

Experimentation of MPPT Control Driving a Buck Converter with PV Module Disturbances and Variable Load in a Nanogrid



Sandaniaina Sedinirina Andriamihaingo Ranaivoson, Nicolas Saincy, Eric Jean Roy Sambatra,
Todizara Andrianajaina, Nirinason Jean Razafinjaka

Abstract: The objective of this paper is to perform a laboratory test on the performance of MPPT control in a nanogrid. The components used for tests are described, namely (i) a PV module SPP031001200 manufactured by Victron energy, a prototype of a synchronous buck converter controlled by Arduino Atmel ATmega V-2560, and a DC electronic load programmable 72-13210 manufactured by TENMA™. Among several MPPT controls, the choice falls on the methods Perturb and Observe "P&O" and Increment of the conductance "INC", which are more widely used than others. Laboratory tests were conducted with various PV module conditions and variable output voltages. In full sunlight, the input power of the buck converter gives a better result with the INC method compared to the P&O method. For a PV module exposed to horizontal or vertical total shading, the INC method provides a slight advantage over the P&O method, which can be beneficial in the long term. Compared to the P&O method, the INC method always gives better results due to its more complex algorithm. Due to the lack of measuring instruments, the different tests were performed without considering irradiance and temperature.

Keywords: Buck Converter, DC Electronic Load, MPPT, Solar Home System.

I. INTRODUCTION

In Madagascar, electricity needs are today served by two radically distinct approaches, which are the construction and operation of traditional power grids on the one hand, and the

distribution of individual off-grid electric systems on the other hand [1], [2].

Traditional power grids can have a significant impact on local economic and social development in the zones where they are deployed. Still, they have failed for several years to address the challenge of access to electricity. Its distribution rhythm is indeed today lower than the population growth rate, because of the colossal investment costs, long implementation times, tariff offers poorly adapted to the local context, development potential limited to relatively dense demand areas in very largely rural countries, etc. [1]-[4].

On the other hand, the diffusion of Solar Home Systems has spread at a remarkable speed over the last decade, and by offering a simple, fast, and affordable response to the basic needs of off-grid populations, it has already made it possible to improve the living conditions of many people rapidly. However, the level of service is limited to domestic needs and not flexible; the limited lifetime of the equipment implies a high long-term cost, but above all, a renunciation of infrastructure construction, etc. [1], [5], [6].

In this context, the weakness of the current development of electrical infrastructures in Madagascar, with renewable energies, the development of new technologies of electrical conversion, and smart grids offers a formidable opportunity to develop 21st-century electrical infrastructures more rapidly [1], [7].

The ambition of the Lateral Electrification model is to emancipate the constraints of the two current electrification models to bring out a third voice capable of reconciling the short-term and long-term challenges of the electricity sector in Madagascar by proposing an efficient solution and ultra-replicable based on i) the distribution of collective autonomous solar DC power system connecting 4 to 6 neighboring users (called "nanogrids") to quickly answer the energy needs of households and ii) their progressive interconnection to participate in the construction of the bottom-up of 21st-century electrical infrastructures (decarbonized, decentralized and digitized), capable of meeting the growing productive energy needs of rural areas [1], [8].

The technologies allowing the implementation of the first stage of this model (i.e., "nanogrids") have already been developed and tested by the company Nanoé. DC power distribution was chosen for its energy efficiency, simplicity, and cost-effectiveness.

Manuscript received on 27 April 2023 | Revised Manuscript received on 08 May 2023 | Manuscript Accepted on 15 May 2023 | Manuscript published on 30 May 2023.

