

A Rapid Feasibility Checking for Reconfiguration of Mismatched PV Arrays

Dafang Zhao, Fukuhito Ooshita, and Michiko Inoue

Nara Institute of Science and Technology, Japan

Email: {zhao.dafang.yu7, f-ooshita, kounoe}@is.naist.jp

Abstract—Power generation efficiency of photovoltaic (PV) arrays is significantly affected by partial shading and PV cell damage. Partial shading or PV cell damage induces mismatched power generation among PV panels and causes an efficiency loss of power generation. Power losses of mismatched PV arrays can be recovered by reconfiguring connection of PV panels. In this paper, we introduce a *feasibility check problem* of PV panel configuration. This problem identifies whether a connection among PV panels can be configured from a given PV module level solution. We also propose an algorithm for the *feasibility check problem*. The experimental results demonstrate that the proposed algorithm can identify feasible configurations more than 32,000X faster than the exhaustive search with around 0.6% errors.

Index Terms—photovoltaic, feasibility, reconfiguration, mismatch

I. INTRODUCTION

As fossil fuel depletion and environmental pollution become more serious, green and renewable energy has become necessary for a sustainable society and environment. Photovoltaic (PV) systems receive significant attention since the sun has unlimited energy and PV arrays can be easily scaled up. However, due to the nature of PV cell, which is a basic component of a PV array, PV arrays are sensitive to partial shading and PV cell damage. PV cells could not uniformly generate power when they experience different irradiances or some of them have physical defects, and such a mismatched condition might accelerate heating and aging of PV cells and cause further damaging. To prevent PV cells from damaging, bypass diodes are usually placed in PV arrays and they are turned on in mismatched conditions. However, the operation of bypass diode will cause a number of PV cells to stop deliver power, it will also introduce voltage drop which cause PV system generates multi maximum power points.

PV arrays are hierarchically constructed such that a group of PV cells form a PV module, a group of PV modules form a PV panel, and a group of PV panels form a PV array. Power generation of mismatched PV arrays can be recovered by reconfiguring connection of these components. Fig.1 shows an example of power generations of a PV array with a partial shading. We distributed shading cells non-uniformly to a PV array with 3×4 PV panels and applied power simulation. Before reconfiguration, it has multiple maximum power points (MPP), while, after we reconfigured connection among PV




Fig. 1: Power generation before and after reconfiguration

panels, MPPs has reduced and power generation increased by 35%.

Though several reconfiguration methods have been proposed, most works consider reconfiguration in PV cell or PV module level [1]–[5]. However, cell level reconfiguration requires a significantly high computation time and a large number of switches for reconfiguration. In addition, they require a special PV panels with capability of switching, and cannot be applied to the system constructed with standard PV panels. From a practical view, reconfiguration of connection among PV panels is a realistic solution since a PV panel is manufactured as a physical one panel with two terminals and PV panels can be flexibly interconnected.

Reconfiguration in PV panel level has been investigated [6]–[8]. A PV array reconfiguration using genetic algorithm (GA) was proposed in [6]. Though it can give a new configuration, computing cost is significantly high and the algorithm cannot generate the best configuration precisely. Hu et al. also addressed PV panel reconfiguration where they formulate a nonlinear integer programming problem to optimize power generation by reconfiguration [7]. Orozco-Gutierrez et al. proposed an efficient and effective reconfiguration method [8] where it first selects candidates of configurations using the product of approximated currents and voltages, then finds the best one with precise power simulation. However, these candidates are specified in a PV module level though PV modules could not be fully reconfigured. Actually, we found that some of configuration candidates are not able to be realized. However, the paper [8] does not show any systematic way to identify such a feasibility.

In this paper, we propose an algorithm to rapidly check feasibility that a given configuration candidate is actually able to form by given PV panels. The proposed method can efficiently check the feasibility while identifying most feasible cases accurately. The experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed method that it can identify the feasibility of configurations and false negative are less than 1%.

II. PHOTOVOLTAIC ARRAY

A PV system or PV array is composed of PV panels that have two terminals of plus and minus and can be interconnected. There are two common connection styles for PV arrays, *series-parallel* array and *total-cross-tied* array. In a series-parallel array, PV panels are connected in series, and multiple series connections are connected in parallel. In a total-cross-tied array, parallel connections of PV panels are connected in series. In this paper, we focus on series-parallel arrays, however the basic idea of the proposed method can be applied also to total-cross-tied arrays. Hereafter, we simply call a series-parallel array a *PV array*.

