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This project is part of the project “GenPowerBox”; this is a project of the company Mastervolt, realized by Whisper Power. The objective of this project is to develop a compact and noiseless energy management system for use on board of yachts. The “GenPowerBox” system is composed of a battery and a generator set; consisting of a diesel engine and a Permanent Magnet Synchronous Generator (PMSG). This MSc project is focused on the Permanent Magnet generator. The generator is integrated in the flywheel of the diesel engine. The main objective of this project is to determine the most suitable generator for the application on yachts. Another goal is to validate the models of different generators designs. These models represent the induced voltage, different losses and the efficiency of the generator. This is done by performing several tests on different prototypes of both 3kW and 9kW generators. The measurements results are then compared with the simulated results. The distinctions between the designs consist of:

- The type of the permanent magnets (ferrite or NdFeB),
- The combination of number of poles and slots (2/3 or 8/9), and
- The type of the slots (Open or semi-closed slots).
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Chapter I

1. INTRODUCTION

This work is part of the project entitled “GenPowerBox” of the company Mastervolt; a worldwide company active in the field of electrical power systems. The purpose of Mastervolt is to guarantee an independent electric power for different applications; therefore it develops, manufactures and distributes high quality electrotechnical systems for independent energy supply. Mastervolt works on three main sectors: Maritime energy, mobile energy and solar energy. In the maritime energy sector, different ‘on-board’ electrical systems are provided by Mastervolt like; storage batteries, charging units, transformers, display panels, invertors and generators sets.

Figure I-1 The GenPowerBox® on board of a yacht (1)

The intention of the GenPowerBox® project is to provide electrical power for different loads on board of the yacht. These loads can be from a basic to an extended range, we can mention lighting, kitchen appliances (such as refrigerator, microwave oven, oven and coffee machine), laptop and entertainment equipment (TV for instance).

The GenPowerBox is a system that can have different sources of energy; such as shore connexion, batteries, and/or the generator set, consisting of a diesel engine and a permanent magnet synchronous generator. The connection between the different sources and loads is guaranteed by the power electronics system (Figure I-2)
The focus of this MSc project is on the Permanent Magnet (PM) generator, which is integrated in the flywheel of the combustion engine, the objective is to develop a compact and efficient generator. Two levels of power have been considered; 3kW and 9kW generator.

To fulfil the requirement of having a compact generator, the basic construction of the permanent magnet generator has been selected to be with a high number of poles, concentrated windings and with an outer rotor design.

By making the generator small and compact we are confronted to problems like dissipation of the heat, which is one of the major problems, therefore an analysis of the losses has to be done. Thus in this MSc project the losses have been modelled and analysed by comparing them with the experimental results.

Different generators have been studied; with different magnets materials (ferrite and NdFeB), different combinations of number of poles and slots (3/2, 9/8), and different types of slots (Open and Semi-Closed slots).

The following pictures show the present generator set that is constructed by Whisper Power and used in the Mastervolt installations; this system is consisting of a diesel engine and a conventional synchronous generator.
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Figure I-3 Conventional generator set of Whisper Power

Figure I-3 shows an assembled 3kW generator set and the rotor of the synchronous generator mounted on the flywheel of the combustion engine (right up) and the stator of the conventional synchronous generator with its cooling system (right down).

Figure I-4 The 9kW generator set
Figure I-4 shows one of the 9kW generator sets of Mastervolt manufactured by Whisper Power where the generator take a considerable space of the whole set.

As the generator system is designated to be used on board of yachts, space represents an important issue as well as the quietness of the system, especially that mostly this system is involved in leisure yachts. Consequently the size, compactness and noiselessness of the system are essential concern.

By replacing the conventional generator by a permanent magnet synchronous generator the generator set will be 40% compacter and smaller.

This thesis has been divided into five chapters. It opens with this introductory chapter where a brief background is given with the motivation behind this project. Also the objective and problems have been stated. This is followed by a second chapter where the theory of PM machines is brought in with an overview of the design choice and the motivation behind it. Chapter three present the modelling of the generator, with derivation of equations presenting the magnetic flux density, the induced voltage and the losses in the studied generators. To validate the models chapter four is introduced where an analysis of the simulation and experimental results is given. Finally conclusions have been drawn in the fifth chapter which contains some prospective and recommendations for future work as well.
II. PERMANENT MAGNET MACHINES

II.1 INTRODUCTION

As mentioned in the foregoing chapter, this work is focussed on the Permanent Magnet (PM) generator of the GenPowerBox®.

PM machines have been used in different applications during the last years, due to the improvement of magnetic materials (better characteristics and lower prices), in addition to the advanced technology of power electronics that provides practical ways and possibilities to control these machines. The PM machines are used as motors and as generators. They can be linear or rotating machines. The PM machines can be classified according to different parameters, among these parameters, we can cite: the materials of the permanent magnets and their mounting, the air-gap (or the flux lines), the rotor position with regard to the stator, and the stator winding.

In the coming sections, a brief overview is given about the main possible constructions of permanent magnet machines, and the motivation behind the selection of the generator design, that have been used in our application.

II.2 PERMANENT MAGNET MATERIALS

Permanent magnets used in rotating electric machines are of two general classes: ferromagnetic materials and ferrimagnetic materials. Ferrimagnetic permanent magnets, often called hard ferromagnetic materials are formed from metallic alloys, usually containing one of the three natural magnetic metals, iron (Fe), nickel (Ni) or cobalt (Co). Ferrimagnetic materials, often called hard ferrites, are oxides of iron and one other metal, usually barium (Ba) or strontium (Sr). (2)

In general, all magnetic materials exhibit varying degrees of permanent magnetism, often called remanence.

PM materials are characterized by what is called a hysteresis loop, \( B(H) \), where \( B \) is the magnetic flux density measured in Tesla [T], and \( H \) is the magnetic field strength measured in Amps per meter [A/m]. For \( H \) is equal to zero a residual flux density remains. This is the remanent flux density \( B_{rm} \) which characterizes the permanent magnet. \( H_c \) is the coercive field strength for which the flux density becomes null.
The second quadrant of the Hysteresis loop represents the demagnetization curve which characterizes the parameters of a permanent magnet. Figure II-2 illustrates the demagnetization curve for some permanent magnets that are usually used in machines construction (3).

Besides the magnetic properties that are essential in the choice of permanent magnets, there are other features, which are also determinant for this choice. Among these features, we distinguish the temperature properties, since the magnetization is influenced by the temperature; this dependence is described by the Langevin-Brillouin function (Figure II-3) (3). When the temperature is above the Curie temperature $T_c$, the magnets lose their magnetization. For instance, for NdFeB magnets, the maximum allowed temperature is usually 120 °C. (In some new magnets this value can even reach 150°C)
In our design we adopted the NdFeB PM material for the reason that it possesses a higher remanent flux density compared to the Ferrite magnets. It means that for the same magnetic flux production, we would need thicker Ferrite PM than when using NdFeB PM. This choice leads to have a more compact machine, which is the major requirement for our application.

II.3 PERMANENT MAGNET MACHINES DESIGN

Different topologies of the PM machine can be found in practice, and they can be classified according to different aspects as follows:

II.3.1 AIR-GAP

Based on the air-gap or on the flux direction three types can be distinguished axial flux machines, radial flux machines and linear machines.
II.3.1.1 **Axial air-gap (Disc rotor):** There are many forms of axial flux air gap permanent magnet machines, they can be classified based on air-gap (single or double air-gap), on the position of the stator with respect to the rotor, and on the slots (slotless or with slots).

The use of slotless construction would reduce cogging torque and result in a small winding inductance. The advantage of a dual air-gap topology is the cancellation of the axial attractive forces between the rotor and the stator resulting from the attraction between the magnets and the stator iron. Usually an axial field permanent magnet machine is used when high torque and very high power density is required, hence it is mostly used in very specific applications. (5) (6) (7)

![Axial flux machines configurations](image)

**Figure II-5** Axial flux machines configurations (a) Single rotor- single stator structure. (b) Two rotors-single stator structure. (c) Single rotor-two stators structure. (d) Multistage structure including two stator blocks and three rotor blocks. (5)

II.3.1.2 **Radial air-gap (Cylindrical rotor):** This type of machines is the most common variant of electrical machines, and is very flexible in terms of scaling in production. The power capability and torque of these machines can be increased simply by expanding the stack length. Generally the rotor is mounted inside the stator, but an opposite placement is sometimes done to fulfil certain requirements as it will be presented in the next section. In (6) and (7) a comparative study is presented of a radial flux machines with axial flux machines that have different topologies.

II.3.1.3 **Linear flux (Linear machines):** The use of linear permanent magnet actuator is relevant for certain specific applications where high force density and high torque are required (8). In some applications the use of linear machines is the most suitable due to the nature of the system itself, a typical example of that is the AWS (Archimedes Wave Swing) system, where the linear machine topology fits the linear movement of the waves (9).

- For our application, as the generator will be mounted on the flywheel of the engine, a rotational machine has been adopted with a cylindrical rotor (radial flux) configuration.
II.3.2 ROTOR

According to the rotor position with respect to the stator, two types are distinguished:

II.3.2.1 Inner rotor: Generally the rotor is placed inside the stator; this is usually the adopted design for machines construction, unless some specific requirements are necessary. In (10) it has been shown that the outer rotor design is slightly lighter than the inner rotor. On the other hand the mechanical design of the outer rotor motor might, however, be tricky in comparison to the inner rotor and the advantage would then be reduced.

II.3.2.2 Outer rotor: This construction can have some advantages compared with the inner rotor topology. In this case there is lower chance of magnets detachment because of centrifugal forces. Another advantage is that outer rotor geometry allows a larger bore diameter which makes it possible to have larger number of poles. Thus a lower current loading is needed to obtain the same torque.

![Cross section of an inner rotor and an outer rotor](image)

- As it has been pointed out earlier, the main requirement of our generator is to be as small and compact as possible, that leads us to take on the outer rotor configuration. It permits us to have a larger number of poles in comparison with a machine of the same size but with an inner rotor.

II.3.3 PERMANENT MAGNETS MOUNTING

Based on the arrangement of magnets in the rotor, the Permanent Magnet machines can be classified into three types, which are:

II.3.3.1 Surface-mounted PM rotor: Compared to interior magnet type, the surface–mounted PM rotors have simple structure, and are more suitable to produce the sine wave form back electromotive force. In this topology the magnets are usually glued on the iron rotor surface.

