





Berlin



APPLICATION OF NOWCASTING TO REDUCE THE IMPACT OF IRRADIANCE, RAMPS ON PY POWER PLANTS Blum, A. Hammer, J. Stührenberg, K. Jäger, C. Becker, S. Wilbert

ZIBEINSTITUTE BERLIN

EU PVSEC 2023 4EO.2.4 22/Sep/2023



WHY POWER SMOOTHING?

• Solar energy challenges grid stability [1]

e.g. grid frequency balance [2] [3]

- Irradiance fluctuations cause ramps
- Proposed solution: Power smoothing [4] [5]

(e.g. 10% power / min)

▶[1] Ottmar Edenhofer et al. IPCC, 2011: Summary for Policymakers.

>[2] Esteban A. Soto et al. "Analysis of Grid Disturbances Caused by Massive Integration of Utility Level Solar Power Systems".

>[3] N. Mithulananthan, R. Bansal, and V. Ramachandaramurthy, "A review of key power system stability challenges for large-scale PV integration".

≻[4] Remember Samu et al. "Applications for solar irradiance nowcasting in the control of microgrids: A review".

>[5] Qianwei Zheng et al. "Overivew of grid codes for photovoltaic integration".

Example: Power Fluctuations





WHICH SOLUTIONS EXIST?

Current solution: energy storage

(e.g. batteries, ...)

- Nowcasting: short-term solar irradiance forecasting
- Ideal nowcasts can substitute battery storage completely [6]

But: Nowcasts with high resolution required

& uncertainties are decisive

≻[6] Mojtaba Saleh et al. "Battery-less short-term smoothing of photovoltaic generation using sky camera".

Example: Power Fluctuations





PROBABILISTIC NOWCASTS





Parameter	ASI network	
Spatial resolution	50 m	
Extent	up to 156 km ²	
Forecasts update	30 s	
Forecast step	1 min	
Forecast horizon	20 min	





[13]

CLASSIFICATION



Class	Sky conditions	Variability
1	Mostly clear sky	Low variability
2	Almost clear sky	Low variability
3	Almost clear sky	Medium variability
4	Partly cloudy	High variability
5	Partly cloudy	Medium variability
6	Partly cloudy	High variability
7	Almost overcast	Medium variability
8	Mostly overcast	Low variability



DATASET

 nowcasts for 18 test days with high variability conditions

Days have large range of classes and vary from each other

 PV power plant production data (Validation)



MODEL PERFORMANCE

- Simulated power vs. validation data
- 18 day test dataset

with various weather conditions

nRMSE between 2.7 and 21.7% (mean 12.0%)

(normalized to max power of day)

• nBIAS of +0.5%

3 STRATEGIES: VAL, IDV & MIX

• Battery works as a fail-save: only interferes in case of control strategy failure

System power = output power + battery

18 TEST DAYS – ACCUMULATED

- Strategy VAL: battery only
- Strategy IDV: ideal nowcast
- Strategy MIX: nowcast +

battery

UPSCALING TO ONE YEAR

Based on:

- 18 test days
- Class frequency

ECONOMIC EVALUATION

Key findings:

- Energy loss reduced to 8.7% for one year
- Levelized-cost-of-energy (LCOE) reduced by 12.7% (MIX)
- Reduction potential of 34.8% (IDV)

CONCLUSION

- Simulation study of nowcasts in power smoothing for Germany
- 18 test days with variety of irradiance conditions

Mean model performance of 12.0% nRMSE (max)

4 out of 5 ramps avoided by control strategy alone

Fail-save battery with smaller capacity (-71.1%) and power (-48.3%)

• Full year (scaled-up)

8.7% curtailment losses

LCOE reduction of 12.7% with potential to 34.8%

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!

Jonas Schaible

Helmholtz Center Berlin

jonas.schaible@helmholtz-berlin.de

• Bijan Nouri

German Aerospace Center (DLR)

bijan.nouri@dlr.de

