# Advanced degradation modelling – finding causes and rates

Steve Ransome (SRCL, UK)

www.steveransome.com mailto: steve@steveransome.com

# PV Cost Webinar on PV Performance Modelling Methods: 1<sup>st</sup> Dec 2020

Acknowledgements : Juergen Sutterlueti (Gantner Instruments) for some measurement data and help.







# Focus of talk

- 1. Many 3<sup>rd</sup> party studies report module degradation rates using performance curve fitting, linear regression, Year on Year etc.
- 2. These usually reporting only **Efficiency changes %/year** often from conditions either "near STC" or "corrected to STC"
- 3. However many different parameters that can change including  $I_{sc}$ , Fill Factor,  $V_{oc}$ ,  $R_{shunt}$ ,  $R_{series}$  ...
- 4. These changes have a non-linear effect on efficiency and energy yield
- 5. They affect power reduction differently under different conditions e.g.
  - A fall in R<sub>SHUNT</sub> will cause a worse power drop at low light levels and therefore a greater energy yield drop at low insolation climates
  - 2. A rise in **R**<sub>SERIES</sub> gives a <u>worse power drop at high irradiance</u> which will give a larger fall under <u>sunny climates</u>



# Focus of talk (continued)

- 1. This talk looks at methods to improve the understanding of degradation rates and causes
- 2. It uses normalised analysis with independent coefficients
- 3. Fits to the data can result in calculated degradation rates at different instantaneous conditions and energy yields at different sites
- 4. Most of the data presented is from Gantner Instruments' OTF in Tempe AZ but many other sites have been analysed including NREL















<u>Measured</u> IV parameters Isc(A) Rsc(Ohms) Imp(A) Vmp(V) Roc(Ohms) Voc(V) on a logarithmic y axis >5 orders of magnitude (10<sup>-1</sup>A to 10<sup>4</sup> Ohms) Absolute values depend on module technology, cell numbers, module area, series strings etc.

### #11 Thin film Measured parameters vs. <u>irradiance</u>

# #11 Thin film Measured parameters vs. <u>datetime</u>



<u>Normalised</u> LFM parameters Isc(%) Rsc(%) FFi(%) FFv(%) Roc(%) Voc(%) yaxis ~70-110%, easier to model, area and number of cell independent LFM = Loss Factors Model

### #11 Thin film Normalised parameters vs. <u>irradiance</u>

instruments

#### Psnx\_Mm11\_t111\_g6\_Xgti\_kw\_m2\_Fnxx\_dxx\_hxx\_mxx\_s190325\_e26\_S1 Psnx\_Mm11\_t111\_g6\_Xdate\_time\_Fnxx\_dxx\_hxx\_mxx\_s190325\_e26\_S1 1.05 4.O **KEY** 3.5 3.5 100% 100% 2.5 tamb (C/100) 100) Isc 3.0 Rsc normalised mlfm values normalised mlfm values tamb FFi **FFv** 90% 90% Lmod Roc 2.0 Voc tcorr o Gi (kw/m' 1.0 X Irrad kW/m<sup>2</sup> 80% 80% Tmod C/100 5 0.5 0.5 70% 0.0 0.7 0.2 0.8 1.0 0.0 0.4 0.6 03-25 03-25 08-25 09-25 00-25 03-25 02-25 03-25 03-25 03-25 03-25 03-25 03-25 18 gti\_kw\_m2 date\_time

**#11** Thin film

Normalised parameters vs. datetime

1-Dec-20



# Calculating PR<sub>DC</sub> from the Loss Factors Model (LFM) PR<sub>DC</sub> = [Pmax at Point **5**] / [Pmax at Point **1**]



# LFM vs. irradiance identify performance limits and changes

PRdc ∝ 1/FF\_ref \* norm[(i<del>se</del> \* rsc \* ffi) \* (ffv \* roc \* voc\_Tcorr \* t\_corr)]



Gantner

instruments

www.steveransome.com



The shape of PR<sub>DC</sub> vs. irradiance is mainly determined by drops in 3 coefficients