II.3.3.2 Inset PM rotor: The same advantages of simplicity and more suitable emf form can be listed for this type of magnets arrangement. Moreover, inset type has the advantage of compact structure to protect against large centrifugal force at high speed operation. In addition this structure presents a shorter air gap. Inset permanent magnet machines produce a reluctance torque in addition to the torque created by the magnets that could improve the performances compared to the surface-mounted permanent magnets (10)
II.3.3.3 Interior (buried) PM rotor; Buried magnets generate flux concentration in the rotor that could allow thinner or cheaper magnets, the protection of the magnet against demagnetization and it provides mechanical strength. The figure below (Figure II-8) illustrates two topologies; (V-shape and tangentially magnetized PM). The drawbacks of the rotors with V-shape magnets are the iron bridges that cause a high leakage flux. Furthermore the V-shape rotor is not very adapted for high pole numbers. It can easily get saturated between the magnets if the angle is too small. Another drawback of the V-shape configuration is the high number of magnets that increases the production cost. The tangentially magnetized PM rotor presents the drawback of many iron and magnet pieces to be manipulated if the number of poles is high. Therefore some production difficulties can arise. However it does not present any bridges and the flux leakage is then very low (10). It has to be mentioned that as precaution to be taken in this case, is that the shaft should be non-ferromagnetic, because with a ferromagnetic shaft, a large portion of flux from the magnets would leak through the shaft.

- The surface mounted PM rotor structure has been adopted, in the design of our generator, for its simple construction. There is no need for a more complicated configuration (inset or interior PM), since it is an outer rotor model, which makes it less probable do have magnets detachment, besides we would not reach extremely high speeds in our application.
II.3.4 Windings

The stator windings can be either distributed or concentrated winding.

II.3.4.1 Distributed winding: Is the most common winding type for rotating machines. It provides an almost sinusoidal magneto motive force, which makes it to be preferred rather than the concentrated winding. But the distributed winding has also drawbacks because of the coils overlapping that leads to longer ends, which means more copper hence more losses and more costs due to that. Another disadvantage is that the construction of such a winding is more expensive than the concentrated one.

II.3.4.2 Concentrated winding: This type of winding can be divided into two types; single layer; which means one coil each second tooth, and double layer; by having one coil on each tooth, i.e. each slot has conductors from different coils. The concentrated winding is easier to realise and less costly. Furthermore another advantage of this construction is that it has shorter end-windings compared to the distributed winding. This results in a more compact machine (shorter axial length), and the volume of copper used in the end-windings is significantly reduced, consequently lower copper losses and lower costs are achieved. (11)

Figure II-9 Distributed and concentrated winding

(a) Distributed winding
(b) Concentrated winding (2/3)
(c) Concentrated winding (8/9)

As stated here above, the concentrated winding is more suitable for a compact machine. And to overcome the problem of harmonics, resulting from the concentrated winding, we make use of different combinations of number of teeth and slots, as it will be shown in a later section.
II.3.5 **SLOTS**

Three different slots types can be cited: totally open, semi-closed or totally closed slots. There are also different slots shapes that can be found; it may be for instance rectangular, trapezoidal, oval or round. Here below are mentioned some of the features of different slots types:

**II.3.5.1 Open slots**; The advantage of the open slots is that it is easier wound; the winding process can also be automated, hence cheaper construction. In addition it has lower leakage reactance. On the other hand the slotting causes a higher cogging torque and eddy current losses, compared to the closed and semi-closed slots.

**II.3.5.2 Semi-closed slots**; By adopting this type of slots, lower slot harmonics are produced, thus a reduction in the reluctance variation around the stator and hence the torque ripples can be notably reduced. For this topology the leakage inductance is higher than in the precedent case, which means that lower power can be produced than that of open slots construction.

**II.3.5.3 Closed slots**; this structure presents more robustness than the two precedents, however it is more difficult to put the winding in the closed slots. Another drawback of such slots is the saturation that is higher in this case.

- Basically the semi-closed slots design have been implemented in our generator, as it provides an adequate robustness, and a lower slotting factor compared to the open slots. However, in the 9kW generator, both options have been tested the semi-closed and the open slots.

II.3.6 **POLES TEETH COMBINATION**

As it has been stated in an earlier section, the use of concentrated winding leads to harmonics appearance. To overcome this problem, different combinations of number of poles and number of slots can be applied, in order to get an appropriate performance of the machine. Parameters that depend on winding configuration are cogging torque and the study in (12) shows the influences that have the different poles-teeth combinations on eddy-current losses in the back iron. Among these combinations we mention:

**3/2 combination**; (3 teeth per 2 poles). This combination presents lower losses than the next one, but on the other hand it has a poor winding factor.

**9/8 combination**; (9 teeth per 8 poles). This combination presents higher losses, which might be acceptable regarding the benefit of having higher winding factor.

On reference (12), more combinations are presented and studied. Based on the provided results, we adopted the two combinations mentioned here above.
II.4 The Chosen Design

The main requirement for our generator is to have a compact generator with high power density and lower losses, hence high efficiency. Therefore the approved design was, a radial flux, surface mounted permanent magnet generator with an outer rotor, thus a larger rotor diameter, which allows us to have a higher number of poles, and moreover the permanent magnets detachment that can be caused by centrifugal forces is less probable.

The magnet material that has been used is NdFeB, which has a high remanent flux density (1.2T) compared to the ferrite magnets, which need to be thicker to get a flux density comparable to rare-earth magnets. That means larger diameter of the generator. Nevertheless we also tested a machine with Ferrite magnets in order to compare its performances with the NdFeB one.

For the windings we selected the double layer concentrated winding topology with the purpose of having more compactness and lower losses caused by copper, which would increase the efficiency. The concentrated winding will produce a lot of voltage harmonic content compared to the distributed winding. For improving the induced voltage we have chosen certain combinations of number of poles and number of slots; (2/3 and 8/9). For the 3kW generator prototypes, both topologies have been built. This would give us the opportunity to compare the performances of both, and to have a deeper insight on the outcome of this choice. And finally make a decision about which combination should be approved.

For the stator slotting we chose a semi-closed slot structure, which presents less cogging torque. Moreover it will produce less eddy current losses in the permanent magnets, which is very important, especially that we are using NdFeB magnets that are more sensitive to temperature increase. For the 9kW generator we have two prototypes as well, one with open slots and the other with semi-closed slots, for comparison purpose, and for analysing the extra losses caused by the open slots, and to decide if a good cooling method can improve it in order to preserve the extra power produced in the case of open slots.
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III. Modelling

III.1 Introduction

After choosing the generator design, as has been presented in the previous chapter, models should be derived for prediction and calculation of the generator performance. As the objective of this work is to determine and compare the efficiency of the different designs, we derived equations that model the no-load voltage, the different losses, (copper losses and iron losses), and the efficiency of the generator.

III.2 Magnetic Flux Density

Based on Ampere's law, the air gap flux density can be calculated as follows:

Ampere's law; The line integral of the magnetic field intensity \( H \) around a closed path is equal to the total current linked by the contour.

\[
\oint H \cdot dl = \iint \mathbf{j} \cdot dA
\]

Equation III-1

With: \( j \) the current density

For Permanent Magnet machines we have:

\[
\oint H \cdot dl = 0
\]

Equation III-2

\[
2(H_g \cdot g_{eff} + H_m \cdot l_m) = 0
\]

Equation III-3

\[
2 \left( \frac{B_g}{\mu_0} \cdot g_{eff} + \frac{B_{cm}}{\mu_0 \mu_m} \cdot l_m \right) = 0
\]

Equation III-4

\[
|B_g| = \frac{l_m}{g_{eff} \mu_m} \cdot B_{rm}
\]

Equation III-5

The maximum flux of the permanent magnets is calculated based on the fundamental flux density by:

\[
\Phi_{PM} = B_{gl} \cdot \frac{2}{\pi} \tau_p \cdot l_s \cdot k_w \cdot k_{fring}
\]

Equation III-6

With:

\[
B_{gl} = \frac{4}{\pi} \cdot B_g \cdot \sin \left( \frac{\pi b_m}{2 \tau_p} \right)
\]

Equation III-7
With: \( \tau_p \) the pole pitch

\[
\tau_p = \frac{\pi \cdot r_s}{p}
\]

Equation III-8

\( g_{ef} \) the effective air-gap, calculated as follows:

\[
g_{ef} = (l_g + \frac{l_m}{\mu_{rm}}) k_{carter}
\]

Equation III-9

### III.2.1 Carter’s Factor

Due to slotting the effective magnetic air gap is different from the mechanical air gap in machines.

The effective magnetic air gap is calculated by introducing the Carter factor, which is given in (13) as follows:

\[
k_{carter} = \frac{r_s}{r_s - \gamma (l_g + \frac{l_m}{\mu_{rm}})}
\]

Equation III-10

Where:

\[
\gamma = \frac{4}{\pi} \left[ \frac{b_{20}}{2 \cdot (l_g + \frac{l_m}{\mu_{rm}})} \cdot \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{b_{20}}{2 \cdot (l_g + \frac{l_m}{\mu_{rm}})} \right) - \ln \left( 1 + \left( \frac{b_{20}}{2 \cdot (l_g + \frac{l_m}{\mu_{rm}})} \right)^2 \right) \right]
\]

Equation III-11
### III.3 Induced Voltage

The induced voltage is found by the change in flux i.e. is derived from Faraday’s law;

**Faraday’s law;** The induced e.m.f. in a coil equals the negative of the time rate of change of magnetic flux through the coil.

From Faraday’s law, the equation of the voltage induced in \( N_s \)-turns coil is:

\[
e(t) = N_s \frac{d\Phi}{dt}
\]

Equation III-12

Assuming a sinusoidal waveform, the root-mean-square (rms) value of the induced voltage is:

\[
E_{\text{rms}} = \frac{E}{\sqrt{2}}
\]

Equation III-13

\[
E_{\text{rms}} = \frac{N_s \omega_e \hat{\Phi}_{PM}}{\sqrt{2}}
\]

Equation III-14

Where:

- \( N_s \): The number of turns per phase
- \( \omega_e \): The electrical angular frequency; \( \omega_e = \omega_m \cdot p \) with \( \omega_m = \frac{2\pi \cdot N}{60} \)

\[
\omega_m = \frac{2\pi \cdot N}{60}
\]

Equation III-15

- \( \hat{\Phi}_{PM} \): The flux produced by the magnets

#### III.3.1 Winding Factor

The winding factor is defined as the ratio of the resulting emf \( E_{cp} \) per current path (or phase) divided by the product of number of coils \( N_{cp} \) to their emfs \( E_c \). (8)

\[
k_w = \frac{E_{cp}}{N_{cp} E_c}
\]

Equation III-16

Given that a concentrated winding is implemented in the studied generators, a winding factor is introduced in the calculation of the induced voltage. The winding factor \( k_w \) consists of pitch factor (also called chording factor or coil-span factor): \( k_p \), and distribution factor: \( k_d \).