*Correspondence Author(s)

Sandaniaina Sedinirina Andriamihaingo Ranaivoson*, Nanoé Company - Decentralized Electrification, Ambanja, Madagascar. Email: sanda.ranaivo@gmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5777-8089>

Nicolas Saincy, Nanoé Company - Decentralized Electrification, Madagascar. Email: nicolas.saincy@nanoe.net

Eric Jean Roy Sambatra, School of Industrial Engineering, Higher Institute of Technology, Antsiranana, Madagascar. Email: ericsambatra@gmail.com

Todizara Andrianajaina, Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Higher Polytechnic School, Antsiranana, Madagascar. Email: todizara.andrianajaina@gmail.com

Nirinason Jean Razafinjaka, Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Higher Polytechnic School, Antsiranana, Madagascar. Email: razafinjaka@yahoo.fr

© The Authors. Published by Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering and Sciences Publication (BEIESP). This is an open access article under the CC-BY-NC-ND license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Experimentation of MPPT Control Driving a Buck Converter with PV Module Disturbances and Variable Load in a Nanogrid

For the second stage of this process, research works are carried out to study the feasibility of interconnecting several nano-grids with each other within DC balancing microgrids of village scale [1], [8]-[10]. Among which, simulations on the MATLAB / Simulink © environment have been performed to produce the maximum power in an electrical nanogrid using the Maximum Power Point Tracking "MPPT" technique with the commands Perturb and Observe "P&O" and Increment of the Conductance "INC" due to their ease of implementation compared to other MPPT controls [10].

This paper proposes a design and prototyping of a buck converter driven by the "P&O" and "INC" controls using a microcontroller. Laboratory tests are performed using a PV module connected directly to a DC electronic load as a reference.

This article is divided into the following sections. Section 2 discusses the equipment used on the test bench, including details on the prototype of the buck converter and the choice of MPPT controls. Then, in Section 3, laboratory experiments under the influence of disturbances at the PV module and the output of the buck converter are followed by discussions. Some conclusions are drawn in section 4.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

First, in Fig. 1, a PV module is connected directly to a DC electronic load to have its power curve for a voltage from 0 to V_{oc} .




Fig. 1: PV module directly connected to a DC electronic load

In Fig. 2, a buck converter ensures adaptation between the PV module and the DC electronic load. The buck converter is driven by an MPPT control that generates a duty cycle using the voltage and current measurements provided by the PV module. The output voltage of the DC electronic load ranges from 10 to 15V, allowing for the same operation as a 12V battery in charging




Fig. 2: Use of a buck converter driven by a MPPT control

mode.

A. PV module

A PV module is formed by the association of several PV cells, which can be considered as an ideal source of current,

providing a current I_{ph} proportional to the irradiance and the temperature [10], [11].




Fig. 3: Single-diode model of a photovoltaic cell

In Fig. 3, the equations corresponding to a model with a diode of a photovoltaic cell are summarized as:

$$I_{pv} = I_{ph} - I_d - I_{sh}, \quad (1)$$

The Photocurrent is expressed as a function of irradiance and temperature:

$$I_{ph} = \frac{\phi}{\phi_{ref}} \left[I_{cc} + \mu_{Icc} (T - T_{ref}) \right], \quad (2)$$

It is assumed that the diode current is related to the temperature according to the expression:

$$I_d = I_{sat} * \left[\exp \left(\frac{V_{pv} + R_s I_{pv}}{n V_T} \right) - 1 \right], \quad (3)$$

And the shunt current through the shunt resistor is equal to:

$$I_{sh} = \frac{V_{pv} + R_s I_{pv}}{R_{sh}}. \quad (4)$$

With V_{pv} and I_{pv} Represent the voltage and current of the PV cell, ϕ and ϕ_{ref} are real and reference irradiances [W / m^2]; T and T_{ref} are effective and reference temperatures [K] Is the temperature Coefficient of the short-circuit current; I_{sat} Is the saturation current [A]; n is the ideality factor of the junction ($1 < n < 3$) et and the thermal voltage of the diode [V].

Table I summarises the characteristics of the PV module used in this paper.

Table I: PV Module Characteristic

Mark	Victron Energy
Model	SPP031001200
Power at MPP (P_{mpp})	100 W
Voltage at MPP (V_{mpp})	17,2 V
Current at MPP (I_{mpp})	5,8 A
Open circuit voltage (V_{oc})	21,8 V
Short circuit current (I_{sc})	6,18 A

B. DC-DC converter

1. Buck converter

The DC-DC converter used is a synchronous buck converter, because a MOSFET S2 is used in place of a freewheeling diode [12].

