© MAR 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 8 Issue 9 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV8I9-1719718

Real Time Maximum Power Point Tracking Algorithm Optimization and Levelized Cost Reduction in Solar Arrays

ANIEKAN OLISEH ENO-IBANGA[1], DR. SAMIR ABOOD[2]
Independent Researcher

Abstract- The economic viability of solar photovoltaic systems hinges on two interlinked factors: how efficiently energy is extracted in real time, and how that efficiency translates into lower lifecycle costs. Maximum Power Point Tracking algorithms are the primary mechanism for reducing immediate power extraction, but typical approaches are often delayed under dynamic environmental conditions, leading to energy losses that accumulate over a system's 20-25-year lifespan. This paper develops a conceptual framework for optimizing real-time Maximum Power Point Tracking algorithms to fully reduce the Levelized Cost of Energy in both residential and commercial solar arrays. We argue that optimizing should be treated as a multi-objective problem in which tracking speed, stability, computational load, and adaptability are balanced against hardware constraints and maintenance costs. The review examines conventional, intelligent, and unique MPPT strategies, emphasizing their implications for energy yield, inverter stress, and system degradation. The analysis suggests that even modest gains in tracking efficiency, when sustained over decades, can meaningfully lower the Levelized Cost Of Energy, by improving energy yield without proportional increases in capital expenditure. The paper concludes by outlining design considerations for implementing such optimization in real-world systems and identifying conceptual gaps that future research should address.

Keywords: Real-time optimization, Solar Photovoltaic, Levelized Cost of Energy, Adaptive control, Energy yield, Lifecycle cost, and Maximum Power Point Tracking.

I. INTRODUCTION

Solar energy has developed from a niche alternative to a mainstream power source, but cost remains the language everyone understands. For developers, financiers, and homeowners, what is important is not just how many kilowatts a panel is rated for, but how much a kilowatt-hour really costs over the system's lifetime. That is where the Levelized Cost of Energy comes in. LCOE bundles capital costs, operating expenses, financing, and expected energy production into a single number that tells you whether a project makes sense.

The major problem is that most cost-reduction efforts focus on cheaper panels, less expensive inverters, or lower installation labor costs. Those matter but they are one-time gains. The other lever is operational efficiency, getting more energy out of the hardware you already paid for, every single day, for decades. That is where Maximum Power Point Tracking algorithms are needed.

A Maximum Power Point Tracker controller's job is simple in theory: to find the voltage and current at which a Photovoltaic array produces maximum power at any given moment. In practice, it is messy (Moradi et al., 2011). Clouds roll in, shadows move across panels, temperatures swing, and panels degrade at different rates. A slow or inaccurate MPPT algorithm does not just lose a bit of power at the moment; it creates a persistent drag on annual energy yield. Over 20 years, a 2 percent annual loss compounds into a significant revenue gap. (Eltamaly et al ., 2015).

Traditional algorithms like Perturb and Observe and Incremental Conductance were designed for simplicity and low-cost microcontrollers. They work, but they are reactive and often back and forth, around the true maximum power point. Under partial shading or rapidly changing irradiance, they can lock onto local maxima, missing substantial power that is available elsewhere in the array's I-V curve.

The opportunity lies in reframing MPPT optimization as a real-time problem with economic consequences. If an algorithm can adapt faster, avoid oscillations, and handle complex shading patterns, it directly increases energy yield. That increase feeds straight into the denominator of the Levelized Cost Of Energy equation, lowering the cost per kilowatt-hour without requiring new hardware.

This paper builds a conceptual framework for that idea. We start by connecting MPPT performance to Levelized Cost Of Energy, then review how different algorithmic families perform in terms of speed, accuracy, and stability. From there, we develop a conceptual model for adaptive, real-time optimization that balances energy gain against computational and hardware costs. The goal is not to present a new algorithm, but to clarify how algorithm design choices ripple through to lifecycle economics.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Maximum Power Point Tracker and the Economics of Energy Yield

The link between MPPT performance and LCOE is straightforward mathematically but often overlooked in practice. Levelized Cost Of Energy is calculated as the sum of all costs over a system's lifetime divided by the sum of all energy produced. Energy production is directly proportional to the integral of power output over time. A better MPPT algorithm increases that integral by reducing tracking error. (Podder et al., 2019).

Empirical and simulation studies consistently show that advanced MPPT methods outperform conventional ones by 3-12 percent under non-uniform conditions. That range matters. On a 100-kilo-watt commercial system generating 150 megawatts a year, a 5 percent gain is 7.5 megawatts, which is enough to power several homes annually and shift project payback periods by months. The value scales with system size and electricity prices, which is why commercial operators pay closer attention to MPPT than most residential users do.

But there is a trade-off. More sophisticated algorithms require more computation, faster sensors, and sometimes higher-grade processors. If the cost of the control hardware rises faster than the value of the extra energy, LCOE can actually increase. Optimization, therefore, must include computational cost and reliability as constraints, not just tracking accuracy.

2. Conventional Maximum Power Point Tracker Algorithms: Strengths and Limits

Perturb and Observe (P&O) remains the most widely deployed method because it is easy to implement and requires minimal parameters. It works by perturbing the operating voltage and observing the change in power. If power increases, it continues in the same direction; if not, it reverses. The method is robust but suffers from steady-state oscillation and slow response to rapid irradiance changes.

Incremental Conductance (INC) improves on this by comparing instantaneous conductance to incremental conductance, theoretically allowing it to settle at the maximum power point without oscillation. In practice, sensor noise and finite step sizes still cause small oscillations, and INC struggles with multiple peaks under partial shading.