In case of skewing (to improve performances), in some machine the skew factor: \( k_s \) is also a constituent of the winding factor. This is not applied to the generators designed for this project.
In (14) and (15), a theoretical method is presented for calculation of winding factor, which yield to winding factors tables, that give the winding factors values for different combinations of number of poles and slots.

### III.4 Losses

The losses in electrical machines can be classified according to different bases; location, origin.

- Based on the location of the loss, there are:
  - **Winding losses**, since the studied generator here is a permanent magnet generator; this loss is only present in the stator.
  - **Core losses**: are found in both the stator core and the back iron of the rotor.
  - **Friction and windage losses**: these losses are due to bearings and air friction.

- Based on the origin,
  - **Electromagnetic loss**: these are winding and core losses
  - Fundamental losses:
    - Fundamental winding losses (stator)
    - Fundamental core losses (stator & rotor)
  - Space Harmonics losses:
    - Space harmonic core loss (stator & rotor)

These losses are related to, mmf space harmonics, air-gap permeance harmonics due to slotting, leakage and main path saturation.

In the coming sections we will derive the equations used in the program for calculation of the studied losses, which are Iron losses, including hysteresis and eddy currents losses in both the teeth and yoke, copper losses and back iron losses.

#### III.4.1 Iron Losses

The iron losses in the generator are caused by two phenomena; Eddy-currents and hysteresis that occur in the stator core. Both losses are proportional to the flux density and the rotational frequency.

\[
P_{\text{iron}} = p_e + p_h
\]

Equation III-17

- **Eddy-current losses** are given by the following equation:

\[
p_e = k_e \cdot \bar{B}^2 \cdot \omega_s^2
\]

Equation III-18

With: \( k_e \)  The eddy-current loss constant (From manufacturer’s data)
- **Hysteresis losses** are given by:

\[ p_h = k_h \cdot \hat{B}^\beta \cdot \omega_s \]

Equation III-19

With:  
- \( k_h \) The Hysteresis loss constant (From manufacturer’s data)  
- \( \beta \) The Steinmetz constant (1.5 < \( \beta \) < 2.3)

For the calculation of the iron loss, the core has been split into two parts (yoke & teeth):

\[ p_{\text{iron}} = p_y + p_t \]

Equation III-20

- **\( p_y \)** The iron loss in the stator yoke;

The nominal value of the iron loss in the stator yoke is given by the following equation;

\[ p_{y,\text{nom}} = M_{Fe} \cdot \hat{B}_y^2 (k_e \omega_e^2 + k_h \omega_e) \]

Equation III-21

Where: \( M_{Fe} \) the iron mass of the yoke, calculated as follows;

\[ M_{Fe} = \rho_{Fe} \cdot V_{Fe} \]

Equation III-22

With:  
- \( \rho_{Fe} \) the iron mass density  
- \( V_{Fe} \) the yoke volume, given by;

\[ V_{Fe} = l_s \cdot \pi \cdot \left( \left( r_z - h_z \right)^2 - \left( r_s - h_s - h_{sy} \right)^2 \right) \]

Equation III-23

And \( \hat{B}_y \) the maximum flux density in the stator yoke, given by:

\[ \hat{B}_y = \frac{B_{gl \cdot 2\pi\rho}}{2\pi \cdot h_{sy}} \]

Equation III-24

- **\( p_t \)** The iron loss in the stator teeth;

\[ p_{t,\text{nom}} = M_{Fe} \cdot \hat{B}_t^2 (k_e \omega_e^2 + k_h \omega_e) \]

Equation III-25

Where: \( M_{Fe} \) the iron mass of the teeth, calculated as follows;

\[ M_{Fe} = \rho_{Fe} \cdot V_{Fe} \]

Equation III-26

With:  
- \( V_{Fe} \) the teeth volume, given by;
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Equation III-27

\[ V_{fest} = N_t \cdot l_s \cdot \left( h_s \cdot b_t + h_{so} (b_{lt} - b_t) \right) \]

And \( \dot{B}_t \) the maximum flux density in the stator tooth. Since we have a concentrated winding, the flux through one tooth is given by:

Equation III-28

\[ \dot{B}_t = \frac{\Phi_{EM}}{l_s \cdot b_t} \]

Finally the stator core loss is:

Equation III-29

\[ p_{iron} = 1.6 (p_y + p_t) \]

As it can be remarked, a correcting factor (1.6) has been introduced to take into account the material deterioration due to punching.

III.4.2 CUPPER LOSSES

For the calculation of the copper losses, the stator resistance is calculated first, using the following basic equations:

Equation III-30

\[ R_s = \frac{\rho_{Cu} l_{Cu}}{\pi \cdot \tau_s \cdot A_{Cu}} \]

With:
- \( \rho_{Cu} \) The copper resistivity \( (= 2.4 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \cdot m) \) (for temperatures 100-120 °C)
- \( l_{Cu} \) The length of the phase conductor, given by:

Equation III-31

\[ l_{Cu} = 2 N_s \left( l_s + \frac{\pi \cdot \tau_s}{2} \right) \]

Where \( N_s \) Number of turns per phase; \( N_s = \left( \frac{N_c}{3} \right) \cdot N_c \)
- \( N_t \) Number of teeth
- \( N_c \) Number of turns per tooth
- \( \tau_s \) The slot pitch, given by:

Equation III-32

\[ \tau_s = \frac{2 \pi \cdot r_s}{N_t} \]

\( A_{Cu} \) The conductor cross section, calculated as follows:
Equation III-33

\[ A_{Cu} = \frac{K_{fill} A_{slot}}{2N_c} \]

With:  
- \( K_{fill} \) The fill factor
- \( A_{slot} \) The slot area, given for semi-closed-slots and open-slots by Equation III-34 and Equation III-35 respectively:

\[ A_{slot,scs} = \frac{(b_{st}+b_s)(h_s-h_{so})}{2} \]

Equation III-34

\[ A_{slot,os} = \frac{(b_{st}+b_s)h_s}{2} \]

Equation III-35

The bellow figure shows the different dimensions used in the foregoing equations.

![Diagram of slots and teeth dimensions](image)

**Figure III-2** Slots and teeth dimensions

In the 3kW NdFeB generators, parallel winding has been used (Appendix_5), as consequence of that the resistance is one third of the stator resistance calculated according to Equation III-30.

For parallel winding the stator resistance is then:

\[ R_s = \frac{\rho_{cu} l_{Cu}}{3 A_{Cu}} \]

Equation III-36

After calculation of the stator resistance, the copper loss is given by the following equation:

\[ p_{Cu} = I_s^2 \cdot R_s \]

Equation III-37
Where \( I_s \) can be calculated from the induced emf as follows;

\[
I_s = \frac{p}{3E_{\text{rms}}\cos \varphi}
\]

Equation III-38

With:  
\( P \) The generator power  
\( \cos \varphi \) The generator power factor

### III.4.3 Back Iron Losses

The rotor eddy-current loss in conventional permanent magnet machines is usually considered to be negligible, since high order time harmonics in the stator currents and space harmonics in the winding distribution are generally small. However the stator magnetomotive force (mmf) distribution contains a richer set of space harmonics. Consequently the rotational speeds of both lower and higher order space harmonic mmfs, which differ from that of the rotor magnets, may induce significant eddy-current loss in the magnets, and results in excessive heating. Furthermore, slotting causes a variation of the magnetic field in the magnets, this component of rotor-eddy current loss is dependent of the slot opening and the pole/ slot number combination. (16)

In (12) a detailed study of eddy-current losses in the solid back-iron of PM machine has been done for different concentrated fractional pitch windings. It shows that these losses are considerable in fractional-pitch windings machines and depend strongly on the combination of number of teeth and number of poles. This study reveals that the eddy-current losses in machines with distributes full-pitch windings are negligible. In machines with fractional-pitch windings, these losses are significant and excessive for machines with a number of coils half the number of teeth.

Many papers present models of the eddy-current losses in the solid back-iron and the permanent magnets of the rotor, that are compared with experimental results and/ or finite elements methods (17; 18)

In the present work these losses are not considered. Nevertheless these can be included in future work to have a more accurate modelling of the generators.

### III.5 Conclusion

After derivation of the machine models (induced emf and different losses), we are going to implement the derived equations in Matlab® in order to simulate the performances of the different designed machines. The results of the simulations are presented in the next chapter, where it will be compared with the experimental results of the different tested generators.
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IV. VALIDATION

IV.1 INTRODUCTION

To validate the models that have been derived in the prior chapter, the equations have been implemented in Matlab® programme, where they have been simulated (the Model program is presented in Appendix_2). The simulation results are then compared with the experiments results, from which conclusions are drawn.

This chapter is introduced by an overview of the tested generators, and then a summarising comparison of the simulated performances of the different generators is given. After that the different performed tests are shown. Finally the experiments results are presented and discussed.

IV.2 TESTED GENERATORS

For the validation of the derived models, different prototypes have been tested.

Table IV-1 gives an overview of the studied generators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Magnets</th>
<th>Number of poles</th>
<th>Number of slots/teeth</th>
<th>Slots/poles combination</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- G3k0</td>
<td>3kW</td>
<td>Ferrite</td>
<td>16p</td>
<td>24t</td>
<td>(3/2)</td>
<td>Reference machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- G3k_3-2</td>
<td>3kW</td>
<td>NdFeB</td>
<td>18p</td>
<td>27t</td>
<td>(3/2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- G3k_9-8</td>
<td>3kW</td>
<td>NdFeB</td>
<td>24p</td>
<td>27t</td>
<td>(9/8)</td>
<td>wrong magnets size (wider magnets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- G3k_9-8c</td>
<td>3kW</td>
<td>NdFeB</td>
<td>24p</td>
<td>27t</td>
<td>(9/8)</td>
<td>corrected magnets size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- G9k_scs</td>
<td>9kW</td>
<td>NdFeB</td>
<td>18p</td>
<td>27t</td>
<td>(3/2)</td>
<td>Semi-Closed slots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- G9k_os</td>
<td>9kW</td>
<td>NdFeB</td>
<td>18p</td>
<td>27t</td>
<td>(3/2)</td>
<td>Open slots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV-1 gives an idea about the major differences between the tested generators. It has to be mentioned that the 1st generator (G3k0) is an off-the-shelf generator for which the stator winding has been adapted to our application. The structure of this generator has been the base of the other NdFeB generators (Generator 2~6) that have been designed and developed at TU Delft by the EPP group.