The operation of Fig. 4 can be divided into two phases, depending on the state of switches S1 and S2 [13]:

- switch S1 is closed (S2 open): the current supplied by the PV gradually charges inductance L during $t1 \in [0, dT]$ The voltage at the output of the converter is defined by:

$$V_{out} = V_{in} - V_L \tag{5}$$

- switch S1 is open (S2 closed): the current flowing through the inductor decreases during $t2 \in [dT, T]$, and this time it opposes this reduction in current:

$$V_L = -V_{out} \tag{6}$$

- The duty cycle d The ratio between the conduction time of S1 and the switching period T defines it:

$$d = \frac{t1}{T} \tag{7}$$




Fig. 4: Non-isolated synchronous buck converter

As summarised in Table 2, the prototype of the buck converter utilises resistor divider bridges to measure input and output voltage, a shunt resistor to measure input current, MOSFETs as switches, an IR 2104 as a bootstrap circuit to drive S1 and S2 switches, and an Arduino Mega 2560 as the microcontroller.

Table II: Synchronous buck converter characteristics

Input voltage Vin	10 – 30 V DC
Output voltage Vout	10 – 20 V DC
Input current	15 A maximum
C1 and C2 capacitor	470 uF
Inductor L	100 uH
S1 and S2 switches	MOSFET IPP12CN10L
Blocking diode D2	10A02
MOSFET driver	IR 2104
Switching frequency of S1 and S2	31,25 kHz
Microcontroller	Arduino MEGA 2560

2. Microcontroller

The microcontroller on the buck converter is an Atmel ATmega V-2560 Arduino board. A 5V DC voltage powers this 8-bit microcontroller.

It is made up of many peripherals, of which the ones we use are:

- Analogue acquisition module (ADC): to measure the value of the voltages at the terminals of the dividing bridges and the current sensor.

- PWM module (with a frequency of 31.25 kHz): to control the MOSFETS using the duty cycle.

3. Current and voltage sensor

Voltage measurement

A voltage divider bridge adapts the voltage level of the PV module to be readable by the Arduino's ADC (the ADC's value range is 0 to 5V DC).

The resistor value pair formed by R1 (51 kΩ) and R2 (10 kΩ) enables the measurement of a voltage up to 30 V DC and has been implemented at the input of the buck converter. The maximum open circuit voltage of the PV module is 21,8 V for an STC condition.

At the output of the buck converter, the pair of resistors R1 (30 kΩ) and R2 (10 kΩ) makes it possible to measure a voltage up to 20V DC.

Current measurement

The current measurement uses a 15 mΩ shunt resistor and a differential amplifier at these terminals (INA181A1). With these components, the gain of the current sensor (G = 20 V/V) makes it possible to measure a maximum current of 16




Fig. 5: Current sensor INA181A1

A. The maximum short-circuit current of the PV module is 6.12 A for an STC condition.

Fig. 6, supplemented by Table 2, illustrates the converter used in this article :

C. MPPT strategy control

MPPT is a command which consists of extracting the maximum power from a non-linear source by playing with the variation of the duty cycle in a DC-DC converter [14]-[16]. There exist many MPPT algorithms such as constant voltage tracking, P&O method, INC method, genetic algorithm, fuzzy logic control method, neural network method, sliding mode control method, predictive control technique, quadratic maximization method, and so on [14], [15].




Fig. 6: Prototype used grouping the control and power part



Experimentation of MPPT Control Driving a Buck Converter with PV Module Disturbances and Variable Load in a Nanogrid

In this paper, we will compare the performance of the Perturb and Observe and Conductance Increment methods, which are more widely used than others [10], [14], [15].

