SIMULATION OF HYBRID POWER SOURCES FOR INDUSTRIAL LED LIGHTING SYSTEMS
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Abstract: This paper will discuss an Air Breathing Fuel Cell (ABFC) stack and solar PV module, which are being investigated as an alternate power sources, produced from an inexhaustible sources of energy for LED lamp based industrial lighting applications. An empirical model has been developed in PSIM software in order to investigate the polarisation characteristics of the ABFC. This model includes phenomena like ‘activation polarisation, ohmic polarisation, and mass transport effect’. The simulation results are also presented to consider the effect of temperature and hydrogen pressure changes on fuel cell voltage. The PV module is modelled and implemented with MPPT controller using boost converter, the P-V and I-V characteristics are presented. This paper will give focus on boost converter and the quadratic buck converter (QBC), as an ABFC stack power conditioning units (PCU) which are designed and simulated using PSIM Software. The objective is to achieve tight regulation of the LED current and should operate over a wide range of input voltages. The boost converter is implemented with sliding-mode (SM) current controller and the QBC with average current-mode (ACM) controller to achieve good line regulation as well as dynamic performance.
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1. Introduction

Fuel cell is an electro chemical device which converts fuel and oxidant into DC electricity [1]. Fuel cell is characterised by high electrical efficiency and zero/low pollutant emission. Only water, heat and electricity are the products of electrochemical reaction in the fuel cell. Cells that take up oxygen, for the cathode reaction, from ambient air by passive means are known as “air-breathing” fuel cells [2]-[8]. In the ABFC, hydrogen and oxygen are fed at anode and cathode respectively as reactants. The electrons transfer from the anode to the cathode through the external circuitry of the fuel cell. Hydrogen ions transfer across the membrane internally from the anode to the cathode to complete the current flow.

Anode side reaction:

$$\text{H}_2 \rightarrow 4\text{H}^+ + 4\text{e}^-$$

Cathode side reaction:

$$\text{O}_2 + 4\text{H}^+ + 4\text{e}^- \rightarrow 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$$

Overall reaction:

$$2\text{H}_2 + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow 2\text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{Electricity} + \text{Heat}$$

Fig. 1 shows the work process and reaction principle of an ABFC.

![Fig. 1 - Work process and reaction principle of an ABFC](image-url)
The growing interest in non-conventional sources of energy has caused the photo-voltaic (PV) power market to expand rapidly, the designers need a pliant and reliable tool to accurately track the electrical power produced from PV arrays of various sizes. A cell is defined as the semiconductor device that converts sunlight into electricity. A PV module refers to a number of cells connected in series and in a PV array the modules are connected in series and parallel. This paper presents the simulation of hybrid power sources for industrial LED lighting system. Now a day’s LED lamps are becoming very popular in many applications which include outdoor spaces, hospitals, offices, automotive display systems and industrial lighting. They have high efficiency, higher durability and smaller size. As LED lamp arrays operate at different ranges of voltages and currents, they should be connected through AC-DC and DC-DC converters to the supply lines.

The switched-mode power supplies (SMPS) are extensively used as power conditioning units for fuel cell applications due to their compactness and efficiency. The existing DC-DC converters like buck converter and multi-phase buck converter are not suitable for large conversion ratios due to limitation in minimum turn-on time requirement of the switch. This limits their operation to lower switching frequencies [9]-[10]. For such requirements the quadratic buck converter (QBC) is the preferable one compared to the other as the dc conversion ratio has a quadratic dependence on duty cycle.

The organization of this paper, section 2 presents the in-depth view of ABFC and PV module power system, section 3 describes the simulation results, efficiency analysis is described in section 4 and finally in section 5 conclusions are stated.

2. Modelling of ABFC and PV module power system

The power system model implemented in PSIM software consists of the following sections:

- ABFC stack model
- PV-module modelling
- Boost converter and the QBC

The proposed schematic of the overall power system is shown in Fig. 2.

