Contribution with global solar radiation forecasting by learning methods in aridclimate
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Abstract— A prior knowledge of Daily Global Solar Radiation (DGSR) is very important for better management and control of various solar installations, mainly photovoltaic and thermal systems. But the complexity of daily behaviour of solar radiation in terms of variability and non-stationary saw its random characteristic leads to consider more robust modelling and forecasting means of this meteorological phenomenon that remains essentially characteristic to the observed region. In this paper, we contribute to develop forecasting models of DGSR in southern region of Algeria (Ghardaia) by Support Vector Machine (SVM) method, for this purpose 42 SVM models are constructed with different possible combinations of measured temperatures (maximum temperature (Tmax), minimum temperature (Tmin) and average temperature (Tmean)) with calculated extraterrestrial radiation (H0) and maximum sunshine duration (S0) as input. Four models are selected for their good forecasting with an NRMSE arranged between 13.163% and 13.305% and a correlation coefficient (r) exceeding 89.4%. To prove the effectiveness of the proposed SVM models a comparative study is conducted with neural network models working with the same inputs.
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1. Introduction

The solar radiation is a very random phenomenon, its modeling and its forecasting has always been an actuality subject and a challenge for the researchers, A literature review shows that many researchers have focused on accurate GSR prediction using artificial neural network ANN [[1-4](#_ENREF_1)]. Although, the forecast of GSRbySVMtechnique (Support Vector Machine), whichwas developed by Vapnik[[5](#_ENREF_5)]andProved hisachievementin computerscience,bioinformatics, andenvironmental science, wasappliedrecently and givesgoodresults.

In 2013, Chen et al [[6](#_ENREF_6)] presents an application of SVM to estimate DGSR using different combination in input attributes based on sunshine duration and five empirical sunshine-based models are evaluated using meteorological data at three stations in Liaoning province in China. The SVM models outperform the empirical models. And results good performances with RMSE < 2.4 MJ/m² and RRMSE < 18%. Zeng et al [[7](#_ENREF_7)] propose a least-square support vector machine (LS-SVM) based model for short-term solar power prediction (SPP, One-hour-ahead ) in Denver-USA. The input of the model includes atmospheric transmissivity in a novel two-dimensional (2D) form,sky cover, relative humidity (Rh), and wind speed (WS). The output of the model is the predicted atmospheric transmissivity, which then is converted to solar power according to the latitude of the site and the time of the day. The coefficient of correlation r is 0.9740. in 2014, Ekici [[8](#_ENREF_8)] developed a Least Squares Support Vector Machine (LS-SVM) based intelligent model to predict the next day’s solar insolation in Turkey location with 99.294% accuracy. The prediction model has five inputs; The number of the day from 1st January, daily mean temperature, daily maximum temperature, sunshine duration, and the insolation of the day before. And recently (2015), Mohammadi et al [[9](#_ENREF_9)] developed an hybrid approach by combining the Support Vector Machine (SVM) with Wavelet Transform (WT) algorithm to predict daily and monthly horizontal global solar radiation in Iran. The different inputs are; relative sunshine duration (S/S0) which is the ratio of sunshine duration (S) to the maximum possible sunshine duration (S0), difference between maximum and minimum ambient temperatures (Tmax–Tmin), relative humidity (Rh), water vapor pressure (VP), average ambient temperature (Tavg) and extraterrestrial global solar radiation on a horizontal surface (Ho). Performance of model gives an MAPE, MABE, RMSE, RRMSE and r for daily estimation are 6.9996%, 0.8405 MJ/m2, 1.4245 MJ/m2, 7.9467% and 0.9086, respectively.

Concerning our contribution, we have to develop SVMs modelsto forecast daily global solar radiation DGSR for one step ahead by using simple inputs. The obtained results are compared with those given by NN models to prove the effectiveness of SVM.

1. Support vector machine (SVM ) theory

The formulation of SVM employs the Structural Risk Minimization (SRM) principle, which has been shown to be superior to the traditional Empirical Risk Minimization (ERM) principle employed in conventional learning algorithms (e.g. neural networks). This difference makes SVM more attractive in statistical learning applications [[10](#_ENREF_10)].