R<sub>sc</sub> at low light∠ V<sub>oc</sub> at low light∠

### oc at high light∖



1-Dec-20



instruments

1-Dec-20

9

Steve Ransome Consulting Limited



(1 clear day) Time →

1-Dec-20

Gantner



# Stacked performance losses <u>1 clear day</u> from $1/FF \rightarrow PR_{DC}$



(1 clear day) Time  $\rightarrow$ 



1 I<sub>sc</sub> loss worst morning and evening (AOI reflection and/or spectral) scatter due to transmission lines shading early morning
2 R<sub>sc</sub> (shunt) loss worst morning and evening at low light
3 Fill Factor ~Current ~ constant
4 Fill Factor ~Voltage ~ constant
5 R<sub>oc</sub> (series) loss worst mid day at high irradiance
6 V<sub>oc</sub> (temperature corrected loss) is worst at lower light levels

**7**T-<sub>corr</sub> Temperature losses highest in the afternoon



1-Dec-20



### **Stacked performance losses 1 day <u>vs. technology</u>**

psi m11 t111 g6 nx0 hxx dxx s190325 e26 False True psi m12 t112 g5 nx0 hxx dxx s190325 e26 False True 4.0 4.0 160% 160% MLFM Performance Value (%)→ 3.5 3.5 lsc 140% 140% **Rsc** 3.0 0.0 2.5 2.0 2.0 (C/100) 3.0 2.5 2.0 2.5 1.5 1.5 1.0 (C/100) Ffi Ffv 2.5 120% 120% Roc 2.0 Voc-T 2) 100% 3 100% **T-corr** 1.5 ¥ PR 80% 80% Irrad kW/m<sup>2</sup> 1.0 0 PR<sub>DC</sub> Tmod C/100 60% 60% 0.5 0.5 40% 0.0 40% 0.0 (1 clear day) Time → (1 clear day) Time  $\rightarrow$ **1** Starts higher (1/ff) Starts lower (1/ff), better Rsc and Roc losses but worse **4** temperature loss 2 worse Rsc and 3 oc losses than cSi

<u>#11 Thin film</u>

<u># 12 cSi</u>

1-Dec-20





# Stacked performance losses vs. <u>clear (left) and cloudy (right) weather</u>



instruments

#### #11 Thin film

SRCL Steve Ransome Consulting Limited

### Stacked performance losses vs. clear (left) and cloudy (right) weather



**#11** Thin film

Gantner

instruments

<u>#12 cSi</u>

1-Dec-20

MLFM Performance Value (%)-





### Long term stacked performance losses >7 years



instruments

#### **#11** Thin film

### Losses change per day each year

- **1** R<sub>sc</sub> (shunt) loss increasing with time
- **2** R<sub>oc</sub> (series) loss increasing with time

**3**V<sub>oc</sub> (temperature corrected loss) increasing with time

 $(\mathbf{4} \mathbf{PR}_{\mathbf{pc}} \text{ fall mainly caused by these 3})$ parameters

**5** Maybe soiling causing variable I<sub>sc</sub> loss (can self reference to get smoother plots of other parameters)





# Long term stacked performance losses >7 years vs. Technology (cSi and failed)



# Analysing changes between two dates

#11 thin film between 2012,2017



Characterise module performance with a few days of variable weather

Then look for differences ...

Isc Rsc Ffi Ffv Roc Voc-T T-corr

Irrad kW/m<sup>2</sup> Tmod C/100 Tamb C/100

1-Dec-20

7 days







# Stacked loss graphs can qualify and quantify any long-term degradation –

Gantner 2012-2019 (self referenced lsc) Unstable

instruments



Steve Ransome Consulting Limited

# Gantner Instruments' OTF Solutions

### Further info at <a href="https://originationalistics.com">originationalistics.com</a> or email authors

#### **PV Modules Measurements:**

1-Dec-20

Fixed and 2D track; IV curve every minute, all environmental sensors, spectral parameters PV Module Power up to 500W/800W High quality digitalization, current accuracy 0.1% FS, voltage: 0.05% FS Scalable system (4 .. 48 channels) with raw data access Local or cloud-based data streaming Derived parameters using Loss Factors and Mechanistic Performance Models Integrated Python Jupyter Lab for direct analysis and automatic reporting

