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Abstract

In outdoor deployed photovoltaics (PV), standard test conditions (STC) of 25 °C PV temperature, 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ solar radiation intensity and 1.5 air-mass rarely prevail. PV temperature can rise 40-100 °C above STC inducing a power drop in crystalline silicon PV with a coefficient of -0.4 to -0.65 %/K above STC. Increased operating temperature also results in accelerated PV degradation due to cell delamination allowing moisture ingress.

Conventional building integrated photovoltaics (BIPV) cooling techniques using passive or active heat removal by air or water flow are limited by (i) very low heat transfer or (ii) large capital as well as maintenance costs respectively. A PV cooling technique employing phase change materials (PCM) exploits latent heat absorption during solid-liquid phase change in a very narrow range of PCM transition temperature was investigated.

The current research aims to investigate suitable PCM materials through experimental characterization in terms of melting point, heat of fusion, thermal conductivity, density and specific heat capacity to determine the suitability of different PCMs for PV cooling in different climatic conditions indoors and outdoors employed at small scale cell size PV systems as well as larger PV panel size system through extensive experimental work supported by the reasonable numerical modeling to determine the associated power improvement of PV through cooling produced by PCM.
Indoor experiments were conducted at small scale cell size PV at 500 Wm\(^{-2}\), 750 Wm\(^{-2}\) and 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) insolation representative PV operating condition that would require PV cooling in most cases. The effect of (i) thermal mass of PCM (ii) melting point of PCM and (iii) thermal conductivities of PCM and PV-PCM system on temperature regulation performance of PCM was observed. Two out of five PCM, a salt hydrate (CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O) and a eutectic mixture of capric -palmitic acid (CP), an aluminium alloy based PV-PCM systems were found optimum for PV temperature regulation at most of the solar radiation intensities. To extend experiments on PV panel size systems, A larger scale PV-PCM system with dimensions 700 cm x 600 cm with metallic fins was fabricated. PCM CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O and CP found optimum through cell size experiments were characterized at 500 Wm\(^{-2}\), 750 Wm\(^{-2}\) and 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) insolation contained in the large scale PV-PCM system. The experiments on large scale PV-PCM systems showed promise for PV cooling provided by PCM and associated power gain. PV-PCM systems were then characterized outdoors in Dublin, Ireland (53.33 N, 6.25 W) and Vehari, Pakistan (30.03 N, 72.25 E) to observe their performance in real time outdoor condition in different climates. Higher PV cooling and associated power savings were observed in climate of Vehari than that of Dublin. Out of the two PCMs, CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O achieved higher PV cooling and power saving than CP. In the best case, peak PV cooling of 21.5 °C with associated measured peak power saving of 13 % and predicted peak power saving of 14 % were recorded in Vehari on 30-10-2009. The results show that PCM are an effective way to cool PV and maintain higher power outputs in higher insolation climates.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIPV</td>
<td>Building integrated photovoltaics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaCl₂</td>
<td>CaCl₂·6H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Capric acid-lauric acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Capric acid-palmitic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>Differential scanning calorimetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTA</td>
<td>Differential thermal analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVA</td>
<td>Ethyl vinyl acetate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GaAs</td>
<td>Gallium arsenide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GaSb</td>
<td>Gallium antimonide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTF</td>
<td>Heat transfer fluid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCM</td>
<td>Phase change material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>Photovoltaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV-PCM₁</td>
<td>PV module containing integrated PCM, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV-PCM₂</td>
<td>PV module containing integrated PCM, CaCl₂·6H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV-T</td>
<td>Photovoltaic thermal systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RET</td>
<td>Renewable energy technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC</td>
<td>Standard test conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THM</td>
<td>Temperature history method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMS</td>
<td>Thin metal sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wₚ</td>
<td>Watt peak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Nomenclature**

\[ A \] Surface area \([m^2]\)

\[ A_c \] Convective heat transfer area of the tube \([m^2]\)

\[ A_I \] Integral of time-temperature curve during liquid phase
\[ = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} [(T - T_{a,a})] dt \] \([^\circ Cs]\)

\[ A_2 \] Integral of time-temperature curve during phase change
\[ = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} ((T - T_{a,a})] dt \] \([^\circ Cs]\)

\[ A_3 \] Integral of time-temperature curve of solid PCM till thermal equilibrium with ambient
\[ = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (\frac{(T - T_{a,a})}{C_p,l}) dt \] \([^\circ Cs]\)

\[ A_{PV} \] Area of the PV exposed to solar radiations \([m^2]\)

\[ Bi \] Biot number \([-\] \]

\[ C_{p,l} \] Specific heat capacity of liquid PCM \([kJkg^{-1}K^{-1}]\)

\[ C_{p,s} \] Specific heat capacity of solid PCM \([kJkg^{-1}K^{-1}]\)

\[ C_{p,t} \] Specific heat capacity of glass tube \([kJkg^{-1}K^{-1}]\)

\[ C_{p,w} \] Specific heat capacity of water \([kJkg^{-1}K^{-1}]\)

\[ E \] East \([-\] \]

\[ FF \] Fill factor \([-\] \]

\[ FF_{st} \] FF neglecting temperature influence \([-\] \]

\[ FF_T \] FF calculated considering temperatures influence \([-\] \]

\[ G \] Solar radiation \([Wm^{-2}]\)

\[ Gr \] Grashof number \([-\] \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H$</td>
<td>Latent heat of fusion</td>
<td>[kJkg$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>Sensible enthalpy</td>
<td>[kJkg$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_c$</td>
<td>Convective heat loss coefficient</td>
<td>[Wm$^{-2}$K$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_{ca}$</td>
<td>Combined convective and radiative heat loss coefficient</td>
<td>[Wm$^{-2}$K$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I$</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>[A]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{sc}$</td>
<td>Short circuit current</td>
<td>[A]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J_{sc}$</td>
<td>Short circuit current density</td>
<td>[Am$^{-2}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l$</td>
<td>Length scale</td>
<td>[m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>Liquid fraction</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m$</td>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>[kg]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_p$</td>
<td>Mass of PCM</td>
<td>[kg]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_t$</td>
<td>Mass of glass tube</td>
<td>[kg]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_w$</td>
<td>Mass of distilled water</td>
<td>[kg]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Nu$</td>
<td>Nusselt number</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOCT</td>
<td>Normal operating cell temperature</td>
<td>['C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>Electrical power</td>
<td>[W]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Pe$</td>
<td>Peclet number</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>[Nm$^{-2}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p’_s$</td>
<td>Boundary pressure</td>
<td>[Nm$^{-2}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_m$</td>
<td>Maximum power point</td>
<td>[W]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Pr$</td>
<td>Prandtl number</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_s$</td>
<td>Power saving</td>
<td>[W]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_T$</td>
<td>Power produced by PV at a temperature $T$</td>
<td>[W]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_A$</td>
<td>Heat lost from PV available to PV-T</td>
<td>[J]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_s$</td>
<td>Heat storage capacity</td>
<td>[kJK$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q''''$</td>
<td>Volumetric heat source</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q_r$</td>
<td>Radiation flux</td>
<td>[Wm$^{-2}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q$</td>
<td>Unit charge</td>
<td>[C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>Radius of the glass tube</td>
<td>[m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Ra$</td>
<td>Raleigh number</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Re$</td>
<td>Reynolds number</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_s$</td>
<td>Series resistance</td>
<td>[Ω]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{sh}$</td>
<td>Shunt resistance</td>
<td>[Ω]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{b}$</td>
<td>Source terms in momentum equation</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_h$</td>
<td>Source term in energy equation</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$St$</td>
<td>Stanton number</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Ste$</td>
<td>Stefan number</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{amb}$</td>
<td>Ambient temperature</td>
<td>[°C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_c$</td>
<td>Temperature coefficient of power drop</td>
<td>[°C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{cell}$</td>
<td>Temperature of PV cell</td>
<td>[°C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{FF}$</td>
<td>Temperature coefficient of fill factor</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_i$</td>
<td>Interface temperature</td>
<td>[°C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_m$</td>
<td>Equilibrium temperature of melting/freezing</td>
<td>[°C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_p$</td>
<td>Temperature coefficient of power</td>
<td>[%/°C$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{pv}$</td>
<td>Temperature of the reference PV</td>
<td>°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{PVPCM}$</td>
<td>Temperature of PV-PCM</td>
<td>°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_r$</td>
<td>Reference PV temperature</td>
<td>°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_s$</td>
<td>Surface temperature</td>
<td>°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{sun}$</td>
<td>Temperature of sun</td>
<td>°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_s$</td>
<td>Surface temperature</td>
<td>°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u_I$</td>
<td>Actual fluid velocity</td>
<td>[ms$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U_{PV}$</td>
<td>Overall heat loss coefficient</td>
<td>[Wm$^{-2}$K$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V$</td>
<td>Output voltage</td>
<td>[V]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v$</td>
<td>Superficial velocities in y direction</td>
<td>[ms$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{oc}$</td>
<td>Open circuit voltage</td>
<td>[V]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_w$</td>
<td>Wind speed</td>
<td>[ms$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W$</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w$</td>
<td>Superficial velocities in z direction</td>
<td>[ms$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_i$</td>
<td>Interface velocity</td>
<td>[ms$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>Position of the interface</td>
<td>[m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>Thermal diffusivity</td>
<td>[m$^2$s$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_{pv}$</td>
<td>Absorptance of PV</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>Thermal expansion coefficient</td>
<td>[K$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma$</td>
<td>Thermal regulation enhancement</td>
<td>[°C-min]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta T$</td>
<td>Change in temperature</td>
<td>[°C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>Heat flow into the solid phase</td>
<td>[Js$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>[%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta$</td>
<td>Coefficient of solar irradiance</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_e$</td>
<td>Energy efficiency of PV system</td>
<td>[%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_r$</td>
<td>Reference PV module efficiency</td>
<td>[%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity</td>
<td>[Wm$^{-1}$K$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa_s$</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity solid phase</td>
<td>[Wm$^{-1}$K$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa_l$</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity liquid phase</td>
<td>[Wm$^{-1}$K$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda$</td>
<td>Porosity</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>Superficial fluid velocity</td>
<td>[ms$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_1$</td>
<td>Superficial fluid velocity</td>
<td>[ms$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_k$</td>
<td>Kinetic mobility</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>Kinematic viscosity</td>
<td>[m$^2$s$^{-1}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\xi$</td>
<td>Half mushy zone</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>Density</td>
<td>[gcm$^{-3}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>Stefan Boltzmann's constant</td>
<td>[Wm$^{-2}$K$^{-4}$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau$</td>
<td>Transmittance of PV</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definitions of Dimensionless numbers**

$Gr = Grashof number$- is the ratio of buoyancy forces to viscous forces acting on a fluid. It determines the transition from laminar flow to turbulent flow for natural convection heat transfer in fluids. The natural convection is laminar at lower $Gr$ while it is turbulent at higher $Gr$ values, the transition to turbulent flow occurs at $10^7 < Gr < 10^8$. For vertical
heated wall, similar to the PV wall heated by incoming solar radiation in current work, the $Gr_i$ is:

$$Gr_i = \frac{g\beta(T_s - T_\infty)t^3}{\nu^2}$$

Where $g$ is the gravitational constant, $\beta$ is the coefficient of thermal expansion of PCM, $T_s$ is the surface temperature, $T_\infty$ is the bulk temperature, $\nu$ is the kinematic viscosity of PCM, $\kappa$ is the thermal conductivity of the PCM, $\rho$ is the density of the PCM, $c_p$ is the specific heat capacity of the PCM and $l$ is the distance from the front surface.

$Nu_l$ - Nusselt number - is the ratio of convective to conductive heat transfer normal to a boundary. A $Nu_l$ number close to unity shows that the convection and conduction are of similar magnitude and that the flow is laminar. A larger value of $Nu_l$ shows the presence of strong convection and the transition of fluid flow from laminar to turbulent, the turbulent flow happens at $Nu_l$ values in the range of 100-1000.

$$Nu_l = \frac{h_c l}{\kappa}$$

Where $h_c$ is the convective heat transfer coefficient.

$Pe_l$ - Peclet number - is the ratio of rate of advection of a physical quantity by flow to the rate of diffusion of the same quantity driven by appropriate gradient. It describes the
transport phenomena in a fluid flow, in context of the heat transport it is the product of the Reynolds number and Prandtl number.

\[ Pe_l = Re_l Pr_l = \frac{lv}{k} \frac{k}{\rho c_p} \]

Where \( v \) is the velocity of the fluid.

**Pr = Prandtl number** - is the ratio of momentum diffusivity to thermal diffusivity. It can be observed that the \( Pr \) depends only on the fluid and its physical state and does not include any length scale variable. Low \( Pr \) values (i.e., 0.015 for Mercury) indicate that conduction is effective with thermal diffusivity dominant while high values (100 – 40000 for engine oils) show that convection is effective with momentum diffusivity dominant.

\[ Pr = \frac{c_p \mu}{\kappa} \]

Whew \( \mu \) is the dynamic viscosity of the fluid.

**Ra = Raleigh Number** - is the product of the Grashof number (\( Gr_x \)) and Prandtl number (\( Pr \)). The \( Ra \) mostly occurs at \( 10^6-10^8 \) for most of the engineering problems. The lower \( Ra \) values show stronger conduction heat transfer while the higher values shows strong convection heat transfer in the fluids.

\[ Ra = Gr_x Pr = \frac{g \beta}{\nu \alpha} (T_s - T_\infty)x^3 \]
Where $\alpha$ is the thermal diffusivity.

**Reynolds Number ($Re$)**-is the ratio of internal forces to viscous forces. The $Re$ describes whether the fluid flow is laminar or turbulent. The $Re$ value showing transition from laminar to turbulent flow depends on the geometry of the system in which fluid is flowing (i.e., in a pipe with a fully developed flow, the laminar flow occurs at $Re < 2300$ and the turbulent flow occurs at $Re > 4000$).

$$Re = \frac{\rho v l}{\mu}$$

**Stanton number ($St$)**- is the ratio of the heat transferred into the fluid to the thermal capacity of the fluid. It is used to measure the heat transfer in the forced convection flows. It can also be written in terms of Nusselt, Reynolds and Prandtl numbers.

$$St = \frac{Nu}{Re \cdot Pr} = \frac{h_c}{c_p \rho \nu}$$

**Stefan number ($Ste$)** is the ratio of sensible heat to the latent heat.

$$Ste = \frac{c_p \Delta T}{H}$$

Where $\Delta T$ is the temperature difference between phases and $H$ is the latent heat.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 World Energy Outlook

World primary energy demand is projected to increase by 40% by 2030 compared to reference scenario in 2007 (IEA, 2009 a). This increase will be met by 77% share of fossil fuels and 23% share of the renewable energy sources (IEA, 2009 a). The CO₂ emissions will increase from 28.8 Gt CO₂ equivalent in 2007 to 40.2 Gt CO₂ equivalent in 2030. With a 25% probability that the global temperature does not rise above 2 °C, the CO₂ emitted needs to be below 1 trillion tonnes over the period 2000-2049, of which 313 billion tonnes have already been emitted from 2000-2009 (IEA, 2009 a). If the present trend continues, global temperature will rise by 6 °C toward the end of this century (IEA, 2009 b).

All proven global oil and natural gas reserves are predicted to be economically usable and exploitable until 2048 (Goswami, 2007) and 2065 (Breeze, 2005) respectively if the current trend in consumption growth continues with the little hope for them being cost competitive in future with the current trend in price hike. Nuclear power as an immediate alternative to fossil fuels is also unlikely to provide a significant proportion of energy need in near future in due to political issues, unavailability of technology to most of the world nations, finite resources of nuclear fuels (currently uranium) and risk of nuclear accidents (Kreith and Goswami, 2007). Due to the finite fossil fuel and nuclear reserves, renewable energy technologies (RETs) must provide an increasing
proportion of future energy if the world’s population are to expect a secure and sustainable developed society.

Electricity generation currently accounts for over 30% of global primary energy demand (Kreith and Goswami, 2007). In 2006, RETs provided 18% of electricity supply while photovoltaics (PV) supplied 0.015% when PV production was only 1603 MW, as shown in Figure 1.1 (IEA, 2009a). From 2006 to 2009 PV production has increased to 6,802 MW, and is expected to reach 22,325 MW at the end of 2013 (EPIA, 2010), 14 times more than it was in 2006. PV converts solar energy, whose potential is such that one hour of solar energy falling on earth could meet the current global annual primary energy demand (Morton, 2006). The immense potential of solar
energy along with rapidly increasing share of PV in energy supply clearly shows PV has an important role in long-term future energy supply.

1.2 Introduction to Photovoltaic Devices

Photovoltaics (PV) are renewable energy systems which convert sunlight directly into electricity. Incoming solar radiation ($G$) is absorbed by a semiconductor absorbing material that generates electron-hole pair mobile charge carriers responsible for an electric current (Würfel, 2005). PV devices are classified according to the type of light absorbing materials, thickness of the absorbing material and application of the PV.

1.2.1 Quantum Efficiency of Photovoltaic Cells

Not all solar radiation ($G$) falling on the PV surface is involved in the electrical conversion process. Only $G$ with energy equal to or above the band gap of the cell material takes part in conversion process. Incoming $G$ is either (i) reflected back from the surface of the cell, (ii) transmitted through or (iii) absorbed by the PV cell material. The ratio of absorbed $G$ to incoming $G$ is called the "external quantum efficiency" of the PV cell (Yang, et al., 2008). Absorbed $G$ generates electron-hole pairs which travel to their corresponding electrodes. Electrons that reach the electrodes successfully to travel through an external circuit to combine with the holes from the other side of the junction are responsible for the photo-generated current available from the cell. Electrons that recombine with the holes in the bulk material before reaching electrodes do not contribute to the electrical current from the PV cell.
and constitute "recombination losses" (Gangadhar and Bhattacharyya, 1968; Lu, 1996). The ratio of electrical current produced from the cell to the absorbed $G$ is called "internal quantum efficiency" (Yang, et al., 2008).

1.2.2 Maximum Power Point

PV can operate over a wide range of voltage ($V$) and current ($I$) depending on the resistive load applied in the external electrical circuit. Applying a very low resistance results in a negligibly small $V$ and maximum $I$ termed as "short circuit current". By increasing the load, $I$ decreases and $V$ increases, at a very high resistive load $I$ is negligibly small and $V$ is very high which is "open circuit voltage". Since the power is product of $V$ and $I$, no power is produced at either open circuit or short circuit conditions as either $I$ or $V$ becomes zero. The load for which PV yields optimum $V$ and $I$ producing maximum electrical power ($P$) is called the "maximum power point" $P_m$. $P_m$ varies with $G$ and PV temperature.

Figure 1.2 I-V characteristic curve of a PV showing the maximum power point (Suntechnic, 2006)
1.2.3 Electrical Conversion Efficiency

A solar cell’s rated electrical conversion efficiency, $\eta$ is the ratio of $G$ converted to electricity at $P_m$ to the total $G$ falling on the PV surface area ($A$) when a solar cell is connected to an electrical circuit at standard test conditions (STC). STC are 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ solar radiation intensity (ASTM G 173-03, 2003), 25 ºC PV temperature and 1.5 air mass solar spectrum (NREL, 2007)

$$\eta = \frac{P_m}{G \times A}$$

(1.1)

The highest reported efficiencies are summarised in Figure 1.2 (Kazmerski, 2008)

Figure 1.3 Electrical energy conversion efficiencies of different types of PV cells (Kazmerski, 2008)
1.2.4 Fill Factor

The "Fill factor" (FF) is defined as a ratio of $P_m$ to the product of open circuit voltage ($V_{oc}$) and short circuit current ($I_{sc}$) that determines actual performance of the solar cell given by equation 1.1.

$$FF = \frac{P_m}{V_{oc}I_{sc}} \quad (1.1)$$

$FF$ decreases with increasing series resistance. Series resistance depends strongly on temperature, $T$ and weakly on $G$ so indirectly $FF$ is a weak function of $G$ and strong function of $T$ (Nelson, 2003).

1.3 Effect of Temperature on Photovoltaic Power

Effect of temperature on power output and long term stability of PV cells and modules have been widely studied both indoors and outdoors (Radziemska and Klugmann, 2002). The normal operating cell temperature (NOCT) for different cells is very important parameters for the service life of the PV cells and required for design qualification for universally acceptability of the PV and its structural stability to operate in different operating temperature. The NOCT is supplied by the PV manufacturers which normally lies in the range of $-40$ °C to $+85$ °C (Suntech, 2007) for crystalline PV cells. Depending on PV cell and encapsulation materials, different responses of PV cells and modules to temperature increase beyond characterization and NOCT have been reported as are described in the following sections.
1.3.1 Crystalline Silicon Photovoltaic Cells

For crystalline silicon PV the influence of temperature and wavelength on electrical parameters of crystalline silicon solar cells and modules are illustrated in figure 1.4. PV voltage decreases while current increases with increasing temperature however the increase in current is much less than the decrease in voltage (Radziemska and Klugmann, 2002).

Figure 1.4 Effect of temperature on power output of the crystalline PV (a) output power against voltage (b) temperature dependence of the maximum output power

Figure 1.4 shows power output for a polycrystalline silicon solar cell with voltage where temperatures range from 28 ºC- 80 ºC. From the figure 1.4 b it is clear that temperature elevation reduces PV power output (Radziemska and Klugmann, 2002). At elevated PV module temperatures reduced power output has been reported for crystalline silicon solar cells with a temperature induced power drop coefficient of -0.5 % ºC⁻¹ to -0.65 % ºC⁻¹ (Radziemska, 2003; Breteque, 2009).
1.3.2 Amorphous Silicon Solar Cells

Temperature has a very different effect on the performance of amorphous silicon solar cells. Initially they show decreased power output with increasing temperature (Hoheisel et al., 1991) but after prolonged exposure the power output stabilizes due to temperature-induced recovery of the light induced degradation and the efficiency of the cells is stabilized at higher temperatures. (Yoshihiro, and Shingo, 1994; Gottschalg, et al., 2005; Shima, et al., 2005). The performance of amorphous PV modules with insulated and uninsulated back was monitored for 2 years; the insulated back PV being at 4.2 °C higher temperature than uninsulated back PV produced 7.3 % higher power output for the duration of the experiment (Yamawaki, et al., 1997). It has also been demonstrated that for prolonged exposure, performance of amorphous silicon solar cells takes into account of temperature and illumination history of the cells. The cells may respond differently to same temperature and illumination during different seasons of the year as shown in the figure 1.5 (Fukushige et al., 2009).
Figure 1.5 Long time performance monitoring of amorphous silicon solar cells showing that the amorphous PV produces different output power during different seasons at same PV temperatures.

1.3.3 GaSb and GaAs Cells

The effect of temperature on electrical output of GaAs and GaSb have been studied between temperature range of 0 °C to 120 °C which showed a power reduction of -0.28 % °C⁻¹ and -0.84 % °C⁻¹ respectively (Siefer, et al., 2005) due primarily to decreased $V_{oc}$. A GaAs PV cell produced 80 % of its nominal power at 90 °C (Ferguson and Fraas, 1995).
1.3.4 Dye-Sensitized Solar Cells

Dye sensitized solar cells have been studied at temperatures 5-55 °C. They have shown an increase in power output from lower temperatures up to maximum 40 °C. At temperatures higher than 40 °C, decreased power output with increasing temperature have been observed as shown in figure 1.6 (Berginc et al., 2007). At lower temperatures the current is limited by low diffusion of charge carrier (i.e. tri-iodide) and temperature needs to increase to get higher current. At higher temperatures above 40 °C the recombination losses dominate over diffusion current and the current starts decreasing resulting in decreased power output. The optimum current is achieved at intermediate temperatures which depends on the concentration of the charge carrier (Berginc et al., 2008)

Figure 1.6 Dependence of the $V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$ ($J_{sc}$) on the temperature of dye sensitized cells.
1.3.5 Organic Solar Cells

In polymer-fullerene organic PV cells increasing temperature results in increased current and decreased voltage, however the increase in current is higher than the decrease in voltage resulting in a net increase in power with increasing temperature. Temperature induced increase in power is followed by a saturation limit, primarily due to saturation current normally occurring in the range of 47 °C - 60 °C (Katz, et al., 2001; Kumar et al., 2007).

Figure 1.7 Temperature dependence of organic PV cells showing an increase in efficiency (power output) with increasing temperature from 0 °C-120 °C, a decrease in efficiency from 120 °C-200 °C, a peak in efficiency at 200 °C and then continued decrease in efficiency from 200 °C -300 °C.
1.3.6 Temperature Induced Structural Damage in Photovoltaic Panels

Crystalline silicon PV exposure to high outdoor temperatures above 85 °C have been reported to induce structural damage in PV panels resulting in moisture ingress, in 17 months (Igari et al., 1994). Damage of PV after five years has been reported primarily due to delamination of encapsulating material ethylene-vinyl-acetate (EVA) along with semiconductor degradation resulting in PV power drop of 1 % annually (Berman, et al., 1995). In another study a performance degradation of 4.8 % for single crystalline and 2 % for polycrystalline silicon PV has also been reported after five years of outdoor exposure (Machida et al., 1997). Moisture ingress results in a reduced active area, corrosion in the metallic contacts, reduced photon absorption leading to reduced charge carrier generation and reduced current resulting in up to a net 14 % drop in power output (Machida, et al., 1997; Saly et al., 2001; Gxasheka et al., 2005).

1.3.7 Outdoor Temperatures Recorded at Photovoltaic Devices

The PV operating temperature depends on the site where they are deployed (Bücher, 1997). The operating temperature of crystalline silicon PV cell considering ambient temperature and solar radiation and module temperature (Mattei, et al., 2006) may be calculated from equation 1.2.

\[
T_{cell} = \frac{U_{pv}T_{amb} + G[(\alpha_{pv}) - \eta_r - T_r\eta_rT_r]}{U_{pv} - \Theta G}
\]  

(1.2)

Where \( \eta_r \) is reference module efficiency, \( T_r \) is the PV cell reference temperature.
(typically 25 °C), $G$ is the solar irradiance on the module (typically 1000 W m$^{-2}$), $\theta$ is the solar irradiance coefficient of PV power which describes the effect of solar radiation intensity on the PV power, $T_c$ is the temperature coefficient of the PV power which describes the effect of PV temperature on power output of PV module, $T_{cell}$ is PV cell temperature which depends on environmental conditions, $U_{pv}$ is overall heat loss coefficient of PV which considers only convective heat loss ignoring radiative heat loss from the PV panel, $\alpha_{pv}$ is absorptance of PV and $\tau$ is transmittance of PV encapsulation. This model assumed that the PV cell and cover have the same temperature while the temperature is uniformly distributed over the PV surface.

Mathematical correlations have shown that the PV operating temperature and associated power drop largely depends on climate where the PV panels are deployed (Skoplaki, and Palyvos, 2009). In Germany 50 % of the solar radiation incident on a PV panel is above 600 Wm$^{-2}$ while in Sudan this value reaches 80 % resulting in different operating temperatures and associated power drop (Bücher, 1997; Emmanuel, 2009). A maximum PV operating temperature of 125 °C has been reported in southern Libya (27.6 N and 14.2 E) resulting in a 69 % reduction in the nominal power (Nassar, et al. 2007). The advisable operating temperature limit for PV ranges from -40 °C to 85 °C (Suntechics, 2008), however in hot and arid climates, PV temperature frequently rises above this temperature range (Nassar et al. 2007), which results in temperature-induced power failure as well as PV cell delamination and rapid degradation (Saly et al., 2001) urging a strong need for PV temperature regulation to maximise both panel lifetime and power output.
1.3.8 Effect of Photovoltaic Building Integration on Photovoltaic Temperature

Integration of the PV into building façades thermally insulates back of PV panel when compared to free standing PV. In a study this thermal insulation has resulted in 20.7 °C increase in PV temperature leading to a 9.3 % decrease in electrical yield of PV façade due solely to its building integration which produces thermal insulation at PV back (Krauter et al., 1999). A similar result has been reported by (Tripanagnostopoulos et al., 2002) who compared free-back-PV with an insulated-back PV and reported that temperature increased from 43 °C in free back PV to 55 °C in insulated back PV (representing BIPV) resulting in a 9 % decrease in PV efficiency in Greece. In a computational study conducted for weather conditions of Macau, China, a 260 m² BIPV wall was modelled and a temperature of 85 °C was predicted on such BIPV system in July (Chow et al., 2003). In a separate study, integration of a PV into a building in Mâcon, France was reported to reduce PV annual conversion efficiency by 2.6 %, resulting in PV power drop of 28 % due to increased PV temperature caused by building integration of PV (Fraisse et al., 2007). 

1.4 Cooling of Photovoltaic Devices

Different passive and active heat removal techniques have been used to maintain PV at low temperatures. Passive heat removal in free standing PV relies on the buoyancy driven air flow in a duct behind the PV. Active cooling of PV relies on air or water flow on the front or back of the PV surface.
1.4.1 Passive Cooling by Arranging a Duct Behind Photovoltaics

This passive technique is the most conventional for PV cooling and employs a duct with length $L$ behind the PV installed at an angle $\theta$ to the horizontal as shown in figure 1.8. The incident thermal energy $q$ is removed by the buoyant circulation of air moving with velocity $u$ acting as heat transfer fluid to regulate PV temperature., effect of which has been studied and a temperature decrease of 20 °C has been reported by heat removal due to buoyancy driven air flow (Brinkworth et al., 1997). A design parameters study of the duct found that cooling of PV is enhanced significantly due to wind which increases the heat loss from the PV front surface and increases the air flow into the duct (Brinkworth, 2000). Optimisations of cooling ducts have found that the ratio of duct length to the hydraulic depth of 20 gives the optimal cooling of the PV (Brinkworth and Sandberg, 2006) with the ratio not being affected significantly by the slope of the PV array.