Given a set of data points:

The principle is to find a functionestablishing a relationship between the variables and grandeur to modelit ;from the set of measurements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  *,*  | (1) |

 : is the high dimensional feature space which is nonlinearly mapped from the input space.For more detailed information could be found in (Vapnik 1995 and 1998). The principle is to solve quadratic problem with constraints, so find the Lagrange multipliers and by minimizing:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | (2) |

With constraints:

Fig 1Relationship between DGSR and each of inputs used

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | (3) |
|  | (4)  |

Where is a user specified constant and determines the trade-off between the empirical risk and the regularization term.

The regression function is given by:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | (5) |

: is defined as the kernel function. Hervalue is equal to the scalar product of two vectors and in the feature space and .

The elegance of using the kernel function is that one can deal with feature spaces of arbitrary dimensionality without having to compute the map explicitly. Any function satisfying Mercer’s condition can be used as kernel function **[**[**11**](#_ENREF_11)**]**. Use of RBF function is recommended for several reasons, among other because RBF handles the case where the relationship between the labels and attributes is nonlinear.

1. Analysis and results

To develop these models, we have exploited the measures taken between February 2012 and February 2015 at Applied Research Unit for Renewable Energies (ARURE)Ghardaia. Situated in southern region of Algeria, of which latitude: +32.37°, longitude: +3.77°, and altitude: 450 m above the mean sea level. This site is characterized by semi-arid to arid climate. Two years are chosen for training the SVM model and one year is reserved to the test. According to Zhao et al [[12](#_ENREF_12)], SVM are highly effective models in solving non-linear problems even with small quantities of training data.

We will proceed to forecast daily global solar radiation DGSR of the following day (D + 1) using as inputs to the model SVM, different daily temperature of D-Day such as; maximum temperature (Tmax), minimum temperature (Tmin), Tmax-Tmin, average temperature (Tmean), extraterrestrial radiation (H0) and maximum sunshine duration (S0) in situ.

To justify our choice of inputs, we illustrate in Fig. 1 the relationship between DGSR and each of inputs used by calculating their correlation coefficients r.

|  |
| --- |
| Table 1.The various inputs used to develop SVM models |
| **Model** | **Input attributs** | **Model** | **Input attributs** | **Model** | **Input attributs** |
| SVM1 | Tmax | SVM15 | Tmax, S0 | SVM29 | Tmax, H0 |
| SVM2 | Tmin | SVM16 | Tmin, S0 | SVM30 | Tmin, H0 |
| SVM3 | Tmean | SVM17 | Tmean, S0 | SVM31 | Tmean, H0 |
| SVM4 | Tdiff | SVM18 | Tdiff, S0 | SVM32 | Tdiff, H0 |
| SVM5 | Tmax,Tmin | SVM19 | Tmax, Tmin, S0 | SVM33 | Tmax, Tmin, H0 |
| SVM6 | Tmax, Tmean | SVM20 | Tmax, Tmean, S0 | SVM34 | Tmax, Tmean, H0 |
| SVM7 | Tmax, Tdiff | SVM21 | Tmax, Tdiff, S0 | SVM35 | Tmax, Tdiff, H0 |
| SVM8 | Tmin, Tmean | SVM22 | Tmin, Tmean, S0 | SVM36 | Tmin, Tmean, H0 |
| SVM9 | Tmin, Tdiff | SVM23 | Tmin, Tdiff, S0 | SVM37 | Tmin, Tdiff, H0 |
| SVM10 | Tmean, Tdiff | SVM24 | Tmean, Tdiff, S0 | SVM38 | Tmean, Tdiff, H0 |
| SVM11 | Tmax, Tmin, Tmean | SVM25 | Tmax, Tmin, Tmean, S0 | SVM39 | Tmax, Tmin, Tmean, H0 |
| SVM12 | Tmax, Tmin, Tdiff | SVM26 | Tmax, Tmin, Tdiff, S0 | SVM40 | Tmax, Tmin, Tdiff, H0 |
| SVM13 | Tmax, Tmean, Tdiff | SVM27 | Tmax, Tmean, Tdiff, S0 | SVM41 | Tmax, Tmean, Tdiff, H0 |
| SVM14 | Tmin, Tmean, Tdiff | SVM28 | Tmin, Tmean, Tdiff, S0 | SVM42 | Tmin, Tmean, Tdiff, H0 |



Fig 2Performance criteriaof the differentSVMmodels developedforDGSR

TABLE 1. shows the different possible combinations. To simplify the writing, we put: Tmax-Tmin=Tdiff

To interpret the results of training and forecasting by different models (SVM1 to SVM42), we will calculate some performance tests; NRMSE, RMSE, MAPE, MBE and the correlation coefficient r. And we chose the plot of representative curves of these criteria that will allow us better reading (see Fig. 2.) and a better selection of models.

