



Single-Axis Tracked Bifacial System Results

Silvana Ayala Pelaez¹, Chris Deline², Peter Greenberg³,
Josh Stein⁴, Raymond K. Kostuk¹

silvanaa@email.arizona.edu

Outline

Single-Axis Tracking Models

- View Factor
- RADIANCE Ray trace

Results for:

- Klamath Falls, Oregon

Closer look at:


- Adaptive Tracking Angle
- Edge brightening
- Torque tube shading

Two open-source tracking models

1. View Factor model – 8760 hourly gain

BifacialVF software release


github.com/NREL/bifacialvf



2. Ray Tracing – annual bifacial gain


Bifacial Radiance software release

github.com/NREL/bifacial_radiance



Modeling Rear Irradiance

Image: <http://opsun.com/mounting-solutions/flat-roof/bifacial-pv-racking/>



Irradiance Model

Location
Weather
Sky Diffuse Model

Others:

Spacing between cells
#rows, #panels
Mounting Structure
Other scene elements


Radiance: Ray-tracing software

Complicated geometries possible, including racking and terrain.

Radiance uses **backward ray-trace** to evaluate the irradiance (W/m^2) at the modules

Reduces complexity and run-time.

Modules \ll Sky



Parameters & Metrics

Ground Coverage Ratio



$$GCR = \frac{\text{CollectorWidth}}{\text{row-to-row}}$$

Normalized Axis Clearance

$$H = \frac{\text{axis height}}{\text{CollectorWidth}}$$


Bifacial Gain (Irradiance)

$$BG_{E,Model} = \varphi_{Pmp} \times \frac{G_{rear}}{G_{front}} (1 - \eta_{loss})$$



TMY3, Albedo = 0.25 (aged concrete) and ⁶H = 0.75

BG_{model} for 1-axis tracked system can be as high as 20%.
(Typical global average 9%)



Satellite-based TMY irradiance data, and satellite-measured albedo values from NASA
 $GCR = 0.35$, $H = 0.75$, $\varphi_{Pmp} = 100\%$, and $\eta_{loss} = 0$

Outline

Single-Axis Tracking Models


- View Factor
- RADIANCE Ray trace

Results for:

- Klamath Falls, Oregon

Closer look at:

- Adaptive Tracking Angle
- Edge brightening
- Torque tube shading



Klamath Falls, OR: Tracker System

100 kW of Silfab HIT,
2-up landscape

100 kW of Trina mcSi,
1-up portrait



$H = 0.75$, $GCR = 0.35$, $Albedo = 0.2$ (short grass)

Overall energy gain for a bifacial system
is determined by comparing Performance Ratio (PR)
[kWh/kW] for both monofacial and bifacial systems



$$BG_{Meas} = 100\% \times \left(\frac{PR_{bifi}}{PR_{mono}} - 1 \right)$$

- Difference in module rating
- Temperature coefficient
- Low light dependence
- Mounting orientation
- Bifaciality


$$BG_{Meas,bifacial} = 100\% \times \left(\frac{PR_{bifi}}{PR_{mono}} \underbrace{\frac{PR_{mono,model}}{PR_{bifi,model}}}_{\text{Correction Factor}} - 1 \right)$$

Correction Factor

Although field IV curve measurements indicate comparable front-side capacity for the two systems, the measured PR was on average 9.4% higher for the bifacial system than for the monofacial system.



BG_{Model} is 6.7%, close to the measured BG_{Meas} of 7%



Some variability,
particularly on
snowy winter
months.

Outline

Single-Axis Tracking Models

- View Factor
- RADIANCE Ray trace

Results for:

- Klamath Falls, Oregon


Closer look at:

- Adaptive Tracking Angle
- Edge brightening
- Torque tube shading

Adaptive Tracking Algorithm for Bifacials

During cloudy conditions, moving the tracker to horizontal can increase energy yield up to 1% in monofacials.


*Optimal tilt angle can depend upon sky conditions and is not always horizontal



N. A. Kelly and T. L. Gibson, "Increasing the solar photovoltaic energy capture on sunny and cloudy days," *Sol. Energy*, vol. 85, no. 1, pp. 111–125, 2011.

M. Gulin, M. Vařak, and N. Perić, "Dynamical optimal positioning of a photovoltaic panel in all weather conditions," *Appl. Energy*, vol. 108, pp. 429–438, 2013

Optimized tracking algorithms improvement is location-dependent for bifacials, and locations at higher-latitudes and greater diffuse irradiance content can show more gain



Outline

Single-Axis Tracking Models

- View Factor
- RADIANCE Ray trace

Results for:


- Klamath Falls, Oregon

Closer look at:


- Adaptive Tracking Angle
- Edge brightening
- Torque tube shading

Edge effects


5 rows with 10 modules brings the G_{rear} within 5% of a semi-infinite assumption.



Within a distance of 5 m from the row edge,
rear irradiance and BG_E is increased by 25% on the south edge,
and 10% on the north edge.



June 21st row shading and BG_E modeling by hour (nearest 5 degree tracking)



Outline

Single-Axis Tracking Models

- View Factor
- RADIANCE Ray trace



Results for:

- Klamath Falls, Oregon

Closer look at:

- Adaptive Tracking Angle
- Edge brightening
- Torque tube shading

Tube Shading Loss



As expected, there is a primary peak in shading loss directly behind the tube at $X = 0$ m, reducing G_{rear} by 15% - 20%.

$$x_{shadow} = 0.5 rtr \left[\left(1 - \frac{g+r}{H \cdot CW} \right)^{-1} - 1 \right]$$

Summary Slide

1. Rear irradiance and available bifacial gain is dependent on **available irradiance and location**.
2. **Isolating the bifacial response** requires normalization of BG by modeled front-side performance PR_{model} for both module types.
3. Under cloudy conditions, bifacial gain can be improved by **not tracking directly at the sun**. The advantage increases with high albedo and for more diffuse climates.
4. The smaller the system, the less there will be mutual shading. So if you are running these models and comparing against field data, a large array system is needed **to match the infinite assumptions**.
5. Rack shading produces 15%-20% shading losses on rear irradiance that need to be considered and further studied.

Thank you

(Sli.do for Questions)

This work was authored in part by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, operated by Alliance for Sustainable Energy, LLC, for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) under Contract No. DE-AC36-08GO28308. Funding provided by the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Solar Energy Technologies Office. The views expressed in the article do not necessarily represent the views of the DOE or the U.S. Government. The U.S. Government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, worldwide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this work, or allow others to do so, for U.S. Government purposes.

NREL/PR-5K00-72518

silvanaa@email.arizona.edu