![Figure 1.8 Schematic diagram of a duct behind PV](image)

Figure 1.8 Schematic diagram of a duct behind PV (Brinkworth, B. J. and Sandberg, M., 2006)
1.4.2 Air Gap Ventilation of Building Integrated Photovoltaics

Passive heat removal in building integrated photovoltaics (BIPV) relies on buoyant circulation of air in an open air channel behind the PV (Sandberg and Moshfegh, 1998; Gan, and Riffat, 2004; Lee, et al., 2009). A theoretical analysis of buoyancy driven air flow in such a design showed a maximum 5 °C temperature reduction in averaged monthly temperature resulting in a net 2.5 % increase in yearly electrical output of the PV (Yun et al., 2007).

![Schematic diagram of a ventilated roof](image)

Figure 1.9 Schematic diagram of a ventilated roof (Lee et al., 2009)

Effect of air flow at (i) different inlet velocities (ii) front and (iii) back air gaps in PV was modelled and a maximum 34.2 °C front surface temperature decrease was predicted at air inlet velocity of 1 ms$^{-1}$ at front and back air gap of 20 mm (Mallick et al., 2007). Though the temperature reduction and the associated prevention of power
drop is very low in such PV systems, improvements can be made in the air channel by (i) suspending metal sheets (ii) inserting fins and (iii) optimising distance between the walls (Fossa et al., 2008). A ventilated façade has been recently reported by numerical simulations to achieve a maximum of 40% net electrical and thermal energy savings in summer times due to PV cooling (Patania et al., 2010).

1.4.3 Hybrid Photovoltaic Thermal Systems

A hybrid PV-T façade element combined with active water cooling has achieved a temperature decrease of 20 °C and an electrical power improvement of 9% (Krauter et al., 1999). The temperature of the PV applying PV-T with air and water has been reported to drop from 55 °C to 41 °C and 38 °C respectively yielding an 11% and 13.3% increase in efficiency respectively (Tripanagnostopoulos et al., 2002).

Figure 1.10 Schematic diagrams of a typical PV-T commonly used, (a) unglazed PV-T with water as coolant (b) glazed PV-T with water as coolant (c) unglazed PV-T with air as coolant (d) glazed PV-T with air as coolant.
Although PV-T achieved higher temperature reduction and power output than PV alone, in summer when there is no heating demand, heat insulation effect on the back of PV results in increased PV temperatures above 100 °C. At this higher temperatures PV shows structural damage as the EVA in the PV modules cannot withstand this temperature for prolonged exposure (Fraisse et al., 2007) which finally reduced the PV life. Low cost improvement have been suggested in air cooled PV-T by inserting fins and thin metal sheets (TMS) in the air channel to avoid overheating in summer as shown in Figure 1.11 (Tonui and Tripanagnostopoulos, 2007). A review of PV/T systems have been made which describes the types of PV-T systems based on their design and heat transfer fluid, their different design parametric studies, their effectiveness in different operating conditions through experimental and modelling work (Charalambous et al, 2007)

Figure 1.11 Cross section view of air cooled PV-T collector showing reference PV-T, PV-T with thin metal sheets (TMS) and PV-T with fins arrangement.
1.4.4 Hydraulic Cooling of Photovoltaics

Hydraulic water flow over the front surface of the PV can decrease the cell temperature by up to 22 °C and can improve electrical output by 10 % after subtracting the power consumed by pump; however the initial and maintenance costs for the pump were ignored (Krauter, 2004).

Figure 1.12 Schematic of a gravity fed water cooling technique (Wilson, 2009)

A gravity fed water cooling technique has also been devised which has theoretically reduced PV cell temperature by 28 °C due to water cooling from initial 62 °C (Wilson, 2009). Although such systems are cost effective and simple, at higher temperature regions a very high water flow rate is needed which increases the pumping power and capital investment.
1.5  Research Aims and Proposed Methodology

Part of the energy carried in solar radiations falling on the PV surface is reflected back from the PV surface while most of it is absorbed in the PV. A certain part of the absorbed energy corresponding to the PV conversion efficiency is converted into electricity while the rest transformed to thermal energy. The absorbed thermal energy increases the PV temperature which has a strong negative impact on the electrical output of the PV as well as on their long-term operation reliability which urges the need of PV temperature regulation. Previous research on temperature regulation of PV to prevent temperature dependent power drops have applied different active and passive cooling techniques however almost each of the techniques is restricted by one or the other factors like (i) high initial costs, (ii) operation and maintenance costs, (iii) low heat removal rate and (iv) inability to produce cooling in higher temperature summer environments.

A novel PV cooling technique using solid-liquid phase change materials (PCM) to overcome the above stated limitations was employed by (Huang et al., 2004, 2006a, 2006b). The solid liquid PCM can absorb large amount of latent heat while melting at a constant temperature and regulate PV temperature close to their characterization temperature.

The detailed energy flows in such a PV-PCM systems are shown in Figure 1.13. The technique can combine the benefits of high heat transfer rates achievable in active heat dissipation systems and low operating and capital costs achievable in passive systems. Incorporating PCM with PV to form a PV-PCM system may enable PV to achieve energy conversion efficiencies closer to those at the standard cell
characterisation condition of 25°C. Additionally the large amount of heat stored as latent heat in PCM can potentially be used for further applications of water or space heating converging to a new type of PV-T system.

In previous research a rectangular container of dimensions 30 cm x 13.2 cm x 4 cm fitted with aluminium fins with front side selectively coated containing PCM was studied (Huang et al., 2004). The fabricated PV-PCM system was evaluated numerically with a 2D finite volume heat transfer model that was validated experimentally with paraffin wax RT25 as PCM located behind a PV (Huang et al., 2006a). For 3D heat transfer analysis, a small scale 3D model was developed and validated with the experimentally-validated 2D model (Huang et al., 2006b).

Figure 1.13  The schematic diagram of the energy flow in the PV-PCM system under investigation
Aim of the current research is to experimentally investigate the PV cooling technique introduced by Huang et al. extending its use to (i) identify and thermophysically characterize new PCMs for their suitability for PV cooling applications (ii) experimentally evaluate the new PCMs indoors with different PV-PCM system configurations at various solar radiation intensities to adopt PV-PCM systems for different weather conditions in order to identify suitable PCM and PV-PCM system (iii) Integrate the optimum PCM into large scale PV panel size system with optimum PV-PCM configurations, measure PV temperature regulation achieved by PCM and quantify the increased electrical output brought about by PV cooling indoors (iv) Evaluate the PV cooling and increased electrical output through use of the novel PV-PCM system outdoors by extensive experimentation in different climates i.e. (i) high latitude cooler climate and (ii) low latitude hotter climate.

Figure 1.14  Schematic diagram of the experimental setup consisting of a PV cell attached at the front surface of an aluminium container filled with PCM.
In the present work instead of coated aluminium plate, actual PV cells were attached to the front surface of small cell size (10 cm x 10 cm x 5 cm) PV-PCM systems shown in Figure 1.14 (Hasan et al., 2010).

Five different PCMs, paraffin wax RT20 (Rubitherm, 2009), salt hydrate CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O (Sigmaaldrich, 2009 a), mixture of salt hydrate and paraffin wax SP22 (Rubitherm, 2009), eutectic mixture of fatty acids, capric acid-lauric acid (CL) (Sigmaaldrich, 2009 b), and eutectic mixture of fatty acids, capric acid-palmitic acid (CP) (Sigmaaldrich, 2009 c), were studied in four different cell size PV-PCM systems. Extensive indoor experiments were conducted to determine thermal regulation of PV indoors at 500 Wm$^{-2}$, 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ solar radiation intensities to optimise the PV-PCM system. The best PV-PCM system (system A detailed in chapter 4) and the best PCM (CP and CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O detailed in chapter 4) were identified small scale cell size indoor experiments.

The best PV-PCM system (A) was fabricated at a larger PV panel scale (70 cm x 60 cm x 5 cm) consisting of PV panel, PCM container fitted with straight back to back aluminium fins and two PCM contained in the PV-PCM system. These PV-PCM systems were evaluated indoors with a large scale solar simulator at solar radiation intensities of 500 Wm$^{-2}$, 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and 1000 Wm$^{-2}$. Temperatures and electrical parameters of PV were measured to quantify thermal regulation of PCM and the associated improvement in power output.

The PV-PCM systems were then installed outdoors in high latitude cooler climatic conditions of Dublin, (53.33 N, 6.24 W) Ireland from 28-08-2009 to 15-09-2009 and in low latitude warmer climates of Vehari, (30.03 N, 72.25 E) Pakistan from 25-10-2009- 13-11-2009. Temperature and electrical parameters were measured at both
locations applying the same experimental setup and measurement procedures. It was found that such systems achieved higher temperature regulations and greater associated power increase in a warmer climate. In the best case a 21.5 °C peak temperature reduction was recorded with a predicted peak PV power saving of 14 % in Vehari, Pakistan
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Different types of phase change materials (PCM) are summarised along with their advantages and disadvantages. An overview is provided of research on the thermophysical properties of PCM. The fundamentals of modelling solid-liquid phase changes are reported together with major applications of PCMs.

2.1 Phase Change Mechanism

On application of heat, the internal energy of a solid is increased to a specific melting point at which it becomes a liquid. In pure materials liquefaction/solidification occurs at the distinct temperature $T_m$, which is known as equilibrium temperature of melting/freezing. This temperature depends solely on pressure and is constant if melting/solidification proceeds at a slow rate. In this case no curvature of the solid-liquid interface is present and no significant difference in specific heats between phases exists. For phase transformation occurring at the equilibrium temperature, the latent heat of melting corresponds to difference of the products of solid and liquid phase densities and specific enthalpies at the temperature $T_m$ (Banaszek et al., 2005).

Phase change materials (PCM) absorb or releases large amount of heat at constant phase transition temperature when they undergo phase change as shown in Figure 2.1.
PCM exhibit solid-liquid, liquid-gas phase change and vice versa. Although liquid-to-gas phase change also involves heat absorption, yet they show large volume changes during phase change. Thus to exploit the heat from liquid-gas phase change, very large containment volumes are required. Solid-liquid PCM are particularly promising as they show very little volume change during phase change which enables heat to be stored in a smaller volume.

Absorption of a large amount of heat at constant temperature during phase change is one of the main advantages of PCM. The isothermal nature of heat absorption and release shown in figure 2.1 renders PCM a suitable candidate for thermal energy storage and temperature control applications.
2.2 Classification of Phase Change Materials

PCM are classified as organic, inorganic and eutectic mixtures. Organic PCM consist of paraffin wax and fatty acids, inorganic PCM consist of salt hydrates and eutectic PCM consist of both organic and inorganic materials. The advantages and disadvantages of each of the PCM class are summarised in table 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Organic</th>
<th>Inorganic</th>
<th>Eutectics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability in a large temperature range</td>
<td>Low thermal conductivity in their solid state. High heat transfer rates required during the freezing cycle</td>
<td>High volumetric latent heat storage capacity</td>
<td>Eutectics have sharp melting point similar to pure substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeze without much super cooling</td>
<td>Volumetric latent heat storage capacity is low</td>
<td>Low cost and easy availability</td>
<td>Volumetric storage density is slightly above organic compounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to melt congruently</td>
<td>Flammable. This can be easily alleviated by a proper container</td>
<td>Sharp melting point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self nucleating properties</td>
<td>Due to the cost consideration only technical grade paraffins may be used which are essentially paraffin mixture and are completely refined of oil</td>
<td>High thermal conductivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility with conventional material of construction</td>
<td>Nucleating agents are needed and they often become imperative after repeated cycling</td>
<td>High heat of fusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No segregation</td>
<td>Corrosion causes damage to containment materials and reduces the life of containers</td>
<td>Low volume change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemically stable</td>
<td>Severe dehydration during thermal cycling yields mass loss, increase in melting point and decrease in latent heat.</td>
<td>Non-flammable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High heat of fusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and non-reactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recyclable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 Summary of advantages and disadvantages of different types of phase change materials (Sharma et al, 2004; Sharma, 2005, Sharma et al. 2009)
2.3 Thermophysical Properties of Phase Change Materials

Fatty acids, myristic acid, palmitic acid and stearic acid having melting temperature ranges of 50 °C-70 °C have been investigated for thermal energy storage (Hasan and Sayigh, 1994). Their densities and dilation volumes were measured using dilatometry techniques and thermal cycling properties were measured using differential scanning calorimetry. It was found that fatty acids were stable to thermal cycling showing little change in melting points and heat of fusion. Thermal properties of binary and ternary mixtures of palmitic acid, stearic acid and oleic acid have also been measured. It has been reported that a reversible solid-solid phase change in oleic acid occurs before melting and a liquid-liquid phase change before solidification (Cedeño et al., 2001). The thermal properties of capric acid, lauric acid and pentadecane mixtures have been measured and their use was evaluated for cooling applications (Dimaano and Watanabe, 2002). An improvement in the melting characteristics of capric-lauric acid mixture was observed by addition of 10% pentadecane to the mixture (Dimaano and Watanabe, 2002).

The total melting and solidification time and the effect of Reynolds and Stefan number on the phase transition behaviour of encapsulated eutectic mixtures of lauric and stearic acids have been described (Sari and Kaygusuz, 2002). Corrosion and thermal stability of stearic, palmitic, myristic and lauric acid were investigated for metallic containment while subjecting them to thermal cycling (Sari and Kaygusuz, 2003; Sari et al., 2004). It was concluded that palmitic and myristic acid may be suited for long-term thermal energy storage with respect to thermal cycling. Stainless steel with chromium oxide (Cr₂O₃) and aluminium with aluminium oxide (Al₂O₃) were found compatible with fatty acids with respect to corrosion. Thermal conductivity of PCM may be enhanced using expanded graphite and carbon fibre. A
linear increase in thermal conductivity of PCM with increasing mass fraction of expanded graphite and carbon fibre has been reported (Karaipekli et al., 2007).

Paraffin wax has been used in a spiral thermal energy storage unit and its melting characteristics were monitored (Banaszek et al., 1999). It was concluded that paraffin melts and solidifies over a range of temperatures and it is difficult to separate sensible and latent heat effects which lead to time changes in melting and solidification. The heat transfer characteristics of paraffin wax in granules of 1-3 mm diameter have been described (Nagano et al., 2004) and the temperature variations in the melting PCM measured. When preparation of stabilized composites of paraffin with high density polythene and expanded graphite was investigated (Sari, 2004), it was found that the thermal conductivity of the composite can be increased by 14%-24% by addition of 3% expanded graphite. Thermal conductivity improvement of paraffin waxes using graphite matrix has also been reported (Mills et al., 2006). Heating and cooling time of aluminium foam filled with PCM were reported to increase as a function of surface area density of the aluminium foam (Hong and Herling, 2006; Sarier and Onder, 2007).

2.4 Modelling of Phase Change Materials

Modelling of phase change phenomena is one of the most important contemporary research activities. The phase change mechanism occurs in number of natural and industrial processes which have significant environmental and financial impact. As the variety of process involving phase change is increasing, so is the scope and complexity of modelling. The natural process involving solid-liquid phase change comprises but not limited to melting of ice on the glaciers due to varying weather conditions which is becoming increasingly important area of research to observe the
effects of green house gas emissions. The accurate modelling of the phenomena may bring understanding about the future aspects of the issue and may guide humanity to take appropriate measures to avoid future disasters. In industrial processes the processing of materials in foundry and semiconductor industry is taking much importance in the present day sciences. Certain measurement constraints involved in studying the behaviour of materials during solidification in high temperature regimes have increased the importance of precise prediction of such phenomena through modelling. Very careful modelling of phase change can predict the behaviour of materials during cooling and solidification which can otherwise be either impossible to measure or is very costly and time consuming thus bringing a huge saving of time and cost. Having obtained precise understanding of the solidification phenomena through predictive modelling tools such materials can be manipulated to obtain desired material properties and purity grades. The recent modelling activities in the area of PCM for energy storage and temperature regulation applications are reviewed below:

Control volume two-dimensional numerical models based on local energy balances and an enthalpy based approach has been developed. Heat transfer and solid liquid phase transition phenomena were studied in a PCM–air spiral thermal energy storage system (Banaszek et al., 2000). The effects of fluid motion, turbulence of air, curvature of air passage and free convection in melting wax were accounted for by boosting heat transfer coefficients. The melting behaviour of PCM by free convection in concentric annuli of different shapes has been numerically described by a finite element computational model (Khillarkar et al., 2000). A finite element semi-analytical model was developed to investigate PCM potential for air conditioning applications (Vakilaltojjar and Saman, 2001). An effective specific heat capacity
approach was used (Roy and Avanic, 2001a, 2001b) to study heat transfer in phase change suspensions in a circular duct. The effect of tube length and bulk Stefan number on laminar and turbulent flow with constant heat flux were described.

An effective specific heat capacity model was developed to enhance forced convective heat transfer in microencapsulated phase change slurries (Hu and Zhang, 2002). It was observed that the conventional Nusselt number correlations used to describe heat transfer in single phase fluids were not suitable to accurately describe the heat transfer in the microencapsulated PCM and a modification in the correlations was necessary to study heat transfer. A numerical model for transient natural convection heat transfer with coupled phase change using fixed solution was used (Scanlon and Stickland, 2004) to investigate the melting of lauric acid adopting a non-Boussinesq approach, where the density inversion effects were considered. A fully implicit two dimensional control volume numerical model based on the enthalpy formulation was used (Trp, 2005) to describe transient forced convection heat transfer between the moderate prandtl number heat transfer fluid (HTF) and the tube wall in shell and tube latent heat thermal energy storage. Banaszek et al., 2005 studied the physical phenomena of solidification such as formation of mushy zone, variation of microstructure during solidification and role of convection in growth of solid phase. Mathematical models for dendrites growth, interface tracking method and interface non tracking methods, macroscopic modelling of mushy zone and macroscopic computer simulation methods were used along with experimental techniques to validate the solidification modelling.

Thermal conductivity and charging/discharging of an inorganic PCM containing carbon fibre were studied using a Crank Nicolson numerical computational model based on enthalpy formulation (Frusteri et al., 2006). It was reported that the thermal
conductivity of the PCM increases linearly with an increase of carbon fibre loading. A transient finite volume numerical model based on a generalized enthalpy formulation developed was used (Nayak et al., 2006) to discover the significant effect of a thermal conductivity enhancer on PCM performance. A simulation model was developed (Cheralathan et al., 2006) to describe the effect of porosity, Stanton number, Stefan number, and Peclet number on the thermal energy storage employing a spherical container containing encapsulated PCM integrated with a chiller.

2.5 Model Development for the PV-PCM system

Solar energy incident on the surface of PV is reflected and absorbed by PV module. Part of the absorbed light generates electricity and greater proportion converts into heat. Converted heat raises the temperature of the PV and is also transferred from the back of the PV to PCM. Heat loss takes place in the system by conduction, convection and radiation (Huang et al., 2006c, 2006b). Heat transfer mechanism in PV-PCM systems described previously in figure 1.13 is modelled using a detailed finite element heat transfer simulation model in FLUENT 6.1.2.2.

2.5.1 Conduction

One dimensional heat diffusion equation is solved for simulating heat transfer in the solid PCM region. The general form of the equation is (Mills, 1999)

\[
\frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x^2} = \frac{\rho c}{k} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}
\]  

(2.1)

Here \( \alpha \) is thermal diffusivity which is a measure of how quickly a material can carry heat away from heat source. A material does just not transmit heat and is also warmed
so \( \alpha \) involves both the conductivity \( \kappa \) and the volumetric heat capacity \( \rho c \). In solid regions, the energy transport equation used by FLUENT has the form:

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho h = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left( k \frac{\partial T}{\partial x_i} \right) + q''
\]

(2.2)

Where

\( \rho \) = density

\( h \) = sensible enthalpy = \( \int_{T_{ref}}^T c_p \, dT \)

\( T \) = temperature

\( q'' \) = volumetric heat source

The terms on the right-hand side of eq. 2.2 are the heat flux due to conduction and volumetric heat sources within the solid, respectively.

### 2.5.2 Radiation

Radiation can be viewed either in terms of electromagnetic waves or in terms of transport of photons. Materials can exhibit different radiative behaviour at different wavelengths. An important consideration in radiative heat transfer is the emissivity. The P1 (Fluent, 2005a) radiation model used in FLUENT incorporates radiation loss in the model by using the emissivity of the medium. Emissivity is the ratio of the radiation emitted by the surface at a given temperature to the radiation emitted by a blackbody at the same temperature. The simple model in Fluent takes less computation time as compared to other models. The transport equation for radiation is (Fluent, 2005a):

\[
- \Delta q_r = \alpha_{pv} G - 4 \alpha_{pv} \sigma T^4
\]

(2.3)
Where \( q_r \) = radiation flux, \( G \) = incident radiations, \( \sigma \) = Stefan-Boltzmann constant

\[ \alpha_{pv} = \text{Absorption coefficient} \] and \( T \) =Temperature. The expression for \(-\Delta q_r\) is directly substituted into the energy equation to account for heat sources (or sinks) due to radiation.

### 2.5.3 Convection

Convection is the mode of energy transfer between a solid surface and the adjacent liquid or gas that is in motion. It involves the combined effects of conduction and fluid motion (Mills, 1999). There are two types of convection i.e. forced convection and natural convection. When fluid is forced to flow over the surface by external mean such as a fan then it is called forced convection. In contrast, natural convection occurs if the fluid motion is caused by buoyancy forces induced by density difference due to the variation of temperature within the fluid. In present model only natural convection is considered as the only heat transfer due to convection that ensues. The Boussinesq approximation model is used as this achieves faster solution convergence in the numerical analysis of many natural convection problems. The Boussinesq approach treats density as a constant value in all solved equations except for the buoyancy term in the momentum equation (Huang, et al. 2006, Fluent, 2005b)

\[
(\rho - \rho_o)g \equiv -\rho_o \beta (T - T_o)g
\]  

(2.4)
Where \( \rho_o \) is constant density of the flow, \( T_o \) is operating temperature, \( \beta \) is thermal expansion coefficient. The eq. 2.4 is obtained by using Boussinesq approximation given in equation 2.5:

\[
\rho = \rho_o (1 - \beta \Delta T)
\]  

(2.5)

Boundary pressure for Boussinesq approximation is redefined as given by equation 2.6 (Fluent, 2005b)

\[
P'_s = \rho_o g x + P_s
\]  

(2.6)

Here \( p_s \) is atmospheric pressure, \( \rho_o \) is the operating density of air, \( g \) is the gravitational acceleration and \( x \) is the height of inlet.

### 2.5.4 Heat Transfer in PCM

An enthalpy formulation based fixed grid methodology is used in FLUENT for the numerical solution of convection-diffusion controlled mushy region phase-change problem (Fluent, 2005c). In pure materials, phase change takes place at a distinct temperature. However in metallurgical alloys, phase change takes place over a temperature range (Voller and Prakash, 1987).

\[
-\xi \leq T \leq \xi
\]  

(2.7)

Here \( \xi \) is half mushy range, that is, the evolution of latent heat has a functional relationship with temperature e.g. \( \Delta H = f(T) \). The enthalpy of the material (the total heat content) can be expressed as \( H = h + \Delta H \) i.e. the sum of sensible heat, \( h = cT \) and latent heat \( \Delta H \) which is specified as a function of temperature. As latent heat is
associated with the liquid fraction in the mushy zone, a general form \( f(T) \) can be written:

\[
f(T) = \begin{cases} 
  L, & T \geq T_s \\
  L(1-F_s)T_s > T \geq T_s \\
  0, & T < T_s 
\end{cases}
\] (2.8)

Where \( L \) is the fully liquid fluid, \( F_s(T) \) is the local solid fraction, \( T_s \) the liquid temperature at which solid formation commences and \( T_s \) is the temperature at which full solidification is achieved.

### 2.5.5 The Governing Equations

The forms of governing equations are similar to the equations for an isothermal phase change in a cavity Voller et al. 1985, Voller at al., 1986 and Voller et al., 1987. In FLUENT, the entire cavity is regarded as porous medium, where the porosity is the ratio of volume of void spaces to the total volume of a medium.

\( \lambda \) takes the value \( \lambda = 0 \) in the solid phase and \( \lambda = 1 \) in the liquid phase, and \( 0 < \lambda < 1 \) in the mushy zone. The governing equations can then be written in terms of velocity defined as:

\[
u = \lambda u_i
\] (2.9)

Where \( u_i \) is the actual fluid velocity. On recognizing that the porosity \( \lambda = 1 - F_s \), the above relationship can be expanded to give

\[
u = \begin{cases} 
  u_i, & \text{in the liquid phase} \\
  (1-F_s)u_i, & \text{in the mushy zone} \\
  0, & \text{in the solid phase} 
\end{cases}
\]
Using this definition along with the assumption of Newtonian, incompressible, laminar flow the governing equations are as follows (Patankar, 1980)

**Conservation of Mass**

\[
\frac{\partial v}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w}{\partial z} = 0
\]  

(2.10)

Where \( w \) and \( v \) are the superficial velocities in the \( z \)- and \( y \)-directions, respectively.

**Conservation of Momentum**

\[
\frac{\partial (\rho v)}{\partial t} + \text{div} (\rho u v) = \text{div} (\mu \text{grad} v) - \frac{\partial P}{\partial y} + S_y
\]

(2.11a)

\[
\frac{\partial (\rho w)}{\partial t} + \text{div} (\rho u w) = \text{div} (\mu \text{grad} w) - \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} + S_z + S_b
\]

(2.11b)

Where \( P \) is pressure, \( \rho \) is density, \( \mu \) is the liquid viscosity, \( u = (v, w) \), and \( S_y, S_z \) and \( S_b \) are the source terms.

**Conservation of Energy**

The heat equation is given as below:

\[
\frac{\partial (\rho h)}{\partial t} + \text{div} (\rho u h) = \text{div} (\alpha \text{grad} h) - S_b = 0
\]

(2.12)
2.5.6 Discretized Form of the Equations

To numerically solve the governing equations along with the associated source terms a finite domain method is used (Voller and Prakash, 1987). The finite domain discretization, following the notation in (Patankar, 1980) and referring to figure 2.2 given below:

\[ a_p T_p = a_e T_e + a_w T_w + a_s T_s + a_n T_n + a_o T_o^o + b \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.13)

Where the subscripts indicate the appropriate nodal values, the \( a \)'s are coefficients which depend on the diffusion and convective fluxes into the \( p \)th control volume, \( a_o = \rho \delta z \delta y / \delta t \) and \( ()^o \) represent evaluation at the previous time step. The parameter \( b \) incorporates a discretized form of the source term \( S_h \).

Figure 2.2: The numerical control volume
The momentum equation (velocity $v$ in $y$-direction)

$$a_p v_p = a_E v_E + a_w v_W + a_N v_N + a_s v_s + a_p^o + b \tag{2.14}$$

Where

$$a_E = \frac{k_y \Delta y}{(\delta x)_v}, \quad a_w = \frac{k_y \Delta y}{(\delta x)_w}, \quad a_N = \frac{k_y \Delta x}{(\delta x)_n}, \quad a_s = \frac{k_y \Delta y}{(\delta y)_s}, \quad a_p^o = \frac{\rho c \Delta x \Delta y}{\Delta t}$$

The important difference between equation 2.13 and 2.14 is that the grids used are ‘staggered’ over the enthalpy grid in momentum equation. (See the dashed control volume in figure 2.2. The reason for this is so that pressure, which is driving force for the velocities, can be correctly accounted (Patankar, 1980, Voller and Prakash 1987).

The finite domain equations are solved by employing the PHOENICS code.

