

30.3734.1 - Comparative Tests PVT vs ST collectors

September, 2020

Solar Thermal Energy & Thermal Storage Department



Report:	Comparative Tests PVT vs ST collectors
Code:	30.3734.1
Client: Contact person:	FEGEN SOLAR LLC. Christos Nikolaidis
Address:	31, Pentelis Av. 15235 Vrilissia Athens Greece
Sending date:	11/09/2020

Made by:	Raquel Erice	Date: 03/09/2020
	Technician	
Reviewed by:	Alberto García de Jalón	Date: 11/09/2020
	Alberto García de Jalón	
Approved by:	Head of Measurement and Characterization Unit	Date: 11/09/2020

Signature:



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	BACKGROUND	. 4
2.	SAMPLES DESCRIPTION	. 4
3.	TESTING METHOD	. 6
3	.1 Methodology	. 7
	RESULTS .1 DAILY THERMAL PERFORMANCE	
	CONCLUSIONS	
6.	REFERENCES	10



1. BACKGROUND

The purpose of this document is to describe a comparative performance test among one PVT collector and one ST collector. The objective of these tests is to assess the performance of a PVT collector constructed by attaching a heat exchanger in the backside of a commercial PV module. For this, the thermal yield of the PVT collector will be compared with the thermal yield of a reference commercial ST collector.

2. SAMPLES DESCRIPTION

On the 07th of May, the client sent to CENER one PVT sample and one ST sample to apply comparative tests. At receipt of the samples, any defect was registered by CENER.



Figure 1. PVT sample. PVT collector composed by PV module Canadian Solar CS6K-295MS, serial number: 11810481170589 and Heat exchanger P-FHE16PS, serial number: 100122190621.







Figure 2. Solar Thermal Collector, Sammler Aris 2004 serial number: 103.739



3. TESTING METHOD

3.1 Methodology

The methodology for the performance comparison was to record and to compare the thermal performance of the two PVT and ST collectors operating under identical ambient conditions. The thermal performance measurement was based on the standard ISO9806:2017 [1]. The tests are carried out in a closed circuit. The inlet temperature of the fluid to the collectors is constant and close to the ambient temperature of the day. The outlet temperature is continuously cooled to reach again the initial set inlet temperature. Regarding the PVT collector, thermal performance test was made under maximum electrical power generation conditions.

This comparison was made during spring season in two complete days (clear days or almost clear days with low wind speed). According to client request, this comparison was performed at 5° and 35° with fixed tilt for the complete day.

Comparative graph and table energy values were performed in order to compare thermal performance of both collectors.



Figure 3. Assembly of solar components at fixed tilt Testing location: Sarriguren, Spain Latitude 42,8º Longitude -1,6º



3.2 Test Conditions

Several parameters were monitored simultaneously for each collector such as Hemispherical Solar Irradiance, Inlet Temperature, Outlet Temperature, Ambient Temperature and Mass Flow rate for every 2 seconds. From these parameters instantaneous efficiency was calculated every 5 minutes. Find below daily average test conditions reached for each day.

	145	ne 1. Day 25/00/20	20 - 1113 - 301a	mermai conect		
Time period 09:01:08 – 20:59:58	Irradiance Ghem (W/m²)	Ambient air Temperature <i>ϑ</i> a (⁰C)	Inner Temperature <i>9</i> i (ºC)	Outlet Temperature <i>ϑ</i> e (⁰C)	Flow rate m (Kg/s)	Wind speed <i>u</i> (m/s)
Min.	18	16,8	28,5	28,6	2,98	0,2
Max.	931	35,9	29,5	35,6	3,02	14,9
Average	608	29,1	29,2	32,9	3,01	1,6

Table 1. Day 25/08/2020 - tilt 5º - Solar Thermal Collector

Table 2. Day 25/08/2020 - tilt 5º - PVT Collector

Time period 09:01:08 – 20:59:58	Irradiance <i>G</i> hem (W/m²)	Ambient air Temperature <i>ϑ</i> a (⁰C)	Inner Temperature <i>9</i> i (ºC)	Outlet Temperature <i>ϑ</i> e (ºC)	Flow rate m (Kg/s)	Wind speed <i>u</i> (m/s)
Min.	18	16,8	28,6	28,1	2,97	0,2
Max.	931	35,9	29,5	32,3	3,02	14,9
Average	608	29,1	29,3	30,7	2,98	1,6