The 2nd generator to be tested is a 3kW generator with NdFeB magnets and (3/2) combination of number of poles and teeth (i.e. 18 poles, 27 teeth).
The 3rd generator to be tested is similar to the second one (it is a 3kW NdFeB magnets), the difference consists on the combination of number of poles and teeth. It is a (9/8) combination with 27 teeth and 24 poles this time (instead of 18 poles).

The first prototype of this configuration was manufactured with a mistaken rotor, in which the permanent magnets of the 3/2 combination have been used. As this generator (9/8) contains 6 additional poles, it implies that the spacing between the poles is small, which may affect the generator performances. Nevertheless we kept this rotor before adjustment, to conduct the experiments on it, with the intention of observing the effect of this construction anomaly on the results.

That means we have two 3kW generators with the 9/8 combination to be tested; one with wrong magnets size, and the other where the permanent magnets are with the right width. We differentiate them by "_c" (for corrected) extension on the generator code.

It has to be mentioned that by using a wrong permanent magnets size (wider magnets), we expected that, the fact that the spacing between the magnets is small would result in higher saturation, hence a lower performance of the generator. In order to validate our suspicion, we have run the experiments on the machine with the wrong PM, before sending it back for adjustment.

**IV.3 SIMULATION**

**IV.3.1 SIMULATION RESULTS OF THE STUDIED GENERATORS**

*Table IV-2 summarize the simulated performances of different tested generators at rated speed (3150 rpm)*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G3k0</th>
<th>G3k_3-2</th>
<th>G3k_9-8</th>
<th>G3k_9-8c</th>
<th>G9k_os</th>
<th>G9k_scs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$V_{\text{nl}}$ [V]</td>
<td>178.23</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>135.98</td>
<td>123.53</td>
<td>120.45</td>
<td>127.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{\text{Cu}}$ [W]</td>
<td>266.59</td>
<td>90.31</td>
<td>50.73</td>
<td>61.67</td>
<td>385.86</td>
<td>347.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{\text{Fe}}$ [W]</td>
<td>53.38</td>
<td>67.79</td>
<td>94.19</td>
<td>77.72</td>
<td>238.44</td>
<td>483.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{\text{tot}}$ [W]</td>
<td>319.97</td>
<td>158.10</td>
<td>144.92</td>
<td>139.39</td>
<td>624.30</td>
<td>831.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta$ [%]</td>
<td>91.44</td>
<td>93.16</td>
<td>94.42</td>
<td>92.22</td>
<td>94.58</td>
<td>94.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table IV-2 Simulated performances of the different studied generators*

The simulation results show that the efficiency of the NdFeB PM generators is higher than that of the Ferrite magnets machine. That is a consequence of the lower losses present at the NdFeB machines.
**IV.3.1.1 3kW Generators**

*No-load voltage*

![Graph showing simulated no-load voltage versus speed for different 3kW generators](image)

The simulation graphs show that the ferrite magnet machine produces more voltage than the NdFeB machines.

The NdFeB machine with 3-2 combination of number of slots and poles seems to be producing the lowest voltage.

By comparing the two 9-8 machines, it is obvious that the one with mistaken rotor generates more voltage, which is logical due to the wider magnets.
Iron losses

![Simulated iron losses versus speed for the 3kW generators](image)

From the graphs we can see that the ferrite magnet machine is predicted to provide lower iron losses in comparison with the NdFeB machines.

Within the NdFeB machines, the Generator with the 3-2 combination presents the lowest iron losses.

As expected the 9-8 generator before correction, thus with wider magnets would have higher iron losses.
From simulation we notice that the ferrite magnet machine has lower efficiency in comparison with the NdFeB machines.

Contrary to what was expected, from the calculated efficiency, we perceive that the erroneous 9-8 generator presents higher efficiency than after correction, which is the result of the high produced voltage.

Based on simulation results, we can conclude that NdFeB generators perform better than the ferrite magnet machine, given that they present higher efficiency.

Among the NdFeB generators, the 9-8 combination is expected to be the best option.
IV.3.1.2 9kW Generators

For the 9kW generator version, two designs have been realized; one with Semi-Closed Slots (scs) stator, and the second with Open Slots (os). The aim behind the execution of both designs is to get a better understanding of the effect of the slots type on the performances of the machine. It has to be considered that the same rotor is used for both machines, the difference consist only on the stator. Thus we have one rotor, with 18 poles made of NdFeB permanent magnets, that is used for both stators.

✧ No-load voltage

![Simulated No Load induced emf (G9kW)](image)

Figure IV-4 Simulated No-load voltage versus speed for the different 9kW generators

From simulations we expect to have more voltage with the semi-closed slots generator than with open slots.

✧ Iron losses

![Simulated Iron losses (G9kW)](image)

Figure IV-5 Simulated iron losses versus speed for the 9kW generators

Simulation results show higher iron losses in case of semi-closed slots generator in comparison with open slots.
Figure IV-6  Simulated efficiency versus speed for 9kW generators

We predict a slightly higher efficiency with the open-slots generator in contrast with the semi-closed slots.

After giving an overview of the simulation results, at this stage it is important to remember that the models on which the simulations are based, are simplified and many parameters are neglected; particularly the back iron losses as well as the eddy current losses in the magnets, which might have a huge affect on the machines performers, especially in the case of NdFeB magnets, as it will be noticed in the coming sections.

In order to validate these results, a number of experiments should be carried out on the provided prototypes. The experiments and their results are presented in the coming sections.
IV.4 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, first of all an overview of the performed tests is given, it is then followed by the experimental results.

IV.4.1 TESTS TO BE PERFORMED

IV.4.1.1 No-load test without stator

The purpose of this test is to measure the mechanical losses of the generator, i.e. the losses due to friction and windage.

In this test the speed and torque are measured, from which the mechanical losses are calculated as follow:

\[ P_{\text{mech,loss}} = T \cdot \omega_m \]  

Equation IV-1

![Figure IV-7 Schematic of the no-load test without stator](image)

IV.4.1.2 No-load test with stator

This experiment is performed to determine the No-load voltage by measuring the line to line voltage across two phases \( E_{LL} \); the phase voltage is calculated by the formula:

\[ E_{ph} = \frac{E_{LL}}{\sqrt{3}} \]  

Equation IV-2

The second purpose of this test is to measure the No-load losses \( P_{N.L,\text{loss}} \):

\[ P_{N.L,\text{loss}} = T \cdot \omega_m \]  

Equation IV-3
The iron losses are determined by subtracting the mechanical losses, measured in the previous test (No-load test without stator), from the No-load losses.

\[ P_{\text{iron.loss}} = P_{\text{N.L.loss}} - P_{\text{mech.loss}} \]

Equation IV-4

**IV.4.1.3 Load test**

The purpose of this experiment is to measure the efficiency of the generator by using the formula:

\[ \eta = \frac{P_{\text{out}}}{P_{\text{in}}} \times 100 \]

Equation IV-5

Where the output power \( P_{\text{out}} \) and the input power \( P_{\text{in}} \) are calculated as follows;

\[ P_{\text{out}} = \sqrt{3} \cdot I_{\text{rms}} \cdot V_{\text{rms(LL)}} \]

Equation IV-6

\[ P_{\text{in}} = T \cdot \omega_{m} \]

Equation IV-7
IV.4.1.4 **Short-circuit test**

This experiment is performed to measure the generator inductance based on the formula:

\[
I_{sc} = \frac{E}{\sqrt{R_a^2 + (\omega_L L)^2}}
\]

**Equation IV-8**

![Schematic of the short-circuit test](image)

From the foregoing sections, it is noticeable that there are lots of experiments and measurements to be carried out; therefore we opted for measurement automation. For the measurement automation we used a GPIB (General Purpose Interface Board), using Matlab® programming (*Appendix_4*).

**IV.4.2 EXPERIMENTS PROBLEMS**

It has to be mentioned that during the testing phase, we faced many problems and challenges. Starting with the mechanical problems of the experimental setup; for instance (stators with different dimensions thus we had to make a new adaptor piece for fixing the stator on the mounting plate). Passing through the coupling of the generator with the DC Motor (the driving machine): in order to have a more stable set up we attempted to put a flexible coupling but it turned out to be inappropriate to our experiment bench. And the most struggling trouble was the torque sensor which was giving inconsistent measurements, therefore it had been sent to the manufacturer for recalibration, yet the readings were not always reliable.
As it can be seen in Figure IV-11, in the initial setup the torque sensor was coupled directly to the PM generator through ball bearings. After the malfunctioning of the torque sensor, we suspected that the magnets are having an erroneous influence on the sensor so we decided to rebuild the setup as shown in the schematic of Figure IV-12, where a stiff shaft has been introduced between the PM generator and the torque sensor and the coupling with the DC machine (prime mover) has been replaced to adapt to the new situation.
Due to malfunctioning of the torque sensor, we adopted an alternative method to calculate the torque, based on the measurement of the DC machine current.

As there is a linear relation between the DC machine current and torque (Equation IV-9)

\[ T = K_T \cdot I_{DC} \]

Equation IV-9

Where \( K_T \)  The DC machine constant

\( K_T \) has been determined by measuring the voltage and the speed of the DC motor according to Equation IV-10

\[ E = K_T \cdot \omega \]

Equation IV-10

With:

\[ \omega = \frac{2\pi}{60} \cdot N \]

Equation IV-11

By measuring voltages for different speeds it appears that the Dc motor constant \( K_T \) is equal to 1.3 (average value); this value is adopted for the calculation of the torque for the following tests, except for the first tested generator (G3k0), for which we only applied the torque sensor measurements.

