@yahoo.fr; wiss.enis@gmail.com

M. CHAABENE, M.B.A KAMOUN  
Unité de Commande de Machines et Réseaux de Puissance (CMERP), ENIS  
maher.chaabene@cmerp.net; mba.kamoun@enis.rnu.tn

Abstract: An invariant parameters based modeling and an offline identification of a single cage, double cage and deep bar Induction Motor (IM) are developed. Using steady state electric measurements (voltage, stator current and active power), the IM identification is developed by performing a locked rotor test for different frequencies. The linear Least Squares Technique (LST) and the Genetic Algorithm (GA) are used so as to classify the IM according to its rotor type (single cage, double cage or deep bar). The identification and classification algorithms are validated on four IMs. The accuracy and validity of the algorithms are verified as the NRMSE between measured and simulated speed during starting are less than 2.24%.
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1. Introduction
Most of the electric energy needed in industrial application is converted into mechanical one by means of squirrel-cage induction motor (IM) [1]. The analysis and the design of motor drive systems require the IM model parameters. Different rotor types are available: single cage, double cage or deep bar. As the single cage model is not suitable to characterize the dynamic behavior of all IM types [2], many authors adopt the modeling of double cage and deep bar motors by adding rotor branches to the equivalent circuit of the single cage IM using constant parameters [3-10]. Nevertheless, this approach engenders an excess in electrical parameters. Moreover, the identification of these parameters, which uses external measures (current, voltage, speed), leads to an infinity of solutions. Hence, reducing the number of parameters is imposed. The model of invariant parameters is considered as the most efficient method. It resolves the parameter identification using linear regression. The new parameters are called MIVs and define both the dynamic and the steady state behavior of the IM model [11-12]. In literature, a complete survey on the various approaches on offline identification is investigated [13]. Mainly, the linear Least Squares Technique is used [14-16]. The parameters identification is based on the transient measurements (current, voltage, speed). The approach is limited as it requires the measurements derivatives for which a data filtering is necessary. Other authors are interested in the parameters identification by using nonlinear classic methods: Newton-Raphson, Gauss-Newton, Levenberg-Marquardt methods. These methods are based on the standard manufacturer data and/or on the tests. These approaches may lead to local minimum while searching for solution in single direction of the search space [17-20]. The Genetic Algorithm (GA) is known as adequate method that solves complex nonlinear optimization problems. The search of the global minimum is launched in multiple directions which avoids to have a local minimum [21]. Moreover, the GA approach does not include derivates which is not avoidable in presence of noisy measurements. Recently, some authors identify the IM parameters by establishing a GA excited with measurements of transient currents and speed during IM starting. Consequently, accurate speed sensor and fast data acquisition system are required. Although GA necessitates a simulation of the starting of the IM in every step, it does not imply a heavy computation time thanks to the performance of the nowadays computers [23].

In this work, an offline IM identification based upon steady state electric measurements (voltage, stator current and active power) is developed by performing a locked rotor test for different
frequencies. This test supplies data over the slip range variation (from g=0 to g=1) without limitation to the IM’s statically stable operating zone. This method allows also a classification of the motor according to rotor type. The present investigation contains four sections. In section two, an IM modeling adopting the MIVs is given. The developed model is generalized for all motor types (single cage, double cage or deep bar rotor). The parameters identification and classification using the linear least squares technique (LST) and the GA are presented in section three. Section four shows the experiment and the validation of the algorithms for four IMs. Finally, a discussion on the obtained results is established. Section five is reserved to the conclusion.

2. MIVs based IM state model

In literature, the IM recognizing based modeling either as single cage, as double cage or as deep bar rotor presents an excess in electrical parameters compared to MIVs model. In fact, when the IM is considered as single cage rotor, its recognizing model necessitates five parameters instead of four in MIVs model. Likewise, the recognizing model of the IM double cage rotor needs eight parameters instead of six in MIVs model [11]. The general equivalent circuit of an IM (single cage, double cage or deep bar rotor) is given by figure 1. In this section, a IMs state model of the IM is expressed. The core-losses and the magnetic saturation are not taken into consideration.

