A comprehensive assessment of MPPT algorithms to optimal power extraction of a PV panel
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\textbf{ABSTRACT}

The electrical energy produced by photovoltaic (PV) process is inexhaustible, developable everywhere and clean. Whatever the conditions, it is desirable to extract the biggest amount of power from the solar panel. This is achieved with the use of a Maximum Power Point Tracking (MPPT) algorithm. Fluctuations in weather conditions (irradiation and temperature) strongly degrade the performance of the photovoltaic module's energy conversion and therefore all the power cannot be transferred to the load. The objective is to study and compare different approaches of MPPT algorithms to evaluate the power extracted under the standard test conditions and varying weather conditions. Results of the performance with all these algorithms are compared under different operating conditions. The results show that the Fuzzy Logic Controller (FLC) is the fastest in terms of stabilization and is followed respectively by Fractional Open-Circuit Voltage (FOCV), Fractional Open-Circuit Voltage (FOCV) Algorithm \textsuperscript{[12-13]}, Fractional Short-Circuit Current (FSCC) Algorithm \textsuperscript{[12-14]}, Hill Climbing (HC) \textsuperscript{[5-9]}, Perturb and Observe (P&O) Algorithm \textsuperscript{[12-15]}, Incremental Conductance (INC) Algorithm \textsuperscript{[14-16]}, Bisectio Numerical Algorithm (BNA), \textsuperscript{[15, 16]}, Artificial Neural Network (ANN) technique and the Fuzzy Logic Control (FLC) \textsuperscript{[17-20]}

A photovoltaic system mainly consists of a PV panel, a DC-DC adaptation stage with a MPPT algorithm and a load as represented by Figure 1. Indeed, the design of a DC-DC adaptation stage corresponds to the modeling of the basic functions of a DC-DC converter. The latter is achieved by the notion of conservation of the power transferred by a static converter \textsuperscript{[21-25]}. This power conversion corresponds to the relations between the four electrical quantities on the input and output points which are its currents and its voltages. The role of the DC-DC converter is to achieve an adaptation between the PV panel and the DC load to be supplied. The DC-DC converter is composed of an inductor and a switch that converts the DC current to a DC voltage. The DC-DC converter is represented by the symbol in Figure 1.
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have a maximum power transfer [26-27]. The operating point is therefore maintained in the vicinity of the Maximum Power Point (MPP) according to the operating conditions. The objective is to study and compare six different approaches of MPPT algorithms to evaluate the power extracted under the standard test conditions and varying weather conditions. In this article, a new FLC method is developed. The design proposed addresses two key questions. First of all, although conventional MPPT are appropriate methods for a PV system under a slow change of irradiation, they face substantial challenges under a quick change. The secondary problem is that the difficult engineering problems of a fuzzy system are reduced when there are few functions designed for members. The fuzzy rules of the proposed method are obtained from a modified conventional MPPT algorithm. The proposed technique allows the maximum power point to be accurately monitored and the drift problem to be avoided.

After introduction modeling of the PV system is presented in Section 2. Then in Section 3, an MPPT method methodology is analyzed. The results of the simulations and conclusion of the work are given respectively in Section 4 and Section 5.

2. PV Model and Characteristics

A PV cell is an electronic component that, when exposed to light (photons), produces electricity thanks to the photovoltaic effect. The circuit consists of two resistors and a diode is shown in Figure 2 [18, 24]. \( R_p \) indicates the presence of a leakage current in the P-N junction while \( R_s \) reports the resistivity of the material and the semiconductor-metal contact, the diode represents the electron-hole recombination in the P-N junction.

\[
I = I_{ph} - I_o \left[ \exp \left(\frac{V + R_s I}{nN_a V_T} \right) - 1 \right] - \frac{V + R_s I}{R_p} \tag{1}
\]

where \( V \) and \( I \) are respectively voltage and current, \( I_o \) is the diode reverse saturation current, \( I_{ph} \) is the generated photocurrent, \( V_T \) is the thermal voltage \( (V_T = kT / q) \), \( k \) is the Boltzmann constant, \( n \) is the diode ideality factor, \( q \) is the electron charge and \( T \) is the cell’s temperature (Kelvin).