It should be taken into consideration that the motor constant value is not completely accurate, due to the fact that the motor constant depends on the machine construction parameter and the magnetic flux \( K_T = K \cdot \Phi \). As the flux is not absolutely constant, because of the presence of hysteresis, this may explain the inaccuracy of the results obtained by calculating torque based on the DC current, in a number of experiments.

**IV.4.3 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS**

The following sections contain discussion of the experimental results by comparing them with the simulation results. First the 3kW generators results are presented with different combinations, followed by a comparison. And then the two 9kW generators are presented as well as a comparison between the open and the semi-closed slots. For each tested generator we present the graphs comparing simulation with experiments results for: no-load voltage, iron losses and efficiency. The experiments data are also given as tables in Appendix_3, for all performed tests.
IV.4.3.1  **3kW Generators**

IV.4.3.1.1  **G3k0  (3kW with Ferrite magnets)**

**No-load voltage**

![Graph: No Load induced emf (G3k0)](image)

Figure IV-13  Measured and simulated induced voltage versus speed for G3k0

The results of the measured voltage compared with the calculations, show that the calculated voltage coincides perfectly with the measurements, which validate the model.

For a maximum speed of 3400 rpm the generator delivers 192 V.

**Iron losses**

![Graph: Iron losses (G3k0)](image)

Figure IV-14  Measured and simulated iron losses versus speed for G3k0

Figure IV-14  shows the measured and predicted iron losses of the 3kW generator with ferrite magnets at different speeds. Although there is a slight difference between the measured and calculated values, the difference is not so much, which allows us to validate the model. In the figure we can also see the measured mechanical losses to give an idea of its link to iron losses.


**Efficiency**

![Figure IV-15](image)

It can be remarked that the measured efficiency is slightly lower than what was predicted from the simulation results, which shows that the model is accurate in this case.

**IV.4.3.1.2 G3k_3-2 (3kW with NdFeB magnets_3/2)**

**No-load voltage**

![Figure IV-16](image)

The figure above shows that the predicted no-load voltage for the 3kW NdFeB generator is higher than the actual measurements.

By analysing this results, and based on the induced voltage equation (Equation IV-12) that can be derived from Chapter III equations, we have:

\[
emf = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} N_s \cdot \omega_e \cdot \frac{l_m l_w}{B_{eff} B_{rm}} \cdot \frac{4}{\pi} \cdot \sin \left( \frac{\pi b_m}{2 \tau_p} \right) \cdot \frac{2}{\pi} \cdot \tau_p \cdot l_s \cdot k_w \cdot k_{fring}
\]

Equation IV-12

From the above equation we can have two hypotheses;
The first one is that the remanent flux density of the magnets is lower than expected; (i.e. $B_{rm} = 1 \, T$ instead of $1.2 \, T$).

Or the effective air gap formula (Equation III-9) that is based on simplifying assumptions, does not model precisely the actual value of the effective air gap (which is the most probable hypothesis).

By simulating the model by putting $B_{rm} = 1 \, T$, we remark that the simulation results match perfectly the measured values (Figure IV-16)

The fact that the no-load voltage is actually 20% lower than expected can also be due to the eddy current losses in the magnets.

Iron losses

As it has been made known in section IV.4.2, this is one of the experiments where the results, which are obtained by using the torque, calculated from the DC current measurement, are totally inaccurate. That is why they have been omitted from the graph.

According to the torque sensor measurements, the actual iron losses are higher than what was predicted particularly for high speeds.

In our model we only considered iron losses, whilst the eddy current losses in the magnets are not taken into account. Nevertheless the actual measurements consist of eddy current losses in the magnets as well as iron losses. In comparison with the ferrite magnet machine we note that the eddy current losses in the NdFeB magnets have more influence, which makes that the experimental results are not matching with the simulation expectations.
Figure IV-18  Measured and simulated efficiency versus speed for G3k_3-2

The actual efficiency based on the torque sensor measurements, is slightly lower than what was predicted from the simulation results. It is also remarkable that the measured efficiency based on the torque sensor readings is closer to the simulation results than the alternative measuring method which is based on DC current measurements, which leads us to ignore the efficiency results.

IV.4.3.1.3 G3k_9-8  (3kW with NdFeB_9/8 “wrong magnets size”)  
This section contains the experiment results of the machine with the “wrong” rotor. And the next one shows the experiments results, after replacement of the wrong size magnets by the ones according the designed machine.

Figure IV-19  Measured and simulated induced voltage versus speed for G3k_9-8

Similarly to the previous generator (G3k_3-2), by simulating with taking $B_{rm} = 1T$ instead of $1.2T$, we get comparable results for both measured and predicted voltage. However it can also be that the applied assumptions for the modelling have a bigger effect, which results in a rougher estimation than expected. Same applies for the modelling of the Carter factor.
Iron losses

![Iron losses graph](image)

From the no-load test results, we can notice that the predicted iron losses are lower than what has been measured by using both measuring methods (torque sensor and calculated torque, based on DC current measurement).

Efficiency

![Efficiency graph](image)

Likewise the previous generator the measured efficiency is slightly lower than the calculated one. In this case also we have got a better correlation between simulation and the measurements obtained by using the Torque sensor readings instead of the DC current measurements.
Chapter IV  Validation

IV.4.3.1.4  G3k_9-8c  (3kW with NdFeB_9/8 "corrected magnets size")

As pointed out in the preceding section, the present results are obtained after replacement of the PM on the Generator. (PM width is 15mm instead of 20 mm)

✧ No-load voltage

![Figure IV-22](image.png)

Figure IV-22  Measured and simulated induced voltage versus speed for G3k_9-8c

The induced voltage measurements show that by considering $B_{rm} = 1T$, the simulated voltage is closer to the actual voltage in comparison with $B_{rm} = 1.2T$. Nevertheless contrary to the previous generator, the simulated values do not fit perfectly with the measured ones. As we said previously this could be an indication that the inaccuracy may be caused by the model and is not due to the magnets’ remanent flux density.

✧ Iron losses

![Figure IV-23](image.png)

Figure IV-23  Measured and simulated iron losses versus speed for G3k_9-8c
Despite the previous experiments, in this case, it seems that the readings given by the torque sensor are more correlating. The measured losses are very close to the simulated values. The measurements based on the calculated DC current show higher iron losses.

**Efficiency**

Contrary to the preceding generators, the efficiency based on the Torque sensor measurements is very low, that is why the torque sensor measurements are not considered in this case. Therefore we omit the efficiency graph, yet it can be found in Appendix_3.

**IV.4.3.2 9kW Generators**

**IV.4.3.2.1 G9k_scs (9kW with NdFeB “Semi-Closed Slots”)**

**No-load voltage**

![Graph of No Load induced emf (G9k_scs)](image)

*Figure IV-24  Measured and simulated induced voltage versus speed for G9k_scs*

Similar to the 3kW generators (with NdFeB PM), the results shows that induced emf, calculated based on a remanent flux density value of 1T, coincides perfectly with the measured emf. But as it will be shown in the next section (IV.4.3.2.2), this might not be a valid justification of the non correlated results.
Iron losses

![Iron losses (G9k_scs)](image)

The figure shows that the iron losses increase with speed. It is also remarkable that there is a slight difference between the measured and the predicted iron losses, especially the measurements based on the torque sensor readings, which seem to correlate almost perfectly with the simulation during this experiment.

As it can be seen, the experiments for the last three speed values were not executed, due to the fact that during testing the available prime move could not deliver the needed power at speeds higher than 2600rpm.

Efficiency

As it has been revealed earlier, the torque sensor readings were not completely trustworthy, due to its malfunctioning. The torque sensor gave very low values of efficiency especially for low speeds. But the alternative method measurements reveals lower efficiency than what was predicted, but once again this result is omitted and the graphs can be found in Appendix_3.
IV.4.3.2.2 G9k_os (9kW with NdFeB “Open Slots”)

This section is about the Open Slot 9kW generator. Despite the stator slots, everything else is the same as for the G9k_scs.

♦ No-load voltage

![Graph showing no-load induced emf (G9k_os)]

The no-load voltage results revealed some remarks related to the induced voltage models. Keeping in mind that the rotor is the same, (for both OS- and SCS-slots generators), thus the same PM. Our hypothesis that the remanent flux density was $B_{rm} = 1T$, is not validated in this case, which lets us suspect that it is the effective air-gap models that need to be reviewed.

♦ Iron losses

![Graph showing iron losses (G9k_os)]

The experiment results reveal much higher iron losses than those expected from the simulation results. This observation implies that the used model is far from being representative of iron losses in the open slots stator contrary to the semi-closed slots stator where it gave correlating results. This can be explained by the fact that the eddy current losses in the magnets, which are not considered in the simulating model, are much higher because of the open slots.
**Efficiency**

![Efficiency Graph](image)

*Figure IV-28  Measured and simulated efficiency versus speed for G9k_os*

Here once more the torque sensor readings for low speeds measurements were very low. But around nominal speed, these were more acceptable and closer to the expected results as well to the measurements based on DC current measurements. Again this can be explained by the malfunctioning of the torque sensor and the inaccuracy of the dc current measurement method.

**IV.4.3.3  Comparison of the different generators**

**IV.4.3.3.1  Comparison between 9/8 & 9/8_c**

**No-load voltage**

![No Load induced emf Graph](image)

*Figure IV-29  Measured induced voltage versus speed for G3k_9-8 & G3k_9-8c*

As it can be seen the measured No-Load voltage in the 3kW generator with 9-8 combination was higher before correcting the permanent magnets size. That is due to the fact that the permanent magnets were wider, so they produce more flux. From this perspective the mistaken machine was performing better than after magnets correction.
Iron losses

The figure above illustrates the iron losses results for the 3kW generator with 9-8 combination in both situations: before and after the correction of the permanent magnets size. The comparison between the two constructions is done for both measuring methods (Torque Sensor measurement and Calculated Torque based on the DC current measurement).

From the simulation results it is noticed that we expected lower iron losses after correction of the PM size. The experimental results based on the torque that was calculated from the DC current readings, shows almost no difference between the two generators for low speeds. For higher speeds we notice that iron losses are lower after correction of the magnets.

The measurements based on the Torque Sensor readings shows that the iron losses of the generator with correct permanent magnets size are noticeably lower (two times lower) than those of the rotor with wider magnets.
**Chapter IV: Validation**

**Efficiency**

From simulated results, it can be seen that with the corrected generator, we expect lower efficiency. This is an effect of the wider magnets; in consequence more voltage is produced.