2.1. Development of ABFC stack model

The analytical model [5]-[8] of the ABFC can be represented by a set of mathematical equations. Gibbs free energy (Δg) is the net electrical work done by the system and is expressed in terms of the enthalpy of formation, temperature and the entropy of formation represented by Eq. (1).

\[ Δg = Δh − TΔs \]  

(1)

For a fuel cell, the change in the enthalpy of formation and the change in entropy were modelled according to the mathematical Eqs. (2) and (3).

\[ Δh = h_{H_{2}O} - h_{H_{2}} - \frac{1}{2} h_{O_{2}} \]  

(2)

\[ Δs = s_{H_{2}O} - s_{H_{2}} - \frac{1}{2} s_{O_{2}} \]  

(3)

However, h and s are expressed as functions of temperature as represented by Eqs. (4) - (5).

\[ h_{T} = h_{298.15} + \int_{298.15}^{T} c_{p}dT \]  

(4)

\[ s_{T} = s_{298.15} + \int_{298.15}^{T} \frac{1}{T} c_{p}dT \]  

(5)

The molar specific heat at constant pressure (C_p) for steam, hydrogen and oxygen, respectively are given by the mathematical Eqs. (6) - (8).

\[ c_{p_{steam}} = 143.05 - 58.04T^{0.25} + 8.2751T^{0.5} - 0.036989T \]  

(6)

\[ c_{p_{hydrogen}} = 56.505 - 22222.6T^{-0.75} + 116500T^{-1} - 560700T^{-1.5} \]  

(7)

\[ c_{p_{oxygen}} = 37.432 - 2.0102(10^{-4})T^{1.5} + 17850T^{-1.5} - 2368800T^{-2} \]  

(8)

It is assumed that pure hydrogen and oxygen are used as reactants (i.e. γ = β = 1). The adopted equations which describe Activation losses, Ohmic losses, and Concentration losses respectively are represented by Eqs. (11) - (13).
The standard potential of a hydrogen/oxygen fuel cell at standard STP (25°C and 1 atm) is 1.229V. The activation losses, ohmic losses, and concentration losses are three types of irreversible losses present in the ABFC, due to which the actual cell potential drops from its equilibrium potential. The output voltage of the single cell ABFC is given by Eqs. (9) and (10).

$$V_{\text{Cell}} = E_{\text{Nernst}} - \Delta V_{\text{Act-Crossover}} - \Delta V_{\text{Ohm}} - \Delta V_{\text{conc}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

$$E_{\text{Nernst}} = -\frac{\Delta g}{2F} + \frac{RT}{2F} \ln\left(\frac{\beta^2}{\delta} \frac{1}{p^2}\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

It is assumed that pure hydrogen and oxygen are used as reactants (i.e. $\gamma = \beta = 1$). The adopted equations which describe Activation losses, Ohmic losses, and Concentration losses respectively are represented by Eqs. (11) - (13).

$$\Delta V_{\text{Act-Crossover}} = \frac{RT}{2\alpha F} \ln\left(\frac{i + i_{i_s}}{i_{i_0}}\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

$$\Delta V_{\text{Ohm}} = ir$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

$$\Delta V_{\text{conc}} = m \exp(n_i)$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

The developed ABFC stack is shown in Fig. 3.

2.2. Power conditioning unit (PCU)

2.2.1. Boost converter with SM current controller

A boost converter is a DC to DC converter whose output voltage is greater than its input voltage. Fig. 4 shows the schematic of the boost converter and its input-output voltage relation is given by Eq. (15).

$$V_0 = \frac{V_s}{(1 - D)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

The sliding-mode (SM) current controller design consists of a switching function and selection of a control law [11]-[13]. The proposed SM current controller employs both the output voltage error and the input inductor-current error as controlled state variables like conventional PWM current mode control.

