

Local and regional PV power forecasting integrating different data and models

Elke Lorenz TwinSolar Workshop DTU Riso, 21.08.2023 www.ise.fraunhofer.de

Agenda

- 1. Model combination
- 2. Regional forecasting
- 3. Model comparison and evaluation



Overview of PV power prediction scheme





Overview of PV power prediction scheme





© Fraunhofer ISE FHK-SK: ISE-INTERNAL

PV power prediction based on measurements

Baseline approach: persistence

Persistence: "situation stays as it is"

 $GHI(t+\Delta t)=GHI(t)$

 $\mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{PV}}\left(\mathsf{t+}\Delta\mathsf{t}\right) = = \mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{PV}}\left(\mathsf{t}\right)$

Do you think this is a good idea?





5

PV power prediction based on measurements

Baseline approach: persistence

Persistence: "situation stays as it is"

For irradiance and PV power forecasting: persistence of cloud situation, decribed by "clear sky index" to capture diurnal course of irradiance

 $k^{*}(t+\Delta t)=k^{*}(t)$ GHI(t+ Δt)= $k^{*}(t) \times GHI_{clear}(t+\Delta t)$

For PV power $k_{P}^{*}=P_{meas}/P_{clear}$ P(t+ Δ t)=k_P*(t) x P_{clear}(t+ Δ t)





Overview of PV power prediction scheme





© Fraunhofer ISE FHK-SK: ISE-INTERNAL

Overview of PV power prediction scheme





8





Evaluation of PV power forecasting

Measurement data

March- November 2013

15 minute values

921 PV systems1) in Germany

information on PV system tilt and orientation

1)Monitoring data base of Meteocontrol GmbH





Evaluation of local forecasts Comparison of NWP and CMV based forecasts



Forecast1 ?

Forecast 2?



Evaluation of local forecasts: comparison of NWP and CMV based forecasts



CMV 2h: 2 hour ahead

cloud motion vector forecast

NWP:

12:00 UTC ECMWF run of previous day



12 © Fraunhofer ISE FHK-SK: ISE-INTERNAL

Evaluation of local forecasts Comparison of NWP and CMV based forecasts



CMV 2h: 2 hour ahead cloud motion vector forecast

NWP:

12:00 UTC ECMWF run of previous day

Clear sky: good agreement of NWP and CMV forecasts with measurements

variable clouds: CMV 2h ahead forecasts capture changes in PV power





Evaluation of regional forecasts Comparison of NWP and CMV based forecasts



Regional forecast/Virtual power plant: Sum of PV power output of all systems

Smoother curves and better agreement between forecasts and measurements: spatial averaging effects

2h ahead CMV forecasts perform better than NWP forecasts



Evaluation of regional forecasts persistence, CMV and NWP forecasts



Regional forecast/Virtual power plant: Sum of PV power output of all systems

Smoother curves and better agreement between forecasts and measurements: spatial averaging effects

2h ahead CMV forecasts perform better than NWP forecasts



Persistence, CMV and NWP based forecasts





Persistence, CMV and NWP based forecasts





Persistence, CMV and NWP based forecasts





Persistence, CMV and NWP based forecasts





Persistence, CMV and NWP based forecasts





Persistence, CMV and NWP based forecasts





German average

╋╋ 6 RMSE P/Pinst [%] 0 2 3 5 4 0 forecast horizon

Data set for validation:

- 15 minute values
- normalization to installed power Pinst
- only daylight values, calculation time of CMV: sunel > 10°
- only hours with all models available included in dependence of forecast horizon

$$rmse = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{P_{meas}}{P_{inst}} - \frac{P_{pred}}{P_{inst}}\right)^{2}}$$





German average

Forecasts for German average

CMV forecasts better than NWP based forecast up to 4 hours ahead





German average

Forecasts for German average

CMV forecasts better than NWP based forecast up to 4 hours ahead

persistence better than CMV forecasts up to 1.5 hour ahead







25 © Fraunhofer ISE FHK-SK: ISE-INTERNAL





26 © Fraunhofer ISE FHK-SK: ISE-INTERNAL

Overview of PV power prediction scheme





Overview of PV power prediction scheme





Combination of forecast models with linear regression:

 $P_{combi} = a_{NWP} P_{NWP} + a_{CMV} P_{CMV} + a_{persist} P_{persist} + a_0$

Coefficients a_{NWP} , a_{CMV} , $a_{persist}$, a_0 are fitted to measured data

What are the influencing factors that determine the weight?



Combination of forecast models with linear regression:

 $P_{combi} = a_{NWP}P_{NWP} + a_{CMV}P_{CMV} + a_{persist}P_{persist} + a_0$

Coefficients a_{NWP} , a_{CMV} , $a_{persist}$, a_0 are fitted to measured data

In dependence:

- Forecast Horizon
- Hour of the day, andforecast horizon



How many days to train forecast combination?



Improvement score:

 $rmse_{ref} - rmse_{combi}$

 $rmse_{ref}$ with respect to best single model

Data set:

All sites average, May to November, 2012 independent test year for model configuration



Why is it bad, if only few days

Why are too many days less

are used for training?

favorable?

31

Regression coefficients in dependence of forecast horizon







Considerable improvement with combined model over single model forecasts



33 © Fraunhofer ISE FHK-SK: ISE-INTERNAL





Thank you for your attention!

Elke Lorenz Power Solutions <u>Vorname.Nachname@ise.fraunhofer.de</u>

Fraunhofer ISE Heidenhofstraße 2 79110 Freiburg www.ise.fraunhofer.de **Fraunhofer** ISE