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Saturday PSMA/PELS Magnetics Workshop

- 2nd Annual Workshop last Saturday, March 25.
- Approximately 150 attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North America</th>
<th>Europe Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Presentations, panel discussions, technology demonstrations.

power.thayer.dartmouth.edu
This talk

- Brief review/overview of Saturday’s workshop.
- Follow-up on topics of interest that came up.
Topics discussed at Saturday workshop

- Discussed:
  - New and improved core materials
  - Core loss measurement
  - Modelling approaches for core and winding loss

- Topics of interest for future:
  - Fringing losses
  - Core dimensional effects
  - Impact of eddy currents on inductance; physics of ac losses.

- To-do: Cooperation on core loss data and modeling standardization with
  - Electronics Transformers Technical Committee (ETTC),
  - PSMA magnetics committee (Power Sources Manufacturers’ Association)
  - IMA (International Magnetics Assoc. sub-group of TTA (The Transformer Assoc.))
Winding models vs. Core models

- Linear, well known material properties.
- Behavior is a solution to Maxwell’s equations.
- Numerical, analytical, or mixed solutions.
- Can be accurately approximated by linear circuit networks, given enough RLC elements (usually just RL).

- Nonlinear material properties, known only through measurements.
- Models are behavioral, based on measurements.
  - Physics-based micromagnetic models exist, but can’t address ferrite loss yet.
- Circuit models based on RLC elements only can’t capture nonlinear behavior.
Needs in core loss data, testing, and modeling

- **Material data and testing**
  - Data consistency between manufacturers:
    More from Chuck Wilde, Dexter, at 10:40
  - Material data in standardized electronic form.
  - More comprehensive data:
    - DC bias effect
    - Waveform effect
  - Tolerance: batch-to-batch variations.

- **Influence of core shape on loss**

- **Modeling**
  - Improve accuracy while retaining modest data requirements.
  - Dynamic simulation models for SPICE and time-domain field simulation.
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Influence of core shape and size

- Straightforward to model and analyze:
  - Flux crowding at corners.
  - Cross section variation.
- Complex, known physics; uncertain parameters:
  - Skin effect in core
  - Dimensional resonance
- Poorly understood:
  - Higher loss on surfaces than in bulk.
    - Loss when flux crosses surface similar to loss in several mm of bulk.
  - See Johan Kolar’s examination of this issue.
Dimensional Effects:
plots of $|B|$ in a round centerpost

- Skin effect, affected by $\mu$ and $\sigma$ (permeability and conductivity)

- Wave propagation, affected by $\mu$ and $\varepsilon$ (permittivity and dielectric const.)

Typical skin depths and wavelengths: 1\textsuperscript{st} order calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skin depth</th>
<th>100 kHz</th>
<th>1 MHz</th>
<th>10 MHz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MnZn Ferrite (3F46)</td>
<td>8.2 cm</td>
<td>1.3 cm</td>
<td>0.18 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NiZn Ferrite (67)</td>
<td>80 m</td>
<td>18 m</td>
<td>2.5 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\lambda/4$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\lambda/4$</th>
<th>100 kHz</th>
<th>1 MHz</th>
<th>10 MHz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MnZn Ferrite (3F46)</td>
<td>6.1 cm</td>
<td>0.87 cm</td>
<td>0.12 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NiZn Ferrite (67)</td>
<td>2 m</td>
<td>237 cm</td>
<td>30.6 cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Approximate values: based on typical resistivity and permittivity vs. frequency from Ferroxcube catalog: not for these specific materials.
- For cross sections (e.g., centerpost diameter) at or below these sizes, there shouldn’t be much effect.
- However, Fair-Rite data presented Saturday shows that 10 MHz performance of 67 material starts to drop at 1.25 cm cross section.
Dimensional effects: implications

- For large area core legs at high frequency:
  - A “bundle of sticks” approach may be useful.
  - Measurement data taken on a different core size may not be adequate.
- Very rough idea of size and frequency thresholds
  - ~ 1 cm at 1 MHz with MnZn ferrite.
  - ~ 1 cm at 10 MHz with NiZn ferrite.
- More data and streamlined modeling could help avoid the need for full loss measurement of every core size.
Waveform effect on core loss: Concepts, rather than how-to

- Initial hope in GSE model: instantaneous loss depends on $B$ and $dB/dt$: $p(t) = p(B(t), dB/dt)$
  - If this worked, you could add up loss for incremental time segments:

$$E_{loss} = E_1 + E_2 + \ldots$$

or better, an integral…

It doesn’t work: flawed concept
Improvement that enabled iGSE

- Loss depends on segment \( \text{dB/dt} \) and on \textit{overall} \( \Delta B \)
Composite waveform method

- Same concept as GSE: add up independent loss for each segment.