Figure 2 shows an example of a PV array. A PV array is a parallel connection of (PV) strings where a string is a series connection of PV panels. A PV panel is a series connection of PV modules, and a PV module is a parallel connection of a series of PV cells and a bypass diode. A typical commercial PV panel is composed of three PV modules each of which has 12-24 PV cells. A PV module can generate power for a given voltage according to its I-V characteristics as shown in Fig.3(a - c). The I-V characteristics is affected by irradiance level and physical damage of PV cells. Figure 3(a) also shows a typical degradation of a I-V characteristics where generated current is reduced with some ratio while keeping the voltage range. When a PV panel has a partial shade, that is its PV modules have different irradiance levels and hence different I-V characteristics, the PV panels might have multiple peaks (maximum power points, MPPs) in power generation as shown in Fig.3(d).

To find out accurate I-V characteristics of a PV panel, we need to apply a time consuming power simulation. However, we can roughly understand I-V characteristics of a PV panel (and also a string) as follows. When a control voltage is low, PV modules with high irradiance level are active while PV modules with low irradiance level are inactive with turning on their bypass diodes. In this case, a high current can flow in the PV panel. When control voltage is increasing, some of bypass diodes become turning off and the corresponding PV modules become active. In that case, the current flow in the panel is determined by current of module with lowest irradiance level, and generated power sometimes increases and sometimes decreases. The generated power at MPPs can be roughly estimated. In Fig.3(d), one PV panel has three PV modules with different irradiance levels. The peak currents for these modules are 4.3A, 3.0A, and 1.5A, respectively. Voltages at MPPs are roughly 20V, 44V, 66V in Fig.3(d), those are roughly multiples of a voltage of MPP for one PV




Fig. 2: PV array, string, module and panel




Fig. 3: I-V characteristics

module (around 22V in this case). At the first MPP (MPP1), only one PV module with a peak current of 4.5A is active at a control voltage of 22V, so the generated power is 94.6W. At the second MPP (MPP2), two PV modules with peak currents of 4.3A and 3.0A are active at a control voltage of 44V. In this case, the current level of the PV panel is 3.0A since two PV panels are connected in series and they have to have the same current level, and the generated power is 132W. At the third MPP (MPP3), the current level of the PV panel is 1.5A at a control voltage of 66V, and the generated power is 99W.

In a PV array, we have two constraints. PV panels in the same string have the same current level, while all the strings have the same control voltage. When considering reconfiguration of PV panel connection, we should find out the best configuration while considering these constraints.

III. OROZCO-GUIERREZ'S METHOD

In this section, we briefly introduce a method proposed by Orozco-Guierrez et al. [8] as the most related work to this paper. Orozco-Guierrez et al. proposed an efficient

TABLE I: Extracted currents of MPPs

	Panels			
	P1	P2	P3	P4
MPP1	3.10A	3.09A	0.52A	2.47A
MPP2	2.98A	2.55A	0.50A	1.53A
MPP3	1.55A	2.48A	0.46A	0.48A

reconfiguration algorithm for mismatched PV arrays. The method utilizes information of MPPs of every PV panel that is extracted using an online monitoring [9] and a power estimation [10].

For the method in [8], first, close values will be approximated and grouped into a small number of classes so that the number of possible combinations, or a search space, is reduced. Then possible combinations of reconfiguration are enumerated. For each candidate configuration their generate power value are estimated by [10] along with careful estimation of possible errors. For example, Table I shows extracted currents for 4 panels each of which has 3 modules, and they are approximated into four current levels as shown in Table II. As mentioned in Section II, if some panel has m MPPs with current level of I or larger, m modules can be active with current level of I . Table III shows the maximum number of active modules for each current level. Control voltage for one PV model is approximated to 20V. Approximated power values for possible configurations are shown in Table IV. Table IV shows an example to form a PV array with two strings, where power value is simply multiplied PV array current with control voltage. The method has a simple feasibility check as follows.

(Feasibility 1) For the n -th highest current level I_n , the number of active modules in a configuration candidate is $N(I_n)/n$ or less,

Where $N(I)$ denotes the total number of active modules for a current level I . For example, consider a candidate current pair (3A, 2.5A). In this case, the highest and the second highest current levels are 3A and 2.5A, respectively, and the total number of active modules for 3A and 2.5A are 3 and 6, respectively (see Table III). Therefore, the number of active modules in the first string is 3 or less, and the number of active modules in the second string is also $6/2 = 3$ or less. Consequently, the number of active modules per string is at most 3 for a candidate current pair (3A, 2.5A). Table IV has values in the cells when Feasibility 1 is satisfied.

The method finds the largest power value from possible candidate configurations (330W for current pair (3A, 2.5A) with three active modules in this case) and evaluates the case more precisely along with the cases with close values to the best value since the analysis are given with approximated values. In the case of Table IV, 330W, 320W and 300W are selected for further evaluation.