The experimental results based on the torque measured from DC current readings, show similar results but with lower values. The reason can be that our model is based on simplifying assumptions. Moreover as we already mentioned in *Chapter II*, our model does not include the back iron losses as well as the eddy current losses in the magnets, which are significant.

As stated in section *IV.4.3.1.4*, the torque sensor measurements are not considered in this test due to the fact that they are considerably low. And the alternative method results are also far from being representative. (see graphs in *Appendix_3*)

*IV.4.3.2 Comparison between 3/2 & 9/8*

**No-load voltage**

It is obvious from *Figure IV-31* that the induced no-load voltage is almost the same for the 3kW NdFeB permanent magnet generator with both 3-2 and 9-8 poles/slots combinations.
Iron losses

Based on simulations we expected higher iron losses with the 9-8 combination than those produced in the generator with 3-2 combination. The experiments results revealed different results, but as the torque sensor measurements are not reliable, we didn’t consider these results.

Efficiency

The results show that the predicted efficiency is slightly higher for the 3-2 combination. We see this difference back in the experiments based on DC current measurements, but in this case the difference is higher than expected. Since the torque sensor readings, when running the experiment on the 9-8 generator, gave very low values, these results were discarded. (see graphs in Appendix 3)
**IV.4.3.3 Comparison between OS & SCS**

**No-load voltage**

The above figure shows that the no-load voltage produced by the open slots machine is slightly higher than what is supplied from the semi-closed slots generator. The reason is that the number of turns per tooth in the open slots stator is 10 turns whereas in the semiclosed slots stator is 9 turns per tooth *(Appendix_5)*.

**Iron losses**

By analysing the above figure, the relatively high iron losses in the open slots machine, compared with the semi-closed slots generator, may be explained by the fact that the eddy current losses on the Permanent magnets are higher, because of the reluctance variation due to the higher slotting factor in the open slots stator.

**Efficiency**

The generator's efficiency based on the calculated torque from DC current measurements of the generator with open slots stator is higher than that of the semi-closed slots stator, despite that we have more iron losses in the open slots generator. This result is again not valid.
IV.5 Conclusion

A survey of the simulations and experiments results of the different studied generators was presented in this chapter.

From the experimental results, we noted that the models are validated for the ferrite magnets machine, but are less representative in the case of NdFeB magnets.

For the no-load voltage we noticed that the experimental results in the NdFeB magnet machines were 20% lower than expected. Except for the open slots 9kW generator where the deviation was less than 20%. This result may be a motivation for further research over the influence of the magnets type on the no-load voltage.

For the losses, the models could not be completely validated (for the NdFeB machines), this is due to neglecting eddy current losses in the magnets which has a bigger effect on the non correlation of the experimental results with simulation expectations. As the ferrite magnets are non conductive the eddy current losses have less effect and therefore they could be neglected. Consequently the model should be improved by considering eddy current losses in the magnets, and the back iron.

Comparing the two 3kW generators with different number of poles and number of slots combinations, we noticed that the 3-2 combination shows higher iron losses in comparison with the 9-8 combination.

Against expectations, we realised that the original 9-8 generator, (with “wrong” magnets size) was performing better than after correction. The extra losses produced by the wider magnets were well compensated with the higher induced voltage.

By comparing both variants of the 9kW generator, we could conclude that open slots leads to a huge increase in the iron losses as expected, and this is a result of the eddy current losses increase in the magnets due to slotting. However the efficiency results show that these losses have been compensated. But efficiency results are far from being trustworthy. Therefore more investment has to be made to acquire a better and reliable setup.
In this MSc project based on simulation and experimental work, the objective was on one hand to determine the most suitable generator construction for our application, which is about generators that will be used on board of yachts, on the other hand to validate the models by applying experiments on different prototypes.

First of all we had to make a choice of generator topologies and construction that would meet the requirement of the customer, which is to obtain a generator that is as compact and efficient as possible. Based on literature research we found out that the most suitable design for our application is basically a permanent magnet machine with concentrated windings. In order to be able to come up with the best generator for the application, we considered different designs. The differences consist in; magnet materials, combinations of number of poles and slots, slots type (open- or semi-closed slots).

After making our choices, models have been derived representing; produced no-load voltage, iron and copper losses and efficiency of the constructed machines.

After derivation of the machine models (induced emf and different losses), the equations have been implemented in simulating program (Matlab®) to replicate the behaviour of the different machines.

Simulations show that that the ferrite magnet generator produce more voltage than the NdFeB ones, on the other hand it presents low efficiency compared to NdFeB generators.

Further the simulation results have been compared with the experimental results of the different tested generators.

As a consequence of the problems faced during the experimentation phase, the results were way far from our expectation. Nevertheless we could draw some conclusions.

First of all we concluded that the model is validated for the ferrite magnet machines, but because of neglecting assumption, these models do not give an accurate representation of the NdFeB magnets machines. This result is mostly for the reason that we did not consider the eddy current losses in the back iron and the magnets, which appears to be huge in the case of NdFeB machines.

For the 9kW generator variants, as has been expected, the use of open slots hugely increases the losses. However it appeared that it does not have that much influence on the efficiency, but the efficiency measurement are not considered because of unreliability of the setup.
The work on this topic is far from being finished, which makes it open for future studies and improvements regarding the models, by including the eddy current losses in the back iron and the magnets. Also the experimental setup has to be enhanced in order to get more accurate and trustful results.

Due to the generator’s complex construction, the models used in this work are based on different assumptions, simplifications and neglected parameters, which are for a first design acceptable but for a more accurate imitation of the generator behaviour, a finite element study may be a good option especially for the electromagnetical behaviour of the generator.

Another aspect of this project is the thermal study; Thermal analysis was first included in the work planning. Some experiments were performed using thermocouples placed on different locations in the PMSG, (on the windings and the stator tooth and yoke), and a thermal camera was used to record the thermal behaviour of the rotor, these experiments were not finished because of time limitation resulting in the several setup problems. But this study can be carried out in future work on the generators including possible cooling solutions.
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MATLAB® SCRIPT FOR ONE OF THE STUDIED GENERATORS

%%%% Generator : G3k2 %%%%%%%
3kW NdFeB 24 Poles 27 Teeth 9/8

clear

%% _________CONSTANTS___________________
mu_0=4e-7*pi;
% magnetic permeability in vacuum [T.m/A]
mu_rm=1.05;
% recoil permeability of magnets
mu_rFe=200;
% relative permeability of Iron Fe
rho_mCu=8900;
% Mass density of Copper Cu [kg/m^3] (8960)
rho_mFe=7700;
% = = = Iron Fe
rho_mm=7500;
% = = = Magnets
rho_Cu=1.72e-8;
% resistivity of Cu [Ohm.m] (1.72e-8 @20°C)
P_Fe0h=.65;
% hysteresis loss coefficient
P_Fe0e=.65;
% eddy_current loss coefficient

% Factors
k_sfil=0.25;
% fill factor
k_fring=1.11;
% fringing factor
k_w=sin(2/3*pi);
% winding factor
k_w=.945;
%(9/8)

%% Machine Geometry____________
N_p=24;
% Number of poles
N_t=27;
% Number of teeth
N_c=55;
% Number of coils

r_s=.155/2;
% Stator radius [m]
l_s=35e-3;
% Stator Axial length
h_sy=11e-3;
% Stator Yoke length
h_s=17.5e-3;
% Slot/tooth height
h_so=2e-3;
% Dovetail height (=10% of the slot height)
b_t=7e-3;
% Tooth width
b_tt=12e-3;
% Dovetail width (=+ 2x60% of the tooth width)
l_g=2e-3;
% mechanical air-gap

%------------Magnets-------------
I_m=1.6e-3;
% Magnet length
b_m=20e-3;
% Magnet width (wrong)
b_m=15e-3;
% Magnet width (correct)
B_rm=1.2;
% Remanent flux density [T]

%---------------------------

p=N_p/2;
% pole pairs
h_so=tau_s-b_t;
% slot opening width
b_si=2*pi*(r_s-h_s)/N_t-b_t;
% slot inner width
A_slot=(b_si+b_s)*(h_s-h_so)/2;
% Slot Area

b_p_tau_p=b_m/tau_p;
% pole width by pole pitch ratio

b_p_tau_p=8;
%% Machine Parameters

P=3000;  % Desired output power [W]
cofi=.9;  % Power factor
rpm=3156;  % Rotational speed [rpm]

om_m=rpm/60*2*pi;  % Angular frequency [rad/s]
om_e=om_m*p;  % Electrical angular frequency [rad/s]

H_c=B_rm/mu_0/mu_rm;  % Coercive Force [A/m]

%% Determination of N_s

% R_s=0.43;  % Phase resistance
D_Cus=.70e-3;  % Conductor diameter
A_Cus=pi*(D_Cus/2)^2;  % Conductor cross section
R_s=rho_Cu*l_Cus/(3*A_Cus);  % Phase resistance

%% air-gap Flux Density
B_g=l_m/g_eff/mu_rm*B_rm;

%% Flux Calculation

PHI_pmmax=B_g1*2*pi*tau_p*l_s*k_w*k_fring;
PhI_pmmax=B_g1*b_m*l_s*k_w*k_fring;

%% Inductance

L_s=3/2*N_c^2*(N_t/3)*(6*R_mg+2*R_msigma)/(3*R_mg*R_msigma);  % Inductance
X_l=om_e*L_s;  % Phase reactance

% Inductive ideal=3/2*pi/tau_p*N_s*PHI_pmmax;
%% ________________LOSSES CALCULATION________________
%----Copper losses----
P_Cus=3*I_s^2*R_s;    \( \% \) COPPER LOSSES

V_Cus=3*l_Cus*A_Cus; \% Cu volume
M_Cus=V_Cus*8900; \% Cu Mass

J=I_s/3*A_Cus; \% Current density

P_gen=3*emf*I_s*cofi;

%------Iron losses----
B_tmax=PHI_pmmax/l_s/b_t; \%tooth flux density

V_Fest=N_t*(h_s*b_t+h_so*(b_tt-b_t))*l_s; \%Teeth Volume
M_Fest=V_Fest*rho_mFe; \%Teeth Mass

P_Festnom=1.6*M_Fest*(B_tmax/1.7)^2*(P_Fe0h*om_e/(2*pi*50)+P_Fe0e*(om_e/(2*pi*50))^2);