- Unlike the GSE, this works pretty well in simple cases:
  - Waveforms where $\Delta B$ is the same for the segment and the whole waveform!
  - It reduces to the same assumptions as the iGSE.

$$E_{\text{loss}} = E_1 + E_2$$
What we know how to do for non-sinusoidal waveforms:

- For simple waveforms, add up the loss in each segment.

- For waveforms with varying slope, add up the loss for each segment, considering overall $\Delta B$ and segment $\delta B$.

- See iGSE paper for how those factor in.

- For waveforms with minor loops, separate loops before calculating loss (see iGSE paper).
Loss models for each segment

- iGSE derives them from a Steinmetz model
  - Limitation: Steinmetz model holds over a limited frequency range.
- Loss map model uses square-wave data directly for a wide frequency range.
  - Clearly better if you have the data.
  - Can also map with different dc bias levels.
- Sobhi Barg (Trans. Pow. Electr., March 2017) shows that the iGSE gets much more accurate if you use different Steinmetz parameters for each time segment in a triangle wave.
Limitation for all of the above

- “Relaxation effect”
- Simple theory says loss for one cycle should be the same for both flux waveforms.
- In practice, it’s different.
- $i^2$GSE (Jonas Mühlethaler and J. Kolar) captures this but is cumbersome and requires extensive data.
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Core simulation models

- Challenge: how to include nonlinearity.

- **Example:** Cauer 1 network to model saturation behavior and frequency-dependent permeability in nanocrystalline tape-wound cores.

  ![Cauer 1 network diagram]

  - Successfully matched pulse behavior in high-amplitude operation (Sullivan and Muetze, IAS 2007)
  - Did not examine loss behavior.

- Open question: what model structures capture dynamic nonlinear behavior correctly?
Winding models

- I presented more topics on Saturday—slides will be available.

- Today: two things that were left out Saturday:
  - *Simple* litz-wire modeling.
    (Winging it with litz can result in higher loss than solid wire.)
  - Another free tool to generate a SPICE model based on a 1-D winding model.
Litz wire can be easy to model

- Sounds complicated to model accurately, but actually easier than Dowell’s analysis:

\[ F_R = \frac{R_{ac}}{R_{dc}} = 1 + \frac{(\pi n N_s)^2 d_s^6}{192 \cdot \delta^4 b^2} \]

- No PhD needed.
- Full explanation at [http://bit.do/simplitz](http://bit.do/simplitz), plus:
  - Even simpler calculation of recommended \( n \).
  - Simple wire construction guidelines to avoid problems.
  - Easy calculation of fringing loss.
  - Excel spreadsheet.
  - Based on 2014 APEC, “Simplified Design Method for Litz Wire”
SPICE models for 1D winding structures: foil, PCB, etc.

- M2Spice: free tool to automatically generate a SPICE model.
- No limit on interleaving, parallel windings, etc.
  - Model correctly predicts distribution of current between parallel windings when you run SPICE!
- By Minjie Chen (Princeton), Dave Perreault, Stephanie Pavlick and Samantha Gunter (MIT)
- Sample results:

![AC Resistance (Ω) ~ \( R_{ac} \)]
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Summary

- Discussions underway to obtain better core-loss data: ETTC, PSMA magnetics, IMA.
- Core loss dimensional effects: skin effect and wave propagation (dimensional resonance).
  - With nominal parameters, becomes an issue ~1 cm or bigger and 1 MHz or higher for MnZn ferrite. Perhaps also ~ 1 cm for NiZn ferrite.
  - We need easy-to-use models and better data.
- Waveform-based core loss models can work well, but data with dc bias is the most important missing piece.
- Dynamic (SPICE) core-loss models need to include nonlinearity correctly: more work is needed.
- Litz wire can be easy to model: http://bit.do/simplitz.
- Automatic SPICE models for 1D geometries, including complex ones: M2SPICE.