The parameters of the Solkar36w PV panel used in this paper under the Standard Test Condition (STC: 25 °C and 1 kW/m²) are listed in Table I [24].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum power</td>
<td>( P_{mpp} ) (W)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum voltage</td>
<td>( V_{mpp} ) (V)</td>
<td>16.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum current</td>
<td>( I_{mpp} ) (A)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-circuit voltage</td>
<td>( V_{oc} ) (V)</td>
<td>21.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-circuit current</td>
<td>( I_{sc} ) (A)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voltage coefficient</td>
<td>( K_v (V/K) )</td>
<td>-1.0017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current coefficient</td>
<td>( K_i (A/K) )</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of series cells</td>
<td>( N_{sc} )</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Maximum Power Point (MPP) determination of the Solkar36w panel, the most important step is to determine the current - voltage and power - voltage characteristics. Figure 3 shows the I-V and P-V characteristic curves under the STC [24].

Figure 3. P-V and I-V characteristic of the Solkar36w PV panel.

### 3. MPPT Algorithms

The main aim of these MPPT commands is to find the MPP by keeping a good fit between the MPP and the load to ensure the transfer of maximum available electrical power.

#### 3.1. FOCV: Fractional Open-Circuit Voltage

The technique is simple and easy to implement. The method process flow chart is described by Figure 4. The Fractional Open-Circuit Voltage (FOCV) algorithm is based on a linear relationship between the open circuit voltage and the voltage at the peak power point [1, 4, 7]. Its expression is as follows:

\[ V_{mpp} = K_v \times V_{oc} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where \( K_v \) is the voltage proportionality constant.

![Figure 4. The FOCV technique flowchart.](image)

#### 3.2. FSCC: Fractional Short-Circuit Current

The method process flow chart is described by Figure 5. The Fractional Short-Circuit Current (FSCC) algorithm is a technique based on the linear relationship between the short-circuit current and the current at the point of maximum power [1, 4, 7]. Its expression is as follows:

\[ I_{mpp} = K_i \times I_{sc} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where \( K_i \) is the constant of proportionality.

![Figure 5. The FSCC algorithm flowchart.](image)

#### 3.3. HC: Hill Climbing

The Hill Climbing (HC) algorithm calculates the duty cycle in each sampling period by comparing the current power to the previous one [1-3, 7]. The flow diagram of the HC algorithm is shown in Figure 6 [11]. The duty cycle in every sampling period is given by the comparison of the power at actual time and prior time. If the incremental power \( dP > 0 \), the duty cycle should be increased in order to make \( dD > 0 \). If \( dP < 0 \), the duty cycle is then reduced to make \( dD < 0 \).

![Figure 6. Flowchart of HC technique.](image)

#### 3.4. P&O: Perturb and observe

The Perturb and Observe (P&O) algorithm is based on a periodic disturbance of the voltage at the
photovoltaic module’s output and by comparison of this disturbed output power with that of the previous disturbance cycle [1-5]. Figure 7 illustrates the flowchart of the P&O MPPT command [6-8]. To determine the power at each moment, two sensors are needed to measure the values of voltage and current. For a disturbance of the voltage, if the power decreases, the direction of the disturbance is maintained. If not, it is inverted so that the operating point converges towards the MPP.

![Figure 7. Flowchart of the P&O method.](image)

3.5. Inc: Incremental of conductance

The Incremental of Conductance (INC) algorithm uses the conductance value and the increment of the conductance to deduce the position of the next operating point as close as possible to the point of maximum power [3-7]. The method process flow chart is described by Figure 8 [11].

![Figure 8. Flowchart of the INC algorithm.](image)

3.6. FLC: Proposed Fuzzy logic control

The Fuzzy Logic Control (FLC) algorithm works with inaccurate inputs that do not require a precise mathematical model [1, 2, 4]. The error and error change CE at times samples k are the two FLC inputs [18-20]. Its output is a PWM signal that controls the boost converter. The two input variables are given by:

\[
E(k) = \frac{\Delta P}{\Delta I} = \frac{P(k) - P(k-1)}{I(k) - I(k-1)} 
\]

(4)

\[
dE(k) = E(k) - E(k-1)
\]

(5)

where \(P(k)\) and \(I(k)\) are respectively the power and the current of the PV panel, \(E(k)\) indicates if the point of operation of the load at the moment \(k\) is located to the left or right of the MPP on the power characteristic curve of Figure 3. \(dE(k)\) shows the direction of shifting of this point. The FLC contains Fuzzification, basic rule and defuzzification.

Fuzzification consists of converting the digital inputs into linguistic variables based on the degree of membership functions. Figure 9 illustrates the fuzzy sets: (a) the input error, (b) the input of the error change and (c) the output that contains seven triangular membership functions.