The instantaneous reference-inductor-current profile $i_{\text{ref}}$ in the proposed controller is generated using the amplified output-voltage error and is given by Eq. (16).

$$i_{\text{ref}} = k(V_{\text{ref}} - \beta V_0)$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

Where $V_{\text{ref}}$ and $V_0$ denote the reference and instantaneous output voltages respectively and $K$ is the amplified gain of the voltage error. Large value of $K$ is preferred to improve the dynamic response and minimizing the steady-state voltage error in the system. The switching function is given by Eq. (17).

$$u = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \text{sign}(s))$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

Where $u$ represents the logic state of power switch $S_w$ and $s$ is the instantaneous state variable’s trajectory, represented by Eq. (18).

$$s = \alpha_1 x_1 + \alpha_2 x_2 + \alpha_3 x_3$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

Where $\alpha_1$, $\alpha_2$ and $\alpha_3$ represents the sliding coefficients.

The adopted controlled state variables are the current error $x_1$, the voltage error $x_2$ and the integral of the
current and the voltage errors $x_3$, which are expressed as

$$
x_1 = (i_{ref} - i_{L})
$$
$$
x_2 = (V_{ref} - \beta V_o)
$$
$$
x_3 = \int (i_{ref} - i_{L}) dt + \int (V_{ref} - \beta V_o) dt
$$

(19)

The equivalent-control signal for the SM current controller is obtained by solving

$$
\tilde{s} = 0
$$

The equivalent-control signal is obtained as

$$
u_s = 1 - \left(\frac{K_2}{V_o}\right) i_k + K_1 \left(\frac{V_{ref} - \beta V_o}{V_o} - \frac{V_o}{V_o} - K_2 \left(\frac{i_{ref}}{i_i}\right)\right)
$$

(20)

where

$$
K_1 = \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} L (K + 1), K_2 = \frac{BL}{C} (K + \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1}), K_3 = \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1} L;
$$

Fig. 5 shows the schematic of the boost converter with sliding-mode current controller.

2.2.2. Quadratic buck converter (QBC)

The schematic of the quadratic buck converter is shown in Fig. 6. The conversion ratio of the QBC is represented by the Eq. (21).

$$
M(D) = \frac{V_o}{V_in} = D^2
$$

(21)

For a quadratic buck converter operating in continuous conduction mode, the control-output voltage transfer function has two complex right hand plane (RHP) zeros. These RHP zeros restrict the control bandwidth and cause sluggish response particularly with voltage mode controllers. The narrow gain-bandwidth limitation of the voltage-mode controller can be overcome with average current-mode controller [14]-[17]. For this, an inner current loop is used in addition to the outer voltage loop. The average current-mode control has several improved features over the peak current mode control such as large noise margin, no additional slope compensation and easy current limit implementation.

The block diagram representation of QBC with average current-mode (ACM) control is shown in Fig. 7. The compensator of the current loop is designed in such a way that the crossover frequency of the current loop is greater than the voltage loop [14].

$$
C_1(S) = \frac{K_1(S + Z_s)}{S}
$$

(22)

For current loop low pass filter the corner frequency must be equal to switching frequency and its transfer function is given by Eq. (23).
F(S) = \frac{w}{S+w} \quad (23)

For getting stable closed loop performance, the gain crossover frequency should be very large i.e. less than 1/6 \text{th} of the converter switching frequency. The phase margin at the cross over frequency should be maintained above 30°. The compensator \( C_2(S) \) is to be designed for fulfilling the above requirements. The \( C_2(S) \) is a lag-lead compensator whose transfer function is represented by Eq. (24).

\[
C_2(S) = \frac{K(S+Z_l)(S+Z_r)}{S(S+P)} \quad (24)
\]

### 2.3. Photovoltaic Module

The solar cell is a non-linear device and can be represented as a current source in parallel with diode [18]-[22] as shown in the Fig. 8.

