

Type of supply system	Benefits	Disadvantages
SELV or PELV (safety extra-low voltage or protective extra low voltage)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No hazard potential on contact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited power if deployment of equipment is to be cost-effective • Specific requirements on current circuits
Protective insulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can be combined with other types of system • Double insulation of equipment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only cost-effective for small loads • Insulating material pose fire hazard on thermal loads
IT system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMC friendly • Increased availability: 1st fault is simply reported Disconnection in the event of a 2nd fault • Low ground leakage current in small systems • Influence on neighboring installations is reduced, this in turn makes grounding easier • Little technical effort for cable and conductor installation • Use of appropriate devices facilitates fault location 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equipment has to be insulated universally for the voltage between external conductors. • An overvoltage protective device is required for N conductors • Potential problems with going offline on second ground fault

TT system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMC friendly • Protection is dependent on the system's short circuit power • Little technical effort for cable and conductor installation • Touch voltage can vary from one area to another • Can be combined with a TN system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only compatible with low power ratings due to the use of GFCIs • Regular functional test required • Operational grounding is complex ($\leq 2 \Omega$). • Equipotential bonding compulsory for every building
TN-C system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy to set up • Low material expenses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not EMC friendly • Building stray currents and low frequency magnetic fields make the system incompatible for use in buildings housing information technology equipment • Risk to life and limb in the event of PEN break • Increased risk of electrical fires
TN-C-S system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A cost-effective compromise for buildings which do not house information technology equipment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not EMC friendly • Low-frequency magnetic fields possible
TN-S system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMC friendly • Low voltage rise in the healthy phases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased safety engineering outlay for remote multiple infeeds • Risk of multiple grounding going unnoticed

Criterion		TT	TN-C	TN-S	IT
Safety of persons		***	***	***	***
Safety against fire hazard		***	*	**	***
Machine protection		***	*	*	***
Availability		**	**	**	*****
Electromagnetic compatibility		**	*	**	***
Maintenance		**	*****	*****	***
Installation		*	**	**	***
Overall result		16	14	16	22
*	Weak				
**	Average				
***	Good				
*****	Excellent				