### 2.5.7 Geometry of the Model

The geometry of the model is developed in Gambit 2.1.6 and exported to FLUENT in filename.msh format. Two models are developed for analysis. First one is PV cell without integrated PCM and second one is PV/PCM system. The geometry is given below in figure 2.3 for both models.
2.5.8 Meshing of the Model

Gambit 2.1.6 is used for the meshing of the model. The PV cell is meshed into 100 x 4 divisions i.e. aspect ratio of 4 which is well within permissible limit and the mesh is

* Not drawn on scale and all dimensions are in metres.
shape regular (Braess, 2001). The cover system is meshed into 240 x 16 divisions. PCM is meshed into 180 x 120 divisions. Entrapped air in container is meshed into 40 x 120 divisions and atmospheric air is meshed into 100 divisions with increasing ratio of 1.2 i.e. each length of next cell is 1.2 times the length of previous cell so cell size increases as it goes away from PV-PCM System. A refined mesh takes more computation time when compared to a coarse mesh so meshing of air is done in such a way that the mesh is refined near to PV-PCM System and takes active part in convection while as it moves away from the system, heat transfer is less so the mesh gets coarse as it moves away from the PV-PCM system. Detail of the Grid used in Model of PV and PV-PCM system is shown in table 2.2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Cells</th>
<th>Faces</th>
<th>Nodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>90720</td>
<td>182548</td>
<td>91821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV-PCM</td>
<td>152240</td>
<td>306718</td>
<td>154467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Detail of the Grid used in Model of PV cell and PV-PCM system

### 2.5.9 Boundary Conditions

For fluid flow, zero velocity in the solid phase is attained by employing high viscosity. No explicit pressure boundary condition is given. The boundary conditions for energy equations are: (i) Energy influx due to solar input and (ii) Energy loss due to convection and radiation to ambient. For buoyancy-driven flows, pressure inlet and outlet boundary conditions are used by FLUENT and as there is no externally imposed pressure gradient so
atmospheric pressure is applied but for buoyancy-driven flows, redefined pressure is used which is calculated from the following equation (Fluent, 2005d).

\[ p'_s = \rho_s g x + p_i \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.15)

Wall boundary conditions are used to bound fluid and solid regions in FLUENT. Thermal along with radiation boundary conditions are applied to calculate heat transfer between solid to solid (Cover System to PV cell) and solid to fluid (Cover to air, Back of PV to PCM and Back of container to air). Different boundary conditions at the wall are as follows: Heat influx boundary condition Wm$^{-2}$ is applied at the top of PV cell. Adiabatic boundary condition is applied on the sides of cover system and of the container as mentioned in (Huang et al., 2006) in a similar problem. As the P1 radiation model is used to simulate radiation losses so emissivity of all media are given and values can be found in the Appendix. Initial temperature on the surface of the PV and container walls are given as calculated experimentally. As the Boussinesq approximation is used to simulate natural convection losses to air, so operating density of air is given along with operating temperature and gravitational acceleration. Solidification and melting model is activated for simulating phase change phenomenon and density as a function of temperature, heat capacity, thermal conductivity, viscosity as a function of temperature, absorption coefficient, melting heat, liquidus temperature and solidus temperature are given as input to model. Velocity suppression is achieved by giving a high value of viscosity at and beyond solidus temperature so that zero velocity at solid phase can be simulated. Three types of continuums are defined in the model i.e. solid, fluid and PCM. Inputs for solids are heat capacity, thermal conductivity and density. Inputs for fluid are density, heat capacity, thermal conductivity, viscosity and thermal expansion coefficient. PCM is
categorized as fluid in Gambit but as solidification-melting model is activated, it is changed to solid-fluid and the properties given as input are described in table 3.2. Flow, Energy and P1 equations (i.e. equations 2.1-2.15) are activated in solution control tab along with PRESTO, pressure discretization scheme because of buoyancy driven flow. Discretization of pressure-velocity coupling, momentum and energy are kept to default values as well as relaxation factors. The solution is initialized at the upper surface of the PV cell with 2D double precision, segregated and unsteady solver with absolute velocity based formulation and cell based gradient option. The results obtained from the model will be described in chapter 4.

### 2.6 Applications of Phase Change Materials

The major research areas of PCM have been their use as a temperature regulator for high power dissipation electronic packaging, mobiles phones and space vehicles in space vehicles (Pal and Joshi, 1995; Gurrum et al., 2002), thermal energy storage (Sharma et al., 2009; Agyenim et al., 2010), food and biological preservation (Wyatt, 1991; Mcdermott, 1997; Drage, 2009), electricity demand peak shifting or lowering (Fath, 1995, 1998; Enibe, 2003; Halford and Boehm, 2007), medical therapies (Saly, I.O. (1996; Junghanss, 2009), textile fabrics for human comfort (Mondal, 2008; Sánchez, et al. 2010) building fabrics that provide passive cooling of buildings (Zalba et al., 2004; Huang et al., 2006a) and thermal management of motors, actuators and power converters in electric vehicles (Jackson III et al., 2002). The areas in which PCM are currently applied are listed in table 2.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thermal energy storage systems for solar energy storage and harnessing</td>
<td>Pillai and Brinkworth, 1976; Fath, 1998; Zalba et al., 2003; Kenisarin and Mahkamov, 2007; Regin et al., 2008; Sharma et al., 2009; Agyenim et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal protection of electronic devices computer chips, space vehicles, power electronics and packaging</td>
<td>Tan and Tso, 2004; Wang et al., 2007; Kandasamy et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2008; Fok et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal regulation of building integrated photovoltaics</td>
<td>Huang et al., 2004, 2006b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive cooling of building by heat storage in building fabrics to main human comfort temperature and electrical appliances in buildings</td>
<td>Hariri and Ward, 1988; Zalba et al., 2004; Huang et al., 2006a; Pasupathy et al., 2008; Zhou et al., 2009; Zhu et al., 2009; Kenisarin, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar energy storage at high temperatures in solar tower power plants</td>
<td>Hoshi et al., 2005; Michels and Pitz, 2007; Gil et al., 2010; Kenisarin, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal protection, preservation and transport of food items.</td>
<td>Wyatt, 1991; Mcdermott, 1997; Drage, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encapsulation in textile fabric to maintain human comfort temperature</td>
<td>Mondal, 2008; Sánchez, et al. 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical applications in transport of blood at controlled temperature, operating tables, hot-cold therapies</td>
<td>Saly, I.O. (1996; Junghanss, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine cooling (electric and combustion)</td>
<td>Jackson III et al., 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal comfort in vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3 Summary of applications of phase change materials.
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3 CHARACTERIZATION OF PHASE CHANGE MATERIALS

3.1 Selection of Phase Change Materials

The properties of phase change materials (PCM) will predominantly determine the performance of PCM-based thermal-regulation devices. For an integrated novel PV-PCM device, the required PCM properties include:

- Fixed melting point close to device desired operating temperature
- Larger latent heat of fusion for a given mass of PCM; as the latent heat of fusion increases so will be the duration of both heat absorption and attained temperature regulation.
- Good thermal conductivity; this encourages efficient heat transfer into solid PCM through the melting-front, enabling uniform temperature distribution via reduced thermal gradient in the PCM
- Phase congruence; this encourages uniform thermophysical behaviour
- Good solidification properties with no, or low, supercooling; in the current work solid PCM absorbs heat and melts during daytime to regulate PV temperature. The absorbed heat is released nocturnally by ambient and radiative cooling bringing back to solid phase. A PCM with higher supercooling needs to be cooled below freezing point to initiate solidification. In sunny warm climates where the need for daytime PV temperature regulation is critical, the night time ambient temperatures are also higher. Such higher night time temperatures do not support PCM cooling
below freezing points (about 25 °C in this application) hampering PCM solidification process rendering PCM with supercooling unsuitable in such climates. It should be noted that though the night time air temperatures can remain warm, clear skies can provide a heat sink for radiative cooling.

- **Chemical stability;** this ensures (i) longer life of PCM itself (ii) no or less change in melting point and (iii) no or less change in the heat of fusion

- **No toxicity;** this assures (i) safe disposal of materials to the environment and (ii) renders possible their use in buildings by being compatible with most building codes and regulations.

- **No combustibility;** this assures (i) fire safety when included in a building integrated façade and (ii) less risk in device manufacture.

- **No or low corrosion of the containment materials;** this enhances the container life

- **Low cost;** this will (i) aid the achievement of economic viability and (ii) reduce initial cost thereby enabling a greater penetration of cost sensitive application contexts.

The properties desired for a suitable PCM are classified and summarized in Table 3.1. A systematic choice is difficult as a particular PCM may only have some of the desired characteristics, but may not possess the others. Very little literature compares performance of different PCM types for thermal regulation. Its high latent heat of fusion, cheap and abundant availability and no-toxicity makes water an ideal PCM; however its solid–liquid phase change temperature at atmospheric pressure is 0 °C
which makes it an unsuitable PCM for any application where ambient temperatures are generally above 0 °C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Reason for requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thermal</td>
<td>High latent heat</td>
<td>Maximum heat absorption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High heat capacity</td>
<td>Minimum sensible heating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good thermal conductivity</td>
<td>Efficient heat removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reversible phase change</td>
<td>Diurnal response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed melting point</td>
<td>Consistent behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Congruent melting</td>
<td>Minimum thermal gradient,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low volume expansion</td>
<td>No overdesign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High density</td>
<td>Low containment requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinetic</td>
<td>No supercooling,</td>
<td>Easy to freeze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good crystallisation rate</td>
<td>Faster solidification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>Chemical stability,</td>
<td>Long life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-corrosive,</td>
<td>Long container life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-flammable,</td>
<td>Comply building safety codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-explosive,</td>
<td>Environment friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-toxic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Abundant, Available,</td>
<td>Market competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheap and Cost effective</td>
<td>Economic viability and market penetration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Recyclable/Reusable</td>
<td>Ease to dispose of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odour free</td>
<td>Comfortable to apply in dwellings environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Properties of a PCM desired for Photovoltaic thermal regulation

In order to simplify the selection of a suitable PCM, an extensive literature review was conducted of all known PCM classes, i.e. paraffin, salt hydrates, fatty acids and mixtures of salt hydrate and paraffins to identify a PCM that had a melting point
between 21 °C- 29 °C i.e. 25 ± 4 °C with latent heat of fusion >130 J g⁻¹. The range of melting points from 21 °C - 29 °C were chosen because:

(i) a PCM that melts and absorbs latent heat below 25 °C (e.g. at 21 °C in this case) has the advantage of stabilizing PV temperature close to the PV characterization temperature of 25 °C due to PCM melting below this desired PV temperature. Nevertheless when ambient temperatures are higher than PCM melting point (in this case an ambient temperature of 25 °C will be higher than PCM melting point which is below 21 °C) melting ensues due to ambient heat gain in addition to incoming solar radiations. This may lead to a shorter melt time, shorter period of heat absorption and subsequently a shorter duration of PV temperature regulation. (ii) A PCM with melting points above 25 °C (e.g. 29 °C) may have advantage of not melting at most ambient temperatures and being melted solely by incident solar radiations. Consequently they may continue melting and absorbing heat for a longer period providing a longer duration of PV temperature regulation. However the disadvantage of melting commencing and absorbing heat above a temperature of 25 °C is higher temperatures at the PV surface. Table 3.2 lists the PCMs identified from the literature possessing the desired properties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heart - Name</th>
<th>Solid</th>
<th>Liquid</th>
<th>Experimental (THM)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental (DSC)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melting point, (°C)</td>
<td>experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat of fusion, (kJkg⁻¹)</td>
<td>Experimental DSC</td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental THM</td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>literature</td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thermal Conductivity (Wm⁻¹°C⁻¹)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thermophysical Properties of PCMs</th>
<th>Solid</th>
<th>Liquid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2°</td>
<td>0.6°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.18°</td>
<td>0.4°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specific heat capacity (KJkg⁻¹K⁻¹)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thermophysical Properties of PCMs</th>
<th>Solid</th>
<th>Liquid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corrosion to metallic containers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thermophysical Properties of PCMs</th>
<th>No°</th>
<th>Yes°</th>
<th>Yes°</th>
<th>Yes°</th>
<th>Yes°</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Thermal cyclic stability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thermophysical Properties of PCMs</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>N.A</th>
<th>Yes°</th>
<th>No°</th>
<th>Yes°</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Chemical Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thermophysical Properties of PCMs</th>
<th>Paraffin wax</th>
<th>Mixture of paraffin wax and salt hydrate</th>
<th>Salt hydrate</th>
<th>Eutectic mixture of fatty acids</th>
<th>Eutectic mixture of fatty acids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Density (kgm⁻³)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thermophysical Properties of PCMs</th>
<th>Solid</th>
<th>Liquid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.88°</td>
<td>0.75°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.49°</td>
<td>1.44°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.71°</td>
<td>1.56°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.89°</td>
<td>0.77°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.87°</td>
<td>0.79°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kinematic viscosity (m²sec⁻¹)x10⁻³**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thermophysical Properties of PCMs</th>
<th>6.25°</th>
<th>1.23°</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.56°</td>
<td>1.84°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.77°</td>
<td>0.0022°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.79°</td>
<td>0.0023°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coefficient of thermal expansion (K⁻¹)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thermophysical Properties of PCMs</th>
<th>0.001°</th>
<th>0.0008°</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0005°</td>
<td>0.00067°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00078°</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Material source**

|----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|

Table 3.2 Thermophysical characteristics identified from literature and experiments of suitable PCMs for temperature regulation of Photovoltaics at close to their characterization temperature.
3.2 Characterization of Phase Change Materials.

SP22, RT20 and CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O were sourced as ready-to-use from commercial manufacturers CL (eutectic mixtures capric acid (45%) and lauric acid (55%) by weight) and CP (eutectic mixture of capric acid (75.2%) and palmitic acid (24.8%) by weight) were prepared in the laboratory from individual chemicals in the form of capric acid, lauric acid and palmitic acids. The fatty acids were mixed as solids in the eutectic combinations given in Table 3.2 to get a net mixture of 25 g. Each solid mixture was melted at 60 °C for three hours to obtain a homogenous solution that then cooled to solidify as eutectic solids. Prepared PCMs were characterized using (i) differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) and (ii) temperature history method (THM) to determine their thermophysical properties. Each was compared with data available in the literature. DSC is a standard instrument to determine thermophysical properties of materials while THM is custom-built method to determine those properties of PCM that are function of PCM mass (and are not determined easily by DSC) such as subcooling and supercooling etc.
3.2.1 Differential Scanning Calorimetry

Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) is a thermodynamic technique to determine thermophysical materials properties including melting point, heat of fusion, specific heat capacity, melting onset, melting peak transition range. The temperature over which a given sample of a material completely melts is a function of sample mass and the heating rate (Dötsch and Fink 1987; Marini et al. 1988). The energy input is measured to establish a nearly zero temperature difference between an empty reference metallic pan and an identical metallic pan containing the sample material, both subjected to identical temperature regimes in heating and/or cooling mode at a controlled rate of temperature rise. DSC setup includes a nitrogen tank for purging at a fixed pressure, a cooling media (liquid nitrogen) to perform cooling, the calorimeter itself and a data acquisition system. DSC systems in common use are classified as either a power-compensation DSC or a heat-flux DSC (Ekeren et al. 1997; Bailey and Hay 1999; Danley 2002).

The sample and the reference temperatures are controlled independently using identical separate crucibles. Identical sample and reference temperatures are maintained by varying the power inputs to the two crucibles. The difference in the energy required to maintain these identical temperatures is a measure of the enthalpy (or heat capacity change) in the sample compared to the reference (Sichina, 2000)
In a heat-flux DSC, the sample and the reference are connected by a low-resistance heat-flow path (a metal disc). The whole assembly is enclosed in a single crucible shown in figure 3.2. Enthalpy or heat capacity changes in the sample caused a difference in its temperature relative to the reference. The temperature difference was recorded and related to enthalpy change in the sample compared with the reference (Danley, 2002). The resulting heat flow was small compared with that in differential thermal analysis (DTA) because the sample and reference were in good thermal contact.
3.2.1.1 Experiments

In this study a heat-flux DSC was used, this provided quick, accurate and detailed measurements from only a very small, 3 to 10 mg sample. Paraffin wax RT20, salt hydrate CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O, a mixture of salt hydrate and paraffin wax SP22, a eutectic mixture of capric acid-lauric acid and a eutectic mixture of capric acid-palmitic acid were characterized sing 5 mg sample of each PCM. During the experiment the crucibles were purged with a constant supply of nitrogen gas whilst each sample was heated from 10 °C to 60 °C at a heating rate of 5 °C min$^{-1}$. At the end of each heating run, the crucibles were cooled to 10 °C with liquid nitrogen in preparation for the next run. Three runs were performed for each PCM with the same experimental conditions to ensure repeatability. The variation of less than 1 % was observed in measured values that represents the accuracy of the device.
Thermal properties of the samples were analysed in the form of energy-time relationships termed thermograms for predetermined operating temperature ranges during the heating (i.e., melting) cycles. The difference in heat input between the reference pan and the pan containing sample for a unit temperature rise formed the DSC output that was plotted against temperature rise. Evaluation of DSC thermograms determined the PCM phase transition temperature, specific heat and latent heat of fusion.

Figure 3.3 : DSC results for RT20 PCM

Paraffin wax RT20 was studied to compare these current results with those obtained from previous work that also used paraffin wax RT25 PCM for temperature regulation of building integrated photovoltaics (Huang et al. 2006a; Huang et al. 2006b)

Figure 3.3 presents the DSC thermograph obtained with paraffin wax RT20 showing the PCM started latent heat of absorption at 18.7 °C with a peak at 24 °C and
completed heat absorption at 31.4 °C. The melting range was 22 °C to 25 °C with a latent heat of fusion of 139 Jg⁻¹ respectively are in good agreement with the manufacturer corresponding data of melting point of 21 °C and heat of fusion of 134 Jg⁻¹ (Rubitherm, 2009). This very large heat absorption from 18.7 °C to 31.4 °C can be attributed to (i) heat transfer mechanisms in the sample crucible, (ii) low thermal conductivity of RT20 and (iii) a too small sample size. The melting point is taken as the point where the slope of the thermograph is maximum so as to ensure the latent heat is taken at close to isothermal conditions. RT20 thus is a potential candidate PCM for PV temperature regulation due to its higher heat of fusion appropriate lower melting point well below a desired PV temperature of 25 °C. However RT20 also has certain drawbacks of which the most important are (i) its low density of 0.88 gcm⁻³ in solid phase and 0.75 gcm⁻³ in liquid phase which means that mass required would occupy comparatively large volume, thus making a PV-PCM unit less readily integrated into typical building facades, (ii) low thermal conductivity of 0.2 Wm⁻¹K⁻¹ and (iii) its large volume expansion of 14 % from solid to liquid phase change (Rubitherm, 2009) may cause containment design problems. The wide range heat absorption in Figure 3.3 (18.7 °C to 31.4 °C) of paraffin RT20 may seem unsuitable for temperature control close to 25 °C. However predicted device design manipulations such as inserting thermal conductive fins in PCM container to enhance heat transfer rate can cause the PCM to melt in a relatively narrow temperature range (Huang et al. 2004). Combustibility of RT20 with flash point of 154 °C (Rubitherm, 2009) can also be a potential problem restricting its use in building integrated
applications as it would not comply with building safety and/or design codes in various legislations.

Figure 3.4: DSC results for the SP22 PCM

Figure 3.4 presents DSC thermographs of a mixture of paraffin wax and salt hydrate, SP22 showing that the PCM has a moderate melting range of 15 °C to 26.8 °C with a peak at 23 °C. The melting range was 21.6 °C to 24 °C with the latent heat of fusion of 125 J·g⁻¹. While the melting point and heat storage capacity indicated in the manufacture’s catalogue were 23 °C and 150 kJ·kg⁻¹ respectively in the temperature range of 13°C-28 °C (Rubitherm, 2009 ). The difference between these values can be attributed to (i) the range of melting, (ii) method of measurement and (iii) too small mass of the sample. Further characterization was conducted with larger sample masses described in section 3.2.2.
PCM SP224A (referred to as SP22 onwards) shows promise for an integrated PV-PCM application due to (i) high heat of fusion (ii) high thermal conductivity of 0.6 W m\(^{-1}\)K\(^{-1}\) (iii) high density of 1.49 g-cm\(^{-3}\) and (iv) low volume expansion of 4.03 % while changing phase from solid to liquid. The large heat absorption range (15 °C-26.8 °C) and beyond evident from the curve suggests that SP22 4A can be a suitable material for thermal energy storage applications as it can store energy as a sensible and latent heat however it may not be suitable for PV temperature control applications where the need is to melt just above typical ambient temperatures (i.e., 25 °C). Furthermore SP22 PCM being a mixture of paraffin wax and a salt hydrate (Rubitherm, 2009) may lead to incongruent melting due to different melting behaviour and thermophysical properties of the constituent PCMs. For effective temperature regulation a PCM should have little or no phase incongruence.

![Figure 3.5: DSC results for the CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O PCM](image)

Figure 3.5: DSC results for the CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O PCM
Figure 3.5 presents the DSC thermograph of pure salt hydrate CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O and shows that heat absorption began at 25.9 °C and completed at 33.9 °C with a peak at 29.7 °C. The melting range was 29.6 °C and 30.4 °C with a latent heat of fusion of 213.2 Jg$^{-1}$ which are in agreement with the reported melting point of 29.8 °C and heat of fusion of 191 Jg$^{-1}$ (Tyagi and Buddhi, 2008). CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O PCM thus has the lowest temperature range of heat absorption (25.9 °C -33.9 °C) of the PCMs measured. The variation observed in heat of fusion was due to (i) grade and purity of the PCM, (i.e., the PCM used in current experiments and those used in the reference literature were different) and (ii) the thermal cycles and dehydration the PCM had undergone before performing the experiment. CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O PCM shows (i) a good range of melting, (ii) relatively high heat of fusion, (iii) high thermal conductivity of 1.09 Wm$^{-1}$K$^{-1}$ and (iv) high density of 1.71 g cm$^{-3}$ and (v) very good thermal cycling properties if carefully melted in hermetically sealed containers (Tyagi and Buddhi, 2008). However the melting occurs at a higher temperature than the desired temperature of 25 °C, this PCM also has a higher corrosion rate in metallic containers materials (Cabeza et al., 2002; Farrell et al., 2006) compared to the other PCMs and a tendency to dehydrate during melting when exposed to air (El-Sebaii et al., 2009).

The DSC results for a eutectic mixture of capric-lauric acid in figure 3.6 show that the heat absorption commenced at 18 °C and completed at 27 °C with the peak at 24.6 °C. The lower and upper melting points were 19.6 and 22.5 °C with latent heat of fusion 188 J g$^{-1}$ that are in good agreement with previously reported values of 18.5 °C and 168 J g$^{-1}$ respectively (Sari and Karaipekli 2008).
This PCM has (i) a suitable melting point (ii) a relatively high heat of fusion (iii) moderate volume expansion and (iv) good thermal cyclic stability when subjected to several solid to liquid phase change cycles (Sedat et al., 2005; Shilei et al., 2006; Sari and Karaipekli, 2008). However this PCM has also (i) a wide heat absorption temperature range (18 °C - 27 °C) may be attributed to (i) its very low thermal conductivity of 0.14 W m\(^{-1}\)K\(^{-1}\) and (ii) relatively low density of 0.89 g-cm\(^{-3}\) in solid phase (Sharma and Sagara, 2005).

Figure 3.7 shows DSC thermographs for eutectic mixture of capric-palmitic acid. Heat absorption commenced at 19 °C and had completed at 31.4 °C with a peak at 26.4 °C. The melting range was found be 22.4 °C to 25 °C with latent heat of fusion of 195 Jg\(^{-1}\) while comparable values in literature were 22.5 °C and 173.6 Jg\(^{-1}\) respectively (Karaipekli and Sari, 2007; Sari and Karaipekli, 2008).
This PCM also shows promise for a PV cooling application due to (i) its high heat of fusion (ii) suitable melting point, (iii) melting peak in close proximity to the desired PV temperature and (iv) a moderate volume expansion of 8-10 % during phase change from solid to liquid. However, this PCM shows (i) an undesired wide range of heat absorption of 19 °C – 31.4 °C caused by its very low thermal conductivity of 0.14 W m\(^{-1}\)K\(^{-1}\) and (ii) also possesses a relatively low density of 0.87 kg dm\(^{-3}\) in solid phase (Schuette and Vogel, 1939; Sharma and Sagara, 2005). DSC characterizations results are summarized and compared with those found in literature in table 3.3.

As can be seen in table 3.2 none of the PCM possesses all of the desired properties. While changing phase from solid-liquid during measurement, each sample is far from
thermal equilibrium. A significant temperature gradient arises within the sample due to the PCM’s relatively low thermal conductivity. This can lead to a deviation of several degrees Celsius from the indicated heat storage capacity with respect to temperature depending on sample size, heating rate and heat storage capacity of the sample. In order to study PCM behaviour more precisely further experiments were conducted using the temperature history method.

3.2.2 Temperature History Method (THM)

The limitations of DSC in accurately determining the thermophysical properties of PCM is that the sample mass is found to be optimum at 5 mg which is not representative of the masses in the range of kilograms used in practical applications. Supercooling-subcooling and nature of melting that depend on the quantity of PCM may vary substantially with a change of PCM sample mass from mg to kilogram. Therefore although the properties measured from DSC may serve as a reference, they do not give reliable information about the bulk PCM behaviour for practical large-scale applications. In order to determine properties for a reasonable PCM sample mass, Yinping et al. (1999) introduced the temperature history method (THM) based on recording the temperature of a PCM while it cools from a higher temperature liquid state to a lower temperature solid state through solidification. The cooling curve thus obtained can be used to determine the (i) start and end of solidification, (ii) specific heat capacity, (iii) amount of sub cooling/super cooling, (iv) latent heat released during solidification, and (v) temperature dependent enthalpy. The original method introduced by Yinping et al (1999) assumed that degree of super cooling
represented the end of melting and assumed no sensible heat due to incongruence, the latter occurring in real melting/solidification contribute to errors in determining thermophysical properties. The method was improved by Hong et al. (2004) by (i) considering the end of melting to be when the derivative of the temperature time graph on the cooling curve becomes minimum and (ii) including sensible heating in the calculation of heat capacity and enthalpy (Hong et al. 2004). Although the original THM was improved by the inclusion of considering sensible heating, the method derived by Hong et al. (2004) did not determine the temperature dependence of heat capacity and enthalpy of PCM. The THM was further extended by Marin et al. (2003) to determine temperature dependent properties such as specific heat capacity and enthalpy of the PCM and produced enthalpy temperature curves for PCMs (Marín et al., 2003).

3.2.2.1 Experiments

To characterize PCM by THM, 25 g samples of each of the five PCMs was placed in 15 cm long glass test tubes with 1cm internal diameter and 0.8 mm wall thickness. These dimensions were selected to ensure that the Biot number, \( \text{Bi} = \frac{hR}{2k} \) was < 0.1 where \( h \) is the convective heat transfer coefficient, \( R \) is radius of the tube and \( k \) is the thermal conductivity of the tube material. Satisfying these conditions enables heat transfer to occur solely in one-dimension along the length of the tube containing PCM so the tube can be considered a lumped system in front of heating or cooling source and the lumped capacitance method can be applied. The PCM and the reference (distilled water with known specific heat capacity) contained in the tube were heated
with the temperature raised to above 40 °C, then maintained at this temperature for 2 hours to get a homogenous solution of PCM and finally exposed to cool ambient. Temperatures of the PCM and the reference were recorded while cooling until the PCM solidified and temperature-time graphs were plotted for both the reference and the PCM. The governing equations to calculate specific heat capacity, heat of fusion and heat transfer coefficient are obtained by simple energy balance (Yinping et al 1999) as follows:

\[
(m_p c_{pl} + m_t c_{pt})(T_1 - T_2) = h_c A_c A_t
\]  

(3.1)

Where \(m_p\) and \(m_t\) are the masses of the tube and PCM respectively, \(c_{pl}\) and \(c_{pt}\) are the mean specific heat capacities of the liquid PCM and the tube material respectively, \(h_c\) is the convective heat transfer coefficient respectively, \(A_c\) is the convective heat transfer area of a tube and \(A_t\) is the convective heat transfer area. The heat loss by the cooling PCM is due to natural convection given by equation 3.2

\[
m_p H_m = h_c A_c A_t
\]  

(3.2)

Where \(H_m\) is the heat of fusion of the PCM and \(A_t = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} ((T - T_{ref}) dt\) and \((t_1 \rightarrow t_2)\)

is the time in which the phase change occurs and:

\[
(m_p c_{pl} + m_t c_{pt})(T_2 - T_3) = h_c A_c A_t
\]  

(3.3)
Where \( c_{p,s} \) is the mean specific heat capacity of the solid PCM, 
\[ A_s = \int_{t_0}^{t_2} ((T - T_{\infty,0})) \, dt \]
\( T_r \) is the reference temperature. If a tube containing pure water is suddenly exposed to
the same ambient as of the PCM, it also cools and releases heat following the curve
shown in figure 3.8. Considering the \( B_i < 0.1 \) similarly we have:

\[
\left( m_e c_{p,e} + m_w c_{p,0} \right) (T_0 - T_2) = h_e A_e A'_1
\]  \hfill (3.4)

\[
\left( m_e c_{p,e} + m_w c_{p,0} \right) (T'_2 - T_r) = h_e A_e A'_2
\]  \hfill (3.5)

Where \( m_w \) and \( c_{p,w} \) are the mass and mean specific heat capacity of water,
respectively,

\[ A'_1 = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} ((T' - T_{\infty,0})) \, dt \quad \text{and} \quad A'_2 = \int_{t_2}^{t_3} ((T - T_{\infty,0})) \, dt \]

Using equation 3.4, the natural convective heat transfer coefficient \( (h_c) \) of air outside
the tube is calculated which is 4.5 Wm\(^{-1}\)K\(^{-1}\). Rearranging the equations described
above, the specific heat capacity and the latent heat of fusion of the PCM can be
calculated using the equations 3.6-3.8.

\[
c_{p,s} = \frac{m_e c_{p,e} + m_w c_{p,0}}{m_p} \frac{A_e}{A'_1} - \frac{m_e}{m_p} c_{p,e}
\]  \hfill (3.6)

\[
c_{p,l} = \frac{m_w c_{p,w} + m_e c_{p,e}}{m_p} \frac{A_e}{A'_1} - \frac{m_e}{m_p} c_{p,e}
\]  \hfill (3.7)

\[
H_m = \frac{m_w c_{p,w} + m_e c_{p,e}}{m_p} \frac{A_e}{A'_1} (T_0 - T_2)
\]  \hfill (3.8)
Figure 3.8: Temperature history curves for the distilled water taken as reference (left) and the sample PCM, CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O (right) when cooling from a higher temperature in the same ambient.