Table 3. Day 26/08/2020 - tilt 35º - Solar Thermal Collector

Time period 09:15:34 – 20:25:14	Irradiance Ghem (W/m ²)	Ambient air Temperature <i>ϑ</i> a (⁰C)	Inner Temperature <i>अ</i> i (ºC)	Outlet Temperature <i>ϑ</i> e (ºC)	Flow rate m (Kg/s)	Wind speed <i>u</i> (m/s)
Min.	12	20,5	27,1	28,1	3,01	0,2
Max.	1023	31,7	29,4	36,4	3,03	6,7
Average	666	28,1	29,1	33,3	3,02	1,3

Table 4. Day 26/08/2020 - tilt 35º - PVT Collector

Time period 09:15:34 – 20:25:14	Irradiance Ghem (W/m²)	Ambient air Temperature <i>ϑ</i> a (⁰C)	Inner Temperature <i>9</i> i (ºC)	Outlet Temperature <i>\$</i> e (⁰C)	Flow rate m (Kg/s)	Wind speed <i>u</i> (m/s)
Min.	12	20,5	27,2	27,3	2,96	0,2
Max.	1023	31,7	29,4	32,3	2,98	6,7
Average	666	28,1	29,2	30,7	2,97	1,3



4. **RESULTS**

4.1 Daily Thermal Performance

From the acquired data for each day, comparative graph and table energy values were performed in order to compare thermal performance of both collectors. The reference area for these energy calculations was the total area of collectors, ST: $2,12 \text{ m}^2$ and PVT: $1,64 \text{ m}^2$.

Table 5. Day 25/08/2020 at tilt 5º							
Collector Type	Solar Thermal Energy Production (MJ)	Solar Thermal Energy Production (MJ/m ²)	Solar Irradiation on collector plane (MJ/m ²)	Daily Thermal Efficiency (%)			
Solar Thermal Sammler Aris 2004	31,4	14,8	25,2	0,59			
FEGEN PVT – CSK6-16PS	13,0	8,0	25,2	0,32			



Figure 4. Comparative graph of thermal performance for both collectors at 5º / 25/08/2020

Notes:

1.- Near the solar noon, a reflection is observed on the radiation sensor for about ten minutes. In terms of comparison, this effect was considered no significant on the study performed.



Table 6	. Day 26/08/2020 at tilt 35	D
---------	-----------------------------	---

Collector Type	Solar Thermal Energy Production (MJ)	Solar Thermal Energy Production (MJ/m ²)	Solar Irradiation on collector plane (MJ/m ²)	Daily Thermal Efficiency (%)
Solar Thermal Sammler Aris 2004	34,9	16,5	26,8	0,62
FEGEN PVT – CSK6-16PS	13,4	8,2	26,8	0,31



Figure 5. Comparative graph of thermal performance for both collectors at 35° / 26/08/2020 Notes:

1.- At the beginning of the day around 10:00 in the morning, a readjustment of the inlet temperature was carried out and the efficiency of both collectors decreased around twenty minutes until the temperature stabilization was correctly again. In terms of comparison, this effect was considered no significant on the study performed.



5. CONCLUSIONS

The main conclusions that we can observe in the valid period of this study are:

- The daily performance obtained by both collectors at 5° and 35° tilt is very similar. In the case of the thermal solar collector, there is a difference of 4,8 % between these two days and in the case of the PVT collector there is a difference of 3,1 %.
- The daily performance obtained by the solar thermal collector is 46 % higher than the hybrid collector for the 5° tilt and 50% for the 35° tilt.

These conclusions can only be applied for the samples tested, location and meteorological conditions at the time of the test.

6. REFERENCES

[1] International Standard ISO 9806:2017 "Solar Energy – Solar thermal collectors - Test methods"