1. Discussion

SVM1toSVM14modelswhoseinputsareonlytemperatures give not goodresults, NRMSEvariesbetween20.095 % 26.844% and r between 0.421 to 0.740. by against, SVM15to SVM42modelswhom weintroduced eitherS0 orH0, the results are betterand approachingthem, butwe manage todistinguish fourmodelswhose performances arebettercompared to theother with respect tothe prediction,which we summarizein table 2.

****

Fig 3DGSR predicted and estimated based on the measured DGSR

|  |
| --- |
| Table 2Performance results of the four selected models |
|  | **Inputs** |  | **RMSE (Wh/m²)** | **RMSE (Cal/cm²)** | **RMSE****(Mj/m²)** | **NRMSE****(%)** | **MAPE****(%)** | **MPE****(Wh/m²)** | **r** |
| **SVM25** | Tmax, Tmin, Tmean, S0 | Test | 757.376 | 65.123 | 2.727 | 12.740 | 10.181 | 29.087 | 0.900 |
|  |  | Train | 777.346 | 66.840 | 2.798 | 13.266 | 10.503 | -57.599 | 0.894 |
| **SVM28** | Tmin, Tmean, Tdiff, S0 | Test | 762.664 | 65.577 | 2.746 | 12.829 | 10.293 | 31.988 | 0.900 |
|  |  | Train | 771.301 | 66.320 | 2.777 | 13.163 | 10.403 | -64.432 | 0.896 |
| **SVM39** | Tmax, Tmin, Tmean, H0 | Test | 757.479 | 65.131 | 2.727 | 12.742 | 10.137 | 28.027 | 0.901 |
|  |  | Train | 771.815 | 66.364 | 2.779 | 13.172 | 10.458 | -61.500 | 0.896 |
| **SVM42** | Tmin, Tmean, Tdiff, H0 | Test | 765.401 | 65.813 | 2.755 | 12.875 | 10.058 | 19.156 | 0.898 |
|  |  | Train | 779.625 | 67.036 | 2.807 | 13.305 | 10.440 | -74.242 | 0.894 |

Fig.3Representsthe estimationandforecastingDGSRthrough selected models

1. Comparison with NN model

Saw that neural networks (NN) have proved their achievement in the field of machine learning and prediction of solar radiation [15-21], so we have developed MLP (Multi Layer Perceptron) models with the same inputs as those of SVM models selected (SVM25, SVM28, SVM39, SVM42), then we compare them to prove the effectiveness of SVM.

Fig. 4. and 5. show the comparison between the correlation coefficients r of the four SVM models selected and those developed by MLP, respectively for training and forecasting. We present on the x-axis the selected inputs (ex: inputs 25 refer to the inputs used in the model SVM25).From these figures, we see that we get almost the same results for training, while for prediction, SVM models perform better.

1. Conclusion

This work has as objective the forecastingof DGSR for one step ahead by SVM method from many combinations of simple inputs.

****

Fig 4Comparison of SVM models to MLP models over training



Fig 5Comparison of SVM models to MLP models over forecasting.

Four models are selected for forecastingof DGSR with a correlation coefficient exceeding 89.4%, this models consider the three types of temperatures (Tmax, Tmin, and Tmean) with either H0 or S0. Their performances gave NRMSE between 13.163% and 13.305%, MAPE of 10.403% to 10.503% and r varies of 0.894 to 0.896.To prove the effectiveness of the proposed SVM models, a comparative study is conducted with neural network models working with the same inputs. We have noted that SVM models give better results compared to NN models. Finally, it can be concluded that the SVM is a reliable technique that can be easily operated whatsoever for estimation or forecasting processes with behavior as random as that of the solar radiation.
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