![Equivalent circuit of the IM](image)

**Fig. 1. Equivalent circuit of the IM**


The input impedance of the IM is expressed as:

\[
Z(\omega, g) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \left( j \omega A_{hi} + B_{hi} \right) (j \omega g)^i \\
+ \sum_{i=0}^{n} B_{hi}^2 (j \omega g)
\]

(1)

The general MIVs model parameters appear in the numerator and the denominator of the motor’s steady-state impedance expression. They are independent of slip (g) and of the supply frequency (\( \omega \)). The MIVs vector \( \text{MIVs} = [A_{h0}, A_{h1}, \ldots, A_{hn}, B_{h0}, B_{h1}, \ldots, B_{hm}] \) represents the invariant parameters of the IM. Using the equivalent circuit, the MIVs parameters are expressed as:

\[
A_{hi} = L_m \sum_{1 \leq l \leq n} \frac{l_1 l_2 \ldots l_{i-1}}{r_{i-1}} \\
B_{hi} = r_i \left[ L_m \sum_{1 \leq l \leq n} \left( \frac{l_1 l_2 \ldots l_{i-1}}{r_{i-1}} \right) \right] \\
+ \sum_{1 \leq l \leq n} \frac{l_1 l_2 \ldots l_{i-1}}{r_{i-1}}
\]

(2)

Where \( j \) is the rotor branch order \( 1 \leq j \leq n \). The stator parameters are found for \( j = 0 \)

\[
B_{h0} = r_s; A_{h0} = L_s = L_m.
\]

Reciprocally \((r_1, \ldots, r_n, l_1, \ldots, l_n)\) are calculated functions of MIVs \((A_{hi}, B_{hi})\):

\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( a_j - a_i \right) \\
\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (-1)^{n-i} \left( \frac{B_{h0} - A_{h0}a_i}{A_{h0}B_{h0} - A_{h0}^2} \right) a_j
\end{array} \right.
\]

(3)

Where \( a_i \) are the roots of the polynomial:

\[
A_{hn} a^n - A_{h0} a^{n-1} + \ldots + (-1)^{n-1} A_{h1} a + (-1)^n = 0
\]

The state model is at first setup according to \([r_s, L_m, r_1, \ldots, r_n, l_1, \ldots, l_n] \) parameters. Using relations (3), the MIVs model is:

\[
\frac{dX_e}{dt} = A_e X_e + B_e U_e
\]

\[
\frac{d\omega_e}{dt} = \frac{3}{2} \frac{p_e^2}{J} A_{h0} \left[ i_{sd} \sum_{i=1}^{n} i_{d} - i_{sd} \sum_{i=1}^{n} i_{q} \right] - \frac{p_e}{J} C_{R}
\]

(4)

Where:

\[
X_e = [i_{sd} \ i_{d1} \ \ldots \ i_{dn} \ i_{q1} \ \ldots \ i_{qn}]^T, \\
U_e = [v_{sd} \ 0 \ \ldots \ v_{sq} \ 0 \ \ldots \ 0]^T,
\]
\[ A_r = \begin{bmatrix} A_R & -\omega_r A_{11} + A_{12} \\ \omega_r A_{11} - A_{12} & A_R \end{bmatrix} \], \quad B_r = \begin{bmatrix} B_c & 0 \\ 0 & B_c \end{bmatrix} \]
\[ A_h = -L^{-1} R, \quad A_{l1} = L^{-1} D_L, \quad A_{l2} = L^{-1} W_L \] and \[ B_c = L^{-1}. \]

\[
L = \begin{bmatrix}
A_{h0} & A_{h0} & \cdots & A_{h0} \\
A_{h0} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (a_i - a_0) & \cdots & A_{h0} \\
& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left( \frac{B_{h,n-i}}{A_{h0}B_{h0}} - \frac{A_{h,n-i}}{A_{h0}} \right) a_i^{-1} & \cdots & A_{h0} \\
& \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
& A_{h0} & \ddots & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (a_n - a_i) & A_{h0} \\
& & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left( \frac{B_{h,n-i}}{A_{h0}B_{h0}} - \frac{A_{h,n-i}}{A_{h0}} \right) a_i^{-1} & \cdots & A_{h0}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
R = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (a_i - a_0) & \cdots \\
& \ddots & \ddots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
& & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (a_n - a_i) & \cdots \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
W = \begin{bmatrix} \omega & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \omega & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \omega \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and } D = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}
\]