Using the equations 3.6-3.8, the specific heat capacity of each of the PCMs in solid and liquid phases is calculated. The $c_{p,s}$ and $c_{p,l}$ and $H_m$ are calculated and are summarised in table 3.2. The calculated values from THM are closer to the values calculated from DSC analysis and the literature values are within maximum 5 % deviation from measured DSC and 10 % from literature values. The deviation can be attributed to the fact that this method relies on overly simplified custom made set up which are not precisely calibrated like conventional compared to DSC. Most of the reported values in literature are determined using DSC which also shows variation between values of the same material due to different measurement modes, operating conditions and instruments used. Considering these factors, the values obtained from
THM are reasonably accurate and can be compared with measured or literature values. Although THM allows calculating temperature dependent properties however this needs highly calibrated THM, where as the set up used in these experiments is very simple and can not be applied with confidence for temperature dependent properties. The temperature-time curve obtained for RT20 using THM is presented in figure 3.8. The PCM cooled from 40 °C to well below the solidification point until all the PCM had melted. It can be observed from the slope of figure 3.9 that the heat release occurs in three different regimes. The sensible cooling starts from initial temperature of 40 °C down to the start of solidification at 21 °C. From start of
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Figure 3.9: Time-temperature curve for paraffin wax RT20 using THM
solidification at 21 °C to the end of solidification at 6 °C the heat release occurs as sensible as well as latent heat. After completing solidification, sensible heat is released below 6 °C. The graph shows that RT 20 has a wide range of solidification heat release from 21 °C - 6 °C in contrast to the isothermal heat release desired for this application.

Figure 3.10 shows the THM cooling curve for salt hydrate CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O when cooling from 55 °C to below its solidification point. It is observed that the PCM undergoes 11°C of subcooling before it starts solidification at 29 °C.

The heat release during solidification occurs between 29 °C-27 °C temperature range that is very close to the isothermal condition due to high thermal conductivity (1.09 W m$^{-1}$K$^{-1}$) of CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O compared to 0.2 W m$^{-1}$K$^{-1}$ of RT20. Heat release in a wide range
temperature range is a strongly desired property for this application. Subcooling is expected in salt hydrates as the salt needs to be cooled below melting point to start nucleation (Günther et al., 2007b). CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O starts nucleation at a relatively lower temperature of 18 °C, below enough to typical ambient temperature of 25 °C, indicating that subcooling can be a major problem during heat removal from CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O.

Figure 3.11 : THM Temperature-time curve for SP22 4A, a mixture of salt hydrate and paraffin wax

Figure 3.11 shows the THM curve of a blend of salt hydrate and paraffin wax, SP22 which undergoes 8 °C of subcooling before it starts solidification at 16 °C. The heat release during solidification occurs between 16 °C-15 °C temperature range that is very close to the isothermal due to high, thermal conductivity (0.6 Wm$^{-1}$K$^{-1}$) of SP22
compared to 0.2 Wm$^{-1}$K$^{-1}$ thermal conductivity of RT20. Heat release in a narrow
temperature range is a strongly desired property for this application. Though
subcooling is expected in a salt hydrate such as SP22 (Günther et al., 2007a), the
particularly lower subcooling than in CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O observed here is due the salt
hydrate being blended with paraffin wax however the disadvantage is it melts over a
wider range. This subcooling may be problematic as the salt needs to be cooled to 16
°C to start nucleation (Günther et al., 2007b). In warm climates extra cooling may
therefore be needed when heat is to be removed from such a PCM.

Figure 3.12 shows the THM time-temperature diagram obtained for eutectic mixture
of capric acid-lauric acid cooling from melted state at 40 °C until complete
solidification.
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Figure 3.12 : THM Temperature-time curve for eutectic mixture of capric acid-lauric acid.
The graph shows that the fatty acid commences solidification at 24 °C without exhibiting any subcooling and completes solidification at 19 °C showing only 5 °C deviation from the isothermal heat release at solidification. The deviation from isothermal heat release during melting can be attributed to the low thermal conductivity, 0.14 W m\(^{-1}\)K\(^{-1}\) of the PCM.

Figure 3.13 shows the THM results obtained for eutectic mixture of capric acid-palmitic acid while cooling from 40 °C to the complete solidification.

Figure 3.13 THM Temperature-time curve for eutectic mixture of capric acid-palmitic acid fatty acids
Results show that the PCM starts solidification at 25.5 °C with negligible sub-cooling of 1 °C and completes solidification at 18 °C. Heat release during solidification occurs in the temperature range of 7.5 °C which is a little higher than temperature for capric-lauric acid although their thermal conductivities are similar at 0.14 Wm$^{-1}$K$^{-1}$. However, the solidification of capric-palmitic acid commences at a temperature 1.5 °C higher than the solidification temperature of capric-lauric acid. Solidification commencing at a higher temperature with very little subcooling are the properties desired for this application.

### 3.3 Conclusions

Thermophysical characterization of all the PCM with DSC and THM showed good agreement with literature and within measured values. Salt hydrate CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O possessed the highest heat of fusion and narrow transition range which renders it suitable for PV thermal regulation however it starts melting at 29.6 °C slightly above desired temperature of 25 °C. CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O solidifies at a higher temperature which renders solidification possible at higher nocturnal ambient temperatures. The drawback of CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O is the highest undercooling of 11 °C down to 18 °C which makes solidification difficult at higher ambient temperatures. Mixture of salt hydrate and paraffin wax, SP22 also shows subcooling of 8 °C below its freezing temperature down to 16 °C and a wide range of melting/solidification which may impede its solidification. However both CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O and SP22 have higher thermal conductivities which make them suitable for efficient heat removal. Paraffin wax
RT20 melts and solidifies over a wide temperature range along with higher volumetric expansion which makes it unsuitable for the temperature control applications.

Both the fatty acids examined commenced solidification close to 25 °C and were fully solidified at close to 19 °C over a short temperature range with a very clear phase transition boundaries. Although they have very low thermal conductivities, the nature of melting and the start and end of solidification renders them suitable for an application requiring temperature control at around 25 °C. Based on these results it can be seen that a systematic choice of the PCM is however difficult and needs further indoor characterization on real PV systems to compare the potential of each PCM for PV thermal regulation.
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4 INDOOR CHARACTERIZATION OF SMALL SCALE PHOTOVOLTAIC PHASE CHANGE MATERIALS SYSTEMS

4.1 Aim of the Experiments

Five different PCMs were characterized using two different thermophysical techniques i.e. DSC and THM as described in chapter 3. The results described the thermophysical properties of PCMs however they were unable to predict the temperature regulation behavior of PCM when integrated into the PV systems. In order to study the behavior of the PCM indoors when integrated into the PV systems indoor experiments were conducted at constant ambient temperature and with no air flow condition with following variables:

- Thermal mass of PCM
- Thermal conductivity of PCM and PCM container
- Melting point of the PCM
- Solar radiation intensity

4.2 Methodology

- Five different PCMs were evaluated experimentally indoors to determine the temperature regulation effect of each of the PCMs on cell-sized PV-PCM systems.
Four different cell-size PV-PCM systems with different container material and dimensions detailed in table 4.1 were used to contain PCM behind the PV. The influence of solar radiation intensity, thermal conductivity of the PV-PCM systems and thermal mass of the PCM on thermal regulation of the PV was determined.

Experiments were conducted at three solar radiation intensities of 500 Wm\(^{-2}\), 750 Wm\(^{-2}\) and 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) for each of the PCMs contained in the four different PV-PCM systems.

Temperatures at front surfaces, back surfaces and side walls of the reference PV and the PV-PCM systems were measured.

Temperature difference from the reference PV of each PV-PCM system was determined to quantify the temperature regulation achieved by each PCM contained in PV-PCM systems.

This methodology provided temperature reduction data achieved by each PCM, the effect of thermal mass of PCM on PV temperature reduction and the effect of PV-PCM container material on performance of the contained PCM.

### 4.3 Experimental Set up

Polycrystalline silicon PV cells with dimensions of 10 cm x 10 cm x 0.05 cm were encapsulated between two sheets of 3 mm thick transparent perspex to simulate a cell size section of a PV module. Perspex thickness of 3 mm was selected corresponding to generally applied thickness of PV encapsulation to obtain enough mechanical strength to bear external pressures and wind speed. Perspex was used as encapsulation
material because it was easily accessible, possesses similar optical thermal and mechanical properties to most of the PV encapsulation materials i.e. glass and polymers. Four rectangular containers, as described in Table 4.1 were fabricated and a PV cell was attached to the front of each container as illustrated in Figure 4.1. Different container materials and container dimensions were chosen to compare thermal performance of (i) Heat conductive (A & C) compared with heat insulating (B & D) containers (ii) PCM having different thermal masses on PV thermal regulation at different insulations (iii) Thermal performance of corrosive metallic PCM container compared to the non corrosive polymeric PCM containers. The dimensions of 3cm and 5cm were calculated by making thermal balances on a PV-PCM system at 500 Wm$^{-2}$ and 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ to accommodate enough thermal mass of paraffin wax PCM to regulate PV-PCM temperature until fully melted in 8 hours from previous work by authors (Huang et al., 2004). The paraffin wax RT25 used in the previous research had similar thermophysical properties to paraffin wax RT20 used in the current research.

Figure 4.1   Photographs of PV-PCM systems A, B, C and D as described in table 4.1
Table 4.1 PV-PCM systems A, B, C and D fabricated from aluminium (A & C) and perspex (B & D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PV-PCM systems</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Container material</td>
<td>Aluminium</td>
<td>Perspex</td>
<td>Aluminium</td>
<td>Perspex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity of material (Wm(^{-1})K(^{-1}))</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container width internal (cm)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Systems A & C were fabricated from 5 mm thickness high thermal conductivity, 237 Wm\(^{-1}\)K\(^{-1}\) aluminium alloy 1050A from Aalco (Aalco, 2007), which enabled increased heat removal rate from PV into PCM leading to a decreased time of melting of the PCM (Shina and Inagaki, 2005; Sharma et al., 2006). However systems A & C being highly heat conductive had less heat retention due to heat loss to ambient through their conductive surfaces (Martin et al. 1990). The high conductivity aluminium side walls and back surface of the PV-PCM systems A and C were kept heat un-insulated to allow maximum heat dissipation through container walls to the ambient to provide maximum cooling of PV cells. Systems B & D were fabricated on all the five sides (front, back, two side and a top and a bottom wall) from a 10 mm thick perspex, "MARCRLY CLEAR" from Vink Plastics that had very low thermal conductivity, 0.19 Wm\(^{-1}\)K\(^{-1}\) (Vink, 2007). This lower thermal conductivity enabled higher heat retention due to less heat loss to ambient because of thermally insulating
side and back perspex walls however it had a low heat removal rate from PV into PCM (Chen et al. 2008).

Although aluminium has higher thermal conductivity which enables efficient heat transfer from PV surface to PCM, it corrodes with most of the PCM which may result in reduced PCM container life. The advantage of using perspex instead of aluminium is its less corrosion to most of the PCM which yields longer PCM container life however it results in less efficient heat removal which may result in higher temperatures at PV surface.

### 4.4 Experimental Procedure

The reference experiments were conducted by irradiating the PV section with a Griven GR262 solar simulator at insulations of 500 Wm\(^{-2}\), 750 Wm\(^{-2}\) and 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) with ambient temperature at 20 ±1 °C (Appendix A). The spectrum of the solar simulator was measured and compared with the standard solar spectrum to calibrate the solar simulator. The solar radiation intensity was measured at the PV front surface at a fixed position of the solar simulator from the PV cell, the positions were marked and fixed for repeatability to produce desired insulations (i.e., 500 Wm\(^{-2}\), 750 Wm\(^{-2}\) and 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\)) in particular experiment which were kept constant for the whole duration of the experiment. Although the common design criteria for design qualification of PV is to test them at lower irradiations of 200 Wm\(^{-2}\), however in context of the current research this low irradiation ends up in low temperatures at PV surface which would need little or no cooling rendering use of PCM irrelevant for temperature regulation of PV. Higher solar radiation intensities however are likely to
achieve sufficiently higher temperatures at PV surface that would cause PV power failure and require temperature regulation to maintain rated power output. The insulations of 500 Wm$^{-2}$ to 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ were selected to achieve higher temperature at PV surface representative of high insolation ambient where PV has higher thermal load and can justify use of PCM for PV thermal management. Temperatures at the PV front and back surfaces were measured with calibrated T-type copper-constantan thermocouples with the maximum measured deviation of ±0.2 °C. Thermocouples were installed with 2 cm displacement from sides, top and bottom of PV and 3 cm distance from each of the adjacent thermocouple locations at front surface of the PV and are illustrated in figure 4.2.

![Figure 4.2: Position of thermocouples on front surface of the PV section](image)

The insolation was measured with a Kipp and Zonen CM6B pyranometer with a maximum measured spatial intensity variation of ±2 % over the PV front surface described in appendix B. (Kipp and Zonnen 2003). The data were recorded in ΔT data logger described in Appendix C. Experiments were conducted with each of the selected PCM contained in systems A, B, C & D under the same test conditions (i.e.,
500 Wm$^{-2}$, 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ at ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C) with the experimental setup as shown in the Figure 4.3. Each experiment was conducted twice to confirm their repeatability. The error in two corresponding measurements for the same experiments remained always in the range of 1-3 % which can be attributed to the error range of the instruments used.

Figure 4.3 Schematic of the experimental setup showing a cell size PV irradiated with a Griven GR262 solar simulator, temperature and irradiation measured with a Kipp and Zonen CM6B pyranometer and T-type thermocouples respectively via a Delta-T 2e data logger.
4.5 Results and Discussion

4.5.1. Validation of PV cell's temperatures

For each experiment the temperature at PV front surface increased rapidly to reach a steady state when heat input to PV due to irradiation equalled the heat lost by the PV to ambient primarily due to natural convection. Reference steady-state temperatures, their corresponding insolutions and the time elapsed to reach these steady state temperatures were, 45°C at 500 Wm$^{-2}$ in 80 minutes, 51°C at 750 Wm$^{-2}$ in 40 minutes and 57°C at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ in 34 minutes. Each of the experiments described in following sections was conducted twice for repeatability and generally good agreement between corresponding measured temperatures was observed with deviation ranging from 1-3%. In following sections average temperatures at the front surface of PV-PCM systems for each experiment will be compared with the average PV cell temperature without PCM at various insolutions, PCMs and PV-PCM systems at fixed ambient temperatures.

Initial simulations were undertaken using the model described in section 2.5 for PV cell without integrated PCM to calculate temperature evolution at the front surface un-cooled PV cell. Model results provide a reference temperature levels obtained at PV front surface which are validated with the measured experimental temperature data shown in figure 30, 31 and 32 at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$, 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and 500 Wm$^{-2}$ insolation, respectively. In case of 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ insolation the temperature rises to 55°C in half an hour while in the same duration, temperature rise was 49°C and 41°C at 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and 500 Wm$^{-2}$ respectively. The initial gradient of temperature is same in both simulated
and experimental results but after 30 minutes the temperature rise is less in simulation as compared to experimental results. This is due to the difference of atmospheric condition between experiment and simulation. In the simulation model air heating adjacent to the heat source, i.e. solar simulator is not considered and the heat transfer is considered only between the PV surface and the adjacent air. In real operating conditions the solar simulator surface also gets heated and transfers heat to the ambient air enclosed between solar simulator and the PV cell reducing temperature difference and the heat transfer between the PV surface and the ambient air resulting in higer PV temperature. However the difference is only ~1-2 Kelvin and will not have a large effect on the solar to electrical conversion efficiency of PV cell. It can be improved by considering air heating near solar simulator and by mesh refinement at the cost of increased computation time.

Figure 4.4: Temperature evolution on PV cell at 500 Wm\(^{-2}\) insolation and 20 ±1 °C ambient temperature.
Figure 4.5: Temperature evolution on PV Cell at 750 Wm$^{-2}$ insolation and 20 ±1 °C ambient temperature.

Figure 4.6: Temperature evolution on PV Cell at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ insolation and 20 ±1 °C ambient temperature.
4.5.2. Validation of PV-PCM System

Figure 4.7 shows both experimental and simulated results of the temperature evolution on PV-PCM System at insolation level 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) using PCM RT20. The insolation of 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) was selected as is the insolation at which the PV are rated while the PCM RT20 was selected because its thermophysical properties input to this model were already verified through an earlier modelling work by Huang et al., 2006a using similar thermophysical properties as in the current model. Initial gradient of temperature rise as well as the final temperature rise is the same for both experimental and simulated results. After half hour of exposure to solar radiations at 750 Wm\(^{-2}\) the temperature in PV-PCM system rose to 43.5 °C in simulated result and 45 °C in experimental results compared to 51 °C in PV without PCM. This shows temperature regulation effect of 7.5 °C in modelled results and 6 °C in experimental results which indicates that the model has over predicted temperature regulation in the start. In the middle part i.e. between 45 minutes to 150 minutes, the model has predicted less temperature regulation than the experimental results as can be seen from figure 4.7. The prime reason for this difference between simulated and experimental result is starting point for phase change process and the variation of density with temperature. In the modelled temperature curve, the gradient of temperature rise starts to decrease earlier than that in experimental curve which indicates an earlier start to melting process and latent heat absorption.
Figure 4.7: Comparison of temperature evolution on PV Cell with and without integrated PCM RT20 at 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) insolation and 20 ±1 °C ambient temperature.

Figure 4.8: Melt fraction of PCM RT20 at 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) insolation and 20 ±1 °C ambient temperature
From figure 4.8, it can be seen that the melting started after 10 minutes represented by sharp increase in melt fraction. Due to earlier start of phase change, temperature regulation starts earlier in simulation model which results in over predicted temperature regulation in first half an hour. Later variation in the middle part of both modelled and experimental temperature curves may be, in author’s point of view, due to density variation of actual and modelled PCM. The input density in the model is piecewise linear with only two points given as input i.e. density in solid phase and density in liquid phase assuming a linear relationship between these two points while in reality, density variation is highly non-linear behaviour (Huang et al., 2006) In actual conditions, density changes very quickly initially due to heat transfer by conduction between solid PCM and PV Cell while as the melting front move towards the back of the container, density variation reduces due heat to transfer by convection rather than conduction caused in part by lower thermal conductivity of PCM i.e. 0.2 Wm$^{-1}$°C$^{-1}$.

![Figure 4.9: Melt fraction against temperature of PCM RT20 at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ insolation and 20 ±1 °C ambient temperature](image)
In simulations the density variation is linear so the melt fraction also follows a linear curve with respect to temperature as the melting front moves away as shown in figure 4.9. Figure 4.10 shows distribution of melt fraction during the experiments. Compared to real PV-PCM system the top, bottom, left and right surfaces shown in figure 4.10 are the front, back, top and bottom of the real PV-PCM system.

![Figure 4.10](image)

Figure 4.10: Melt fraction of RT20 at 1000Wm$^{-2}$ insolation and 20±1 ambient temperature (a) after 20 minutes, (b) after 50 minutes, (c) after 100 minutes and (d) after 160 minutes.

It shows that the melting front is planar at the start of the experiment (figure 4.10 a) when heat transfer is due to pure conduction however after 50 minutes, it starts to form curvature (figure 4.10 b) when sufficient PCM melt has developed. After 100
minutes (figure 4.10 c) it can be observed that the lighter PCM with higher melt fraction in the mushy zone moves upward due to buoyancy driven natural convection caused by density difference and heavier PCM with lower melt fraction in the mushy region moves downward in the direction of gravity with solid PCM accumulated at the bottom of the PV-PCM system. After 160 minutes no pure solid is present and the a stronger distribution of melt fraction in the mushy region is observed due to stronger buoyancy driven natural convection with clear distinction of fully melted PCM at top and near the heated surface and heavier less-melted PCM layers moving all the way downwards to the bottom due to gravity. This shows how natural convection in the melt changes the shape of the initially plane melting front.

### 4.5.3. Heat Transfer Mechanism in the PV-PCM System

In the PV-PCM system, the continuous heat input from incoming solar radiations raised PV and consequently PCM temperature. At start temperature rise in PV-PCM system was rapid up to 25-30 °C due to sensible heating of PV which transferred heat to the solid PCM at the back due to conduction showing very little deviation from the reference system temperature. Above 30 °C PV front surface temperature, the PCM contained in PV-PCM system in direct contact with the PV back surface started melting and absorbing PV thermal energy as latent heat. As a result of PCM melting at fixed melting point the rate of temperature rise at PV front surface started to decrease and deviate from the reference system temperature. A thin layer of melted PCM developed between the heated PV back surface and the solid PCM. The melted PCM layer started sensible heating with a rise in temperature while the solid PCM
further away still continued to melt and absorb latent heat. The melted layer had a lower thermal conductivity than the initially solid PCM decreasing heat transfer rate to solid PCM and induced a temperature difference between the melted and solid PCM. As the melt fraction increased, temperature difference in melted PCM induced a density difference in the melt with lighter and heated fluid moving upward to the container top due to buoyant natural convective heat transfer. The natural convection resulted in different rate of melting at top and bottom PCM layers that introduced a curvature in the initial planar melting front that caused the melting front to breakdown. Higher density solid PCM started falling to the bottom of the PCM container while lower density liquid PCM moved upward due to buoyancy to the top of the PCM further increasing the temperature difference between top and bottom of the PCM. As the heat absorption continued, the melt fraction continued to grow rendering increasing convection in the melted PCM compared to conduction in the solid PCM thus a larger deviation from isothermal heat absorption ensued. The melting rate thus decreased the temperature rising slowly controlled by natural convection until whole the PCM had melted. After the PCM had melted fully as the latent heat is fully used a sharp increase in the PV temperature was observed which reached the reference PV temperature in shorter time. In order to describe the heat transfer mechanism in the PCM indicative Raleigh numbers \((Ra)\) are calculated using (Huang et al., 2006):

\[
Ra = \frac{g \beta (T_y - T_{\infty}) x^3}{\nu^2 \frac{k}{\rho c_p}}
\]  

(4.1)
Where \( g \) is the gravitational constant, \( \beta \) is the coefficient of thermal expansion of PCM, \( T_s \) is the surface temperature, \( T_{\infty} \) is the bulk temperature, \( \nu \) is the kinematic viscosity of PCM, \( \kappa \) is thermal conductivity of the PCM, \( \rho \) is density of the PCM, \( c_p \) is the specific heat capacity of the PCM and \( x \) is the distance from the front surface.

with the following assumptions (i) The melting front location is taken at the centre of the PCM, i.e. at 2.5 cm from the heated front PV surface after half of the time of turning the solar simulator on (ii) The bulk PCM temperature is taken as average temperature between the front and back surface temperature of PV-PCM system after half of the PCM had melted. (iii) Constant phase and temperature independent values of thermal conductivity, specific heat capacity, density, viscosity and volumetric expansion coefficient of PCM are considered. The thermal mass and \( Ra \) number were calculated for each PCM and are given in table 4.2. Table 4.2 shows that CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O has the highest thermal mass (2.65 kJK\(^{-1}\)) while RT20 has the lowest thermal mass (1.03 kJK\(^{-1}\)) while the fatty acids fall in between which indicates that the CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O would result least temperature rise while RT20 would result in the highest temperatures rise with same amount of heat input.

Table 4.2 shows also that the \( Ra \) number varies from 3.8 \( \times 10^3 \) to 1.4 \( \times 10^7 \) which confirms the presence of natural convection and laminar fluid flow in PV-PCM system. It also shows that the salt hydrates CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O has the lowest \( Ra \) number (\( 10^3 \)) indicating less convective heat transfer compared to fatty acids having the highest \( Ra \) (\( 10^7 \)) number showing the strongest convection within all the PCMs. It also shows that in each PCM the \( Ra \) number increases with increasing solar radiation intensity due primarily to increased temperature difference.
Table 4.2; Calculated thermal mass and indicative Raleigh numbers from the thermophysical properties of the PCMs described in table 3.2.

### 4.5.4. Thermal Regulation at 500 Wm\(^{-2}\) Insolation

Each experiment was conducted until all the PCM had melted and solar simulator was stopped after PV-PCM temperature equalled reference temperature because if the solar simulator was kept running after the PCM afterwards, the increased thermal mass of PV-PCM system due to PCM would continue absorbing heat and act as heat insulator compared to free back PV thus overheating the PV. In outdoor experiments however it is not possible to stop heat input due to uncontrolled nature of solar radiation, it becomes extremely necessary to remove heat from melted PCM effectively by flowing cooling fluid (water or air) into the PCM at complete PCM
melting. This heat extraction mechanism needs to be optimized for different climates and ambient condition to avoid overheating of the PV-PCM system due to thermal insulation provided by integrated PCM.

Figure 4.11 presents the temperatures on the PV front surface for all PCMs in system A compared with the reference system at 500 Wm$^{-2}$ insolation and 20 ±1 °C ambient temperature.

![Graph showing temperature evolution on the front surface of the reference PV system and PV-PCM system A containing each PCM type at 500 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C.]

Figure 4.11 Temperature evolution on the front surface of the reference PV system and PV-PCM system A containing each PCM type at an insolation of 500 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C.

The temperature at the reference system without PCM increased rapidly due to continuous heat input from the solar radiation falling on the PV and reached steady state at 45 °C in 1 hour. The magnitude and duration of deviation of PCM temperature in system A from the reference PV system quantifies the thermal regulation enhancement of PV achieved using PCM. The duration of the deviation is given by
the time in which the temperature in system A containing PCM equalled the
temperature in the reference system which is 6.5 hours for RT20, 9 hours for CL, 9.5
hours for SP22, 11 hours for CP and 13 hours for CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O. RT20 showed the
shortest time of temperature deviation that is expected result due to its lowest thermal
mass while CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O showed the longest duration of melting owing to its highest
thermal mass compared to other PCMs which fell in between. Observing temperature
difference from reference, after 4 hours the temperatures in system A were below the
reference temperature by 4.6 °C with RT20, 6.5 °C with SP22, 7 °C with CL, 7.5 °C
with CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O and 8 °C with CP respectively. It was observed that RT20 showed
the smallest temperature deviation from reference of 4.6 °C and shortest duration of
the deviation of 6.5 hours primarily due to lower thermal mass and heat of fusion
compared to salt hydrate and fatty acids. CP showed the largest temperature deviation
from the reference of 8 °C due to its lower melting point compared to CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O
while CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O showed the longest duration of the temperature deviation of 13
hours due to its highest thermal mass and heat of fusion compared to other PCMs.
Results obtained when using PCMs contained in systems B, C and D under the same
conditions of 500 Wm$^{-2}$ and 20 ± 1 °C are shown in Figures 4.12 – 4.14. Similar
trends in temperature evolution can be observed in all three PV-PCM systems
however each PV-PCM system, B, C and D achieved less temperature difference from
the reference system for shorter time durations than PV-PCM system A.
Figure 4.12 Temperature evolution at front surface of the reference PV system and the PV-PCM system B at an insolation of 500 Wm\(^{-2}\) and ambient temperature of 20 ±1°C.

Figure 4.13 Temperature evolution at front surface of the reference PV system and the PV-PCM system C at an insolation of 500 Wm\(^{-2}\) and ambient temperature of 20 ±1°C.
Figure 4.14 Temperature evolution at front surface of the reference PV system and the PV-PCM system C at an insolation of 500 Wm\(^{-2}\) and ambient temperature of 20 ±1°C

In order to compare the performance of different PCMs in system A, B, C and D, the duration for which PCM in each of these systems maintained their temperature 10 °C below the reference system temperature is illustrated in Figure 4.15. It can be seen that all PCM types when used in system A maintained a 10 °C temperature reduction for the longest duration compared to system B, C and D. Although system A & B have the same dimensions (accommodating the same PCM thermal mass with same PCM thermophysical properties of melting point, heat of fusion and thermal conductivity) system A been fabricated from aluminium alloy has a higher thermal conductivity than system B which have been fabricated from polymer perspex.

Since system A and B only differ in thermal conductivity of container, it indicates that thermal conductivity of the container helps improve efficient heat transfer in system A
compared to system B yielding lower temperatures at PV front surface for longer durations of time. Similarly PCM in system C maintained a temperature reduction for a longer duration than system D, although both have the same dimensions (accommodating the same PCM thermal mass with same PCM thermophysical properties of melting point, heat of fusion and thermal conductivity) however system C has higher thermal conductivity than system D. It also indicates that the thermal conductivity of the container material helps to achieve lower temperature for longer duration of time. From observation mentioned above it can be concluded that at low insolation all PCM types performed better in high thermal conductivity systems A & C compared with the same sized lower thermal conductivity systems B & D.

![Figure 4.15 Duration for which PCM maintained PV front surface temperature 10 °C below the reference temperature in systems A, B, C and D at an insolation of 500 W m⁻² and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C.](image)

Comparing PCM types, fatty acids CL and CP maintained temperature deviation of 10 °C from the reference for the longest duration of 2.5 hours followed by salt hydrates.
SP22 and CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O at 2.25 hours and paraffin wax RT20 at 1.5 hours. Fatty acids CL and CP have a low thermal conductivity of 0.14 Wm$^{-1}$K$^{-1}$ (Sharma and Sagara 2005) compared to paraffin RT20 having 0.2 Wm$^{-1}$K$^{-1}$ (Rubitherm 2009 -a), SP22 having 0.6 Wm$^{-1}$K$^{-1}$ with similar melting points (Rubitherm 2009 -b). It indicates that the lower thermal conductivity PCM types performed better than higher thermal conductivity PCM at lower insolations.

Lower thermal conductivity PCM types performed better than higher thermal conductivity PCM however higher thermal conductivity PV-PCM systems performed better than the lower thermal conductivity PV-PCM systems. This leads to the conclusion that at low insolation the thermal conductivity of the PV-PCM system is more important than the thermal conductivity of the PCM itself to maintain higher thermal regulation.