IV. FEASIBILITY

In the method [8], to execute a power simulation for a PV array, we need to assign panels into strings to realize a candidate configuration. For example, a candidate configuration for

TABLE II: Approximated currents of MPPs

	Panels			
	P1	P2	P3	P4
MPP1	3A	3A	0.5A	2.5A
MPP2	3A	2.5A	0.5A	1.5A
MPP3	1.5A	2.5A	0.5A	0.5A

TABLE III: Maximum number of active modules

	Panels				total
	P1	P2	P3	P4	
3A	2	1	0	0	3
2.5A	2	3	0	1	6
1.5A	3	3	0	2	8
0.5A	3	3	3	3	12

a current pair (2.5A, 2.5A) with 3 active modules is realized by assign panel P2 to the first string and panels P1 and P4 to the second string as shown in Fig.4. However, we could not find feasible assignment for a current pair (3A, 2.5A) with 3 active modules or a current pair (2.5A, 1.5A) with 4 active modules though they are expected to generate higher powers 330W or 320W. That is, the condition Feasibility 1 is necessary but not sufficient to give a actual feasibility result.




Fig. 4: Feasible configuration

Now we will define the feasibility. For a PV array A with s strings, let $M_{A,i}(I)$ denote the number of modules that can be active with a current level I in the i -th string. Let $Q = (Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_s)$ be a sequence of currents required for strings. A sequence of currents Q is feasible with m modules if and only if it is possible to form a PV array A such that

$$M_{A,i}(Q_i) \geq m \quad (1)$$

holds for each string $i(1 \leq i \leq s)$.

V. AN ALGORITHM TO IDENTIFY FEASIBILITY

A. Feasibility Problem

In this section, we propose an algorithm to identify feasibility. First we will formulate the feasibility problem that

TABLE IV: Approximated power

# modules per string	currents sequence for strings (A)									
	(3,3)	(3,2.5)	(3,1.5)	(3,0.5)	(2.5,2.5)	(2.5,1.5)	(2.5,0.5)	(1.5,1.5)	(1.5,0.5)	(0.5,0.5)
1	120W	110W	90W	70W	100W	80W	60W	60W	40W	20W
2	-	220W	180W	140W	200W	160W	120W	120W	80W	40W
3	-	330W	270W	210W	300W	240W	180W	180W	120W	60W
4	-	-	-	-	-	320W	240W	240W	160W	80W
5	-	-	-	-	-	-	300W	-	200W	100W
6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	240W	120W

identifies the feasibility for given current sequence and the number of active modules per string as follows.

Definition 1 (Feasibility Problem):

Input: Information of MPPs (approximated values), a current sequence Q , the number of m of active modules per-string.

Output: Whether Q with m modules is feasible or not.

B. Outline of the algorithm

In the proposed algorithm, we try to configure a PV array and identify the feasibility of configuration. For a given current sequence $Q = (Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_s)$ ($Q_i \geq Q_j$ if $i \leq j$), we will assign panels to strings in the order of Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_s . When selecting a panel to a string, we will consider how much we lose an opportunity that the panel is more effectively used for other current level. For example, if we select Panel 1 in Table III for a string with a current level 3A, two modules can be active while the remaining one module becomes inactive. The remaining one module still is not active if $P1$ is used for a current level 2.5A, while it can be active if it is used for current level 1.5A or 0.5A. We will consider that when selecting $P1$ for a current level 3A, we do not have any loss for a current level 2.5A but lose one module for 1.5A and 0.5A. The algorithm select panels so as to minimize such losses.

Let $M_p(I)$ denote the number of modules that can be active at current level I in a PV panel p . For a given current sequence $Q = (Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_s)$ ($Q_i \geq Q_j$ if $i \leq j$), a loss of selecting a panel p at the $k-1$ -th string for the k -th string is defined as $Loss(p, k) = M_p(Q_k) - M_p(Q_{k-1})$.

To assign panels for the n -th string, the following steps are applied. Let m be the required number of active modules.

- 1) Sort unselected PV panels in a lexicographically ascending order of $Loss(p, n+1)$, $Loss(p, n+2), \dots, Loss(p, s)$ and $M_p(Q_n)$.
- 2) Select PV panels until selecting m or more active modules for a current level Q_n .
- 3) Cancel redundant PV panels so that the number of active modules at a current level Q_n is minimized.
- 4) Swap selected PV panels with unselected PV panels so that the number of selected PV panels is minimized.