B_ymax=B_g1*tau_p*2/pi/2/(h_sy); \%Yoke flux density

V_Fesy=l_s*pi*((r_s-h_s)^2-(r_s-h_s-h_sy)^2); \%Yoke Volume
M_Fesy=V_Fesy*rho_mFe; \%Yoke Mass

P_Fesynom=1.6*M_Fesy*(B_ymax/1.7)^2*(P_Fe0h*om_e/(2*pi*50)+P_Fe0e*(om_e/(2*pi*50))^2);

P_Fes=P_Festnom+P_Fesynom; \%IRON LOSSES

V_Fes=V_Fest+V_Fesy;
M_Fes=M_Fest+M_Fesy;

%% Total Losses
P_loss=P_Cus+P_Fes;
Eff=(P_gen-P_loss)/P_gen*100;

%%

V_pm=l_m*.05*N_p*b_m;
N_pm=V_pm*7700;

%% ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~Thermal~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
%___ Constants ___
rho_ThCu=0.385; \% Specific heat capacity of Copper Cu [j/g/K]
rho_ThFe=0.450; \% Specific heat capacity of Iron Fe   [j/g/K]
rho_ThvCu=3.45; \% Volumetric heat capacity of Copper Cu [j/cm^3/K]
rho_ThvFe=3.537; \% Volumetric heat capacity of Iron Fe   [j/cm^3/K]

-----------------------

C_thFes1=M_Fes*1e3*rho_ThFe;
C_ThCus1=M_Cus*1e3*rho_ThCu;

C_Ths1=C_thFes1+C_ThCus1; \%Thermal capacitance of stator [j/K] (M)

C_thFes=V_Fes*1e6*rho_ThFe;
C_ThCus=V_Cus*1e6*rho_ThCu;

C_Ths=C_thFes+C_ThCus; \%Thermal capacitance of stator [j/K] (V)

%%
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Experiments Results

Efficiency graphs (non validated)

✦ G3k_9-8c

Measured and simulated efficiency versus speed for G3k_9-8c

✦ G9k_scs

Measured and simulated efficiency versus speed for G9k_scs
Experiments Results

**G3k_9-8 vs. G3k_9-8c**

![Graph showing efficiency versus speed for G3k_9-8 and G3k_9-8c]

**G3k_3-2 vs. G3k_9-8**

![Graph showing efficiency versus speed for G3k_3-2 and G3k_9-8c]
Experiments Results

**G9k_os vs. G9k_scs**

Measured efficiency versus speed for G9k_os & G9k_scs
### G3K 3-2 (NoLoad Test with Stator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed (rpm)</th>
<th>Torque (Nm)</th>
<th>Voltage (V)</th>
<th>Dc_Current (A)</th>
<th>Dc_Torque (Nm)</th>
<th>T=1.5 kic (W)</th>
<th>Chm_m (W)</th>
<th>P_NL (W)</th>
<th>P_NL(Total) (W)</th>
<th>P_Fe (W)</th>
<th>P_Fe(Total) (W)</th>
<th>Simulated (W)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>1.500E-05</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>1.500E-05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>3.000E-05</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>3.000E-05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>4.500E-05</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>4.500E-05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3600</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>6.000E-05</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>6.000E-05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### G3K 3-2 (Load Test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed (rpm)</th>
<th>Torque (Nm)</th>
<th>Voltage (V)</th>
<th>Current (A)</th>
<th>Power (W)</th>
<th>Incidence (W)</th>
<th>Resistance (W)</th>
<th>P_dC (W)</th>
<th>P_out (W)</th>
<th>Efficiency (%)</th>
<th>Total (W)</th>
<th>Total (W)</th>
<th>Simulated (W)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.844</td>
<td>12.750</td>
<td>1.450</td>
<td>15.470</td>
<td>15.470</td>
<td>15.470</td>
<td>15.470</td>
<td>15.470</td>
<td>15.470</td>
<td>15.470</td>
<td>15.470</td>
<td>15.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>3.684</td>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>50.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000</td>
<td>6.281</td>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>70.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Experiments Results

- **Appendix 3**
## Appendix 3: Experiments Results

### G3K 9-8 (NoLoad Test with Stator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed [rpm]</th>
<th>Torque [Nm]</th>
<th>Voltage [V]</th>
<th>Dc Current [A]</th>
<th>Dc Torque [Nm]</th>
<th>T11, X1, Toc</th>
<th>Dc_m</th>
<th>P_{NL} (V)</th>
<th>P_{NL} (Total)</th>
<th>P_{m} (W)</th>
<th>P_{m} (Total)</th>
<th>P_{p_1} (V)</th>
<th>P_{p_1} (W)</th>
<th>P_{p_2} (V)</th>
<th>Measured Voltage ph</th>
<th>Simulated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>19.800</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>6.273 E+01</td>
<td>28.265</td>
<td>5.41E+03</td>
<td>28.265</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>23.929</td>
<td>6.072</td>
<td>4.237</td>
<td>11.276</td>
<td>11.076</td>
<td>12.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>28.100</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>9.137 E+01</td>
<td>32.835</td>
<td>8.27E+03</td>
<td>32.835</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>22.602</td>
<td>6.072</td>
<td>4.237</td>
<td>11.276</td>
<td>11.076</td>
<td>12.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>30.900</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>9.087 E+01</td>
<td>49.277</td>
<td>11.73E+03</td>
<td>11.73E+03</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>17.322</td>
<td>7.149</td>
<td>4.995</td>
<td>11.276</td>
<td>11.076</td>
<td>12.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>35.600</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>1.013 E+02</td>
<td>54.503</td>
<td>17.16E+03</td>
<td>17.16E+03</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>26.822</td>
<td>8.453</td>
<td>6.365</td>
<td>11.276</td>
<td>11.076</td>
<td>12.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>49.900</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>1.098 E+02</td>
<td>59.508</td>
<td>21.68E+03</td>
<td>21.68E+03</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>31.271</td>
<td>11.276</td>
<td>8.474</td>
<td>11.276</td>
<td>11.076</td>
<td>12.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>116.100</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>1.184 E+02</td>
<td>65.609</td>
<td>26.82E+03</td>
<td>26.82E+03</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>26.822</td>
<td>11.276</td>
<td>8.474</td>
<td>11.276</td>
<td>11.076</td>
<td>12.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>152.900</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>1.270 E+02</td>
<td>71.810</td>
<td>32.04E+03</td>
<td>32.04E+03</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>32.042</td>
<td>11.276</td>
<td>8.474</td>
<td>11.276</td>
<td>11.076</td>
<td>12.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>173.700</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>1.352 E+02</td>
<td>78.011</td>
<td>37.26E+03</td>
<td>37.26E+03</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>37.262</td>
<td>11.276</td>
<td>8.474</td>
<td>11.276</td>
<td>11.076</td>
<td>12.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>200.200</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>1.432 E+02</td>
<td>84.211</td>
<td>42.48E+03</td>
<td>42.48E+03</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>42.482</td>
<td>11.276</td>
<td>8.474</td>
<td>11.276</td>
<td>11.076</td>
<td>12.252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### G3K 9-8 (Load Test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed [rpm]</th>
<th>Torque [Nm]</th>
<th>Voltage [V]</th>
<th>Current [A]</th>
<th>Power Efficiency [W]</th>
<th>Dc Current [A]</th>
<th>Dc Torque [Nm]</th>
<th>T11, X1, Toc</th>
<th>Dc_m</th>
<th>P_{NL} (V)</th>
<th>P_{NL} (Total)</th>
<th>P_{m} (W)</th>
<th>P_{m} (Total)</th>
<th>P_{p_1} (V)</th>
<th>P_{p_1} (W)</th>
<th>P_{p_2} (V)</th>
<th>Measured Voltage ph</th>
<th>Simulated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>3.412</td>
<td>44.400</td>
<td>2.190</td>
<td>33.700</td>
<td>30.090</td>
<td>29.300</td>
<td>47.150</td>
<td>18.20E+03</td>
<td>18.20E+03</td>
<td>30.090</td>
<td>29.300</td>
<td>47.150</td>
<td>30.090</td>
<td>29.300</td>
<td>47.150</td>
<td>30.090</td>
<td>29.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>3.886</td>
<td>53.400</td>
<td>2.460</td>
<td>37.800</td>
<td>35.290</td>
<td>34.590</td>
<td>54.450</td>
<td>21.44E+03</td>
<td>21.44E+03</td>
<td>35.290</td>
<td>34.590</td>
<td>54.450</td>
<td>35.290</td>
<td>34.590</td>
<td>54.450</td>
<td>35.290</td>
<td>34.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>4.836</td>
<td>71.400</td>
<td>2.920</td>
<td>45.800</td>
<td>45.490</td>
<td>44.790</td>
<td>68.900</td>
<td>27.93E+03</td>
<td>27.93E+03</td>
<td>45.490</td>
<td>44.790</td>
<td>68.900</td>
<td>45.490</td>
<td>44.790</td>
<td>68.900</td>
<td>45.490</td>
<td>44.790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