4.5.5. Thermal Regulation at 750 Wm$^{-2}$ Insolation

Figure 4.16 shows temperatures at the front surface of system A containing each of the five PCMs compared with the temperature at front surface of the reference PV system irradiated at 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and 20 ±1 °C ambient temperature. It can be observed that the temperature rise at front surface of the reference systems and system A is similar for all PCM types up to 30 °C. Above this temperature the temperature rise in the reference continued with the similar gradient however the gradient of temperature rise in system A with different PCMs started to decrease. This indicates onset of latent heat absorption by the melting PCM contained in systems A at the back of PV. Temperature in system A remained lower than the temperature in the reference system
due to continued latent heat absorption. After 4 hours, temperature in system A was below the reference temperature by 4 °C with RT20, 7.5 °C with SP22, 8 °C with CL, 9 °C with CP 10 °C and with CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O respectively.

![Figure 4.16](image_url)  

Figure 4.16 Temperature evolution on front surface of PV in system A at an insolation of 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C

Again PCM RT20 achieved the lowest temperature regulation for the same reasons described in the previous section, however at 750 Wm$^{-2}$ CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O achieved higher temperature regulation than CP in contrast to what was observed at 500 Wm$^{-2}$. CP has lower melting point while CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O has higher thermal mass and thermal conductivity which shows that at 750 Wm$^{-2}$ the thermal mass and thermal conductivity has relatively stronger effect than the melting point in stabilising lower PV temperatures. After complete melting of the PCM, the temperature in system A started to rise with a higher gradient and eventually equalled the temperature in the reference system. The time for which the temperature in system A remained below the temperature in reference system indicates the potential of each PCM contained in
system A to regulate PV temperature. The duration to reach temperature equilibrium was 6 hours for RT20, 8 hours for CL, 9 hours for SP22, 10 hours for CP and 12 hours for CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O. RT20 achieved the smallest temperature difference from the reference and the shortest time to achieve equilibrium for the same reasons explained in previous section. CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O showed the largest temperature difference from the reference system and also achieved the longest duration of the temperature difference primarily because of highest thermal mass, thermal conductivity and heat of fusion of the PCM compared to all other PCMs.

Results obtained when using PCM with system B, C and D under same conditions of 750 Wm$^{-2}$ insolation and 20 ± 1 °C ambient temperature are shown in Figures 4.17 – 4.19. Similar trends as in Figure 4.10 can be observed for the temperature evolution in all the three figures with each of the PV-PCM systems, B, C and D showed a lesser temperature difference from reference than system A.

Figure 4.17 Temperature evolution on front surface of PV in system B at an insolation of 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C.
Figure 4.18 Temperature evolution on front surface of PV in system C at an insolation of 750 Wm\(^{-2}\) and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C.

Figure 4.19 Temperature evolution on front surface of PV in system D at an insolation of 750 Wm\(^{-2}\) and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C.
The duration for which each PCM maintained PV temperature 10 °C below the reference temperature were compared and are illustrated in Figure 4.20.

Figure 4.20 Duration for which PCM maintained PV front surface temperature 10 °C below the reference temperature in systems A, B, C and D at insolation of 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C.

Comparing systems A, B, C and D, the temperature reduction for the longest duration was achieved with system A for all PCMs. Similarly comparing different PCMs, CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O maintained the temperature reduction of 10 °C for the longest duration of 3.5 hours followed by SP22 at 2.7 hours CP and CL at 2.5 hours and RT20 at 2 hours. At 750 Wm$^{-2}$ high thermal conductivity and thermal mass of PCMs, CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O and SP22 performed better than lower thermal conductivity and thermal mass PCMs, CP, CL and RT20 opposite to what was observed at 500 Wm$^{-2}$ insolation where CL and CP performed better than RT20, SP22 and CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O. It can be concluded that at intermediate insolation the optimum performance was achieved with
the combination of high thermal conductivity and higher thermal mass PCM CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O with high thermal conductivity PV-PCM sytems A.

4.5.6. Thermal Regulation at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ Insolation

Figure 4.21 shows temperatures at front surface of system A for all PCMs compared with the reference at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ insolation and 20 ±1 °C ambient temperature. Similar to the trend observed at 500 Wm$^{-2}$ and 750 Wm$^{-2}$ insolation, the use of the PCM in system A maintained lower temperatures than the reference system.

![Figure 4.21](image_url)

Figure 4.21 Temperature evolution on PV front surface in system A at an insolation of 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C.

At start of the experiments the temperature in the reference system and the system A was similar until it reached 35 °C. As soon as the PCM at the back of PV in system A started melting and absorbing latent heat the gradient of temperature rise in systems A
started decreasing and the difference of temperatures between the reference and the system A started to increase. After 4 hours, the temperature in system A was maintained below the reference temperature; 3.5 °C with RT20, 4 °C with CL, 7.5 °C with SP22, 11 °C with CaCl₂·6H₂O and 12 °C with CP.

Each melting PCM in system A continued to absorb latent heat and maintained lower temperature in PV until the whole PCM had melted. At this point gradient of temperature rise in system A started increasing sharply and eventually system A reached temperature equilibrium with reference system. The temperature reduction and time length for such reduction varied for each PCM. The duration in which the PCM in system A equalled the temperature in the reference system is 5.5 hours for RT20, 6 hours for CL, 9 hours for SP22, 9.5 hours for CP and 11 hours for CaCl₂·6H₂O respectively. It is observed that RT20 showed the smallest temperature difference with shortest duration to reach the equilibrium with the reference system due to lower thermal conductivity, thermal mass and heat of fusion compared to CaCl₂·6H₂O. C-P showed the largest temperature difference due primarily to lower melting point and higher heat of fusion and CaCl₂·6H₂O showed the longest duration to reach equilibrium with the reference system due to higher thermal mass and heat of fusion. Results obtained when using PCM with system B, C and D under same condition of 1000 Wm⁻² and 20 ± 1 °C are shown in Figures 4.22 – 4.24. Similar trends can be observed for temperature evolution in all the three figures however each of the PV-PCM systems, B, C and D showed a lesser temperature difference from reference than system A.
Figure 4.22 Temperature evolution on PV front surface in system B at an insolation of 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C.

Figure 4.23 Temperature evolution on PV front surface in system C at an insolation of 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C.
Figure 4.24 Temperature evolution on PV front surface in system D at an insolation of 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C.

The duration for which each PCM maintained PV front surface temperature 10 °C below reference temperature are illustrated in Figure 4.25. Comparing containers A, B, C and D, container A achieved the longest duration of the 10 °C temperature reduction for all PCM. Comparing different PCM types, CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O achieved the longest duration of the temperature reduction of 5 hours followed by CP at 4.2 hours, CL and SP22 at 3 hours and RT20 at 2.6 hours in system A. Largest amount of temperature difference was obtained with CP in system A while largest duration of temperature difference was achieved with CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O in system A. It illustrates that at high insolation, the combination of low thermal conductivity, lower melting point and comparable heat of fusion PCM, CP in combination with higher thermal conductivity system A achieved the largest temperature reduction. Also the combination of high thermal conductivity, high thermal mass and high heat of fusion...
PCM CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O in combination with high thermal conductivity system A achieved the longest duration of temperature difference.

![Graph](image)

Figure 4.25: Duration for which PCM maintained PV front surface temperature 10 °C below the reference temperature in systems A, B, C and D at an insolation of 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C.

4.5.7. Effect of Thermal Conductivity of Container Material of PV-PCM System on PCM Performance

To determine the best container type two PCMs with different thermal conductivities, thermal mass and heat of fusions, CP and CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O were characterized in same sized systems A & B having different thermal conductivities at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ insolation and 20 ±1 °C ambient temperature. Temperatures were recorded at the front surface of system A and B using CP and CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O and are illustrated in Figure 4.26 (a) and Figure 4.26 (b) respectively.
Figure 4.26 Temperature at PV front surface using (a) C-P in system A and B (b) CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O in system A and B and (c) CP and CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O in system A at an insolation of 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C.

System A maintained lower temperatures at the PV front surface than system B for CP as shown in Figure 4.26 (a) with a maximum temperature difference of 5 °C. In Figure 4.26 (b) again system A maintained lower temperature than system B using CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O however the maximum temperature difference was 1 °C. Since for CP the temperature difference in A and B was higher (5 °C) than for CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O (1°C) it suggests that CP having lower thermal conductivity and lower melting point improves more when placed in higher thermal conductivity container than higher thermal conductivity and higher melting point PCM, CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O. This is very encouraging behaviour showing that the lower thermal conductivity of PCM can be compensated for by higher thermal conductivity of PV-PCM container if the lower melting point PCM is selected for temperature regulation compared to higher melting point PCM.

To compare CP and CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O in same system A, temperatures at PV front surface are presented in Figure 4.25(c) at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ insolation and 20 ±1 °C ambient temperature. CP maintained lower PV temperature than CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O for the initial 5
hours in low PV temperature range. After which CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O maintained a lower temperature for rest of experiment at the higher PV temperature range. Since CP has lower thermal conductivity as well as lower melting point than CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O, it can be concluded that the lower thermal conductivity PCM with a lower melting point performs better at lower PV operating temperatures. However, higher conductivity PCM (CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O) with higher melting point performs better at higher PV operating temperature. However, PCM with high thermal conductivity, thermal mass and heat of fusion (CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O) is highly corrosive to the metallic containers while low thermal conductivity and lower melting point PCM, CP with comparable heat of fusion is less corrosive to the PCM container which brings the possibility that lower thermal conductivity and lower thermal mass PCM, CP to compete with higher thermal conductivity and higher thermal mass PCM at higher PV operating temperature not in terms of producing higher temperature regulation but in terms of longer PCM container life due to reduced corrosion.

4.5.8. Determination of Thermal Regulation Enhancement ($\Gamma$) for Different PCM types

PCM can remove thermal energy available at the PV and maintain lower temperatures during melting. Heat removed by PCM is the sum of the sensible heat absorbed when its temperature rises from ambient to its melting point, the latent heat absorbed during melting and the sensible heat from the end of melting until it reaches thermal equilibrium with the reference system. This can be represented by equation 4.2.

$$Q = mC_{p_s} (T_m - T_i) + mL + mC_{p_f} (T_f - T_m)$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.2)
Where $Q$ is the heat removed by PCM, $C_{p,s}$ and $C_{p,l}$ are specific heat capacities of PCM in solid and liquid phase respectively, $T_i$, $T_m$ and $T_f$ are initial, melting and final temperatures of PCM respectively, $m$ is the mass of PCM and $L$ is the latent heat of fusion of the PCM. The difference between temperature evolution of a reference PV system and PV system with PCM are plotted in figure 4.27.

\[
\Gamma = \int_{t_o}^{t_n} T_{PV} \, dt - \int_{t_o}^{t_n} T_{PVPCM} \, dt
\]  

(4.3)

Where $T_{PV}$ and $T_{PVPCM}$ are the PV and PV-PCM temperature, $t_o$ and $t_n$ are the start and end time of the experiment.

Figure 4.27 Temperature difference between the reference and the PV-PCM systems represented by the shaded area.

Figure 4.27 is a indicative of the total thermal regulation enhancement, $\Gamma$ provided using PCM. Mathematically $\Gamma$ for a particular PCM at constant insolation and ambient temperature is obtained by subtracting the integral of PV temperature evolution over time with PCM from the integral of reference PV temperature evolution.
evolution over time as shown in equation 4.3. When the test conditions are identical for both the PV and the PV-PCM systems, the equation 4.4 is obtained:

\[ \Gamma = \int_{t=t_0}^{t=t_u} (T_{PV} - T_{PVPCM}) \, dt \]  

While for \( n \) discrete measurements of \( T_{PV} \) and \( T_{PVPCM} \) under identical conditions, the thermal enhancement becomes

\[ \Gamma = \sum_{i=0}^{i=n} (T_{PV,i} - T_{PVPCM,i}) \]  

As described equation 4.5 \( \Gamma \) is a function of deviation of PV temperature with PCM (\( T_{PVPCM} \)) from the reference temperature (\( T_{PV} \)) and the duration of the deviation.

Figure 4.28 shows that initially there was no deviation between \( T_{PVPCM} \) and \( T_{PV} \); however, as the PCM commenced melting, this deviation started and continued increasing to a maximum (14 - 18 °C in 50 minutes) where it stabilized for up to 30 minutes. After which the combination of latent and sensible heating of PCM raised the temperature in the PCM at back of PV yielding higher temperature at PV front surface. The increase of temperature in PV-PCM system resulted in a decrease in the temperature difference from reference (10 - 14 °C in 100 minutes). As the melt fraction of PCM continued to increase, the temperature difference between reference PV and the PV-PCM systems continued to decrease. After the PCM had completed melting the temperature of PCM started increasing with a larger gradient and the
temperature deviation between reference and PV-PCM system started decreasing with larger gradient until $T_{PVPCM}$ equalled $T_{PV}$ and the deviation became zero in 11 hours. CaCl$_2\cdot$6H$_2$O and CP achieved the largest temperature deviation of 18 °C followed by SP22 and CL at 16.5 °C and RT20 at 14 °C. CaCl$_2\cdot$6H$_2$O maintained the temperature deviation for the longest duration of 11 hours followed by CP at 9.5 hours, SP22 at 9 hours, CL at 6 hours and RT20 at 4.5 hours. A similar trend was observed with PCM in systems B, C and D.

![Figure 4.28 Temperature difference from reference for RT20, CL, C-P, CaCl$_2\cdot$6H$_2$O and SP22 at an insolation of 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 20 ± 1 °C for system](image)

To quantify the thermal regulation enhancement, $\Gamma$ for all PCM in PV-PCM systems, integrals of the temperature deviation were determined at 500 Wm$^{-2}$, 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ insolation and 20 ± 1 °C ambient temperature and are presented in figure 4.29.
Figure 4.29 Thermal regulation potential for all PCM at 500 Wm\(^{-2}\) in systems A, B, C and D.

Figure 4.29 illustrates that at 500 Wm\(^{-2}\), system A achieved the maximum $\Gamma$ value of all PCM followed by systems C, B and D with systems C & B achieving similar $\Gamma$ values. Since the high conductivity system C contains 3/5 PCM mass compared to the low conductivity system B, yet achieved the same $\Gamma$ suggests that 2/5 mass of PCM can be saved by using high thermal conductivity system at low insolation. Comparing PCMs, CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O achieved the highest value for $\Gamma$ followed by CP, SP22, CL and RT20 respectively which shows that highest thermal conductivity, higher thermal mass PCM CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O in combination with highest thermal conductivity system A achieved the highest $\Gamma$.

Figure 4.30 illustrates that system A achieved the highest $\Gamma$ at 750 Wm\(^{-2}\) as well followed by B, C and D. CP and CL gave a marginally higher $\Gamma$ in container C than B while CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O, SP22 and RT20 gave higher $\Gamma$ in container B than C. Since
container C has higher thermal conductivity than container B, it suggests that it is more appropriate for use with low thermal conductivity PCM (i.e., CP and CL which perform better in C and B) than for higher thermal conductivity PCMs (i.e., CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O, SP22 and RT20). Comparing PCMs, CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O achieved the highest $\Gamma$ followed by CP, CL, SP22 and RT20 the same trend as was observed in the previous section.

Figure 4.30 Thermal regulation potential for all PCMs at 750 Wm$^{-2}$ in systems A, B, C and D.

Figure 4.31 illustrates that system A achieved the highest $\Gamma$ followed by, B, C and D respectively at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$. Comparing B and C, all PCMs showed higher $\Gamma$ in container B than in container C. This was opposite to the trend observed at 500 Wm$^{-2}$ where all PCMs had higher $\Gamma$ in container C than in container B. It can be concluded that although the increased PV-PCM thermal conductivity improved $\Gamma$ for all PCMs...
at high insolation, however the improvement at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ was less than that observed at 500 Wm$^{-2}$ where 2/5 PCM mass saving was achieved due to increased thermal conductivity of the PV-PCM system.

![Graph showing thermal regulation potential for all PCM at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ in systems A, B, C and D.](image)

Figure 4.31 Thermal regulation potential for all PCM at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ in systems A, B, C and D.

The results obtained from all indoor experiments for temperature regulation, end of melting time and thermal regulation enhancement of PV using PCM for all five PCMs, four PV-PCM systems, and three solar radiation intensities are summarized in table 4.3
Table 4.3 : Summary of results obtained from indoor experiments at three different solar radiation intensities, four PV-PCM systems and five PCMs at 20±1 °C ambient temperature.
4.6 Conclusions

Five PCMs evaluated at three different insulations showed that thermal regulation performance of a PCM depends on the thermal conductivity, thermal mass, heat of fusion and melting point of PCM and over all thermal conductivity of PV-PCM systems. A simple heat transfer simulation model was developed and initial validation of the experimental results was carried out. It was observed that the heat transfer does not happen as pure conduction and natural convection is present which can not be ignored. Comparing PCMs, the highest temperature reduction was achieved (i) at 500 Wm$^{-2}$ by eutectic mixture fatty acids CP (ii) at 750 Wm$^{-2}$ by salt hydrate CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O and (iii) at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ again by CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O. In the best case, CP and CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O maintained a maximum of 18 °C temperature reduction at PV front surface for 30 minutes, while CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O maintained a 10 °C temperature reduction for 5 hours at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ insolation in system A.

Although time to maintain 10 °C temperature difference is a good figure of merit to evaluate the temperature regulation because in most of the cases PV temperature curve using PCM was flatter at this temperature difference from the reference which means maximum latent heat absorption occurred in this regime. However it does not inform for how long the PCM will maintain temperature difference at a lower temperature than 10 °C. For example some PCMs may maintain 10 °C temperature difference for shorter time duration but may maintain lower temperature difference (say 5 °C) for longer duration which means they still can compete with those producing 10 °C for longer time duration. In order to better understand PCM performance for longer time duration integral of temperature difference over time was
taken. The preferred figure of merit would be $\Gamma$ as it shows the overall behaviour of PCMs in all temperature difference regimes. Comparing PV-PCM systems, system A yielded the highest temperature reduction and $\Gamma$ with all PCM types. Finally the thermal conductivity of the PV-PCM system had stronger impact on performance enhancement of lower thermal conductivity and lower melting point eutectics of fatty acids, CL and CP than on higher thermal conductivity salt hydrates SP22 and CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O.

It is observed that CP performs best of all PCMs at low insolation (500 Wm$^{-2}$) while CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O performs better at intermediate (750 Wm$^{-2}$) and higher (1000 Wm$^{-2}$). The reason being probably at low insolation the temperature at PV surface is lower enough that the low melting point PCMs (CP with melting point 22.5 °C) fully melts and absorbs more heat resulting lower temperature at PV than high melting PCMs (CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O with melting point 29.8 °C) which melts partially and absorbs less amount of heat resulting in higher PV temperature. At high temperature the melting point may not be very crucial and the thermal conductivity and heat of fusion (both are higher for CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O than for CP) plays dominant role due to increased need of efficient and maximum heat removal from PV to yield lower temperatures.

Aluminium container always produced the best results with all the PCMs, although it is corrosive with most of the PCMs however this problem can be resolved with further research applying corrosion protective coatings. The effectiveness and cost incurred to such improvements in the container is still an open issue and needs extensive research.
4.7 References


5 INDOOR LARGE SCALE EXPERIMENTS ON PV-PCM MODULAR SYSTEMS WITH CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O AND EUTECTIC MIXTURE OF CAPRIC PALMITIC ACID.

5.1 Aim of the Experiments

Five different PCMs were characterized indoors with different PCM masses, containment materials and solar radiation intensities on small scale cell size PV-PCM systems discussed in chapter 4. It was observed that the eutectic mixture of capric-palmitic acid (CP) and the salt hydrate (CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O) performed better than the other materials, paraffin wax (RT20), eutectic mixture of capric-lauric acid (CL) and the mixture of salt hydrate and the paraffin wax (SP22) in indoor experiments. It was also observed that the system A (i.e., PV integrated into the aluminium container with volume to surface area ration of 5 cm$^3$cm$^{-2}$) performed better than all the other systems at all characterization solar radiation intensities (500, 750 and 1000 Wm$^{-2}$), using all PCMs.

The aim of these experiments is to study the behavior of the two PCMs (CP and CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O that performed better in small scale indoor experiments) on large scale panel size (600 mm x 700 mm) systems. These two PCMs were integrated into large scale PV modules referred to as PV-PCM$_1$ (i.e., PV module containing integrated CP) and PV-PCM$_2$ (i.e., PV module containing CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O). Indoor experiments were conducted with reference PV module and the two PV-PCM systems using a larger solar simulator housed at the Centre for Sustainable Technologies, Ulster University, Jordanstown, N-Ireland.
5.2 Methodology

- Experiments were conducted at solar radiation intensities of 500 Wm\(^{-2}\), 750 Wm\(^{-2}\) and 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) for the reference PV, PV-PCM\(_1\) and PV-PCM\(_2\).

- Temperature evolution was recorded at the reference PV system and both the PV-PCM systems and the difference in the temperatures was determined and compared.

- Open circuit voltage (\(V_{oc}\)) and the short circuit currents (\(I_{sc}\)) were measured for the reference and the two PV-PCM systems. Temperature induced change in \(I_{sc}\) being very low has marginal effect on PV power while temperature induced change in \(V_{oc}\) is significant that is mainly responsible for the temperature induced change in PV power. Therefore only difference of the \(V_{oc}\) between the reference system and the two PV-PCM systems will be analyzed.

- Fill factor (\(FF\)) was determined from the reference PV power and \(I-V\) curves provided by the manufacturer at standard test conditions (STC) and were extrapolated to determined \(FF\) at operating conditions (i.e., solar radiation intensities and temperatures) of reference PV, PV-PCM\(_1\) and PV-PCM\(_2\).

- The calculated \(FF\) was used with measured \(V_{oc}\) and \(I_{sc}\) to determine measured power output (\(P\)) for the reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems.

- Finally the percentage difference between measured \(P\) from the reference system and the measured \(P\) from the two PV-PCM systems were compared to
calculate prevention of temperature dependent power drop, so called power saving \( P_s \) obtained by PV cooling.

- Temperature reduction achieved by the two PCMs multiplied by temperature coefficient of power drop \( T_c \), provided by the PV manufacturer’s catalogue, to obtain predicted \( P_s \) obtained by reduced PV operating temperature.

- Finally the measured and predicted \( P_s \) values were compared to validate the experimental results with manufacturer’s data.

### 5.3 Experimental Setup

Three 65 W Suntechnics polycrystalline silicon PV panels (Suntechnics, 2006) were installed and characterized outdoors at Focas Institute, Dublin, (53.33 N, 6.24 W) to observe any inconsistencies in their \( V_{oc} \) and \( I_{sc} \). Data measured confirmed the consistency of performance in all the three PV with respect to the \( V_{oc} \) and \( I_{sc} \) with the highest deviation of ± 1 %.

Two rectangular PCM containers with internal dimensions of 600 mm x 700 mm x 50 mm were fabricated from a 5 mm thick aluminium alloy to contain the PCM. Seven straight fins of dimensions 700 mm x 50 mm x 5 mm with inter fin spacing of 75 mm fabricated from the same alloy were vertically fitted back to back between internal walls of the container to enhance the thermal conductivity of the PCM container. Such finned systems have been reported (Huang et al., 2004; Huang et al., 2006) to achieve increased heat transfer into the PCM matrix. This results in increased PCM melting leading to decreased melting time and reduced PV temperature closer to the desired
PV temperature. The fabricated containers were attached to back of the PV panels with epoxy resin and were fixed to the PV under pressure for 48 hours to allow glue to uniformly settle and yield strong bond between PV and the container.

Thermocouples

Figure 5.1 Indoor experimental setup consisting of a large scale solar simulator to produce desired insolation, PV with thermocouples, multimeters and data logger.

Figure 5.1 shows the experimental set up where the reference PV and PV-PCM were connected to multimeters to measure their $V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$. The calibrated t-type copper-constantan thermocouples with measurement error of ±0.2 °C were installed on the reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems at locations shown in figure 5.1 (b) to measure temperature. A Kipp and Zonen CM6B pyranometer with an accuracy of ± 0.2 % was installed to measure the solar radiation intensity (Kipp and Zonnen 2003).
A large solar simulator consisting of a 7 x 5 array of 575 W metal halide lamps was used to produce the desired insolation. The solar simulator was capable of producing 1200 Wm$^{-2}$ on a 2 m x 2.2 m target surface area at a variable distance of 1.8 m to 2.2 m with 95% measured uniform intensity distribution (Zacharopoulos et al., 2009). A delta-T 2e data logger with an accuracy of ±0.1% was used to record temperatures and solar radiation intensities described in Appendix F (Delta-T, 2010).

5.4 Experimental Procedure

The PCMs, CP was prepared by mixing 75.2% by weight of capric acid (≥ 96% pure from Sigma Aldrich) with 24.8% by weight of palmitic acid (≥ 98% pure from Sigma Aldrich). The mixture was heated until all the PCM had melted and stirred for 12 hours to obtain a uniform mixture. The salt hydrate CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O was also melted and stirred for 12 hours to obtain a uniform solution. The melted PCM were filled in their respective PV-PCM systems up to 650 mm of container height leaving a 50 mm empty top space to accommodate PCM expansion during phase change. The PV-PCM systems were kept indoors at 16 °C for 48 hours until both PCM had fully solidified and were ready to be exposed to the solar simulator to start the experiment. Reference experiments were conducted on a vertically installed PV panel without PCM irradiated by the solar simulator at insulations of 500 Wm$^{-2}$, 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ with an ambient temperature of 20±1 °C. Temperatures at the front and back PV surfaces, $V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$ were measured for the reference PV exposed to the solar simulator.
PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} containing fully solidified CP was installed vertically and exposed to solar simulator for 6 hours at 500 Wm\textsuperscript{-2} and temperatures, $V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$ were also recorded. The temperatures on front surface of PV and PV-PCM\textsubscript{1}, the $V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$ were compared to quantify cooling of PV produced by melting CP and the concomitant effect of this cooling on PV electrical output.

After the heating cycle was over, the solar simulator was switched off to allow PCM in the PV-PCM system to cool down for at least 16 hours simulating night time conditions to get it ready for the next run of the experiment. Similarly the experiments were conducted at 750 Wm\textsuperscript{-2} and 1000 Wm\textsuperscript{-2} with the same ambient temperature of 20 ± 1 °C. After the experiments were finished with CP, the same experiments under same conditions were conducted using CaCl\textsubscript{2}.6H\textsubscript{2}O in PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} for the same length of time and again temperatures, $V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$ were recorded.

5.5 Results and Interpretations

5.5.1. Thermal Regulation at Low Insolation

Figure 5.2 shows the temperature rise at front surface of the reference PV, PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} and PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} when all three were exposed to a solar radiation intensity of 500 Wm\textsuperscript{-2} and 20 ±1 C ° ambient temperature. It is observed that the reference temperature provided by the PV without PCM stabilized at 40 °C at 500 Wm\textsuperscript{-2} solar radiation intensity. Temperatures in the two PV-PCM systems also followed a similar trend in temperature rise however maintained a lower temperature than the reference temperature.
Figure 5.2 Temperature evolution in the indoor experiment at solar radiation intensity of 500 Wm\(^{-2}\) and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C measured on the front surface of reference PV, PV-PCM\(_1\) and PV-PCM\(_2\)

The lower temperature was achieved due to heat (produced by incident radiations at the PV surface) being absorbed by the melting PCM as latent heat of fusion at the back of each PV-PCM system. It is observed that PV-PCM\(_2\) maintained lower temperatures than PV-PCM\(_1\) for the length of the experiments. Temperature difference between the reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems at 500 Wm\(^{-2}\) is presented in Figure 5.3. A higher temperature difference was observed in the start of the experiments for 25 minutes with 5 °C for PV-PCM\(_1\) and 8 °C for PV-PCM\(_2\), which continued to decrease as the experiment proceeded. The higher temperature difference occurred at the start of the experiments due to maximum heat absorption by PCMs due to dominant latent heat absorption by PCM close to their melting points.
As the melting proceeded, the melt fraction increased leading to dominant sensible nature of heat absorption at further beyond to transition temperature resulting in increase PCM temperature and decreased temperature difference between the reference and the two PV-PCM systems. Towards the end of the experiments, most of the PCM had melted and the sensible heating of the PCM dominated shown by sharp increase in the PV-PCM temperatures with a higher gradient shows that PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} maintained a higher temperature difference from the reference throughout the experiment than PV-PCM\textsubscript{1}. At the end of the experiment after 6 hours, the temperature difference of PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} from the reference PV dropped to zero however the temperature difference of PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} from the reference PV remained at 4 °C. This showed that the PCM in PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} still had potential to absorb heat and regulate PV temperature for a further period of time. Both the PV-PCM systems have same dimensions and containment materials distinguished solely by the PCM, CP in PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} and CaCl\textsubscript{2}.6H\textsubscript{2}O in PV-PCM\textsubscript{2}. It can be inferred that CaCl\textsubscript{2}.6H\textsubscript{2}O performed
better than CP at 500 Wm\(^{-2}\) achieving higher temperature difference and longer duration of time to maintain the temperature difference.

Figure 5.4 shows the measured \(V_{oc}\) for the reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems which showed that the two PV-PCM systems maintained higher \(V_{oc}\) than the reference PV.

Figure 5.4 Open circuit voltage for indoor experiments at solar radiation intensity of 500 Wm\(^{-2}\) and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C

Higher \(V_{oc}\) in the two PV-PCM systems is due the lower temperatures of the systems compared to the reference PV, shown in Figure 5.2, due to heat absorbed by melting PCM contained in the PV-PCM systems. Results found are in agreement with previous studies (Green, 2003; Radziemska, 2003) that found that higher operating temperatures in PV systems caused a drop in PV voltage and power, which can be avoided by maintaining PV at lower temperatures (Krauter, 2004; Tonui and Tripanagnostopoulos, 2007). At start of the experiments, as PV temperatures were lower, \(V_{oc}\) was higher for the reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems. As the
temperatures started to increase during the experiments due to incident insolation, the $V_{oc}$ started to decrease. At the end of the experiment the $V_{oc}$ in the PV-PCM$_1$ equalled $V_{oc}$ in the reference PV. However $V_{oc}$ in PV-PCM$_2$ remained higher than the reference PV which is in agreement with the temperatures profiles in Figure 5.2.