3. **IM parameters identification**

The identification of IM parameters is carried out by means of two methods: the linear least squares technique (LST) which identifies the MIVs by applying Eq.1, and the real coded Genetic Algorithm (GA) which computes the \((r_i, l_i)\) parameters. Since one of the parameters set \((r_i, l_i)\) or MIVs) is calculated, the other set is deduced thanks to Eq.2 and Eq.3. The parameters \(A_{h0}\) and \(B_{h0}\), which correspond respectively to \((L_n = L_m)\) and \(r_i\) are known. They are measured respectively by no load test and volt-amperometric experiment. The reduced equivalent circuit of IM is shown by figure 2. Its
parameters $R_2$ and $X_{mew}$ vary function of the slip ($\delta$) and of the supply frequency ($\omega$).

The input impedance of the IM, given by equation 1 is:

$$Z(\omega, \delta) = r_s + R_2 + jX_{mew}$$

(5)

Where: $R_2 = \frac{V_s}{I_s} \cos(\phi) - r_s$, $X_{mew} = \frac{V_s}{I_s} \sin(\phi)$ and $\cos(\phi) = \frac{P}{3V_s I_s}$.

Fig.2: The reduced equivalent circuit of the IM

3.1 LST based identification

Using Eq.5 and Eq.1, the decomposition of the impedance $Z(\omega, \delta)$ in the real and imaginary parts leads to:

$$\sum_{p=0}^{s} (-1)^p \omega^{2p} g^{2p} \left( -\delta \omega A_{h2p} \frac{X_{mew}}{r_s} B_{h2p} + \frac{R_k}{r_s} \omega g B_{h2p+1} \right) = 0$$

(6)

$$\sum_{p=0}^{s} (-1)^p \omega^{2p} g^{2p} \left( \omega^2 g A_{h2p+1} + \frac{R_k}{r_s} B_{h2p} - \frac{X_{mew}}{r_s} \omega g B_{h2p+1} \right) = 0$$

(7)

Where $s$ is the integer part of $\frac{n}{2}$, $n$ is the number of rotor branches in the IM equivalent circuit. Equations 6 and 7 are valid either $n$ is odd or even. In case $n$ is even $A_{h2s+1} = A_{h s+1}$ and $B_{h2s+1} = B_{h s+1}$ are fixed to zero.

The IM parameter identification requires two steps:

**Step1:** For $m$ values of the slip "$\delta$", the variables $X_{mew}$ and $R_2$ are measured. Accordingly, $A_{h2p}, B_{h2p}$ and $B_{h2p+1}$ are identified by applying the LST algorithm to Eq.6.

Let:

$$\tilde{T} = [\hat{A}_{h1} \hat{A}_{h3} \hat{A}_{h5} \ldots]^T$$

$$x_{kp} = (-1)^p \omega^{2p+2} g(k)^{2p+1}$$

$$y_{kp} = (-1)^p \omega^{2p} g(k)^{2p} \frac{R_k(k)}{r_s}$$

$$z_{kp} = (-1)^p \omega^{2p+1} g(k)^{2p+1} \frac{X_{mew}(k)}{r_s}$$

Equation 6 becomes:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{m} x_{kp} A_{h p} + y_{kp} B_{h p} + z_{kp} B_{h p+1} = 0$$

(8)

Considering LST approach, for $m$ measurement points, equation 8 is written in matrix form ($1 \leq k \leq n$ ):

$$XT = Y$$

Where:

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} z_{00} & x_{11} & y_{11} & z_{11} & \cdots & x_{1p} & y_{1p} & z_{1p} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ z_{m0} & x_{m1} & y_{m1} & z_{m1} & \cdots & x_{mp} & y_{mp} & z_{mp} & \cdots \end{bmatrix}$$

$$Y = \begin{bmatrix} -x_{10} A_{h0} - y_{10} B_{h0} \\ \vdots \\ -x_{m0} A_{h0} - y_{m0} B_{h0} \end{bmatrix}$$

The parameters $A_{h0}$ and $B_{h0}$ are known, they correspond respectively to $L_s$ and $r_s$.