1. P&O

The P&O method consists of varying the voltage. V_{pv} and observing the impact on the output power of the PV module [17], [18]. At each cycle (Fig. 7), V_{pv} and I_{pv} are measured to calculate $P_{pv}(k)$, which will be compared to the previous power value $P_{pv}(k-1)$.




Fig. 7: Flow chart of P&O method

2. INC




Fig. 8: Incremental conductance algorithm flow chart

This method is based on the calculation of the ratio of the derivatives of power and voltage $\frac{dP}{dV}$ to reach the point of

maximum power [17], [18].

Knowing that the derivative of the product compared to the tension gives the following relation:

$$\frac{dP}{dV} = \frac{d(V \cdot I)}{dV} = I + V \frac{dI}{dV}, \quad (8)$$

The required incremental changes dV and dI are obtained by comparing the most recent measured values for V and I To those measured during the previous cycle (Fig. 8).

D. DC load

A programmable DC electronic load type 72-13210, manufactured by TENMATM, was used, firstly to measure the power supplied by the PV module in direct mode (for a voltage ranging from 0 to V_{OC}), then secondly to ensure the role of a battery in the output of the DC converter (for a voltage ranging from 10 to 15).

E. Focus time

Every 5 seconds, the voltage of the DC electronic load at the output of the buck converter varies with a step of 0.5V



Fig. 9: Bench test

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Results

1. In full sunlight




Fig. 10: Input power and voltage with P&O




Fig. 11: Input power and voltage with INC




Fig. 12: Input power with P&O and INC




Fig. 16: Input power with P&O and INC




Fig. 13: Input voltage with P&O and INC




Fig. 17: Input voltage with P&O and INC

2. Total horizontal shading




Fig. 14: Input power and voltage with P&O




Fig. 18: Input power and voltage with P&O

3. Total vertical shading




Fig. 15: Input power and voltage with INC




Fig. 19: Input power and voltage with INC

Experimentation of MPPT Control Driving a Buck Converter with PV Module Disturbances and Variable Load in a Nanogrid




Fig. 20: Input power with P&O and INC




Fig. 21: Input voltage with P&O and INC

B. Discussion

In full sunlight, for the first test, the PV module connected directly to the DC electronic load reaches a power peak around 70W for a V_{mpp} voltage of 14 to 15V (Fig. 10, Fig. 11, Fig. 12).

With the buck converter driven by the two commands P&O and INC, we have two cases on this first test:

- For an output voltage of 10 to 14V, in Fig. 13, the power at the input of the buck converter oscillates around the power peak for both controls.

The input voltage of the buck converter oscillates in the MPP zone with the INC command, which is not the case for the P&O command (it oscillates at the limit of this MPP zone).

- For an output voltage of 14 to 15V, in Fig. 13, a decrease in power and an increase in voltage at the input of the buck converter are observed for both controls.

The voltage drop explains this increase in the voltage at the input of the buck converter. ΔV Between the input and the output of the latter. On the order of 0.9V, this voltage drop ΔV Is equal to the sum of the voltages at the terminals of (i) the shunt resistor R, (ii) the power MOSFET S1, (iii) the ESR of the inductor L, (iv) the blocking diode D2 and (v) the assembly of the “high-side” conductor of the buck converter (cf. Fig. 4).

From where is its expression:

$$\Delta V = V_R + V_{S1} + V_L + V_{D2} + V_{HS}, \quad (12)$$

Therefore, in Fig. 13, when the output voltage is equal to that of the MPP zone, the input voltage cannot equal the output voltage because of this voltage drop, which forces it to increase (to go out of the V_{mpp} voltage range) and to lose power.

For the second test, the PV module, connected directly to the DC electronic load, reaches a power peak of

approximately 2W for a V_{mpp} voltage of 15.5 to 16.5 V (Fig. 14, Fig. 15, Fig. 16).

With both P&O and INC controls in Fig. 17, for an output voltage of 10 to 15V, the buck converter input power oscillates around the power peak, and the input voltage is inside the MPP range.

The V_{mpp} voltage range is always higher than the output voltage, so both controls have a margin to drive the buck converter input voltage to reach the maximum power.

