





# Day-ahead and Intra-day PV production Forecasting

Spyros Theocharides Special Scientist, University of Cyprus







Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union



# Outline

- Introduction
- Approach
- Motivation
- Experimental Apparatus
- Data Quality Routines
- Day-ahead Forecasting
- Intra-day Forecasting
- Regional PV Power Forecasting
- Conclusions











#### Introduction

- Current focus on PV production forecasting because of the increasing number of grid-connected PV systems and the need for predictable generation.
- Important for both grid and plant operators:
  - Ensures grid stability and dispatchability of the electric system (energy management and grid flexibility).
  - Advancement of commercialization for selling onto the next day market.









#### Background & Objectives

• The focus is to provide accurate Day-ahead (DA) and Intra-day PV production forecasts for point and regional sites in the state-of-the art levels.

#### **Specific Objectives**

- Develop data-driven approaches to yield accurate forecasts only on historical data.
- Prove whether the forecasting accuracy can reach state-of-the art levels.
- Establish a DA and Intra-day PV power forecasting tool that will also act as a multi-agent system for active grid management.







### Approach

- ANNs can approximate any linear and nonlinear mapping.
- PV system information not required Capture systematic behaviour.



Drawback: Numerical Weather Predictions

Solution: Post-processing could be utilized to reduce the respective error.







#### Machine learning - ANN Brief









#### Machine learning - ANN Brief









#### **Experimental Apparatus**

- Grid-connected Poly-c-Si PV (1.3 kWp).
- Monitoring system to acquire PV operational and meteorological measurements.
- Data acquired since June 2015 and accumulated as 60-minute averages.









### Methodology – Data Quality Routine

- Identify missing (or erroneous) data, outliers and outages.
- Estimate system availability and sensor deviations.
- Correct data through data imputation techniques (kNN and Kalman filtering).











#### Day-ahead Forecasting







#### ANN Model Development

| 1. Data preparation |           |    |    |    |    |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------|-----------|----|----|----|----|--|--|--|--|
|                     | Range (%) |    |    |    |    |  |  |  |  |
| Training            | 30        | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 |  |  |  |  |
| Testing             | 30        | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |  |  |  |  |



#### 2. ANN Design

- Architectural Design
- Validation
- Optimization







#### Methodology Prediction Assessment Metrics - Validation

 $e_i = y_{i,forecasted} - y_{i,actual}$ 

 $APE = 100 \times \left| \frac{y_{i,forecasted} - y_{i,actual}}{y_{i,actual}} \right|$ 





01/04/2019







#### Model design: Input Parameters









#### Results – Model design: Number of Neurons









#### **Model Performance - Cross validation**









#### **Model Performance**









#### **Model Performance**











#### Intra-day Forecasting









# Methodology









### Data Pre-processing (Training Set)



 $P_{DC}(t+n) = G_I(t) + T_{amp}(t) + \dots$ 







### Methodology – ANN Model Development

|   |           |    |    |          |    | Data set (1 year of hourly data) |                         |    |    |                                 |     |  |        |
|---|-----------|----|----|----------|----|----------------------------------|-------------------------|----|----|---------------------------------|-----|--|--------|
| 1. Data preparation                                       |           |    |    |          |    |                                  |                         | ۸۸ |    |                                 |     |  |        |
|   | Range (%) |    |    |          |    | Train Set (70 %)                 |                         |    |    | Test Set (30 %)<br>111 Days     |     |  |        |
| Training  | 30        | 40 | 50 | 60       | 70 | G                                | Τ.                      | RH | WS | W                               | Δ75 |  | P      |
| Testing   | 30        | 30 | 30 | 30       | 30 | <b>O</b> poa                     | amb                     |    |    | alpha                           | JL  |  | J DC   |
|   |           |    |    | Measured |    |                                  | Calculated              |    |    |                                 |     |  |        |
| <ul><li>Ann Design</li><li>Architectural Design</li></ul> |           |    |    |          |    |                                  | Training<br>(Train Set) |    |    | Validation<br>(Test Set (15 %)) |     |  |        |
| <ul><li>Validation</li><li>Optimization</li></ul>         |           |    |    |          |    | Testing<br>(Test Set (15 ۶       |                         |    |    |                                 |     |  |        |
|   |           |    |    |          |    |                                  |                         |    |    |                                 |     |  | 04/04/ |







#### Results – Model design: Input Parameters



01/04/2019







#### Results – Model design: Number of Neurons









#### **Results – Performance Assessment**









#### **Results – Testbed Period**











#### **Regional PV Power Forecasting**





Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union



### Methodology







Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union



### Methodology









#### Results – Summary of PV Parks

| PV Park | nRMSE | MBE   |                     | PV Park      | nRMSE | MBE   |
|---------|-------|-------|---------------------|--------------|-------|-------|
| B1      | 8.74  | 2.10  |                     | B15          | 8.20  | 1.47  |
| B2      | 9.60  | -1.19 |                     | MEMNON       | 8.55  | -2.07 |
| B3      | 7.17  | 1.30  |                     | TSERI        | 7.50  | 1.21  |
| B4      | 6.10  | 0.95  |                     | APV          | 8.22  | 1.18  |
| B5A     | 8.39  | 1.32  | nRMSE (%): 8.0% ±2% | ATHINPOULLAS | 8.06  | 0.89  |
| B5B     | 6.44  | 1.13  |                     | WAVERON      | 7.55  | 1.27  |
| B6      | 7.67  | 2.21  |                     | NISOU        | 6.99  | -0.75 |
| B11     | 7.47  | 1.76  |                     | PALIOMETOCHO | 8.06  | 1.41  |
| B12     | 7.08  | 1.43  |                     | MALOUNTA     | 8.74  | 1.19  |
| B13     | 9.10  | 2.62  |                     | FRENAROS     | 9.29  | -1.86 |

01/04/2019







## Results – Study Case (20/09/2018)









#### Results – Aggregated Forecasts for the whole of Cyprus









#### Conclusions

- Machine learning models could be utilized for the implementation of agile PV power forecasting techniques.
- NWP utilised for DA forecasting.
- NWP-free approach for intra-day forecasting
- The best-performing DA and HA forecasting model comprised by 4 inputs ( $G_{\nu}$ ,  $T_{amb}$ , AlS and AzS) with randomly selected data from the 70% of the data set and 18 and 22 hidden neurons for the DA and intraday forecasting respectively.
- The DA model demonstrated nRMSE of 6.10%
- The intra-day forecasting model demonstrated nRMSE of 3.63% and MBE 0.15% indicating no biases among the data over the testset period (55 days). For clear sky days the nRMSE was ≈ 1%.
- The regional DA PV power forecasting demonstrated an nRMSE of  $8\% \pm 2\%$ .
- Post Processing techniques will be utilized to further increase the forecasting accuracy.









#### More Information...

#### Website

www.pvtechnology.ucy.ac.cy









# Thank you for your attention

Spyros Theocharides Special Scientist

University of Cyprus 1 University Avenue New University Campus P.O. 20537 1678, Nicosia





Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme

of the European Union



Tel: +357 22 894397 Email: theocharidis.spyros@ucy.ac.cy Website: <u>www.pvtechnology.ucy.ac.cy</u>

01/04/2019