As $XT = Y$ then $\tilde{T} = \left(X'X\right)^{-1} X'Y$.

**Step2:** The obtained values of all $\hat{A}_{h}$ are used to calculate $A_{h2p+1}$ (Eq.7). This is accomplished by applying the LST again.

Let:

$$\tilde{T} = [\hat{A}_{h1} \hat{A}_{h3} \hat{A}_{h5} \ldots]^T$$

$$x_{kp} = (-1)^p \omega^{2p+2} g(k)^{2p+1}$$

$$y_{kp} = (-1)^p \omega^{2p} g(k)^{2p} \frac{R_k(k)}{r_s}$$

$$z_{kp} = (-1)^p \omega^{2p+1} g(k)^{2p+1} \frac{X_{mew}(k)}{r_s}$$
Since $X^\hat{T} = Y$ then $\hat{T} = \left(X'X\right)^{-1}X'Y$.

### 3.2 GA based identification

GAs are stochastic optimization technique that tend to imitate the natural evolution process of species and genetics. These evolving algorithms applied on an optimization problem make develop a set of candidate solutions called population of individuals (or chromosomes). Each individual is characterized by a chain of genes that correspond to the process parameters. To each individual is attributed a function “fitness” that measures the solution’s quality it represents, it’s often the value of the function to optimize. Then a new population of possible solutions is produced by selecting the parents among the best of the actual generation to make the crosses and the mutations. The new population contains a large proportion of characteristics of the preceding generation best individuals. In this way, from a generation to another, the best genes propagate in the population by combining or exchanging the best features. By favoring the best individuals, the most promoting regions of the research space are explored [21, 22]. (fig.3)

Inequality restrictions on the parameters have been used, $r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \ldots \leq r_m$ and $l_1 \leq l_2 \leq \ldots \leq l_n$. They are included in the algorithm with the following change of variables:

\[
\begin{align*}
X &= \begin{bmatrix}
x_{10} & x_{11} & \cdots & x_{1p} & \cdots \\
x_{20} & x_{21} & \cdots & x_{2p} & \cdots \\
\vdots & & & \vdots & \\
x_{m0} & x_{m1} & \cdots & x_{mp} & \cdots \\
\end{bmatrix}, \\
Y &= \begin{bmatrix}
y_{0}B_{0} - z_{0}B_{k_1} - y_{1}B_{k_2} - z_{1}B_{k_3} - \cdots - y_{p}B_{k_{2p+1}} \\
y_{0}B_{k_1} - z_{0}B_{k_1} - y_{1}B_{k_2} - z_{1}B_{k_3} - \cdots - y_{p}B_{k_{2p+1}} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \\
y_{0}B_{k_{2p+1}} - z_{0}B_{k_{2p+1}} - y_{1}B_{k_2} - z_{1}B_{k_3} - \cdots - y_{p}B_{k_{2p+1}} \\
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]

By applying the GA technique for parameters identification of the IM’s, a chromosome (fig.4) contains the $(x_i, y_i)$ parameters, where $i$ is the order of rotor branch of the IM model. A real coding is used for this algorithm. The fitness function is the sum of quadratic errors between the measured and the calculated rotor impedances, defined as:

\[
Fit = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \left| Z_{n}^{m} (k) - \tilde{Z}_{n}^{m} (k) \right|^2
\]  

(10)

Where “c” is the index of the measured value, “c” corresponds to the index of the calculated value for the evaluated chromosome’s parameters and $m$ is the number of measurements for different slips. The expression of the rotor impedance characterized by paralleling $n$ branches $(r_i, l_i)$ is:

\[
Z_{n}^{m} (k) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{1}{j \omega l_i + r_i / s(k)} \right)^{-1}
\]