Figure 5.5 presents the difference in $V_{oc}$ of the two PV-PCM systems from the reference PV leading to quantification of voltage improvement i.e., prevention of temperature induced voltage drop by maintaining the PV at lower temperatures.

![Figure 5.5](image)

**Figure 5.5** Voltage improvement in indoor experiments as a result of temperature regulation by PCM at solar radiation intensity of 500 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C

It can be observed that the PV-PCM$_2$ maintained higher voltage improvement than the PV-PCM$_1$ which is in accordance with the temperature difference shown in Figure 5.3 the higher the temperature difference from the reference the higher the voltage improvement and vice versa. At the start of the experiments the voltage improvement
was higher in both PV-PCM systems, 0.6 V for PV-PCM$_1$ and 0.9 V for PV-PCM$_2$ which continued to decrease as the experiments proceeded, a similar behaviour as was observed in case of the temperature difference shown in Figure 5.3

5.5.2. Thermal Regulation at Intermediate Insolation

![Graph showing temperature evolution](image)

Figure 5.6 Temperature evolution in the indoor experiments for reference PV, PV-PCM$_1$ and PV-PCM$_2$ at solar radiation intensity of 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 20 ± 1 °C.

Figure 5.6 shows the temperature rise at the front surface of the reference PV, PV-PCM$_1$ and PV-PCM$_2$ when exposed to the solar simulator at 750 Wm$^{-2}$ solar radiation intensity and 20 ± 1 °C ambient temperature. Temperature in the reference PV stabilized at 51 ± 1 °C, temperatures in the PV-PCM$_1$ and PV-PCM$_2$ followed the
trend in temperature rise however maintained a lower temperature than the reference PV due to cooling effect produced by latent heat removal by the melting PCM at the back of each PV-PCM system. PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} maintained slightly lower temperature than PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} for the initial 1 hour of the experiment, afterwards PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} maintained a lower temperature than PV-PCM\textsubscript{1}. Towards the end of the experiment PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} exhibited a higher gradient of temperature rise than the PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} indicating end of melting and predominantly sensible heating of CP contained in PV-PCM\textsubscript{1}. PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} exhibited continued temperature rise with a smaller gradient indicating that CaCl\textsubscript{2}.6H\textsubscript{2}O was still melting and absorbing latent heat.

Figure 5.7 shows the temperature difference between the reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems at 750 Wm\textsuperscript{-2} insolation and 20 ±1 °C ambient temperature.

![Figure 5.7 Temperature regulation in the indoor experiments for reference PV, PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} and PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} at solar radiation intensity of 750 Wm\textsuperscript{-2} and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C](image-url)

Figure 5.7 Temperature regulation in the indoor experiments for reference PV, PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} and PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} at solar radiation intensity of 750 Wm\textsuperscript{-2} and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C
It can be observed that both PV-PCM systems showed a higher temperature difference initially, 14 °C for PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} and 12 °C for PV-PCM\textsubscript{2}, which continued to decrease until the end of the experiment in 6 hours. For both PV-PCM systems, the temperature difference at 750 Wm\textsuperscript{-2} was higher than the temperature difference at 500 Wm\textsuperscript{-2}. Comparing reference PV temperatures, at 750 Wm\textsuperscript{-2} the reference temperature was 11 °C higher than the reference temperatures at 500 Wm\textsuperscript{-2} which provided PV-PCM systems with possibility to obtain higher temperature difference at higher solar radiation intensities. Figure 5.8 shows $V_{oc}$ of the reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems at 750 Wm\textsuperscript{-2} insolation and 20 ±1 °C ambient temperature.

![Figure 5.8](image)

Figure 5.8 Open circuit voltage in indoor experiments at solar radiation intensity of 750 Wm\textsuperscript{-2} and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C

It was observed that $V_{oc}$ of the two PV-PCM systems was higher than $V_{oc}$ of the reference PV due to the lower temperature at the PV-PCM systems than the reference PV, similar trend in $V_{oc}$ was observed at 500 Wm\textsuperscript{-2}. $V_{oc}$ in the reference PV remained
around 19.2 V for the duration of the experiment because its temperature remained stable, while $V_{oc}$ in the PV-PCM systems was initially higher and continued to decrease as their temperatures increased during course of the experiments. This again confirms the drop in $V_{oc}$ caused by the increase in PV temperature which can be prevented by keeping the PV at lower temperatures. Figure 5.9 shows the difference in $V_{oc}$ between the reference PV and the PV-PCM systems at 750 Wm$^{-2}$ solar radiation intensity and 20 ± 1 °C ambient temperature.

Figure 5.9 Voltage improvement in indoor experiments as a result of temperature regulation at solar radiation intensity of 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 20 ± 1 °C.

PV-PCM$_1$ had a higher $V_{oc}$ difference from the reference PV for the initial 1 hour of the experiments, afterwards $V_{oc}$ of PV-PCM$_2$ remained higher. In last hour of the experiments, $V_{oc}$ difference of PV-PCM$_1$ from the reference started to drop with a larger gradient than that of PV-PCM$_2$ indicating that the PCM in PV-PCM$_1$ completed melting while PCM in PV-PCM$_2$ continued to melt and absorb latent heat, a similar behaviour as was observed for the temperature difference in Figure 5.7.
5.5.3. Thermal Regulation at High Insolation

Figure 5.10 shows the temperature rise at the front surface of the reference PV, PV-PCM$_1$ and PV-PCM$_2$ when exposed to the solar simulator at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ solar radiation intensity and 20 ±1 °C ambient temperature.

Temperature in the reference PV stabilized at 60 °C while temperatures in PV-PCM$_1$ and PV-PCM$_2$ remained lower than the reference temperature due to cooling effect produced by latent heat removal by the melting PCM. Both PV-PCM systems maintained similar temperatures evolution upto 45 °C for the initial 3.5 hours of the experiments with PV-PCM$_1$ having slightly higher temperature than PV-PCM$_2$. After 3.5 hours the temperature in PV-PCM$_1$ started to increase at a much higher rate.
indicating the predominant sensible heating of CP contained in PV-PCM₁ however temperature in PV-PCM₂ continued to increase with the previous rate indicating the predominant latent heating of the CaCl₂.₆H₂O contained in the PV-PCM₂. It clearly indicates that CaCl₂.₆H₂O possesses higher heat absorption and temperature regulation potential for longer duration than CP.

![Temperature regulation for indoor experiments of the reference PV, PV-PCM₁ and PV-PCM₂](image)

Figure 5.11 Temperature regulation for indoor experiments of the reference PV, PV-PCM₁ and PV-PCM₂ at solar radiation intensity of 1000 Wm⁻² and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C

Figure 5.11 shows the temperature difference between the reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems at 1000 Wm⁻² insolation and 20±1°C ambient temperature. It was observed that both PV-PCM systems showed a higher temperature difference initially, 18 °C for PV-PCM₁ and 19°C for PV-PCM₂ which continued to decrease at a lower rate until 3.5 hours for both the PV-PCM systems. After 3.5 hours, the temperature difference in PV-PCM₁ started decreasing at a much higher rate indicating
predominantly sensible heating of PCM. The temperature difference for the PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} however continued to decrease with smaller gradient indicating predominant latent heating of the PCM. After 6 hours at the end of experiments, the temperature difference of PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} from reference PV dropped to 5 °C while the temperature difference of PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} remained at 13 °C indicating higher heat absorption potential of CaCl\textsubscript{2}.6H\textsubscript{2}O in PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} than CP in PV-PCM\textsubscript{1}. Comparing temperature differences in both PV-PCM systems from reference PV at all the insulations discussed, temperature difference was the highest at 1000 Wm\textsuperscript{-2}. Since the reference PV temperature was also highest at 1000 Wm\textsuperscript{-2} than the reference PV temperatures at 500 Wm\textsuperscript{-2} and 750 Wm\textsuperscript{-2} which indicates that PV-PCM systems are more effective at higher solar radiation intensities and PV temperatures.

Figure 5.12 Open circuit voltage in indoor experiments at solar radiation intensity of 1000 Wm\textsuperscript{-2} and ambient temperature of 20 ± 1 °C
Figure 5-12 shows the $V_{oc}$ for the reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ solar radiation intensity and 20 ± 1 °C ambient temperature. $V_{oc}$ of the PV-PCM systems was higher than $V_{oc}$ of the reference PV due to the lower temperature at the PV-PCM systems than the reference PV similar to what was observed in Figure 5.4 and Figure 5.8. $V_{oc}$ in the reference PV remained around 19 ± 1 V for the whole duration of the experiment because its temperature remained stable while the $V_{oc}$ in the PV-PCM systems continued to decrease as their temperatures continued to increase during the course of the experiments. Similar to the trend in temperature rise, the voltage drop was similar for both PV-PCM systems for initial 3.5 hours, after that $V_{oc}$ in PV-PCM$_1$ dropped with larger gradient than $V_{oc}$ in PV-PCM$_2$. Figure 5.13 shows $V_{oc}$ improvement for the reference PV and the PV-PCM systems at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ solar radiation intensity and 20 ± 1 °C ambient temperature.

![Figure 5.13 Open circuit voltage improvement in indoor experiments at solar radiation intensity of 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 20 ± 1 °C](image)

Figure 5.13 Open circuit voltage improvement in indoor experiments at solar radiation intensity of 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 20 ± 1 °C
It is observed that PV-PCM₂ maintained a higher voltage improvement than PV-PCM₁ for the duration of experiments with initial $V_{oc}$ improvements of 1.2 V and 1.5 V for PV-PCM₁ and PV-PCM₂ respectively. After 3.5 hours a larger difference between $V_{oc}$ improvement of PV-PCM₁ and PV-PCM₂ was observed. Comparing $V_{oc}$ improvements at all the three insulations discussed it is observed that $V_{oc}$ improvements were the highest at 1000 Wm⁻² than $V_{oc}$ improvements at 500 Wm⁻² and 750 Wm⁻² similar to what was observed for temperature reduction.

Experiments conducted at solar radiation intensities of 500 Wm⁻², 750 Wm⁻² and 1000 Wm⁻² prove consistently through measured data of temperature rise, temperature reduction, $V_{oc}$ output and $V_{oc}$ improvements that the use of PCM in the PV-PCM systems maintained lower temperatures and achieved higher $V_{oc}$.

5.5.4. Average Temperature Reduction and Voltage Improvement

Temperature reduction and $V_{oc}$ improvement did not stay constant over the duration of the experiments i.e., higher temperature reduction and $V_{oc}$ improvement was observed at the start of the experiments, which decreased as the temperatures in the PV-PCM systems increased towards the end of the experiments in all cases. Higher initial temperature reduction and $V_{oc}$ improvement were caused by latent heat absorption by the PCM in direct contact with PV back at constant temperature. If this situation i.e., pure isothermal latent heat absorption is stabilized for longer durations, maximum temperature regulation and associated power savings ($P_s$) can be achieved. However as the experiment proceeds sensible heat absorption by melted PCM and latent heat absorption by melting PCM occurs. This causes a rise in PV-PCM temperature and its
temperature difference from the reference PV starts decreasing down the peak. Although the peak temperature reduction could not be maintained through out the experiment however they are important benchmarks to give insight into how higher temperature reductions can be achieved provided the PCM melts without sensible heating.

However the peak $V_{oc}$ improvement and temperature reduction are not realistic indicators to quantify relative performance of the PV-PCM systems because they last for short time. Therefore average temperature reduction and $V_{oc}$ improvement is a more realistic approach to quantify the potential of PV-PCM systems to regulate temperature and prevent temperature induced power drop in PV devices.

Figure 5.14 Comparison of average temperature reduction achieved for 6 hours in PV-PCM$_1$ and PV-PCM$_2$ at solar radiation intensities of 500 Wm$^{-2}$, 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 21 ±1 °C.
Figure 5-14 shows average PV temperature regulation achieved by both PV-PCM systems at solar radiation intensities of 500 Wm\(^{-2}\), 750 Wm\(^{-2}\) and 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) and ambient temperature of 20 ±1 °C. PV-PCM\(_2\) achieved higher average temperature reduction than PV-PCM\(_1\) at all solar radiation intensities. In the best case, average temperature reduction of 13 °C was achieved for PV-PCM\(_1\) and 15 °C for PV-PCM\(_2\) at 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\). Higher temperature reduction was observed at higher solar radiation intensities and reference PV temperatures. This is due to maximum heat absorption by PCM during solid-liquid phase change at higher PV temperature. It can be concluded that these PCMs are more suitable for hot climates where higher PV temperatures are more likely to be achieved even at lower solar radiation intensities. In cooler climates although the PCM produce temperature regulation, however because the temperatures at PV surface remain very low which results in very low temperature regulation and the associated improvement in the electrical power, the temperature regulation may be too low to justify economic viability of using PCM.

Average improvement in the \(V_{oc}\) was also determined as shown in Figure 5.15, which shows that the voltage improvement also followed the same trend as in temperature reduction shown in Figure 5.14. It was observed that the PV-PCM\(_2\) maintained higher average \(V_{oc}\) improvement than the PV-PCM\(_1\) at all insolations, the lowest being 1.4 % obtained at 500 Wm\(^{-2}\) by PV-PCM\(_1\) and the highest being 5.5 % obtained at 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) by PV-PCM\(_2\).
Figure 5.15 Average open circuit voltage improvement compared with the reference PV for 6 hours at solar radiation intensities of 500 Wm$^{-2}$, 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ and ambient temperature of 20 ± 1 °C for PV-PCM$_1$ and PV-PCM$_2$.

5.5.5. **Average Measured Power Saving by Cooling of PV**

The term measured power saving points to the fact that the power saving is based on measured electrical parameters of $V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$ and calculated value of fill factor ($FF$) from the PV characteristic curve. Use of PCM in this integrated PV-PCM system reduced PV operating temperature and improved $V_{oc}$ which resulted in the prevention of temperature dependent power drop providing power savings ($P_s$). Measured $P_s$ for the PCM was determined by comparing Power output ($P$) from PV with and without PCM.
Figure 5.16 Power and $I-V$ characteristic of the reference PV panel at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$, 800 Wm$^{-2}$ and 600 Wm$^{-2}$ at standard test conditions (STC) (Suntech, 2006).

$FF$ was obtained from the $I-V$ and power characteristics of the reference PV panel shown in Figure 5.16 by dividing optimum power ($P_m$) by the product of $V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$ at respective solar radiation intensities provided by Figure 5-16 as given by equation 5.1

$$FF = \frac{P_m}{V_{oc}I_{sc}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.1)

Equation 5.11 and $I-V$ curves of the PV provided by Figure 5.16 were used to calculate $FF$ at solar radiation intensities of 1000 Wm$^{-2}$, 800 Wm$^{-2}$ and 600 Wm$^{-2}$. Which were interpolated to obtain $FF$ at 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and 500 Wm$^{-2}$ insulations. $FF$ determined by this procedure at 500 Wm$^{-2}$, 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ assumed a constant PV temperature at 25 °C.
In previous sections, it has been shown that increased solar radiation resulted in increased PV temperature above 25 °C e.g. 60 °C at 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) illustrated Figure 5.10. \(FF\) which has been reported to decrease with a temperature dependent coefficient \((T_{FF})\) of -0.12 %/K (Marshal and Malinovska 2002) to -0.2%/K (Radziemska and Klugmann 2002) for polycrystalline PV as PV temperature rises above 25 °C. Replacing standard \(FF\) at 25 °C with \(FF\) calculated at corresponding temperatures \((F_{FT})\) Power produced by PV at a temperature \(T\), \((P_T)\) can be calculated as:

\[
P_T = F_{FT} \times V_{OC} \times I_{SC}
\]

The \(F_{FT}\) can be calculated as:

\[
F_{FT} = FF - T_{FF} (T - 25)
\]

Substituting equation 5.3 in equation 5.2, the \(P_T\) can be calculated as:

\[
P_T = (FF - T_{FF} (T - 25))V_{OC} I_{SC}
\]

\(P_T\) has been calculated using equation 5.4 for the reference PV, PV-PCM\(_1\) and PV-PCM\(_2\). The difference of \(P_T\) between reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems have been determined. This procedure is adopted to quantify the power saving \((P_s)\) achieved by using the PCM by cooling PV. Figure 5.17 summarizes \(P_s\) obtained by the PV-PCM systems at solar radiation intensities of 500 Wm\(^{-2}\), 750 Wm\(^{-2}\) and 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) and ambient temperature of 20 ± 1 °C.
Figure 5.17 Measured average power saving $P_s$ as a percentage of optimum power from PV.

PV-PCM$_2$ achieved higher $P_s$ than PV-PCM$_1$ at all the three solar radiation intensities. $P_s$ increased with increasing solar radiation intensity with a lowest value of 2.8 % achieved by PV-PCM$_1$ at 500 Wm$^{-2}$ and highest value of 9.7 % achieved by PV-PCM$_2$ at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$.

5.5.6. Average Predicted Power Saving

The term predicted power saving is based on the non electrical measured parameters of temperature and temperature coefficient of power drop obtained from PV manufacturer’s data and literature research from which power saving ($P_s$) is predicted. Average predicted power saving $P_s$ was obtained by using the temperature coefficient of power drop ($T_c$) provided by the manufacturer presented in table 5.1 and
the measured temperature reduction achieved by PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} and PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} using equation 5.5.

\[ P_s = T_P (T_{PV} - T_{PV-PCM}) \]  
(5.5)

\( T_{PV} \) and \( T_{PV-PCM} \) denote temperature of the reference PV and PV-PCM respectively. Predicted \( P_s \) was obtained from equation 5.5 shown in figure 5.18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOCT</th>
<th>48°C±2°C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current temp. coefficient</td>
<td>%/K 0.06 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voltage temp. coefficient</td>
<td>mV/K -78±10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power temp. coefficient</td>
<td>%/K -(0.5±0.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Temperature dependent coefficients of voltage, current and power drop provide by PV catalogue data at standard test conditions (STC) (Suntech, 2006).

Figure 5.18 Predicted PV power saving obtained by multiplying average temperature regulation by temperature coefficient of power drop.
Comparison of measured and predicted $P_s$ in Figure 5.19 shows that measured and predicted $P_s$ are in good agreement at low temperatures and insolation but deviate for PV-PCM$_2$ at higher temperatures and solar radiation intensities. This shows that the temperature coefficient of power drop provided from manufacturer is not a true reflection of the actual power drop at higher temperatures and insolation intensities.

Figure 5.19 Comparison of measured and predicted power saving using PCM integrated into PV.

The calculated value of $FF$ changes slightly due to change in solar radiation i.e., from 75.8 % at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ to 74.7 % at 600 Wm$^{-2}$ when effect of temperature on $FF$ is not considered. However considering temperature dependence of $FF$ by using the temperature coefficient of fill factor ($T_{FF}$) of -0.2%/K, the $FF$ drops from 75.8 % to 68.8 % when PV temperature increased from 25 °C to 60 °C at solar radiation
The intensity of 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\). The results obtained \(FF\), power output \((P)\) and power savings \((Ps)\) due to PV cooling are presented in table 5.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fill Factor</th>
<th>Reference PV</th>
<th>PV-PCM(_1)</th>
<th>PV-PCM(_2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insolation</td>
<td>Insolation</td>
<td>Insolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Wm(^{-2})</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.7515</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750 Wm(^{-2})</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 Wm(^{-2})</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power (W)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Corresponding conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>18.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.88</td>
<td>28.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.23</td>
<td>38.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>18.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.86</td>
<td>30.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.58</td>
<td>41.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>18.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.04</td>
<td>30.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.16</td>
<td>42.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power savings, Ps (W)</th>
<th>Power saving using (FF)</th>
<th>Power saving using (T_C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 Summary of Results for fill factor \((FF)\), Power \((P)\) and Power savings \((Ps)\).
5.6 Conclusions

Results obtained from indoor experiments, at solar radiation intensities of 500 Wm\(^{-2}\), 750 Wm\(^{-2}\) and 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) and ambient temperature of 20 ± 1 °C indicate that both PV-PCM systems perform comparable however PV-PCM\(_2\) achieved slightly higher temperature regulation, resulting \(V_{oc}\) improvement and associated \(P_s\). Measured and predicted \(P_s\) were found in agreement apart from at higher solar radiation intensities indicating that the temperature coefficients provided by the manufacturer may only be useful at lower temperatures and insulations. Finally, the best-case measured average temperature reduction of 15 °C and \(P_s\) of 9.7 % for 6 hours was achieved with PV-PCM\(_2\) at 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) and 20 ±1 °C which were found in agreement with the predicted values.
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6 OUTDOOR LARGE SCALE EXPERIMENTS IN THE CLIMATES OF IRELAND AND PAKISTAN

6.1. Aim of the Experiments

Results from indoor large scale experiments in the PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} and PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} showed agreement with those achieved from small scale indoor experiments; it was desired to investigate the performance of the PV-PCM systems in real outdoor operating conditions. The aim of these experiments is to compare the behaviour of the PV-PCM systems in outdoor realistic uncontrolled conditions with the indoors controlled test conditions to determine how effective the PV-PCM systems are in ‘real’ conditions. In addition the PV-PCM systems were characterized in two different climates i.e., high latitude cool climate of Dublin, Ireland and low latitude hot climate of Vehari, Pakistan to compare their performance.

6.2. Methodology

- Experiments were conducted with the same experimental set up and PV-PCM systems as were used in indoor large-scale experiments.

- Experiments were conducted outdoors on the roof of the Focas Institute, Dublin Institute of Technology Dublin, Ireland (53.33 N, 6.24 W) from 28-08-2009 to 12-09-2009 with reference PV, PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} and PV-PCM\textsubscript{2}
Experiments were conducted outdoors on roof of Jam house, Vehari, Pakistan (30.03 N, 72.25 E) from 30-10-2009 to 13-11-2009 with reference PV, PV-PCM$_1$ and PV-PCM$_2$

Temperature evolution was measured on the reference PV, PV-PCM$_1$ and PV-PCM$_2$ and the difference of the temperatures of PV-PCM$_1$ and PV-PCM$_2$ from the reference was determined to quantify the effect of using PCM on the temperature regulation of the PV.

$V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$ were measured for all systems and the difference of $V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$ between reference and the two PV-PCM systems were calculated to determine the effect of PV temperature reduction achieved by PCM on the electrical performance of the PV.

$FF$ was determined from the power and $I-V$ curves for the PV at STC and these were interpolated to get the $FF$ at real outdoor operating condition of the PV.

$FF$ thus obtained were used with measured $V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$ to determine electrical power ($P$) produced by reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems to evaluate the effect of the PV temperature reduction on the gain of PV power.

Temperature coefficient of power ($T_p$) provided by the PV manufacturer’s catalogue was used to predict the power saving, $P_s$ obtained by reduced PV operating temperature achieved using the two PV-PCM systems.

Predicted $P_s$ obtained using $T_p$ with measured temperature reduction and the measured $P_s$ obtained using $FF$ and measured $V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$ were compared to validate the experimental results with the manufacturer’s data.
6.3.  Experimental Setup

Experimental set up, sample preparation and the measurement procedures were the same as for indoor large scale experiments explained in chapter 5. The only difference was the source of insolation, instead of the solar simulator; PV and PV-PCM systems were placed outdoors and exposed to sun at the latitudes of Dublin, Ireland (53.33 N, 6.24 W) and Vehari, Pakistan (30.03 N, 72.25 E).

Figure 6.1 Outdoor experimental setup consisting of a reference PV, PV-PCM$_1$ and PV-PCM$_2$ installed on the roof of Focas Institute, Dublin Institute of Technology, Dublin, Ireland.

Figure 6.1 shows the experimental setup consisting of the reference PV panels without PCM, PV-PCM$_1$ and PV-PCM$_2$ installed outdoors on roof of Focas Institute. The temperatures and $V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$ were measured with delta-T 2e data logger and the multimeters shown in Figure 6.1.
6.4. Experimental Procedure

Three PV panels were characterized outdoors in Dublin for three days with solar radiation values ranging from 400 Wm\(^{-2}\) to 950 Wm\(^{-2}\) over the duration of experiment from 09:00 to 18:00 hours prior to their integration into PV-PCM systems: The \(V_{oc}\) and \(I_{sc}\) were measured for all three panels to quantify any inconsistencies in the panels which confirmed measured deviation below 1 % which can be described by the accuracy of the measuring instruments.

The reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems were deployed outdoors facing south in Dublin, Ireland at the latitude (53.33 N, 6.24 W) and the experiments were conducted from 28.08.2009 to 12.09.2009 from 09:00 to 18:00. In the same way the reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems were deployed outdoors facing south in Vehari, Pakistan at latitude (30.03 N, 72.25 E) and the experiments were conducted from 30.10.2009 to 13.11.2009 from 09:00 to 18:00. The ambient temperatures, wind speed, solar radiation intensities, temperatures at front and back surfaces, \(V_{oc}\) and \(I_{sc}\) for the reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems were measured.

6.5. Results and Interpretation

The temperatures, \(V_{oc}\) and \(I_{sc}\) were measured for the reference PV, PV-PCM\(_1\) and the PV-PCM\(_2\). The difference in the temperatures and the improvement in \(V_{oc}\) and \(I_{sc}\) from the reference were determined for the PV-PCM\(_1\) and PV-PCM\(_2\) which quantified the effect of using PCM on the temperature and the electrical output of the PV. Based on
the temperature reduction and $V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$ improvement, the predicted $P$ was calculated with two different methods, which will be illustrated in the following sections.

6.5.1. Temperature Evolution

Although experiments were conducted from 30-08-2009 to 12-09-2009 for Dublin, Ireland and from 30-10-2009 to 13-11-2009 for Vehari, Pakistan, the weather conditions were not stable on all days. On certain days the solar radiation intensity and the ambient temperatures were not high enough due to overcast weather conditions in Ireland and fog conditions in Pakistan which restricted temperatures at the PV surface to such low values that the PCM could not melt properly. For other days the ambient temperatures and the solar radiation were high enough to raise the PV temperature above the PCM melting point which allowed heat absorption and thus melting of PCM to occur. Higher solar radiation intensity, higher ambient temperature and lower wind speed were available for few days which provided higher reference temperatures at PV surface allowing higher temperature regulation and associated $P_s$ by applying PCM making their use justifiable. Due to this experimental constraint, the solar radiation, ambient temperature, PV panel temperatures, PV-PCM temperatures, thermal regulation by PCM and the associated $V_{oc}$, $I_{sc}$ and $P_s$ data are given for one day, the best case at each location which provided peak solar radiation intensity of 990 Wm$^{-2}$ and 950 Wm$^{-2}$, peak ambient temperature of 24 °C and 34 °C, wind speed of 3.1 ms$^{-1}$ and 0.9 ms$^{-1}$ and combined convective and radiative coefficient of heat transfer of 9.1 Wm$^{-2}$K$^{-1}$ and 17 Wm$^{-2}$K$^{-1}$ for Dublin, Ireland and Vehari, Pakistan, respectively.
Figure 6.2 Solar radiation intensity measured in Dublin (53.33 N, 6.25 W) Ireland on 12-09-2009.

Figure 6.3 Ambient temperature and wind speed measured in Dublin (53.33 N, 6.25 W) Ireland on 12-09-2009.
Figure 6.2 shows that solar radiation intensity ranged from 380 Wm\(^{-2}\) at 9:00 to 200 W-m\(^{-2}\) at 18:00 with a peak at 990 Wm\(^{-2}\) at 13:20. Figure 6.3 shows that the data measured showed that the ambient temperature remained between 18 °C and 24 °C, the wind speed remained between 0.25 and 3 m-s\(^{-1}\). The best case data with higher solar radiation intensities (990 Wm\(^{-2}\)) peak and ambient temperatures (24 °C peak) was obtained at 12-09-2009. The stable conditions resulted in higher temperatures at the reference PV front surface. This made more heat available at PV enabling higher heat harnessing by the PCM at the back of PV resulting more temperature reduction. The temperature reduction caused a \(V_{oc}\) gain leading to improved PV power and \(P_{s}\), in PV-PCM\(_1\) and PV-PCM\(_2\) compared to the reference PV. The aim of these experiments is to investigate into the behavior of the PV-PCM systems in climates with higher ambient temperatures.

Figure 6.4 shows the average temperature evolution on the front surface of the reference PV, PV-PCM\(_1\) and PV-PCM\(_2\) measured on September 12th 2009 in Dublin. Temperature at the PV front surface increased rapidly from 22 °C (at 09:00) to 40 °C in 2 hours and 5 minutes (at 11:05) and remained above 40 °C for 4 hours and 15 minutes (up to 15:20) with a peak temperature of 49 °C at 13:20. The peak temperature corresponds to the ambient temperature of 24 °C and solar radiation of 990 Wm\(^{-2}\) at a low wind speed of 0.25 m-s\(^{-1}\). Temperature of the reference PV remained around the peak for an hour (between 13:00 to 14:00) followed by a rapid drop to 37 °C in 1.5 hours. This rapid temperature drop was caused by the increase in wind speed from 0.25 ms\(^{-1}\) to 2.9 ms\(^{-1}\) shown in Figure 6.3; however during the same
duration the solar radiation intensity continued to decrease with a smooth gradient (figure 6.2). This shows the impact of wind speed on the PV temperature. As shown in figure 6.4 PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} and PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} followed the same trend in temperature rise as the reference PV temperature however the PV-PCM systems maintained lower temperatures than the reference PV throughout the experiment. After 14:00 the temperature of the reference PV dropped rapidly due to combined effect of (i) decreased incoming heat caused by decreasing solar radiation intensity and (ii) increased heat loss to ambient due to rapid increase in wind speed. The temperature in the PV-PCM systems showed less of a decrease, primarily due to the stored latent heat and thermal mass of the PCM in the PV-PCM systems, which releases stored heat with a small temperature changes.