Before explaining more details, we first show an example. Table V shows how to select PV panels for the first string where the required number m of active modules is 5. Panels are sorted by $Loss$ and $M_p(Q_1)$ (the number of active

TABLE V: An example of the proposed method ($m = 5$)

	Panels						
	$P1$	$P2$	$P3$	$P4$	$P5$	$P6$	$P7$
$M_p(Q_1)$	1	1	1	1	2	2	1
$M_p(Q_2)$	1	2	2	2	3	3	2
$M_p(Q_3)$	1	2	2	2	3	3	3
$Loss(p, 2)$	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
$Loss(p, 3)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
step 2	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
step 3	✓	✓	✓		✓		
step 4	✓				✓	✓	

modules for the first string) in the order of $P1, P2, \dots, P7$. In the example, panels $P2$ to $P6$ are at the same loss level $(1, 0)$. PV panels are selected for each loss level. First, $P1$ is selected, then panels at the second loss level are selected in the order of $P2, P3, \dots$. After selecting until $P5$, the number of active modules exceed $m (= 5)$. In this case, if some redundant panels, these panels are canceled. In the example, $P4$ is canceled. Finally, if some of selected PV panels can be swapped with less number of unselected panels, they are swapped. In the example, $P2$ and $P3$ are swapped with $P6$. Consequently, three panels $P1, P5$ and $P6$ are selected.

C. Algorithm

This algorithm roughly divided into 4 steps.

Step 1 sorts unselected panels in a lexicographically ascending order of index $Loss$ and $M_p(Q_n)$. This sorting step will give a basic selecting priority for all unselected panels. A panel with uniformly irradiance distribution is preferred over non-uniformly irradiance distributed panel.

Step 2 selects sorted panels one by one until reaching the required number of active modules. In this selection step, panel with no active modules will be skipped.

Step 3 optimizes the number of active modules. In Step 3, if the number of active modules exceeds the required number m , redundant panels are canceled if exist. A panel is *redundant* if the number of active modules is still m or more even if the panel is canceled. Redundant panels are searched at loss level. Starting with a loss level where the last panel is selected, we will check the number of active modules $M_p(Q_n)$ for each panel p where Q_n is a required current level for the current string. Redundant panels are selected and canceled from panels with less number of $M_p(Q_n)$ in the same loss level. If they still exceed m after canceling, the same procedure will operate on previous loss level. This

procedure is repeated until selecting an exactly m active modules or checking all the loss levels.

Step 4 optimizes the number of selected panels. In Step 4, we will swap selected panels and an unselected panel in the same loss level to reduce the number of selected panels. There are 3 swap cases as shown in Table VI. This swap procedure will minimum the total module losses and further more reduce the number of panels. **Algorithm 1** shows a pseudo code of the proposed algorithm.

TABLE VI: Swap rule

The numbers of active modules	
selected panels	unselected panels
1, 1, 1	3
1, 1	2
1, 2	3

VI. EVALUATION

Although the pilot example refers to three strings only, the extension of the method to any number of parallel connected string is the same.

To evaluate the performance of proposed algorithm, we compare the result with exhaustive searching algorithm for 100 random shadow distributed PV arrays. For each PV array, 6 - 24 PV panels connected into 3 - 6 PV strings. For each PV panel, it will has 3 - 8 working current values.

The computational time required for finding optimal configuration and accuracy of feasibility judgment in the proposed algorithm and exhaustive search algorithm are compared in Table VII. As shown in Table VII, from 100 PV arrays, 486 configuration candidates are selected where each candidate is specified with a required current sequence for strings and the number of active modules per string. Since the exhaustive search checks all the combinations of panel connections for each configuration candidate, it accurately identifies the feasibility of every configuration but that takes a lot of time.

The calculation was performed using an Intel i7-4770 Quad-Core processor and 16 GB of RAM memory. The time used by the proposed feasibility check method was 3ms, which is significantly lower than the 98s needed by the exhaustive search algorithm. On the other hand, the proposed method misidentifying only 3 feasible negative cases, the error rate is less than 1 %.

In conclusion, the proposed method provides a solution for checking the feasibility of PV configurations with an error lower than 1% but execution time are significantly lower than the one required by exhaustive search algorithm.