For the last test, the PV module, connected directly to the DC electronic load, reaches a power peak of approximately 3.5 W for a V_{mpp} voltage of 15 to 17 V (Fig. 18, Fig. 19, Fig. 20).

Similar to the second test, the input power to the buck converter oscillates around the reference peak, and the input voltage remains within the MPP region, regardless of the output voltage, with both control settings (Fig. 21).

IV. CONCLUSION

The objective of this paper is to compare the performance of the P&O and INC controls driving a buck converter under various PV module conditions and a variable output voltage using a DC electronic load (from 10 to 15V, with a step of 0.5V every 5 seconds). The power supplied by a PV module connected directly to a DC electronic load is selected as the object of comparison.

The equipment used is (i) a 100W PV module SPP031001200 manufactured by Victron Energy, a synchronous buck converter driven by an Atmel ATmega V-2560 Arduino board with a frequency of 31.25 kHz, and a programmable DC electronic load of type 72-13210 manufactured by TENMA™.

The P&O and INC performed well for a V_{mpp} voltage range above the buck converter output voltage. However, they fail to stabilise the PV module power around the peak as soon as the buck converter output voltage equals the V_{mpp} voltage range. The voltage drop explains this power loss. ΔV Between the input and output voltages of the buck converter, which forces the input voltage out of the V_{mpp} voltage range.

For a PV module exposed to full sunlight, the INC method performs better than the P&O method. For a PV module exposed to total horizontal or vertical shading, the INC method offers a slight advantage over the P&O method, which can be beneficial in the long term.

The choice of a 10-15V buck converter output voltage aims to show the performance of the MPPT control for a 12V battery in charge mode. An MPPT-type solar charge controller uses MPPT control during the bulk phase, where the battery voltage is typically below a threshold voltage of 14.4V or 28.8V, depending on the installation voltage and the battery technology.

It should be noted that all tests were carried out without considering irradiance and temperature due to the lack of suitable measuring instruments.

DECLARATION

Funding/ Grants/ Financial Support	No, I did not receive.
Conflicts of Interest/ Competing Interests	No conflicts of interest to the best of our knowledge.
Ethical Approval and Consent to Participate	No, the article does not require ethical approval or consent to participate, as it presents evidence.
Availability of Data and Material/ Data Access Statement	Not relevant.
Authors Contributions	All authors have equal participation in this article.