(11)

\[
\tilde{Z}_{n}^{m} (k) = \left( \frac{R_i |k|^{2} \omega^2 l_i^2}{(\omega^2 l_i^2 - X_m^i (k))^2 + R_i^2 (k)} + \left\{ \frac{\omega^2 l_i^2 (\omega^2 l_i^2 - X_m^i (k))^2 + R_i^2 (k)}{\omega^2 l_i^2 - X_m^i (k)} \right\} \right)
\]

(12)

$(r_i, l_i)$ are deduced from Equation 9 function of $x_i$ and $y_i$.

The GA algorithm is executed respecting the following conditions:
- The crossover BLX-α is applied with a probability of 0.9.
- The uniform mutation is applied with a mutation probability of 0.01. It’s about modifying a
parameter by choosing a new value uniformly at random in the interval defined by the space constraints.

- The individuals’ number per population Np is limited to 300.
- The algorithm is stopped when the fitness function (Eq.10) is less than a considered error fixed to $10^{-5}$ for seven successive times.

$$x_1 \ldots x_n y_1 \ldots y_n$$

Fig.4. Chromosome representation for the parameters of the IM’s rotor branches.

4 Experimental validation

4.1 Experiment description

A test bench has been installed at the National Engineering School, University of Sfax (ENIS) Tunisia. It includes four IMs, an 8KVA alternator, a DC motor and a data acquisition system. The DC motor provides mechanical power to the alternator. The alternator supplies the locked rotor IMs for different frequency. The PC computer in which the algorithm is implemented is connected to an acquisition system which measures stator voltage and stator current. The voltage and current sensors are integrated into the acquisition system. Figure 5a shows the real test bench as for figure 5b gives its synoptic schema.

The IM’s identification and classification algorithms require the measurement of $R_2$ and $X_{new}$ over the slip range variation ($g \in [0, 1]$). Nevertheless, browsing the zone $g \in [g_{c_{max}}, 1]$ cannot be ensured since it represents the instability zone of the IM ($g_{c_{max}}$ is the slip at the breakdown torque). Therefore, an equivalent test is proposed. This test [24] considers figure 6 where the motor is at locked rotor and supplies by $V_{g}$ in variable frequency. Instead of varying the load torque to browse the interval of $g \in [0, 1]$ in figure 2, it is possible to obtain the same values of $R_2$ and $X_{new}$ by performing a locked rotor test for different frequencies $f \in [0, 50]$. Hence, the locked-rotor induction motor under test is supplied by a three-phase alternator. This latter allows the adjustment of the frequency and the amplitude of the IM supply. The ratio $\frac{V_{g}}{V_{g}}$ is maintained constant which guaranties a constant magnetic flux. So, the saturation state remains unchanged during the test. The frequency is adjusted by varying the speed of DC motor, while the amplitude is fixed by the excitation voltage of the alternator. Measurements of $V_{g}, I_{g}, P_{g}$ are performed by an acquisition system connected to a PC computer (Fig.5.a,b).

The IM input impedance at locked rotor is (figure 6):

$$\bar{Z}(\omega, g) = r_i + R_2 g + jX_{new}$$

Where:

$$R_2 g = \frac{V_{g}}{I_{g}} \cos(\phi_g) - r_i$$

$$X_{new} = \frac{V_{g}}{I_{g}} \sin(\phi_g)$$

Consequently, the IM input impedance for variable speed and fixed frequency is:

$$\bar{Z}(\omega, g) = r_i + R_2 g + jX_{new}$$

First the virtual slip is calculated as:

$$g = \frac{f}{50}$$

Then $R_2$ and $X_{new}$ are deduced as [24]:

$$R_2 = \frac{R_2 g}{g}$$

$$X_{new} = \frac{X_{new}}{g}$$

Where $g \in [0, 1]$ and $\omega = 100\pi$.  

Fig.5.a IM measures test bench.