![Equivalent circuit of PV cell](image)

The current source \( I_{ph} \) represents the cell photocurrent. The \( R_{sh} \) and \( R_{sc} \) are the intrinsic shunt and series resistances of the cell. Usually the value of \( R_{sh} \) is very large and \( R_{sc} \) is very small. The module photocurrent is given by Eq. (25).

\[
I_{ph} = \left[ I_{sc} + K_i (T - 298) \right] \frac{\lambda}{1000} \quad (25)
\]

The module reverse saturation current is given by

\[
I_{rs} = I_{sc} \left[ \exp(qv_{sc}/N_{kA}T) - 1 \right] \quad (26)
\]

The module saturation current \( I_o \) vary with the cell temperature and is given by Eq. (27).

\[
I_o = I_{sc} \left[ \frac{T}{T_0} \right]^n \exp \left\{ qE_{oc}/Bk \left[ \frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{T_0} \right] \right\} \quad (27)
\]

The current output of PV module is represented by

\[
I_p = N_p I_{ph} - N_p I_o \left[ \exp[q*(V_{pv} + I_pR_s)/N_{pAkT}]-1 \right] \quad (28)
\]

The output voltage obtained from the PV module is given as input to the MPPT boost converter. The second boost converter connected at the output of MPPT converter acts as a PCU for the PV source and controls the unregulated output voltage of the MPPT boost converter, maintains constant LED lamp voltage. Hence this converter can provide line voltage regulation as well as tight LED current regulation.

### 2.3.1. Maximum power point tracking (MPPT) controller

The Perturb & Observe (P&O) is one of the MPPT techniques and easy to implement. The time complexity of this algorithm is very less but on reaching very close to the MPP it doesn’t stop at the MPP and keeps on perturbing on both the directions. When this happens the algorithm has reached very close to the MPP and we can set an appropriate error limit or can use a wait function which ends up increasing the time complexity of the algorithm. The MPPT principle and its flowchart are shown in Fig. 9 and Fig. 10 respectively.

![The principle of P&O MPPT strategy](image)

The Perturb & Observe algorithm states that when the operating voltage of the PV panel is perturbed by a small increment, if the resulting change in power \( \Delta P \) is positive, then it gives the direction of MPP, hence the duty cycle \( (\delta) \) of the MPPT boost converter has to be incremented and keeps on perturbing in the same direction. If \( \Delta P \) is negative, it gives away from the direction of MPP and the sign of perturbation supplied has to be changed, hence the duty cycle \( (\delta) \) of the MPPT boost converter has to be decremented. The \( \Delta P \) zero represents the maximum power point.

Two parameters needed to be designed carefully to achieve fast tracking of maximum power point with P&O MPPT algorithm. One of them is the time interval between iterations while another one is the step size of each voltage perturbation. The large step size \( \Delta V_{PV} \) leads to fast tracking of the maximum power point under varying atmospheric conditions yet results in reduced overall average power conversion in steady state due to
large oscillations around the maximum power point. Likewise, the design of time interval between iterations should leave enough operating time for computer calculation, but if the time interval is designed too long, the MPPT algorithm will lose the fast response capability to a varying environmental condition.

\[
P(\text{k}) = v(\text{k}) \cdot i(\text{k}) \\
P(\text{k}) > P(\text{k}-1) \\
v(\text{k}) > v(\text{k}-1) \\
\delta = \delta_1 - \Delta\delta \\
\delta = \delta_1 + \Delta\delta \\
\delta = \delta_1 + \Delta\delta \\
\delta = \delta_1 - \Delta\delta \\
k = k + 1
\]

Fig. 10 - Flow chart of the P&O method

3. Simulation results

3.1. Simulation results of the ABFC power system

The ABFC stack model built in PSIM software based on block diagram of Fig. 3 is shown in Fig. 11(a)-11(d), consists of Activation loss block, Mass transportation block, Ohmic loss block and Nernst open circuit voltage block.