![Figure 9. Membership functions, (a) for E(k), (b) for dE(k), and (c) for D.](image)
$E(k)$, $dE(k)$, and $D$. Here is an example of a control rule from Table II:

**if $E$ is NL and $dE$ is NW then $D$ is NM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$dE$</th>
<th>NF</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>PW</th>
<th>PF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NF</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>PW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>PW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II. Rules of the Fuzzy System.

4. Results and Discussion

In this section, the standalone PV system in Figure 1, which consists of a solar panel, a DC-DC boost converter with its MPPT command and load is implemented and simulated in the MatLab/Simulink environment. The Solkar36w is the photovoltaic module used for our study. The latter produces a power of 40 W in the STC (see Table 1). In order to transfer all this power to the load, the Boost converter used receives simultaneously the current and voltage from the PV panel and a control signal from the MPPT controller with a switching frequency of 10 KHz.

In this paper, the value of the boost inductance is 290 µH, the capacitors of the input and output filters are 250 µF and 330 µF respectively. The switching frequency used is 10 kHz and a resistance load of 250Ω.

In order to validate the effectiveness of the different MPPT methods, the latter are tested using respectively, the Standard test conditions and the Changes of the solar irradiance with a constant temperature of 25 °C cases. The results of the power of the PV of algorithms are shown in Figure 11 and Figure 12.

4.1. Case 1: Standard test conditions

In this case, the six algorithms are evaluated for $G = 1000 \text{ W/m}^2$ and $T = 25 \degree \text{C}$. Figure 11 shows the power extracted from the PV panel and delivered to the load with the six methods in a simulation test over duration of 0.5 s. By analyzing the power curves produced by the PV module using the different MPPT algorithms in Figure 11. Two points have been enlarged; it appears from its bridges that the response times are 5 ms for FLC, 60 ms for the P&O algorithm, 70 ms for the INC algorithm, 150 ms for the HC algorithm, 20 and 20 ms respectively for the FSCC and FOCV algorithms.

**Figure 10. Three-dimensional surface corresponding to the membership in Figure 9 and the rule in Table II.**

Defuzzification consists of converting the output of the linguistic variable into a precise numeric variable ($D$):

$$D = \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu(D_j) - D_l \right] \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu(D_j) \right]$$

(6)

**Figure 11. The output power of PV system with the 6 MPPT methods.**
4.2. Case 2: Changes of the solar irradiance with a constant temperature of 25 °C

Figure 12 shows a test for varying weather conditions. Initially, \( G = 1000 \text{ W/m}^2 \), goes to 800 W/m², rises to 900 W/m² then decreases to 750 W/m² and finally reaches 950 W/m². Changes in irradiance were made every 0.2 s with total simulation duration of 1 s. It can be observed that the FLC algorithm gives the best results by extracting 39.65 W, followed by the P&O algorithms (39.5 W), INC (39.4 W), HC (38.5 W), FSCC (37.5 W) and FOCV (37 W). In addition, the proposed FLC converges to the MPP with a fast response time, higher performance and a small static error compared to other algorithms during irradiation changes.

![Figure 12. The performance of the different MPPT algorithms.](image)

4.3. Performance of MPPT algorithms

Results with all these algorithms are compared under different operating conditions. The tracking efficiency \( \eta \) is an important parameter in the MPPT algorithm \([2, 4, 6]\). This value is calculated as follows:

\[
\eta = \frac{\int_0^t P_{\text{mppt}}(t)dt}{\int_0^t P_{\text{max}}(t)dt} \times 100
\]

![Equation (7)]

A summary of the performance indicators of the 6 algorithms is presented in Table III. The FLC is the fastest in terms of stabilization and is followed respectively by FSCC, FOCV, P&O, INC and HC algorithms. The FLC also gives the best results in extracting, followed by P&O INC, HC, FSCC and FOCV algorithms.

![Table III. Comparison of different MPPT algorithms.](image)

5. Conclusion

Results with all these algorithms are compared under different operating conditions and shows that the FLC algorithm is the fastest in terms of stabilization time with a response time of 5 ms. This approach also presents very low oscillations around the operating point. The response times are 60 ms for P&O algorithm, 70 ms for the INC algorithm, 150 ms for the HC algorithm, 20 and 20 ms respectively for the FSCC and FOCV algorithms. The power generated with the different MPPT algorithms is evaluated at the maximum power point with a 40 W
photovoltaic module. The FLC algorithm gives the best results by extracting 39.65 W, followed by the P&O algorithms (39.5 W), INC (39.4 W), HC (38.5 W), FSCC (37.5 W) and FOCV (37 W).
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