VII. CONCLUSION

Power generation of mismatched PV arrays can be recovered by reconfiguring connection of PV panels. In this paper, we introduced a feasibility check problem to configure PV panel connections from PV module connections and proposed an algorithm that efficiently and effectively solves the problem. The experimental results show that the proposed algorithm can identify feasible configurations more than 32,000X

Algorithm 1: Feasibility Check Problem

Input:

$Q = Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_s$: required current for each string;
 m : the minimum number of active modules per string;
 M_p : the number of active modules in each panel p ;
 s : the number of strings;

Output: Feasibility Result;

```

1 for each string  $k(2 \leq k \leq s)$  and panel  $p$  do
2   |  $Loss(p, k) = M_p(Q_k) - M_p(Q_{k-1})$ 
3 end
4 for  $j = 1$  to  $s$  do
5   | if  $\sum M_p(Q_j)$  for unselected panels  $< m$  then
6     | return : Feasibility = NO
7   end
8    $PS =$  a set of unselected panels with
9      $M_p(Q_j) > 0$ ;
10  // step 1
11  sort  $PS$  in a lexicographically ascending order of
12     $Loss(p, j+1), Loss(p, j+2), \dots, Loss(p, s),$ 
13     $M_p(Q_j)$ ;
14  // step 2
15  select panels in the order in  $PS$  until  $\sum M_p(Q_j)$ 
16    for selected panels  $\geq m$ ;
17  //step 3
18  group selected panels  $LV_1, LV_2, \dots, LV_h$  with
19    loss level ( $LV_1$  is the lowest level);
20  for  $i = h$  to  $1$  do
21    | find and cancel redundant panels in  $LV_i$  in the
22      order in  $PS$ 
23  end
24  //step 4
25  for  $i = h$  to  $1$  do
26    | apply swap rules for selected panels in  $LV_i$ 
27      and an unselected panel in the same loss level
28  end
29 end
30 return : Feasibility = YES

```

TABLE VII

COMPARISON BETWEEN EXISTED METHODS
AND PROPOSED ALGORITHM

	Proposed Algorithm	Exhaustive search Algorithm
Number of PV Array	100	
Number of MPP candidates	486	
Feasible Candidates	324	327
Infeasible Candidates	162	159
Error Rate	0.62%	0%
Ave. times per Array	0.003s	98s

faster than the exhaustive search with around 0.6% errors. The proposed method is useful to identify or configure actual PV panel connections from PV module level specifications or connections. Since there are many works of PV module level reconfiguration and PV panel level reconfiguration using PV module level optimization as an intermediate solution, the proposed algorithm is useful to actually find PV panel connections from PV module level solutions. PV panel level reconfiguration is a practical and realistic solution for PV arrays composed of standard PV panels, and the proposed method contributes to find efficient and effective solution for PV panel level reconfiguration.

REFERENCE

- [1] D. Nguyen and B. Lehman, "An adaptive solar photovoltaic array using model-based reconfiguration algorithm," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 2644–2654, 2008.
- [2] Y. Wang, X. Lin, Y. Kim, N. Chang, and M. Pedram, "Architecture and control algorithms for combating partial shading in photovoltaic systems," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 917–930, 2014.
- [3] J. P. Storey, P. R. Wilson, and D. Bagnall, "Improved optimization strategy for irradiance equalization in dynamic photovoltaic arrays," *IEEE transactions on power electronics*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 2946–2956, 2013.
- [4] J. Storey, P. R. Wilson, and D. Bagnall, "The optimized-string dynamic photovoltaic array," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 1768–1776, 2014.
- [5] P. Udenze, Y. Hu, H. Wen, X. Ye, and K. Ni, "A reconfiguration method for extracting maximum power from non-uniform aging solar panels," *Energies*, vol. 11, no. 10, p. 2743, 2018.
- [6] P. L. Carotenuto, A. Della Cioppa, A. Marcelli, and G. Spagnuolo, "An evolutionary approach to the dynamical reconfiguration of photovoltaic fields," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 170, pp. 393–405, 2015.
- [7] Y. Hu, J. Zhang, P. Li, D. Yu, and L. Jiang, "Non-uniform aged modules reconfiguration for large-scale pv array," *IEEE Transactions on Device and Materials Reliability*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 560–569, 2017.
- [8] M. Orozco-Gutierrez, G. Spagnuolo, J. Ramirez-Scarpetta, G. Petrone, and C. Ramos-Paja, "Optimized configuration of mismatched photovoltaic arrays," *IEEE J. Photovolt*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 1210–1220, 2016.
- [9] P. L. Carotenuto, P. Manganiello, G. Petrone, and G. Spagnuolo, "On-line recording a pv module fingerprint," *IEEE Journal of Photovoltaics*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 659–668, 2014.
- [10] M. Orozco-Gutierrez, J. Ramirez-Scarpetta, G. Spagnuolo, G. Petrone, and C. Ramos-Paja, "Fast estimation of mpps in mismatched pv arrays based on lossless model," in *Clean Electrical Power (ICCEP), 2015 International Conference on*, pp. 435–440, IEEE, 2015.