REFERENCES


1. M. Boillot, A. Doulet, and N. Saincy, *Electrification latérale : Vers un nouveau modèle d'électrification pour l'Afrique*, Paris : Fondation Tuck, 2018.
2. M. Rebecca and E. Ergen, *Le secteur de l'énergie en Afrique subsaharienne : état des lieux et perspectives*, La Revue de l'Energie no. 626, 2015.
3. WWF, *Diagnostic du secteur énergie à Madagascar*, Rapport Septembre 2012.
4. A. Voninirina and S. Andriambeloso, *Étude sur l'énergie à Madagascar*, Centre de recherches, d'études et d'appui à l'analyse économique à Madagascar, 2014.
5. Étienne Beeker, 2017/2027 - Énergie centralisée ou décentralisée ? – Actions critiques, France Stratégie, 2017
6. A. Wheldon, C. Sharma, and E. Dobbs, 15 ans d'initiatives dans l'accès à l'électricité renouvelable décentralisée : l'expérience des Ashden Awards, Field Actions Science Reports, Paris, 2016.
7. A. Georgelin, *Le secteur de l'énergie à Madagascar : Enjeux et opportunités d'affaires*, 2016.
8. L. Richard, C. Boudinet, A. S. S. Ranaivoson, J. O. Rabarivao, A. E. Befeno, D. Frey, M. C. Alvarez-Hérault, B. Raison, N. Saincy, "Development of a DC Microgrid with Decentralized Production and Storage: From the Lab to Field Deployment in Rural Africa," *Energies MDPI*, vol. 15, no. 18, 6727, 2022. [CrossRef]
9. L. Richard, D. Frey, M. C. Alvarez-Hérault, B. Raison, "Experimental Design of Solar DC Microgrid for the Rural Electrification of Africa," *Proceedings of the PCIM Europe, Nurnberg, Germany*, pp. 1–10, 2022.
10. A. S. S. Ranaivoson, N. Le Saux, N. Saincy, E. J. R. Sambatra, T. Andrianajaina, T. D. Razafimahefa, "Comparison of two MPPT controls in a nanogrid." *International Journal of Education and Research*, vol.10, no. 9, pp. 143 – 158, 2022.
11. M. Scott, "A switched extremum seeking approach to maximum power point tracking in photovoltaic systems," *Grid Integration of Alternative Energy Sources*, Berkeley, 2009.
12. S. S. Ahmad and H. M. Y. Abdul, "Dynamic evolution control for synchronous buck DC–DC converter: Theory, model and simulation," *Simulation Modelling Practice and Theory, Elsevier*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 663-676, 2010. [CrossRef]
13. A. Rufer and P. Barrade, *Cours d'électronique de puissance – Conversion DC/DC*, Masson, 1994.
14. H. Abbes, H. Abid, K. Loukil, A. Toumi, and M. Abid, "Etude comparative de cinq algorithmes de commande MPPT pour un système photovoltaïque," *Revue des Energies Renouvelables*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 435-445, 2014
15. S. Li, "A MPPT control strategy with a variable weather parameter and no DC/DC converter for photovoltaic systems," *Solar Energy*, vol. 108, pp. 117-125, 2014 [CrossRef]
16. H. Rezk, A. M. Eltamaly, "A comprehensive comparison of different MPPT techniques for photovoltaic systems," *Solar Energy*, vol. 112, pp. 1-11, 2015. [CrossRef]
17. N. Aouchiche, M. S. Aït Cheikh, A. Malek, "Poursuite du point de puissance maximale d'un système photovoltaïque par les méthodes de l'incrémentation de conductance et la perturbation & observation," *Revue des Energies Renouvelables*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 485-498, 2013.
18. M. Saad, A. El Hammoumi, and A. El Ghzizal, "Photovoltaic systems with quantitative comparison between an improved MPPT and existing

INC and P&O methods under fast varying of solar irradiation," *Energy Reports*, vol. 4, pp. 341-350, 2018. [CrossRef]

AUTHORS PROFILE



Sandaniaina Sedinirina Andriamihaingo Ranaivoson received his Engineer's degree in Electrical Engineering from the Higher Polytechnic School of Antsiranana in 2017. His research interests include Photovoltaic Systems, DC-DC converters, MPPT control, and the smart grid.



Nicolas Saincy is a Co-founder of Nanoé - Decentralised electrification, a company whose objective is to develop access to electricity and employment in Africa by relying on renewable energies, local entrepreneurship, and information and communication technologies.



Eric Jean Roy Sambatra has a Ph.D. degree in Electrical Engineering. He is currently teaching at the School of Industrial Engineering, Higher Institute of Technology of Antsiranana. His research interests include renewable energy systems, Electrical machines, Photovoltaic Systems, Wind turbines, Rural electrification, and NGD design engineering.



Todizara Andrianajaina has a Ph.D. degree in science and technology. He is currently teaching at the Higher Polytechnic School of Antsiranana. His research interests are in the areas of Electrical and Electronics Engineering, Photovoltaic Systems, Fault Detection, and Renewable Energy Technologies.



Nirinason Jean Razafinjaka is currently a Professor at the Higher Polytechnic School of Antsiranana. His research interests include Power Factor Correction, Control Theory, Automation and Robotics, Automotive Engineering, Artificial Neural Networks, Fuzzy Logic Control, Systems Dynamics, Control and Instrumentation, and Optimal Estimation.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering and Sciences Publication (BEIESP)/ journal and/or the editor(s). The Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering and Sciences Publication (BEIESP) and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