Figure 6.4 Average temperature at front surface of reference PV, PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} and PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} measured on 12-09-2009 for Dublin, Ireland (53.33 N, 6.25 W).
Figures 6.5, figure 6.6, and figure 6.7 show the solar radiation intensity, wind speed and temperature evolution of the reference PV and the PV-PCM systems containing PCM$_1$ and PCM$_2$ measured on 30-10-2009 in Vehari, Pakistan (30.03 N, 72.25 E).

Figure 6.5 Solar radiation intensity measured on 30-10-2009 on roof of Jam house, Vehari (30.03 N, 72.25 E), Pakistan.

Figure 6.6: The wind speed data measured on 30-10-2009 for Vehari (30.03 N, 72.25 E), Pakistan.
Figure 6.5 shows that the solar radiation intensity started at from 390 Wm$^{-2}$ at 9:00, reached a peak at 950 Wm$^{-2}$ at 13:40 and dropped to below 200 Wm$^{-2}$ till 18:00. The wind speed shown in figure 6.6 remained always between 0 ms$^{-1}$ to 1 ms$^{-1}$ from 9:00 till 18:00. The ambient temperature increased from 16 °C to 34 °C (figure 6.7) at peak around 14:20.

Figure 6.7 Average temperature at front surface of reference PV, the PV-PCM$_1$ and the PV-PCM$_2$ measured on 30-10-2009 for Vehari (30.03 N, 72.25 E), Pakistan.

Figure 6.7 shows that PV-PCM$_1$ and PV- PCM$_2$ followed the trend of temperature evolution as of the reference PV with smaller temperature difference at start of the experiment for 25 minutes however they started deviating from reference afterwards due to heat absorption by melting PCM at the back of the PV. The temperature at the
front surface of the reference PV increased from 18 °C to 50 °C in 2 hours reaching a peak of 63 °C at 13:45. The temperature remained at or above 50 °C for 6 hours until 17:00 when it dropped to 38 °C in the last hour of the experiment till 18:00. After 13:45, the temperature started to decrease in the reference PV with a stable gradient (higher than that of PV-PCM$_1$ and PV-PCM$_2$) indicating smooth cooling of the PV as the solar radiation started to decrease.

The temperature decrease in the PV-PCM systems was very slow which shows the heat retention of the PV-PCM system due to latent heat and thermal mass of the PCM. This also illustrates an important finding that in hot climates, higher ambient temperatures in the evenings result in lesser convective heat loss to ambient. This mechanism encourages higher heat retention of the system. Higher heat retention is required if the heat stored is to be exploited later for domestic water heating. High heat retention however discourages nocturnal solidification of the PCM which may affect its readiness and thermal regulation performance for the next day. In such cases coolant flow into the PCM to maximise heat extraction may be required. A further study needs to be conducted in this direction to make such systems energy efficient in hot climates by finding mechanisms to extract stored energy in PCM.

### 6.5.2. Temperature Reduction

Temperature difference of the two PV-PCM systems from the reference PV is shown in the Figure 6.8 for Dublin, Ireland. Figure 6.8 shows that PV-PCM$_2$ maintained a higher temperature reduction than the PV-PCM$_1$ for the duration of the experiment. Peak temperature reduction of 10 °C was achieved for PV-PCM$_2$ compared to 7 °C
for PV-PCM₁. The higher temperature reduction achieved in PV-PCM₂ is due to CaCl₂·6H₂O, the PCM in PV-PCM₂ that has higher heat of fusion, thermal conductivity and density than CP, the PCM in PV-PCM₁.

Figure 6.8  Temperature regulation – temperature difference between the reference PV and the PV-PCM systems measured on 12-09-2009 for Dublin, Ireland (53.33 N, 6.25 W).

Figure 6.9  Temperature Regulation measured on 30-10-2009 for Vehari (30.03 N, 72.25 E), Pakistan
PCM$_2$ possessed higher heat of fusion that resulted in large amount of heat removal from the PV, higher thermal conductivity that resulted in more efficient heat removal from the PV, and higher density that resulted in higher thermal mass of PV-PCM$_2$.

Temperature difference between the reference PV and the PV-PCM systems is shown in Figure 6.9 measured on 30-10-2009 for Vehari (30.03 N, 72.25 E), Pakistan. Figure 6.9 shows that at the start of the experiment, the temperature difference was lower. The temperature difference increased as the incoming solar radiation and the ambient temperature increased to a peak of 17 °C at 12:20 for PV-PCM$_1$ and a peak of 21.5 °C at 13:55 for PV-PCM$_2$. It is observed that PV-PCM$_2$ maintained a higher temperature difference than PV-PCM$_1$ for the duration of the experiment. PV-PCM$_2$ maintained a temperature difference from the reference of over 20 °C for two hours between 12:20 to 14:20 which illustrates its potential to achieve high temperature reduction for longer durations. PV-PCM$_1$ maintained a temperature difference of 15 °C for 2 hours 20 minutes from 10:40 to 13:00. The temperature difference started decreasing after the peak with similar gradient for both PCMs however temperature in PV-PCM$_1$ equalled reference PV temperature i.e. zero temperature difference at 16:30 while temperature in PV-PCM$_2$ equalled the reference temperature at 17:50, just before the end of the experiment, which shows higher heat retention in PV-PCM$_2$ than PV-PCM$_1$.

6.5.3. Open Circuit Voltage

Figure 6.10 presents the measured $V_{oc}$ for the reference PV and PV-PCM systems measured on 12-09-2009 for Dublin, Ireland.
Figure 6.10 Open circuit voltage for the reference PV and the PV-PCM systems measured on 12-09-2009 for Dublin (53.33 N, 6.25 W)

$V_{oc}$ was highest for all systems at the start of the experiment at 9:00 but continued to decrease during the course of the experiment. $V_{oc}$ is reported to increase with the increase in solar radiation intensity (Dvorsky et al., 2009), therefore $V_{oc}$ should be at a minimum at start of the experiment and reach a maximum at 13:45 when the solar radiation intensity is maximum. However, increasing solar radiation also increases the temperature of the PV which has been reported to decrease $V_{oc}$ and PV power (Radziemska and Klugmann, 2002; Nassar and Salem, 2007).

It can be observed that at start of the experiment $V_{oc}$ is at a maximum corresponding to the minimum PV temperature although the solar radiation intensity is at minimum. It is partly due to low PV temperature which encourages higher voltage gain. It can be observed that the two PV-PCM systems maintained higher $V_{oc}$ than the reference PV due to lower temperatures in PV-PCM systems than the reference PV. PV-PCM$_2$
maintained a higher $V_{oc}$ than the PV-PCM$_1$ for the duration of the experiment due to the lower temperature.

Figure 6.11 shows the open circuit voltage for the reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems 30-10-2009 in Vehari.

![Figure 6.11  Open circuit voltage for reference PV and PV-PCM systems measured on 30-10 2009 for Vehari, Pakistan (30.03 N, 72.25 E)](image)

At the start of the experiment from 9:00 to 10:00, the $V_{oc}$ started to increase for the reference PV and the PV-PCM systems. The increase in $V_{oc}$ was due to the increase in solar radiation. However this increase in solar radiation caused an increase in temperature of the PV. Increase in the solar radiation intensity tends to increases the $V_{oc}$, however the associated increase in the temperature of the PV tends to decrease the
\( V_{oc} \) in the PV. Both the phenomena occurred together in the PV as the solar radiation increased when the sun stared coming into the plane of the panel.

Up to 10:00 the increase in the \( V_{oc} \) due to increasing solar radiation dominated the decrease in the \( V_{oc} \) due to the associated temperature rise resulting a net increase in \( V_{oc} \). Although the solar radiation intensity continued to increase beyond 10:00 tending to increase \( V_{oc} \) in the reference PV however the temperature in the PV has increased up to 44 °C which tended to decrease the \( V_{oc} \). This temperature was high enough that the associated temperature dependent decrease in the \( V_{oc} \) dominated the insolation induced increase in \( V_{oc} \) with a net effect of decreased \( V_{oc} \) in the reference PV. On the contrary, for the PV-PCM systems, the \( V_{oc} \) continued increasing beyond 10:00 as the temperature in the PV-PCM system remained below the temperature of reference PV. This shows that the cooling in PV-PCM systems caused by heat absorption of the melting PCM prevented the temperature dependent \( V_{oc} \) drop yielding a net effect of increased \( V_{oc} \) in the PV-PCM systems.

However after 11:00 the temperature in the PV-PCM systems became higher enough that the temperature dependent \( V_{oc} \) drop dominated the insolation induced \( V_{oc} \) gain with a net effect of decreased \( V_{oc} \) in both PV-PCM systems. From figures 6.11 it can be seen that net decrease in the \( V_{oc} \) of PV-PCM systems occurred corresponding to 37 °C (figure 6.) while in the reference PV, the net decrease in \( V_{oc} \) occurred corresponding to 44 °C (figure 6.7) which seems a disagreement between the reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems.

The temperature distribution on the reference PV was quite uniform which indicates that all the cells in the reference PV were at similar temperatures and their corresponding \( V_{oc} \) output was similar. However in the PV-PCM systems the
temperature was not uniform over the surface due to temperature distribution (described in detail in section 6.5.5) which meant that different cells were at different temperatures. It is possible that while the average temperature was 37 °C on PV-PCM surface, the highest temperature on a cell at the top surface may have reached 44 °C where the temperature dependent $V_{oc}$ drop dominated the insolation induced $V_{oc}$ gain yielding a net decrease in $V_{oc}$. It should be noted that though average temperatures were considered in both cases (i.e., reference PV and in PV-PCM system), in reference PV the average temperature and maximum temperature were similar due to uniform temperature distribution while in PV-PCM system (due to thermal gradient) the average temperature in PV-PCM system may be quite lower than maximum temperature.

Towards the end of the experiment after 16:00 the $V_{oc}$ in the PV-PCM systems started to decrease with a greater gradient than the $V_{oc}$ in the reference PV. This can be explained by the temperatures in the reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems, it was observed in figure 6.9 that the reference PV started to rapidly decrease in temperature due to lower thermal mass while the PV-PCM systems maintained a slower temperature reduction due to higher thermal mass. This caused the temperature in the reference PV to drop below the temperature in the PV-PCM systems which caused a higher prevention of $V_{oc}$ drop in the reference PV than in the two PV-PCM systems. $V_{oc}$ in PV-PCM$_1$ and PV-PCM$_2$ dropped below the $V_{oc}$ in the reference PV at 16:20 and 17:45 respectively similar to the temperature difference in Figure 6.9.
6.5.4. Improvement in Open Circuit Voltage

Figure 6.12 shows the difference in $V_{oc}$ of the PV-PCM systems from the reference PV in Dublin. It can be observed that the PV-PCM$_2$ maintained higher $V_{oc}$ difference than PV-PCM$_1$ similar to the temperature difference. $V_{oc}$ difference was found to be highest at the start of the experiment at 09:00 and at the time when solar radiation intensity was highest at 13:40 similar to what was observed for temperature difference.

![Figure 6.12 Voltage improvement - Difference of $V_{oc}$ between reference PV and PV-PCM systems measured on 12-09-2009 for Dublin (53.33 N, 6.25 W)](image)

It confirms that higher temperature regulation resulted in higher $V_{oc}$ improvement. The peak $V_{oc}$ improvement was of 0.5 V for PV-PCM$_1$ and 0.8 V for PV-PCM$_2$ obtained at 13:40. The temperature coefficient of voltage provided by the PV panel manufacturer was $0.078 \pm 0.01 \text{ VK}^{-1}$ (Suntech, 2006). Measured peak temperature
regulation was 7 °C for PV-PCM$_1$ and 10 °C for PV-PCM$_2$. Alternatively the predicted peak $V_{oc}$ improvement was obtained by multiplying peak temperature regulation and the temperature coefficient which gave predicted $V_{oc}$ to be 0.47-0.61 V compared to measured value of 0.5 V for PV-PCM$_1$. Similarly the predicted $V_{oc}$ improvement was found to be 0.68-0.88 V compared to measured value of 0.8 V for PV-PCM$_2$. It shows that the measured and predicted $V_{oc}$ improvements are in good agreement for both PV-PCM systems. Figure 6.13 shows the improvement in $V_{oc}$ between the reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems for Vehari (30.03 N, 72.25 E), Pakistan measured on 30-10 2009.

![Figure 6.13 Voltage improvement: the difference of voltage between the reference and the two PV-PCM systems measured on 30-10 2009 for Vehari, Pakistan (30.03 N, 72.25 E)](image-url)
PV-PCM₂ maintained a higher $V_{oc}$ improvement compared to PV-PCM₁ for the duration of the experiment. $V_{oc}$ improvement showed a similar trend as the temperature reduction in Figure 6.9. In the start of the experiment the $V_{oc}$ improvements were similar for both PV-PCM systems when the temperature was lower. As the temperature increased, $V_{oc}$ improvement for PV-PCM₂ showed a remarkable difference from that of PV-PCM₁. This indicates that at higher temperatures CaCl₂.6H₂O in PV-PCM₂, performed much better than CP in PV-PCM₁. Peak $V_{oc}$ measured improvements were 1.35 V and 1.75 V for PV-PCM₁ and PV-PCM₂ respectively.

Measured temperature regulation was 17 °C for PV-PCM₁ and 21.5 °C for PV-PCM₂. Alternatively predicted $V_{oc}$ improvement were calculated by multiplying the temperature coefficient of voltage by the temperature reduction of each PV-PCM system. The $V_{oc}$ predicted improvement was found in the range of 1.16-1.49 V for PV-PCM₁ compared to measured value of 1.4 V. The $V_{oc}$ improvement for PV-PCM₂ was found 1.43-1.85 V compared to measured value of 1.75 V. In both PV-PCM systems the measured and the predicted values of $V_{oc}$ improvements were in close agreement which shows accuracy of the measured data.
6.5.5. Temperature Distribution Over PV surface

Measured temperature was found to be much higher at the top of the front surface compared to the temperature at the bottom of the surface for both PV-PCM systems, showing temperature distribution. Temperature distribution was lower at the start of the experiment when the temperature of the PV was low and only a small amount of PCM had melted. As the temperature increased at the PV front surface, the amount of melted PCM increased and continued moving upward due to natural convection; this buoyancy driven flow of the melted PCM resulted in higher temperatures at the top surface and lower temperatures at the bottom surface of the PV-PCM systems.

The disadvantage of this upward movement of the melted PCM due to natural convection was that a certain amount of incoming heat was carried away by the melted PCM to the top surface into already melted PCM as sensible heat. This resulted in incoming heat being used as sensible heat, heating the melted PCM and raising its temperature instead of being used as latent heat to melt the solid PCM which would inhibit sensible heating and result in lower temperatures in the PV-PCM system. Thus in-homogenous temperature distribution slowed down PCM melting and resulted in increased PV-PCM temperature and limited PCM thermal regulation.

Temperature was measured at 9 thermocouple locations on the front surface of the PV-PCM systems. The temperature difference between thermocouple location with the highest temperature at top surface of PV-PCM system and the thermocouple location with the lowest temperature at bottom surface of the PV-PCM system was taken to quantify temperature distribution. Figure 6.14 shows measured top-bottom temperature difference as an indicator of temperature distribution measured for both
PV-PCM systems for Dublin, Ireland and Vehari, Pakistan. The figure shows that the temperature distribution was higher in Pakistan compared to that in Ireland for both PCM with PV-PCM \textsubscript{2} due primarily to lower convective heat loss coefficient from PV surface in Pakistan (9.1 Wm\textsuperscript{-2}K\textsuperscript{-1}) than in Ireland (17 Wm\textsuperscript{-2}K\textsuperscript{-1}), however was considerable at both the locations.

Increased temperature difference on the PV surface causes different cells to operate at different temperatures. The temperature rise decreases voltage from the PV cells, thus cells in the same PV panels would produce different voltages and currents. Since power output from PV corresponds to the minimum cell voltage, reduced voltage at certain cell reduces net power output from the PV panel referred to as power mismatch losses (Ramabadran, 2009). The power drop due to unequal temperature distribution needs further investigation to quantify the effect of this phenomenon on the net power output of PV.

The evenly distributed temperature would enable cells to produce same power to minimise power loss due to mismatch. Although the PV-PCM system already consisted of high thermal conductivity metallic fins installed vertically to enhance heat transfer and decrease the temperature distribution, the temperature distribution can further be decreased by optimising fins structure, arrangement and spacing. Different honey comb structures can be incorporated in the PCM matrix to achieve still increased thermal conductivity and reduced temperature distribution over the PV surface due primarily to natural convection.
Figure 6.14 Peak measured temperature difference between top and bottom thermocouple locations for both PV-PCM systems in Dublin (53.33 N, 6.25 W), Ireland and Vehari (30.03 N, 72.25 E), Pakistan

6.5.6. Measured and Predicted PV Power Saving

The reduced PV temperature achieved by applying PCM prevented the temperature dependent $V_{oc}$ drop which were measured and are presented in previous sections for Dublin, Ireland and Vehari, Pakistan for both PV-PCM systems. At both geographical locations, PV-PCM$_2$ obtained the higher temperature regulation and $V_{oc}$ improvement than PV-PCM$_1$. Since the use of PCM showed savings on $V_{oc}$, it is important to determine the impact of temperature reduction on the $P_s$. $P_s$ are predicted by multiplying temperature coefficient of power ($T_p$)(provided by the manufacturer, -0.5 % K$^{-1}$ (Suntechics 2008) and $T_p$ reported in the literature, -0.65 %K$^{-1}$) by the peak and daily averaged temperature reductions measured for both PV-PCM systems presented in Figure 6.15.
Figure 6.15 Measured peak and daily averaged temperature regulations for the PV-PCM systems in Dublin (53.33 N, 6.25 W), Ireland and Vehari (30.03 N, 72.25 E), Pakistan.

Figure 6.16 Predicted Power saving obtained by using the temperature coefficient of power drop from the manufacturer (-0.5 %K\(^{-1}\)) with the measured temperature reduction for PV-PCM\(_1\) and PV-PCM\(_2\) in Dublin (53.33 N, 6.25 W), Ireland and Vehari (30.03 N, 72.25 E), Pakistan.
Figure 6.17 Predicted Power saving obtained by using the temperature coefficient of power drop from the literature (-0.65 % K\(^{-1}\)) with the measured temperature reduction for PV-PCM\(_1\) and PV-PCM\(_2\) in Dublin (53.33 N, 6.25 W), Ireland and Vehari (30.03 N, 72.25 E), Pakistan.

Figure 6.16 and 6.17 show that a lower peak and daily averaged predicted \(P_s\) was obtained for both PV-PCM systems in Ireland than in Pakistan. PV-PCM\(_2\) maintained a higher peak and daily averaged \(P_s\) than PV-PCM\(_1\) at both the geographical locations. Peak and daily average \(P_s\) of 10.8 % and 6.8 % respectively were obtained using \(T_p\) from manufacturer (-0.5 % K\(^{-1}\)) and peak and daily average \(P_s\) of 14 % and 8.8 % respectively were obtained using \(T_p\) from literature (-0.65 % K\(^{-1}\)) in Pakistan with PV-PCM\(_2\).

Measured data of \(V_{oc}\) and \(I_{sc}\) from the reference PV and the PV-PCM systems were used to determine the measured peak and daily averaged \(P_s\) by multiplying product of \(V_{oc} I_{sc}\) by \(FF\). \(FF\) for the reference PV and the PV-PCM systems were determined by extrapolating from the PV characteristic curve to the required operating conditions in Dublin and Vehari and applying the methodology described in chapter 5. \(P_s\) obtained from \(V_{oc}\), \(I_{sc}\) and \(FF\) is termed as measured \(P_s\) because it is based on extrapolation of measured electrical outputs of \(V_{oc}\) and \(I_{sc}\) from the experiments.
In Dublin, the measured peak and average $V_{oc}$ (Peak $V_{oc}$ corresponds to the value of $V_{oc}$ at which the highest $V_{oc}$ improvement was achieved by using PCM) were 20.1 V and 20.41 V for reference PV, 20.81 V and 20.52 V for PV-PCM$_1$ and 20.95 V and 20.81 V respectively for PV-PCM$_2$. Peak and average daily $I_{sc}$ were 3.74 A and 2.82 A for the reference PV, 3.70 A and 2.77 A for PV-PCM$_1$, 3.68 A and 2.78 A for PV-PCM$_2$.

In Vehari The measured peak and average $V_{oc}$ were 18.32 V and 18.72 V for reference PV, 19.71 V and 19.42 V for PV-PCM$_1$ and 20.15 V and 19.92 V respectively for PV-PCM$_2$. The peak and average daily $I_{sc}$ were 3.42 A and 2.45 A for the reference PV, 3.35 A and 2.41 A for PV-PCM$_1$, 3.33 A and 2.39 A for PV-PCM$_2$.

Peak and average $FF$ corresponding to the peak and average solar radiation intensities were first calculated at characterization temperature of 25 °C neglecting temperature influence on $FF$, denoted by $FF_{st}$ applying the methodology described in chapter 5. Then the temperature influence on $FF$ was incorporated with a coefficient, $T_{FF}$ taken as -0.2 %K$^{-1}$ drop in $FF$ with increasing temperature above 25 °C and $FF$ at real operating temperatures ($FF_T$) was calculated for the reference PV and the two PV-PCM systems. $FF$ calculated were used with the peak and average daily $V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$ to determine the corresponding peak and daily average power produced ($P$) at particular temperatures and solar radiation intensities for the reference PV and the PV-PCM systems. Peak and daily average $P$ from the PV-PCM systems were compared with peak and daily average $P$ from the reference PV to determine the peak and daily $P_s$ for the PV-PCM systems. $P_s$ was determined for both the locations, Dublin Ireland and Vehari, Pakistan.
FF at peak and average solar radiation intensities neglecting temperature effect (FF_{st}),
FF at peak and average solar radiation intensities considering temperatures effect (FF_{t}), peak and daily average $P$ for the reference PV and the PV-PCM systems and the peak and daily average $P_s$ for the PV-PCM systems are shown in Table 6.1.
The peak and daily average $P_s$ were recorded as 4 % and 1 % respectively for PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} and 5.1 % and 1.8 % respectively for PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} in Dublin, Ireland. In Pakistan, the peak and average daily $P_s$ were recorded as 11.3 % and 4.4 % respectively with PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} and 13 % and 7.7 % respectively with PV-PCM\textsubscript{2}. It clearly shows that the integration of PCM into PV for their temperature regulation is particularly effective in high temperature climates such as in Vehari, Pakistan, than in low temperature climates, Dublin, Ireland in this study.
Key results of temperature regulation and $P_s$ obtained from indoor experiments and outdoor experiments in Vehari, Pakistan and Dublin, Ireland using PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} and PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} are compared in table 6.2 which show reasonably closer values of temperature regulation and $P_s$ in indoor experiments to outdoor experiments in Vehari, Pakistan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reference PV</th>
<th>PV-PCM(_1)</th>
<th>PV-PCM(_2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehari</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insolation, Wm(^{-2})</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>PV-PCM(_1)</th>
<th>PV-PCM(_2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>74.82</td>
<td>74.78</td>
<td>74.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehari</td>
<td>74.82</td>
<td>74.78</td>
<td>74.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fill Factor, FF</th>
<th>Average FF(_{in})</th>
<th>PV-PCM(_1)</th>
<th>PV-PCM(_2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>72.22</td>
<td>69.64</td>
<td>72.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehari</td>
<td>71.26</td>
<td>73.22</td>
<td>72.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(V_{oc}) (V)</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>PV-PCM(_1)</th>
<th>PV-PCM(_2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>20.41</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>20.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehari</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>19.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I_{sc}) (Amp)</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>PV-PCM(_1)</th>
<th>PV-PCM(_2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehari</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power (W)</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>PV-PCM(_1)</th>
<th>PV-PCM(_2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>42.52</td>
<td>55.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehari</td>
<td>47.34</td>
<td>48.04</td>
<td>55.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Summary of the results for Dublin (53.33 N, 6.25 W), Ireland and Vehari (30.03 N, 72.25 E), Pakistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indoor Experiments</th>
<th>Outdoor Ireland</th>
<th>Outdoors Pakistan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference PV</td>
<td>PV-PCM(_1)</td>
<td>PV-PCM(_2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>20±1</td>
<td>21±1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV-PCM(_1)</td>
<td>20±1</td>
<td>18-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV-PCM(_2)</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>18-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient Temperature</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insolation (Wm(^{-2}))</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measured (P) (W)</td>
<td>38.33</td>
<td>42.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measured (P_s) (%)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Comparison of results for indoors and outdoors in Dublin (53.33 N, 6.25 W), Ireland and Vehari (30.03 N, 72.25 E), Pakistan.
6.6. Conclusions

PCM, CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O achieved higher PV temperature regulation and resulted in higher $P_s$ than CP at both locations outdoors. In the best case CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O achieved a 1.7 \% higher $P_s$ than CP in Vehari, Pakistan. The temperature regulation and resulting $P_s$ is affected adversely by temperature distribution in PCM between top and bottom surface which reached up to 17 °C using PCM CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O in Pakistan. Although the temperature regulation and $P_s$ was higher for CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O, yet the adverse effect of temperature distribution was also higher for CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O compared to CP. A maximum PV temperature regulation of 21.5 °C was achieved with CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O in Vehari, Pakistan yielding a peak measured and predicted $P_s$ of 13 \% and 14 \% respectively. $P_s$ predicted using $T_p$ provided by the manufacturer was always less than $P_s$ calculated through measured values of $V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$ with $FF$ while considering temperature dependence of $FF$. Both PCM evaluated showed promising potential for the desired application, with higher potential in low latitude hot climate of Pakistan compared to high latitude cool climate of Ireland.
6.7. References


7 ENERGY AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF PV-PCM SYSTEMS

7.1 Introduction

Crystalline silicon photovoltaic (PV) cells have currently a 90% share of the PV market (Bagnall, 2008). As global silicon PV module manufacturing capacity has increased, average manufacturing costs have decreased from US$6 W\textsuperscript{p} in 1992 to US$2.75 W\textsuperscript{p} in 2005 (Margolis et al., 2006), with the rate of reduction being greatest in the period 1992-2000 (Margolis et al., 2006). The reduction in average costs slowed significantly after 2000 when the cost per W\textsubscript{p} was already as low as $2.75W\textsubscript{p} equivalent to €2.03 W\textsubscript{p}. A recent study has shown that actual costs of installed PV are $6.5 W\textsuperscript{l} in USA (Sciencedaily, 2010) equivalent to €4.8 W\textsuperscript{l} (XE, 2010). In the next 20 years, total costs p W\textsubscript{p} of “1st generation” silicon PV technologies are predicted to fall by less than 30% (Bagnall, 2008). This indicates that PV production costs are not expected to decrease enough in the near future to make them cost competitive compared to available conventional energy technologies. The current research seeks to maintain high PV efficiency and increase the operating life by maintaining PV at a low temperature. Making use of the heat available at the PV system may also enable it to reach financial viability. Energy efficiency analysis of PV systems is conducted to evaluate their potential for improved electrical and thermal efficiency. Finally the additional costs incurred in PV-PCM system and the resulting benefits are discussed in this chapter.
7.2 Energy Analysis of a PV-T System

The PV-PCM system in the current research is considered as a new type of a photovoltaic-thermal systems employing latent heat storage. The energy efficiency of a (PV-T) system can be defined as a ratio of total thermal (available on PV as heat) and electrical energy produced to the total solar energy falling on the PV surface given by equation 7.1 (Joshi et al., 2009).

\[ \eta_e = \frac{V_{oc}I_{sc}+Q_A}{A_{PV}} \]  

(7.1)

Where \( \eta_e \) is the energy efficiency of PV system, \( A_{PV} \) is the area of the PV exposed to solar radiation and \( Q_A \) is the heat lost from the PV to ambient given by equation 7.2

\[ Q_A = h_{ca}A_{PV}(T_{PV} - T_{amb}) \]  

(7.2)

Where \( T_{amb} \) and \( T_{PV} \) are the ambient and PV temperatures, respectively, \( A_{PV} \) is the heat transfer area of the PV and \( h_{ca} \) is the combined convective and radiative heat loss coefficient given by equation 7.3 (Tiwari, 2002, Tiwari and Sodha, 2006)

\[ h_{ca} = 5.7 + 3.8v_w \]  

(7.3)

Where \( v_w \) is the wind speed taken from figure 6.3 for Dublin, Ireland and figure 6.6 for Vehari, Pakistan on 12-09-2009 and 30-10-2009, respectively. The maximum heat transfer coefficients \( (h_{ca}) \) calculated for Ireland and Pakistan using Equation 7.3 and \( v_w \) data from figures 6.3 (3 ms\(^{-1}\)) and 6.6 (0.9 ms\(^{-1}\)) respectively are 17 Wm\(^{-2}\)K\(^{-1}\) and 9.12 Wm\(^{-2}\)K\(^{-1}\), respectively which shows that \( h_{ca} \) for Ireland is almost twice that for Pakistan which is in agreement with the general trend of temperature recorded at both
location on PV surface which show that at the same solar radiation intensity, the PV surface temperature in Pakistan was always higher than that in Ireland due primarily to less heat lost from the PV surface in Pakistan. Substituting equations 7.2 and 7.3 into equation 7.1, $\eta_e$ can be obtained as given in equation 7.4

$$\eta_e = \frac{V_{oc}I_{sc}+(5.7+3.8v_w)(T_{PV}-T_{amb})}{g_{PV}}$$ (7.4)

Using equation 7.4, $\eta_e$ of the PV systems were calculated for two different locations of Dublin, Ireland and Vehari, Pakistan and are presented in table 7.1. For Dublin, the weather data of ambient temperature, wind speed and solar radiation required for equation 7.4 was taken from figures 6.2, figure 6.3 and figure 6.4 respectively while $V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$ was taken from table 6.1. For Vehari, Pakistan the weather data of solar radiation, wind speed and ambient temperature required for equation 7.4 was taken from figure 6.5, figure 6.6 and figure 6.7, respectively while $V_{oc}$ and $I_{sc}$ were taken from table 6.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ireland</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electrical energy, $V_{oc}I_{sc}$ (MJ)</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined convective and radiative heat loss coefficient, $h_{ca}$ (Wm$^{-2}$K$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat lost, $Q_A$ (MJ)</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar energy, $G_{APV}$ (MJ)</td>
<td>11.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy efficiency of PV-PCM (%)</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1 Results obtained for energy efficiency of PV measured from 09:00 to 18:00 for Dublin, Ireland on 12-09-2009 and Vehari, Pakistan on 30-10-2009.
The average $\eta_e$ values for the duration of experiment (9:00 to 18:00) were 44.6% for Dublin and 32% for Vehari, Pakistan and are summarised in Table 7.1. The $\eta_e$ values obtained (32% and 44.6%) are in good agreement with previously reported values ranging from 33% to 45% obtained for weather conditions of New Delhi using the same method (Joshi, et al., 2009).