Continuous measurements in Arizona since 2010; Other sites available around the world

Trusted by leading PV Module manufacturers, Technology providers and Research Labs

Name	Description	Units
Gн	Global Horizontal Irradiance	kW/m²
Dн	Diffuse Horizontal Irradiance	kW/m²
B <sub>N</sub>	Beam Normal Irradiance	kW/m²
Gı	Global Inclined Irradiance (Pyranometers and c-Si ref cells)	kW/m²
T <sub>AMB</sub>	Ambient Temperature	С
T <sub>MOD</sub>	Back of Module Temperatures	С
WS	Wind Speed	ms <sup>-1</sup>
WD	Wind Direction	0
RH	Relative Humidity	%
G(λ)	Spectral Irradiance G(350–1050nm)	W/m²/nm



# Gantner



### Mechanistic Performance Model –location and technology independent

"Fits PV performance vs. irradiance and temperature with robust coefficients"

 $MPM: = C_1 + C_2 \times (T_{MOD} - 25) + C_3 \times Log_{10}(G_I) + C_4 \times G_I + \cdots$ 

www.steveransome.com

- C<sub>1</sub> = Tolerance = (meas/ref)
- C<sub>2</sub> = Temperature coefficient (e.g. gamma\_pmp ~ -0.4%/K)
- C<sub>3</sub> = low light loss (caused by Voc(G<sub>1</sub>))
- C<sub>4</sub> = high light loss (caused by R<sub>SERIES</sub>)

instruments

Reference : PVSC46 Chicago.pdf



We don't have time to discuss the fitting methodology in this talk, also angle of incidence and spectral correction please contact me or look at previous papers for details

1-Dec-20

Predicted (lines) vs. Measured (dots) LFM values fitted with MPM (7 years cSi module in Tempe AZ)



# Distinguishing technologies by time(top) or irradiance (bottom)





# Summary

- Good quality data required for best understanding
- Graphical analysis shown of stacked losses to find cause of any underperformance and quantify degradation
- We are doing much more analysis that hasn't been covered in this short talk e.g. fitting mismatch, spectral, aoi/beam fraction ... see our previous talks.
- Methodology is being introduced to Gantner Instruments OTF, cloud based Performance services and digital twins
- Feedback welcome !







### Contact

Steve Ransome (SRCL, UK) <u>www.steveransome.com</u> ; <u>mailto: steve@steveransome.com</u>

**Acknowledgements: Juergen Sutterlueti (Gantner Instruments)** 

Contact us for OTF enquiries and high-quality data sets for your own research

www.gantner-instruments.com/products/software/gi-cloud/

Thank you for your attention



1-Dec-20





SPARE



1-Dec-20

### Loss Factors Model - area and technology independent

### "Extracting normalised independent losses from the shapes of IV curves"

PRdc = 1/FF\_ref \* norm[(isc \* rsc \* ffi ) \* (ffv \* roc \* voc\_Tcorr \* t\_mod)] <1>



Normalise IV curve currents and voltages by datasheet STC values so ref.imp.norm = 1 and ref.vmp.norm =1

- 2 Multiply by 1/FF\_ref to get to isc\*voc
- **3** Find Current losses ref.isc → meas.imp
- 4 Find Voltage losses ref.voc → meas.vmp
- **5** PR<sub>DC</sub> (= meas.pmp/ref.pmp/gi)

Any changes with time show degradation and cause

- Some definitions updated since the original LFM paper in 2011 EUPVSEC Hamburg.
- Naming convention in <u>PV Modelling Glossary</u>
- For more information on spectral and reflectivity corrections not covered here PVSC46 Chicago.pdf

1-Dec-20