![Cell voltage of an ABFC for different cell temperatures](image)

![Polarization curve of an ABFC operating at 30°C](image)

Table 1: Simulation parameters of ABFC model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.00003 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>0.008 cm² mA⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>0.0002 KΩ cm²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i₀</td>
<td>3 mAc⁻²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iₙ</td>
<td>1 mAc⁻²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The values of simulation parameters adopted from the literature [5]-[8] are tabulated in Table 1. The polarisation curve is plotted for a range of current densities and at different operating temperatures of 30°C, 50°C and 60°C as shown in Fig. 12. The operating voltage of a fuel cell ranges between 0.5 and 0.6 V. According to Fig. 13, the above voltage range is produced within a current density range of approximately 40-60 mA/cm². Thus for the implemented model, an operating current density of 50 mA/cm² was selected in order to produce a reasonable operational voltage for the fuel cell. Subsequently, it was found that for a current density of 50mA/cm², and an exchange current density of 1 mA/cm², the resulting operational voltage is 0.5656V per fuel cell.

Fig. 14 presents a comparison between polarisation plots at three different cell temperatures of 30°C, 50°C, and 60°C to demonstrate the correctness of the simulation results. Theoretically, the cell voltage will be lower over the operating current density with increased cell temperature. Fig. 15 shows the output voltage of single ABFC and the fuel cell stack.
Fig. 11. (a) - PSIM model of Activation loss block

Fig. 11. (b) - PSIM model of Mass transportation block

Fig. 11. (c) - PSIM model of Ohmic loss block

Fig. 11. (d) - PSIM model of Nernst open circuit voltage block
At 35° each ABFC produces a voltage of 0.55V and also the fuel cell stack voltage (106 cells in series) is 58.3V. Fig. 16 shows the effect of step change in temperature (35°- 75°) on single ABFC voltage and the fuel cell stack voltage, the fuel cell voltage falls by 0.1V. Fig. 17 shows the effect of step change in pressure (1.5bar-4.5bar) on single ABFC voltage and the fuel cell stack voltage, the fuel cell voltage increases by 0.000052V.

The simulation results for temperature and pressure variations are tabulated in Table 2 and Table 3. It is evident that the change in fuel cell voltage is more with temperature compared to hydrogen pressure.
The output voltage (nearly 60V) obtained from the fuel cell stack model is given as input to the boost converter. The boost converter produces output voltage (311V) with a steady-state ripple of ±1V (±0.322%) as shown in Fig. 18.

### 3.2. Simulation parameters of QBC and Boost converter

Table 4 shows the specifications of the QBC and the LED lamp. The simulation is performed using PSIM software and the results are presented.

#### Table 4: Specifications of the LED lamp and quadratic buck converter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Nominal value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LED lamp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal voltage</td>
<td>170V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal current</td>
<td>20mA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power rating</td>
<td>3.4W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic buck converter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC input voltage</td>
<td>311V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductance (L₁)</td>
<td>180mH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductance (L₂)</td>
<td>180mH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductive resistance</td>
<td>0.4mΩ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacitance (C₁)</td>
<td>1µF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacitance (C₂)</td>
<td>1µF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacitor (ESR)</td>
<td>0.2mΩ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switching frequency</td>
<td>100kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load resistance</td>
<td>8.5kΩ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output voltage</td>
<td>170V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output power</td>
<td>3.4W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2: Effect of step change in temperature on single ABFC voltage at constant hydrogen pressure of 4bar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel cell voltage at 35º</th>
<th>Step change in temperature</th>
<th>Fuel cell voltage after step change</th>
<th>Decrease in fuel cell voltage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.55V</td>
<td>35º - 45º</td>
<td>0.53V</td>
<td>0.02V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55V</td>
<td>35º - 55º</td>
<td>0.50V</td>
<td>0.05V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55V</td>
<td>35º - 65º</td>
<td>0.47V</td>
<td>0.08V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55V</td>
<td>35º - 75º</td>
<td>0.45V</td>
<td>0.10V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3: Effect of step change in hydrogen pressure on single ABFC voltage at constant cell temperature of 35º