Fig.5.b synoptic schema
4.2 Results and discussion

The developed algorithms are applied to four IMs. Their nominal characteristics are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Name-plate parameters of IMs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>P(kW)</th>
<th>N(rpm)</th>
<th>f(Hz)</th>
<th>Pp</th>
<th>I(A)</th>
<th>U(V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IM_1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM_2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM_3</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM_4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identification results are presented in Table 2. Identified parameters allow computation of the rotor impedance \( \bar{Z}_r \) using (Eq. 11). The comparison between calculated and measured data of \( \bar{Z}_r \) is evaluated by calculating for each IM model the Normalized Root Mean Square Error (NRMSE) defined by (Eq. 13), [3]:

\[
NRMSE (\%) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \left| \frac{\bar{Z}_r (k) - \bar{Z}_r (k)}{\bar{Z}_r (k)} \right|^2 \times 100 \tag{13}
\]

Assume the type of rotor is unknown. Then GA and LST algorithms are executed for the three models (n=1, 2, 3 rotor branches). For each case the computed parameters \((r_r, l_r)\) are used to calculate NRMSE. The comparison of obtained NRMSE classifies the motor in single, double or triple cage (Fig. 7). This procedure is applied to all previously chosen motors (table 1).

The parameters of the first branch \((r_1, l_1)\) are accurately identified using only the low slip measurement points.

The rotor impedance is:

\[
\bar{Z}_r = \frac{R_r}{g} + jX_r
\]

Fig. 6. The reduced equivalent circuit of the IM at locked rotor test

Figures 8, 9, 10 and 11 show measured and calculated \( R_r \) et \( X_r \) in terms of the slip.

Let’s consider the IM_1, the LST method provides erroneous parameters (leakage inductance negative) because measurements \( R_r \) et \( X_r \) are too disturbed by measurement noise as is shown in Figure 8. In fact, the measurement of low current leads to a noisy acquisition. In this case GA results become more interesting. The values of NRMSE obtained for the models of two and three rotor branches \((n = 2, 3)\) are similar while the NRMSE of the single cage model is the highest. Consequently, the double cage model is selected as it is less complicated in use. For the IM_2 motor, the smallest NRMSE is obtained with the LST method for the double cage model \((n = 2)\). In this case LST has converged to reasonable results. The shape of the curves \( R_r \) and \( X_r \) are smooth and have no noise. So the assessed IM must be classified as double cage. The identification using LST is very simple since it is reduced to a linear regression according to invariant parameters. However, as it’s very sensitive to measurement’s errors the measure should be accurate. For IM_3 the smallest NRMSE is delivered by the AG method, this latter confirms that the model is of a deep bar rotor with three rotor branches \((n = 3)\). As for the LST method, it gives negative values for the IM parameters which discard this method of classification.
Table 2. Identification results of the IM, LST: Linear least squares technique GA: Genetic algorithm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IM_1</th>
<th>( r_1 (\Omega) )</th>
<th>( l_1 (H) )</th>
<th>( r_2 (\Omega) )</th>
<th>( l_2 (H) )</th>
<th>( r_3 (\Omega) )</th>
<th>( l_3 (H) )</th>
<th>NMRSE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LST</td>
<td>2.6670</td>
<td>0.0240</td>
<td>85.254</td>
<td>-0.2737</td>
<td>173.39</td>
<td>-1.295</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>2.8670</td>
<td>0.0248</td>
<td>60.169</td>
<td>0.0770</td>
<td>173.39</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8755</td>
<td>0.0273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6307</td>
<td>0.0238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7994</td>
<td>0.0277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7893</td>
<td>0.0274</td>
<td>76.185</td>
<td>0.0274</td>
<td>166.82</td>
<td>0.0548</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LST</td>
<td>0.1650</td>
<td>0.0053</td>
<td>5.3089</td>
<td>0.0068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>0.1769</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
<td>4.7279</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
<td>-70.468</td>
<td>0.0475</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1764</td>
<td>0.0053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1644</td>
<td>0.0053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1628</td>
<td>0.0055</td>
<td>4.1352</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1622</td>
<td>0.0055</td>
<td>4.4796</td>
<td>0.0108</td>
<td>32.416</td>
<td>0.0164</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LST</td>
<td>0.1789</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
<td>2.9735</td>
<td>0.0040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>0.2017</td>
<td>0.0042</td>
<td>1.1071</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
<td>-1.2332</td>
<td>-0.0067</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1960</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1728</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1843</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
<td>2.3234</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1843</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
<td>2.4244</td>
<td>0.0049</td>
<td>42.763</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LST</td>
<td>0.1701</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
<td>3.1169</td>
<td>0.0040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>0.1858</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1838</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
<td>-4.8i</td>
<td>0.016-0.006i</td>
<td>2+4.8i</td>
<td>0.016+0.006i</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1720</td>
<td>0.0029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1813</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td>2.8525</td>
<td>0.0042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1815</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td>2.7580</td>
<td>0.0043</td>
<td>1002.9</td>
<td>0.0435</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig.8. Variation of  \( R_r' \) and  \( X_r' \) in terms of slip for IM_1