7.3 Cost Analysis of the PV-PCM systems

Total cost associated with the PV-PCM systems is derived using three different costs i.e. (i) cost of the PCM (ii) cost of the containment materials (iii) manufacturing cost of the container. Each of the cost is then further divided into the cost of materials when purchased in kilograms for the experiment and the cost of the materials for large scale mass production when purchased in tonnes of the materials. Cost of the materials was €30 kg$^{-1}$ for PCM$_1$ and €22 kg$^{-1}$ for PCM$_2$ respectively when purchased in smaller quantities (Sigma Aldrich, 2008). The cost is projected to reduce to €2.5 kg$^{-1}$ for PCM$_1$ and €1.9 kg$^{-1}$ for PCM$_2$ when purchased in tonnes (ISIS, 2010). 12 kg of PCM$_1$ and 19 kg of PCM$_2$ were consumed to make the PV-PCM$_1$ and PV-PCM$_2$ respectively. So the total cost of the PCM incurred was €360 and €418 from local suppliers which is projected to reduce to €30 and €36 for PCM$_1$ and PCM$_2$ respectively.

The amount of aluminium alloy used was 13 kg to fabricate each PV-PCM system. The cost of the aluminium was €3.8 kg$^{-1}$ when purchased from Pakistan and €5.6 kg$^{-1}$ when purchased from Ireland for fabrication of the single PV-PCM system. The cost of aluminium is €1.71 kg$^{-1}$ (Commodity, 2010) for Asian market and €2.5 kg$^{-1}$ (LME, 2010) for European market when purchased in tonnes. Total cost of aluminium is €74
when purchased for single PV-PCM system which drops to €32.5 when purchased for mass production of PV-PCM systems in Ireland. The cost of aluminium is €49.4 when purchased in smaller quantities to fabricate PV-PCM system and €22.2 when purchased for mass production of such PV-PCM systems in Pakistan. Cost of fabrication was € 300 for Ireland and €40 for Pakistan for each PV-PCM system. If the production cost of mass produced systems decreases by a factor of 10 which is normal (KSB, 2010) then the manufacturing cost are expected to be €4 for Pakistan and €30 for Ireland. The costs are presented in table 7.2.

Table 7.2 Summary of manufacturing and material costs incurred to produce the proposed PV-PCM systems in Ireland and Pakistan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Single fabricated PV-PCM system</th>
<th>Mass produced PV-PCM system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PV-PCM₁</td>
<td>PV-PCM₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>PCM</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aluminium</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net cost</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>PCM</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aluminium</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net Cost</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the most simple cost analysis cost incurred on the PV-PCM systems to regulate PV temperature is compared with the benefit obtained through improved PV electrical output due to temperature regulation. It can be observed that the cost incurred in Ireland on the production of PV-PCM systems was €734 for PV-PCM₁ and €792 for PV-PCM₂ produced as single system which is expected to drop to €92 for PV-PCM₁ and €98 for PV-PCM₂ when mass produced. Similarly the cost incurred in Pakistan on the production of PV-PCM systems was €413 for PV-PCM₁ and €471 for PV-PCM₂ produced as single system and is expected to drop to €56 for PV-PCM₁ and
€62 for PV-PCM$_2$ when mass produced. Since the rated power of PV is 65 W$_p$ so the additional cost incurred due to integration of PCM into PV for mass produced PV-PCM systems in Ireland is €1.41 W$_p^{-1}$ for PV-PCM$_1$ and €1.50 W$_p^{-1}$ for PV-PCM$_2$. Similarly the cost involved in mass produced PV-PCM systems in Pakistan is €0.86 W$_p^{-1}$ for PV-PCM$_1$ and €0.95 W$_p^{-1}$ for PV-PCM$_2$.

7.4 Benefit of the proposed PV-PCM systems

- Peak electrical energy gain due to temperature regulation by PV-PCM$_1$ in Dublin was found to be 2.16 W. The cost to produce same amount of electricity through installing extra PV would be obtained by multiplying cost per watt of PV (i.e., € 4.81 W$_p^{-1}$) to the extra electricity produced (i.e., 2.16 W) which gives the financial benefit of 10.39 € of the PV-PCM system. However the cost incurred to mass produce such PV-PCM$_1$ in Ireland systems was 92 € which shows that PV-PCM$_1$ costs 8.8 times the benefit in Ireland.

- Peak electrical energy gain due to temperature regulation by PV-PCM$_2$ in Dublin was found to be 2.69 W. The cost to produce same amount of electricity through installing extra PV would be obtained by multiplying cost per watt of PV (i.e., € 4.81 W$_p^{-1}$) to the extra electricity produced (i.e., 2.69 W) which gives the financial benefit of 12.94 € of the PV-PCM system. However the cost incurred to mass produce PV-PCM$_2$ in Ireland was € 98, which shows that PV-PCM$_2$ costs 7.5 times the benefit in Ireland.

- Peak electrical energy gain due to temperature regulation by PV-PCM$_1$ in Vehari was found to be 4.82 W. The cost to produce same amount of electricity through installing extra PV would be obtained by multiplying cost per watt of PV (i.e., € 4.81 W$_p^{-1}$) to the extra electricity produced (i.e., 4.82 W) which gives the financial
benefit of 23.18 € of the PV-PCM system. However the cost incurred to mass produce PV-PCM\(_1\) in Pakistan was € 56 which shows that PV-PCM\(_1\) costs 2.4 times the benefit in Pakistan.

- Electrical energy gain due to temperature regulation by PV-PCM\(_2\) in Vehari was found to be 5.52 W. The cost to produce same amount of electricity through installing extra PV would be obtained by multiplying cost per watt of PV (i.e., € 4.81 W\(^{-1}\)) to the extra electricity produced (i.e., 5.52 W) which gives the financial benefit of 26.55 € of the PV-PCM system. The cost incurred to mass produce PV-PCM\(_2\) in Pakistan was € 62 which shows that PV-PCM\(_2\) costs 2.3 times the benefit in Pakistan.

### 7.5 Conclusions

The energy and economic analysis of the PV-PCM systems was performed. For PV the \(\eta_e\), was 44.6% for Dublin, Ireland and 32% for Vehari Pakistan that is in good agreement with reported values for the similar work in literature. It was observed that in both Ireland and Pakistan, the financial benefit of electrical energy saved by temperature regulation through PV-PCM systems was lesser than the cost incurred to mass produce such systems at the corresponding locations confirming that at this stage the PV-PCM systems are not cost effective. Cost of the systems is from 7-8 times of the benefit in Ireland while about 2 times of the benefit in Pakistan which encourages the possibility of future research to improve performance of such systems in context of warmer climates like Pakistan. Additionally in the current analysis the benefit of exploiting thermal energy stored in PCM, increased PV life due to reduced operating temperature, environmental incentives due to carbon savings, State
incentives for green energy production and increased power density for building integrated photovoltaics were not considered which will further bridge the gap in cost and benefit to make PV-PCM systems cost competitive.
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8 FUTURE PROSPECTS AND CONCLUSIONS

8.1 Future Prospects of the Research

8.1.1 Building Integration of PV-PCM Systems

The next step in this research can be to integrate the PV-PCM system into a building façade or roof and determine the heat gains, temperature regulation and PV power gain due to the system integration. The performance of BIPV systems strongly depends on the climate of geographical location where they are installed. It is strongly recommended that such systems should be installed at selected locations with substantially different latitudes and climatic conditions to measure their operating temperatures, temperature effects on electrical and thermal performance, effectiveness of cooling through use of variety of PCM to generate enough data for validation and establishing general correlations between climatic conditions and PV and PV-PCM performance. A successful integration and performance evaluation of the integrated system with respect to thermal and electrical performance evaluation/improvement will be very important research contribution which is very limited at present.
8.1.2 Heat Extraction from PV-PCM System

It has been shown that PCM integrated into PV stores a large amount of thermal energy available from PV as latent heat. Utilizing the stored energy brings additional benefit of these systems which can be maximised by future research:

- A heat extraction methodology can be devised that will enable improve heat exchange from the PV-PCM into heat transfer media. The study may focus on the cost, effective life and competitive heat exchanger materials. The measures can help to reduce temperature distribution in PCM by efficient heat extraction to improve PV power quality.

- Selection of appropriate heat transfer fluid, qualifying for little to no additional investment and operating cost, higher heat gains, possibility of utilizing heat using water for domestic water heating or air for space heating can be investigated. It has been shown in literature (Wilson, 2009) that water can be passed through such system using the normal hydraulic head available at home water supply systems which will save on pumping power need and extra capital cost. An arrangement of high thermal conductivity metallic cylindrical pipes equally distributed into the PCM matrix can be a start point.

- Optimisation of coolant flow rates will also be important for efficient and optimised heat removal from PCM and would reduce pumping or fan power if any of them arises. The study may involve modelling of heat transfer within the system between PCM and the coolant for design and flow rate optimization.
The timings of heat extraction from PCM may easily be overlooked nevertheless it can be potentially important depending on site of the installed systems. Timing to start heat extraction may vary with the seasonal variation at the same site or geographical variation between sites during the same season. At high thermal loads in warmer climates the PCM may melt completely in shorter time duration and will thermally insulate PV from back tending to overheat the PV provided the heat is not extracted in timely fashion. Initially starting heat extraction at the (i) end of the day and (ii) mid of the day can be considered. End of the day heat extraction may more suit to cooler climates where PV can absorb heat for longer time durations. Mid of the day heat extraction may be necessary in hot climates where the temperatures are high enough to melt PCM in initial few hours of exposure.

8.1.3 Thermal Conductivity Improvement of the PV-PCM System

It is observed that thermal conductivities of the PCM and PV-PCM container play an important role in thermal regulation performance of the PV-PCM systems. Very low thermal conductivities of the PCM reduces heat transfer rate from PV into PCM and encourages natural convection in the PCM generating temperature gradient within PCM resulting in higher PV operating temperatures. Following measures can be taken to enhance thermal conductivity of the PV-PCM system

- Manipulation of fin design and investigation into different fin arrangements by numerical modelling and validation with experimental measurements.
Addition of thermal conductivity enhancers (i.e., metallic nanopowders and carbon nanotubes) into the PCM and make uniform distribution (Lee *et al.*, 2005; Collins and Phaedon, 2000)

### 8.1.4 Optimization of PV-PCM System for Different Climates

Modelling of BIPV systems for different geographical locations with available weather data can be very important contribution to understand the electrical performance, additional benefits and potential challenges for competitive and reliable operation of such systems world wide. Simulation models can be developed using commercial packages such as TRNSYS and RET taking meteorological data to predict performance of BIPV systems at diverse weather conditions which will help provide rational for cooling need of the BIPV systems. At the second stage performance improvement of BIPV can be predicted with integrated PV-PCM systems. The model will help optimise PV-PCM system integrated into BIPV for thermal as well electrical gain for different climates avoiding increased effort and investment for experimental measurements and will guide investigation of suitable PCMs for different climatic conditions.

### 8.1.5 Corrosion Studies

It has been reported that some PCM show higher tendency to corrode PCM container materials than others. Comparison of different PCMs for their corrosion to the container materials is important to predict PCM container life-time and well as effectiveness of PCM materials for long time performance compatibility. The
corrosion studies will help understand the possible ways and materials to protect PCM containers from corrosion, comprehensive studies relating corrosion protection measures and their effectiveness and limitations have not been reported as yet to Author's knowledge.

8.1.6 Search for New PCM

Investigation into different PCM with suitable thermophysical properties, long time operation reliability, cost competitiveness and availability to suit different climates for PV cooling and enhanced performance is an open area of research. Research with an aim of discovering new materials, learning from cooling potential, techniques, limitation and challenges reported for cooling performance of PCM applied in electronics, building fabrics and food preservation can provide very important inputs for future research. Characterization of new materials, improvement in their properties and measures to functionally grade them can generate a list of optimum PCM for different geographical locations.
8.2 Conclusions

Aim of the current research is to experimentally investigate the PV cooling technique introduced by Huang et al., 2004, 2006 extending its use to (i) identify and thermophysically characterize new PCMs for their suitability for PV cooling applications (ii) experimentally evaluate the new PCMs indoors with different PV-PCM system configurations at various solar radiation intensities to adopt PV-PCM systems for different weather conditions (iii) integrate the optimum PCM into large scale PV panel size system with optimum PV-PCM configurations, measure PV temperature regulation through use of PCM and quantify the increased electrical output brought about by PV cooling indoors (iv) evaluate the PV cooling and increased electrical output through use of the novel PV-PCM system outdoors by extensive experimentation in two different climates i.e. (i) high latitude cool climate and (ii) low latitude hot climate.

Different PV types, their efficiencies and effect of temperature on their performance have been reviewed. It is proven that temperature has a strong impact on the electrical output as well as long-term operation reliability of almost all PV types. Different active and passive cooling techniques have been reviewed. Almost all of the conventional PV cooling techniques are limited by (i) high initial costs, (ii) operation and maintenance costs, (iii) low heat removal and (iii) inability to produce cooling at higher temperature summer environments.

The thermophysical properties of PCM were reviewed to determine suitable PCM for PV temperature regulation. Consequently five different PCM, RT20, SP22, CaCl₂.6H₂O, CL
and CP from three major classes of PCM, (i.e., paraffin waxes, salt hydrates and fatty acids) were selected with melting points around 25±4 °C and heats of fusion between 125-212 kJkg\(^{-1}\). Initial characterization of PCM using DSC verified thermophysical properties of PCM. DSC could accommodate only 5-15 mg of the PCM mass, further characterization was deemed necessary with larger PCM masses. THM offered the possibility to place 25 g sample material and showed characterization comparable to DSC. Characterization with both DSC and THM showed good agreement with the results reported in literature. It was found that RT20 melts and solidifies over a wider temperature range and has high volumetric expansion (14%) during melting however it is non corrosive to most of the containment material which favours its use for PV temperature regulation being contained in metallic containers. CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O possessed the highest heat of fusion (i.e., 213 Jg\(^{-1}\)), highest thermal conductivity (i.e., 1.09 Wm\(^{-1}\)°C\(^{-1}\)) and melts and solidifies over a small temperature range. It shows an undesired strong corrosion to most of the container materials, a higher undercooling of 11 °C below its freezing point rendering difficulty in solidification and dehydration during thermal cycles if not contained in hermetically sealed containers. CL and CP melt and solidify over relatively narrow temperature ranges and possess higher heats of fusions (i.e., 168 Jg\(^{-1}\) and 191 Jg\(^{-1}\), respectively) however CP and CL have very low thermal conductivities (0.14 Wm\(^{-1}\)°C\(^{-1}\)) which impedes heat transfer. SP22 has higher thermal conductivity (0.6 Wm\(^{-1}\)°C\(^{-1}\)) than CP, CL and RT20 however it has the lowest heat of fusion (122 Jg\(^{-1}\)) of all PCM, shows undercooling of 8 °C below its freezing temperatures which renders difficulty in solidification
Further indoor experiments on the cell size PV-PCM system enabled to determine actual thermal regulation of PV. Extensive indoor experiments conducted at 500 Wm\(^{-2}\), 750 Wm\(^{-2}\) and 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) solar radiation intensities enabled to understand the effect of (i) PV-PCM container material, (ii) melting point of PCM (iii) thermal mass of PCM (iv) heat of fusion of PCM (v) thermal conductivities of PCM and PV-PCM system on thermal regulation enhancement of PV. It was observed that the thermal regulation performance of a PCM depends on the thermal mass of PCM, melting point of PCM, heat of fusion of PCM and thermal conductivity of both (i) PCM and (ii) PV-PCM container material. Comparing PV-PCM systems, the aluminium based system A was found to be the optimum while CP and CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O were found to be the best PCMs. Better thermal regulation was produced at lower insolation by CP and at higher insolation by CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O. In the best case both CP and CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O maintained a maximum of 18 °C temperature reduction at PV front surface for 30 minutes, while CaCl\(_2\).6H\(_2\)O maintained a 10 °C temperature reduction for 5 hours at 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) insolation in system A. Indicative Ra numbers were calculated for all PCMs at three insulations which ranged between 10\(^3\) - 10\(^7\) which shows that the natural convection is present in the PV-PCM system and also the fluid flow is laminar. The experimental results were validated with an emissivity based P1 (Fluent, 2005 a) radiation model for incoming solar radiations and an enthalpy based two dimensional heat transfer model applying Boussinesq approximation for density variation in the fluid to solve phase change. PV without PCM was validated systems at all the three solar radiation intensities while PV-PCM system was validated at 1000 Wm\(^{-2}\) insolation using RT20 as PCM which showed good agreement with measurement results. Simulation results confirmed the presence of natural convection by
distribution of melt fraction along the vertical direction, with melted PCM moving to the top surface due to buoyancy and solid PCM moving downwards under gravity.

The best PCM (i.e., CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O and CP) and PV-PCM from small scale indoor experiments (i.e., system A) were characterized, at a larger PV panel scale (70 cm x 60 cm x 5 cm) consisting of PV panel, PV-PCM container fitted with metallic fins with PCM filled in. Indoor experiments with a large scale solar simulator producing solar radiation intensities of 500 Wm$^{-2}$, 750 Wm$^{-2}$ and 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ enabled to quantify the PV thermal regulation produced by each of the two PCM, CP and CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O. Increase in $V_{oc}$ was observed with decreasing PV temperature. It was observed that PV-PCM containing CaCl$_2$.6H$_2$O produced highest PV thermal regulation and associated improvement in $V_{oc}$ than the PV-PCM containing CP at all solar radiation intensities. In the best case temperature regulation of 13 °C and 15 °C was achieved with PV-PCM$_1$ and PV-PCM$_2$ respectively for 6 hours at 1000 Wm$^{-2}$ solar radiation intensity. This PV thermal regulation increased PV power by 7.52 % and 9.7 % with PV-PCM$_1$ and PV-PCM$_2$ respectively.

Good results in indoor characterization encouraged outdoor characterization to be conducted in high latitude cool climates of Dublin, (53.33 N, 6.24 W) Ireland and low latitude warm climate of Vehari, (30.03 N, 72.25 E), Pakistan respectively applying the same experimental setup and measurement procedures. Similar indoor large-scale characterization, temperature reduction and associated PV power improvements were observed outdoors. In Dublin a peak PV temperature regulation of 7 °C with PV-PCM$_1$ and 10 °C with PV-PCM$_2$ was achieved yielding a predicted power improvement of 4.6 % with PV-PCM$_1$ and 6.5 % with PV-PCM$_2$ (using $T_{cp}$ of 0.65 % °C$^{-1}$). In Vehari a peak
PV temperature regulation of 17 °C with PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} and 21.5 °C with PV-PCM\textsubscript{2} was recorded which produced predicted power improvement of 11 % with PV-PCM\textsubscript{1} and 14 % with PV-PCM\textsubscript{2}. It was observed that both PV-PCM systems produced higher PV temperature regulation and greater associated power increase in the warm climate of Vehari than in the cool climate of Dublin. A simplified cost and benefit analysis showed that the PV-PCM systems cost more than the electrical saving due to cooling of PV, however the difference between cost and benefit is much lower in climates of Pakistan than in climates of Ireland.

Although the temperature regulation and power improvement was higher for CaCl\textsubscript{2}.6H\textsubscript{2}O, yet the adverse effect of temperature distribution (temperature difference between top and bottom of PV-PCM system) was also higher for CaCl\textsubscript{2}.6H\textsubscript{2}O compared to CP causing power loss due to voltage mismatch. It is expected that with improved heat transfer, exploiting stored thermal energy, better design and comprehensive cost analysis, these systems can become cost competitive.
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Appendix

Appendix A- Solar Simulator

Product Name: Griven GR-262 Inse 1200 Followspot 1200W
Product Model: INSE1200
Manufacturer: GRIVEN

Griven GR-262 Inse 1200 Followspot 1200W

Followspot for 1200 MSR discharge lamp, zoom optical system: high light output and perfect focusing. Complete with two cooling fans, safety micro-switch, iris diaphragm, built-in ballast, on/off switch and supply cable.

The lamp is sold separately.

Technical features

- LAMP SOURCE

  Type: MSR
  Wattage (W): 1200
  Base: G22
  Lamp life (h): 750
  Lumens: 110,000

- COLOURS

  Color (MIX): Optional colour changer group

- PROJECTION

  Zoom: 7-12
  Iris:
Dimmer: Optional
Effects: Optional 4-way shutter

- HOUSING

Cooling: FV

- SIZE (mm)

Height: 420
Width: 350
Depth: 1010

- - WEIGHT (kg)

Main fixture: 30

- POWER

Input (V): 230
HZ: 50-60
AMP: 12
Appendix B-Pyranometer

Abbildung 3 1. Relative spektrale Durchlässigkeit zweier Pyranometer Dome. (Vier Oberflächenreflexionen und ein Indexwechsel mit Wellenlänge sind berücksichtigt)
2. Spektrale Verteilung der Solarstrahlung auf Meereshöhe, Sonne im Zenit (Luftmasse 1).

1.2.3 Richtungsfehler

## 2. TECHNISCHE DATEN

### 2.1 SPEZIFIKATIONEN

#### 2.1.1 Technische Daten der Einzelversion CM 6B

**Leistung**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spalt/Hinter:</th>
<th>Bereich:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spektralbereich:</td>
<td>305-2800 nm (50% Punkte)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>335-2200 nm (95% Punkte)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sensitivität: zwischen 9 und 15 μV/W·m²

Impedanz: 70 - 100 Ohm

Antwortzeit: < 18s (95%)<br> < 24s (99%)

Nichtlinearität: < ± 2% (± 10 °C bis ± 40 °C)

Temperaturabhängigkeit der Sensitivität: < ± 2% (± 10 °C bis ± 40 °C)

Richtungsfehler: < ± 20 W/m² (Strahl 1000 W/m²)

Neigungsfehler: < ± 1% (Strahl 1000 W/m²)

Nulloffset durch Far Infrared (ventiliert mit CV2) < 15 W/m² at 200 W/m² Netto-Thermalsstrahlung

Nulloffset durch Temperaturschwanungen < 4 W/m² bei 5 K Schwankung

Betriebstemperatur -40 °C to +80 °C

Sichtfeld: 180° ± 2° zu er

Strahlungsaufnahme: 0 - 1400 W/m² (max. 2000 W/m²)
Sensitivitätsabweichung: < ± 1% pro Jahr
Spektrale Trennscharfe: ± 2% (0.30 μm bis 1.5 μm)

Das genannte Richtungsverhalten enthält folgende relative Fehler:

Kosinusverhalten: max. ± 1% Abweichung vom Ideal bei 60° Sonnenzenitwinkel in jeglicher Azimuthrichtung
max. ± 3% Abweichung vom Ideal bei 80° Sonnenzenitwinkel in jeglicher Azimuthrichtung

**Konstruktion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farbe Sensorelement:</th>
<th>Kohleschwarz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glasdom:</td>
<td>Schott K5 optisches Glas, 2mm dick, 30mm und 50mm äußerer Durchmesser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trocknungsmittel:</td>
<td>Silika-Gel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libelle:</td>
<td>Sensitivität 0.5° (Luftblase zur Hälfte außerhalb des Ringes, Deckung mit Sensorsockel) Oberfläche des Sensorelements und Sensorsockel sind deckungsgleich innerhalb 0.1°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialien:</td>
<td>seeaueIFESTES Aluminiumgehäuse und Nivellierschrauben, eloxiert. Rostfreie Stahlschrauben, korrosionsfrei montiert Weißer Plastiksonnenschirm ASPC, Trocknungspatrone PMMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gewicht:</td>
<td>850 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabellänge:</td>
<td>10 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abmessungen:</td>
<td>B x H 150 x 95 mm. (S. a. Abbildung 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: ΔT Data logger

The DL2e is a versatile, programmable field data logger, well suited to remote site, industrial and laboratory applications. Easy to operate, the DL2e system offers a wide choice of sensors, logging intervals, data collection and analysis facilities.

- Battery powered, weatherproof, rugged and portable
- Logs DC, AC, Resistance, Counter, Frequency and Status channels
- Simple GSM Modem connections and automatic data collection from remote sites
- Memory for up to 128k readings
- Easy programming with new Ls2Win 32-bit Software

Expandable As standard, the DL2e includes a 15/90 channel DC analogue input card, 4 resident channels (9 digital inputs and 2 relay outputs), and memory for over 64,000 (64k) timer readings. An extra RAM chip extends this to 128k readings. Input cards and extra RAM are easily fitted by the user.

Suitable for most sensors The DL2e measures DC and AC voltage, current, resistance, logic state, pulse train and contact closure inputs. In almost any configuration (see panel on page 9). During programming, each channel can be set up with an individual sensor type and range, a data conversion characteristic, reading frequency from 1 second to 24 hours, and limits above or below which a flag is set or an output relay switched. Logging sequences may be started at a preset time and date, or by an external event, and can be repeated as many times as desired. The DL2e also provides for sensor excitation and warm-up, control outputs, and malfunction warnings.
DL2e Specifications

Logging

- Logging interval and speed: 1, 5, 10, 30 seconds, 1, 5, 10, 20 minutes, or 1, 2, 4, 12, 24 hours, programmable for each channel. Readings can also be reduced to averages, maxima or minima at these intervals. Typically 10 channels per second in total.

Analogue Inputs

- Standard analogue card, LAC1: Each LAC1 multiplexer card can select analogue inputs from either:
  - 15 channels of differential voltages and/or 2wires resistances
  - 22 channels of single-ended (common ground) voltages and/or 2 wires resistances
- 4-wire card, LFW1: Each LFW1 card can handle up to 16 differential or 2 wires resistances. 4-wire resistance measurements virtually eliminate cable resistance errors. 4-wire Pt100 platinum resistance thermometers (e.g. DIN 43760/851904 types) are measured over 500 to +65°C. The 17 to +65°C range of LPT and IP100 temperature, resolution of 0.1°C and accuracy of ±0.2°C are obtained.
- AC/DC input card, AC01: Each AC01 card provides 15 measurement channels which may be individually configured for AC voltage (true rms), DC voltage (differential), 2-wire or 4-wire resistance sensors.

Voltage readings:

- Full scale: 4 ranges, user-selected or autoranged.
- Resolution: (12 bits + sign)

Supported input levels:

- 0 to 10
- ±5mV
- ±0.3mV
- ±3.7mV
- ±10mV
- ±50mV

DC accuracy:

- Logarithm temperature: ±0.07% reading ±0.02% reading.
- Non-logarithm temperature: ±0.1% reading ±0.02% reading.
- Non-logarithm offset: ±0.6% reading ±0.25mV.
- Maximum additional error: ±0.1% reading.

Common mode rejection ratio:

- Range I: ±140 dB.
- Range II: ±80 dB.
- Range III: ±30 dB.
- Range IV: ±16 dB.

Resistance readings:

- Autoranging 12-bit voltage readings with programmable 2, 20, 200, 2000 range, giving 1mA full scale, or better than 0.01% resolution on lowest range.
- Accuracy: ±0.3% reading ±0.08% reading ±0.6% reading ±0.25mV.
- Common mode rejection ratio:±16 dB.

Digital inputs and outputs

- All inputs have 16-bit input channels that continuously monitor logic levels or switch closures, logging digital states, counts or frequency (up to 100Hz) or for triggering special logging sequences.
- Counter Card, DCL1: Each DCL1 counter provides up to 15 extra 16-bit counter or frequency channels. Maximum frequency: 950kHz for switch closures, 950kHz for logic level signals. Every channel can record up to 65535 counts over the logging interval. 2 SPDT relays for powering up sensors, or for providing alarms or malfunction warnings. 1A, 32V rating.

Other specifications

- Delta-T Devices Ltd
  128 Low Road, Burwell, Cambridge, CB5 9JX, England
  Tel: +44 (0)1638 742922 Fax: +44 (0)1638 743165
  Email: sales@delta-t.co.uk  Web: www.delta-t.co.uk

Thanks for using Delta-T Devices Ltd.