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step change in pressure</th>
<th>Fuel cell voltage before step change</th>
<th>Fuel cell voltage after step change</th>
<th>Increase in fuel cell voltage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5-2.5 bar</td>
<td>0.56550V</td>
<td>0.56552V</td>
<td>0.000022V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5-3.5 bar</td>
<td>0.56550V</td>
<td>0.56554V</td>
<td>0.000039V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5-4.5 bar</td>
<td>0.56550V</td>
<td>0.56555V</td>
<td>0.000052V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 18 - Output and stack (Input) voltage waveforms of boost converter
Fig. 21 shows the fuel cell stack voltage, boost converter output voltage, load voltage and load current waveforms, the output voltage is maintained constant at 170V with negligible ripple.

Fig. 19 - Bode plot for open-loop gains of current loop and voltage loop

3.3. Simulation results of PV power system

The name-plate details of the 3.4W PV module are given in Table 5.

Table 5: Electrical characteristics data of solar 3.4W PV module

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simulation parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rated power</td>
<td>3.4W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voltage at maximum power (V_{mp})</td>
<td>60V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current at maximum power (I_{mp})</td>
<td>0.05667A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open circuit voltage (V_{oc})</td>
<td>66V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short circuit current (I_{sc})</td>
<td>0.0512A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of cells in series (N_{s})</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of cells in parallel (N_{p})</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PV module is implemented in PSIM software using Eqs. (25-28). The model yields the PV current I, using the electrical parameter of the module (I_{sc}, V_{oc}, n) and the variables Voltage, Irradiation (G) and Temperature.
(T) as the inputs to the model. Fig. 22 and Fig. 23 show the P-V and I-V characteristics for different irradiation levels, at constant temperature of 25°C.

Fig. 22 - The P-V characteristics for different irradiation levels, at constant temperature of 25°C

Fig. 23 - The I-V characteristics for different irradiation levels, at constant temperature of 25°C

Fig. 24 shows the MPP tracking for three different irradiations, at t=4 sec the irradiance is varied from 400 W/sq.m to 600 W/sq.m and at t=6 sec the irradiance is varied from 600 W/sq.m to 1000 W/sq.m, which leads to output power rise correspondingly. The output voltage (nearly 60V) obtained from the PV module is given as input to the boost MPPT converter. This converter produces a varying intermediate voltage, the second boost converter rises this voltage to constant LED lamp voltage of 170V, provides tight regulation of the LED current.

4. Efficiency analysis

The efficiency plot of the QBC is shown in Fig. 25, the measured input power is 3.7W and the output power is 3.4W at rated input voltage of 311V, the efficiency is found to be 91.89%. The efficiency of the boost converter is also found to be 91%.

Fig. 25 - Input power and output power waveforms

The overall efficiency of the ABFC power system is found to be 69.4% (0.83*0.91*0.9189 = 0.694).

The overall efficiency of the PV module power system is found to be 27.3% (0.33*0.91*0.91 = 0.273).

5. Conclusions

In this paper a hybrid power system model is presented, includes an ABFC stack and the PV module. An empirical model of an ABFC has been developed using PSIM software in order to obtain its polarisation characteristics. The simulation model also verifies the effect of temperature and hydrogen pressure on cell voltage. At constant hydrogen pressure, as the cell temperature increases the cell voltage falls and also as hydrogen pressure increases the cell voltage increases slightly. As the output voltage of the fuel cell stack is
unregulated and often not constant, the PCU’s part has been modelled and included in the overall power system model. The DC-DC converters enable tight regulation of the LED current (3.0%), besides offering a good dynamic performance. The overall efficiency of the ABFC power system is found to be 69.4%. Similarly the PV module modelling and its characteristics are also presented along with the MPPT controller. The overall efficiency of the PV power system is found to be 27.3%.
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