Fig.10. Variation of  \( R_r' \) and  \( X_r' \) in terms of slip for IM_3

Fig.9. Variation of  \( R_r' \) and  \( X_r' \) in terms of slip for IM_2

Fig.11. Variation of  \( R_r' \) and  \( X_r' \) in terms of slip for IM_4
IM_4 analysis gives similar NRMSE for models with two and three rotor branches \((n = 2, 3)\). The leakage inductance of the third branch appears too large. It is close to \(L_s\) (cyclic inductance of the stator). For this reason the third branch is eliminated from the model and the model is considered as two branches. Measurements of the stator current in phase \(a\) and the rotor speed during direct starting of IM_2 are established. The identification results of IM_2 classify it as double cage. The calculated parameters (Table 2) allows to simulate the start-up using the state model (Eq.4) for \((n = 2)\). The measured and simulated current and speed are shown in Figures 12 and 13. A good agreement of the model and its parameters with the experimental measurements are observed. In fact, the NRMSE computed for the current and the speed are respectively equal to 27.26\% and 2.24\%.

5 Conclusion

A MIVs state model of the squirrel cage induction motor is developed. An offline IM identification based upon steady state electric measurements (voltage, stator current and active power) is elaborated by performing a locked rotor test for different frequencies. The parameters identification using the linear Least Squares Technique (LST) and the Genetic Algorithm (GA) is established. The identification and classification is validated on four IMs. The LST method is adequate as the model in the steady state is linear function of the MIVs parameters, but it shows its limitation when measurement errors increase. GA is judged more efficient since it persists and converges for a high measurement noise. The parameters that are determined by means of experimental tests are used in order to establish the dynamic model of the IM. The algorithms are verified and validated by computing NRMSE of measured and simulated current and speed during starting of the IM. A good agreement of model and its parameters with the experimental measurements are observed.

Nomenclature

\(v_{ad}, v_{aq}\) dq stator voltages (V)
\(i_{ad}, i_{aq}\) dq stator currents (A)
\(i_{id}, i_{iq}\) dq rotor currents of the \(i^{th}\) branch (A)
\(V_s\) phase voltage (V)
\(I_s\) line current (A)
\(p\) active electrical power (W)
\(MIVs = [A_{00} \ A_{01} \ ... \ A_{0n} \ B_{00} \ B_{01} \ ... \ B_{0m}]\)

Invariant parameters

\(r_s\) stator resistance (\(\Omega\))
\(r_i\) rotor resistance of the \(i^{th}\) branch (\(\Omega\))
\(L_m\) mutual inductance (H)
\(l_i\) rotor leakage inductance of the \(i^{th}\) branch (H)
\(Z\) input impedance of th IM per phase (\(\Omega\))
\(\omega_s\) synchronous angular speed (rad/s)
\(\omega_{re}\) electrical rotor speed (rad/s)
\(f\) Synchronous frequency (Hz)
\(g\) slip (p.u)
\(p_p\) number of pairs of poles
\(J\) total mechanical inertia (\(Kg.m^2\))
\(C_R\) load torque (\(N.m\))
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