TU Delft
### G3K 9-8C (NoLoad Test with STATOR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>16.940</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>8.92089e-01</td>
<td>20.4699</td>
<td>26.8323</td>
<td>4.1014</td>
<td>6.784</td>
<td>9.5549322</td>
<td>1.7198</td>
<td>11.8390</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>11.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>32.010</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>9.1138e-01</td>
<td>45.0482</td>
<td>32.0229</td>
<td>7.4825</td>
<td>12.9823</td>
<td>20.786</td>
<td>18.481</td>
<td>23.5685</td>
<td>7.378</td>
<td>18.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>47.980</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>9.4118e-01</td>
<td>64.0668</td>
<td>25.7917</td>
<td>7.6852</td>
<td>15.5338</td>
<td>23.707</td>
<td>25.707</td>
<td>33.7625</td>
<td>7.942</td>
<td>25.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>63.700</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>9.6966e-01</td>
<td>85.2634</td>
<td>21.7080</td>
<td>7.8866</td>
<td>17.5259</td>
<td>28.277</td>
<td>28.277</td>
<td>47.0483</td>
<td>12.618</td>
<td>28.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>78.500</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>1.0198e+00</td>
<td>107.5397</td>
<td>19.4868</td>
<td>8.0880</td>
<td>19.0090</td>
<td>32.373</td>
<td>32.373</td>
<td>63.8591</td>
<td>19.009</td>
<td>32.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>55.500</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>1.0556e+00</td>
<td>136.5997</td>
<td>21.6141</td>
<td>8.2969</td>
<td>24.4765</td>
<td>35.301</td>
<td>35.301</td>
<td>68.8311</td>
<td>19.009</td>
<td>35.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>111.500</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>1.0956e+00</td>
<td>191.5600</td>
<td>24.7761</td>
<td>8.4956</td>
<td>27.707</td>
<td>38.777</td>
<td>38.777</td>
<td>74.4508</td>
<td>20.777</td>
<td>38.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>125.700</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>1.1508e+00</td>
<td>251.4313</td>
<td>26.8743</td>
<td>8.6931</td>
<td>32.173</td>
<td>41.872</td>
<td>41.872</td>
<td>88.3454</td>
<td>20.777</td>
<td>41.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>142.500</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>1.2288e+00</td>
<td>282.6405</td>
<td>30.0545</td>
<td>8.8906</td>
<td>35.502</td>
<td>45.794</td>
<td>45.794</td>
<td>93.8561</td>
<td>20.777</td>
<td>45.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>158.500</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>1.2695e+00</td>
<td>314.0500</td>
<td>33.2341</td>
<td>9.0875</td>
<td>39.003</td>
<td>49.249</td>
<td>49.249</td>
<td>98.7157</td>
<td>20.777</td>
<td>49.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>166.400</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>1.3182e+00</td>
<td>355.4694</td>
<td>36.4855</td>
<td>9.2855</td>
<td>52.562</td>
<td>52.562</td>
<td>52.562</td>
<td>102.9456</td>
<td>20.777</td>
<td>52.562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### G3K 9-8C (LOAD TEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>14.573</td>
<td>75.300</td>
<td>8.880</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>8.4700</td>
<td>7.4100</td>
<td>8.2500</td>
<td>15.685</td>
<td>22.476</td>
<td>10.4830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>15.785</td>
<td>85.300</td>
<td>10.050</td>
<td>34.750</td>
<td>8.3800</td>
<td>7.3200</td>
<td>8.3800</td>
<td>16.985</td>
<td>24.003</td>
<td>10.7230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### G9K sgs (NoLoad test with Stator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed (rpm)</th>
<th>Torque (Nm)</th>
<th>Voltage (V)</th>
<th>DC_Current (A)</th>
<th>DC_Torque (Nm)</th>
<th>T=1.3 K [s]</th>
<th>Om_m (rad/s)</th>
<th>P_L (W)</th>
<th>P_NL (W)</th>
<th>P_NL (torq)</th>
<th>P_m (W)</th>
<th>P_m (kW)</th>
<th>P_p (W)</th>
<th>P_p (torq)</th>
<th>Measured Voltage (V)</th>
<th>Simulated Voltage (V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>17.230</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>1.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>69.600</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>1.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>86.400</td>
<td>1.411</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>1.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>103.200</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>1.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>122.300</td>
<td>1.659</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>2.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>141.000</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>2.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2956</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td>178.500</td>
<td>1.968</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>2.423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### G9K sgs (load test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed (rpm)</th>
<th>Torque (Nm)</th>
<th>Voltage (V)</th>
<th>Current (A)</th>
<th>Power (W)</th>
<th>Impedance (Ω)</th>
<th>Resistance (Ω)</th>
<th>P_in (W)</th>
<th>P_out (W)</th>
<th>Efficiency (%)</th>
<th>DC_Current (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>14.101</td>
<td>17.300</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td>3.869</td>
<td>39.070</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>7.381</td>
<td>53.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>13.281</td>
<td>80.400</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>20.740</td>
<td>106.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>28.361</td>
<td>131.200</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>35.460</td>
<td>157.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>42.761</td>
<td>182.800</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700</td>
<td>50.260</td>
<td>208.700</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2956</td>
<td>57.761</td>
<td>234.600</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3400</td>
<td>65.260</td>
<td>260.500</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## G9K os (NoLoad test with Stator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>41.40</td>
<td>1.379</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>63.235818</td>
<td>67.908384</td>
<td>112.97</td>
<td>11.452787</td>
<td>55.4222728</td>
<td>56.062</td>
<td>55.999</td>
<td>23.305</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>23.138</td>
<td>19.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>61.70</td>
<td>1.577</td>
<td>2.081</td>
<td>2.081</td>
<td>94.277966</td>
<td>126.907748</td>
<td>190.314</td>
<td>14.8289347</td>
<td>91.3619031</td>
<td>111.999</td>
<td>101.952</td>
<td>33.808</td>
<td>28.831</td>
<td>34.417</td>
<td>33.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>81.90</td>
<td>1.777</td>
<td>2.310</td>
<td>2.310</td>
<td>125.105003</td>
<td>197.841633</td>
<td>291.470</td>
<td>24.2640052</td>
<td>125.07177</td>
<td>177.145</td>
<td>165.937</td>
<td>44.715</td>
<td>36.491</td>
<td>40.001</td>
<td>51.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>102.10</td>
<td>1.977</td>
<td>2.520</td>
<td>2.520</td>
<td>157.205072</td>
<td>254.812446</td>
<td>336.384</td>
<td>26.4519026</td>
<td>160.05063</td>
<td>253.271</td>
<td>227.504</td>
<td>61.006</td>
<td>47.066</td>
<td>57.430</td>
<td>71.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>122.30</td>
<td>2.121</td>
<td>2.770</td>
<td>2.770</td>
<td>188.002219</td>
<td>243.001901</td>
<td>522.903</td>
<td>30.8421979</td>
<td>215.509292</td>
<td>334.916</td>
<td>305.972</td>
<td>64.892</td>
<td>57.294</td>
<td>66.973</td>
<td>95.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>142.50</td>
<td>2.262</td>
<td>3.020</td>
<td>3.020</td>
<td>220.016206</td>
<td>408.733738</td>
<td>680.293</td>
<td>40.1871032</td>
<td>281.90144</td>
<td>442.836</td>
<td>396.283</td>
<td>75.402</td>
<td>66.855</td>
<td>83.345</td>
<td>123.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>162.70</td>
<td>2.394</td>
<td>3.253</td>
<td>3.253</td>
<td>251.746291</td>
<td>601.257051</td>
<td>1026.443</td>
<td>67.026509</td>
<td>305.43301</td>
<td>553.993</td>
<td>505.225</td>
<td>86.190</td>
<td>73.661</td>
<td>91.923</td>
<td>151.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>182.90</td>
<td>2.526</td>
<td>3.485</td>
<td>3.485</td>
<td>282.562778</td>
<td>764.592503</td>
<td>907.411</td>
<td>73.1075794</td>
<td>243.074153</td>
<td>601.476</td>
<td>642.426</td>
<td>95.010</td>
<td>86.107</td>
<td>120.333</td>
<td>104.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>203.10</td>
<td>2.658</td>
<td>3.716</td>
<td>3.716</td>
<td>313.269995</td>
<td>877.971892</td>
<td>1141.652</td>
<td>104.1949</td>
<td>98.836</td>
<td>114.76</td>
<td>219.85</td>
<td>104.194</td>
<td>104.02</td>
<td>120.515</td>
<td>238.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>223.30</td>
<td>2.790</td>
<td>3.947</td>
<td>3.947</td>
<td>343.951448</td>
<td>941.681684</td>
<td>1351.115</td>
<td>159.6585</td>
<td>109.412</td>
<td>138.09</td>
<td>238.444</td>
<td>104.194</td>
<td>104.02</td>
<td>120.515</td>
<td>238.444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## G9K os (Load test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>61.70</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.034998</td>
<td>124.22</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>61.70</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.034998</td>
<td>124.22</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>61.70</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.034998</td>
<td>124.22</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>61.70</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.034998</td>
<td>124.22</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Simulated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P (kW)</th>
<th>P Fe [kW]</th>
<th>P Osa [kW]</th>
<th>Simulated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64.46</td>
<td>64.46</td>
<td>64.46</td>
<td>64.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.95</td>
<td>91.95</td>
<td>91.95</td>
<td>91.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.73</td>
<td>51.73</td>
<td>51.73</td>
<td>51.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.36</td>
<td>64.36</td>
<td>64.36</td>
<td>64.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.61</td>
<td>45.61</td>
<td>45.61</td>
<td>45.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.07</td>
<td>51.07</td>
<td>51.07</td>
<td>51.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.61</td>
<td>45.61</td>
<td>45.61</td>
<td>45.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.61</td>
<td>45.61</td>
<td>45.61</td>
<td>45.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experiments Results

Appendix 3
Appendix_4

Measurements Automation

Graphic User Interface of the Measurement Automation

Start, Stop or Save Measurements

File name where the measurements data will be saved

Electrical measurements On & Off

Measurement readings of the single phase power analyzer

Measurement thermocouples temperatures measured on different locations of the stator; (4 different windings, the yoke & 2 different teeth) read with a data logger
Appendix_5

TECHNICAL DATA & DRAWINGS
WINDING OF THE 3kW NdFeB GENERATORS
27 slot stator with open slots
3 inlets, 3 outlets, each 3 stages connected
Wire area: 2 x 1.08 mm² (AWG 14) parallel
Number of turns: 10 clockwise

27 slot stator with semi closed slots
3 inlets, 3 outlets, each 3 stages connected
Wire area: 2 x 1.08 mm² (AWG 14) parallel
Number of turns: 10 clockwise

\[ \text{Diagram of stator configurations} \]
STATOR DRAWINGS OF THE 9kW GENERATORS
**KUBOTA DIESEL ENGINE** (prime mover of the GenPowerBox®)

**Dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>D722</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cylinders</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bore x Stroke (mm in)</td>
<td>67 x 98 (2.64 x 3.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement (L (cu in))</td>
<td>0.719 (43.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combustion / Intake System</td>
<td>E-TVCS/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling System</td>
<td>Liquid-Cooled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starter</td>
<td>V-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>12.0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Output Industrial Use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIFICATION</th>
<th>3600</th>
<th>3000</th>
<th>2500</th>
<th>2400</th>
<th>2200</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>1800</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kW (HP)</td>
<td>14.0/20.0/20.3</td>
<td>12.4/16.6/16.9</td>
<td>11.5/15.7/15.7</td>
<td>10.7/14.3/14.6</td>
<td>9.8/13.3/13.5</td>
<td>9.0/12.1/12.3</td>
<td>10.0/14.6/14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Curve**
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