Both methods assume a single, smooth power-voltage curve. That assumption breaks down when parts of an array receive different irradiance levels, creating multiple local maxima. In such cases, conventional algorithms can get stuck, losing 15-30 percent of potential power until conditions change. For arrays in urban environments or with nearby obstructions, this is a regular occurrence.

3. Intelligent and Hybrid Approaches

To address these limits, researchers have turned to intelligent methods. Unclear logic controllers use rule-based systems to handle nonlinearity and uncertainty. They respond faster than P&O under changing conditions but require expert knowledge to design the rule base, and performance varies significantly between sites.

Artificial Neural Networks (ANNs) learn the mapping between environmental inputs and optimal operating points from data. Once trained, they can predict the maximum power point without searching,

© MAR 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 8 Issue 9 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV8I9-1719718

reducing tracking time (Mohammed et al., 2025). The challenge is data dependency and the risk of poor generalization if training data doesn't cover the full range of operating conditions. (Sundareswaran et al. 2015).

Reinforcement Learning (RL) takes a different route by learning through interaction. The controller tries different actions, receives feedback in the form of power output, and adjusts its policy to maximize cumulative reward. RL is attractive for adaptive systems because it can update online as panel characteristics change due to aging and soiling. However, early exploration phases can produce suboptimal behavior, which is problematic for grid-connected systems.

Hybrid approaches try to combine the reliability of conventional methods with the adaptability of intelligent ones. A common structure uses P&O or INC as a baseline controller and engages an ANN or RL module when rapid environmental changes are detected (Harrison et al., 2022). This reduces risk while still capturing gains during dynamic conditions. From an LCOE perspective, hybrids are promising because they reduce the need for expensive hardware upgrades while still improving yield in high-variability environments.

4. Real-Time Optimization as a Conceptual Problem

Real-time optimization in this context means adjusting Maximum power point tracking parameters, step size, search range, and decision logic, on the fly, based on system state. The state includes irradiance rate of change, temperature, array voltage, current variance, and historical performance data.

The conceptual challenge is framing the optimization objective. If you optimize only for maximum instantaneous power, you may increase inverter stress and switching losses, shortening component life. If you optimize only for stability, you may sacrifice energy during transients. A more balanced objective function would weigh energy yield against control effort, thermal cycling, and expected maintenance.

This is where multi-objective optimization becomes relevant. Instead of a single goal, the controller navigates a Pareto front where improvements in one metric come at the cost of another. For example, a larger step size increases tracking speed but also increases oscillation. An adaptive system would reduce the step size when the array is stable and increase it when rapid changes are detected.

5. Implications for Levelized Cost Reduction

The pathway from algorithm optimization to LCOE reduction runs through three mechanisms.

First, there must be an increased energy yield. Even small percentage gains, sustained over thousands of operating hours, reduce the denominator in the LCOE equation. This is the most direct effect. (Esram et al., 2007).

Secondly, a reduced component stress. Algorithms that minimize oscillation and rapid voltage swings reduce thermal cycling in power electronics. Lower thermal stress correlates with longer inverter life and fewer replacement cycles, cutting operating and replacement costs.

Lastly, there should be improved fault tolerance. Adaptive algorithms can detect and compensate for partial shading, soiling, and cell degradation by adjusting the search space. This reduces mismatch losses and delays the point at which physical maintenance becomes necessary.

The conceptual model here is that MPPT is not just an energy extraction tool; it is a lifecycle management tool. The control strategy influences both revenue and costs across the system's life, not just power at a single moment (Daraban et al., 2014).

6. Gaps and Design Considerations

Several gaps remain in translating these ideas into practice. One is the lack of standardized metrics for evaluating MPPT algorithms beyond tracking efficiency. Metrics like control energy cost, thermal impact, and fault detection latency are rarely reported but matter for LCOE.

Another gap is scalability. An algorithm that works well on a 5-kilowatt residential system may not be feasible on a 5-megawatt utility array due to computational load and communication latency.

Distributed control architectures, where each string or panel has a lightweight adaptive controller, are a conceptual solution but raise questions about coordination and stability.

Finally, there is the issue of interpretability. In commercial and utility contexts, operators need to understand why a controller made a decision, especially if it deviates from conventional behavior. Black-box algorithms create trust and regulatory barriers, even when they perform well.

III. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR ADAPTIVE REAL-TIME MPPT OPTIMIZATION

The proposed framework consists of four interconnected components:

1. Sensing and State Estimation
High-frequency sampling of voltage, current, irradiance, and temperature provides the raw inputs. State estimation filters out noise and computes derived metrics such as the irradiance rate of change and array uniformity. This layer determines whether the system is in a stable, dynamic, or fault condition.
2. Decision Layer

This is where the adaptive algorithm operates. It selects control parameters based on the estimated state. In stable conditions, it prioritizes stability and low oscillation. In dynamic conditions, it prioritizes speed and breadth of search. The decision logic can be rule-based, model-based, or learned, but it must include constraints on computational load and hardware limits.

3. Actuation Layer
The selected parameters are translated into duty cycle adjustments for the DC-DC converter. This layer also monitors actuator response to detect faults or degradation in the power electronics.

4. Feedback and Adaptation Loop
Performance feedback, measured energy yield, oscillation magnitude, and thermal data are used to update the decision layer. Over short time scales, this might adjust the step size. Over longer timescales, it might trigger retraining of a learned model or recalibration of rule thresholds.

The key conceptual shift is treating MPPT as a continuous learning and adjustment process rather than a static control loop. The system is expected to evolve as the array ages and environmental patterns change (Daraban et al., 2014).

IV. CONCLUSION

Real-time MPPT algorithm optimization is more than a technical exercise in control theory; it's an economic lever for reducing the Levelized Cost of Energy in solar arrays (Moradi et al., 2011). By improving tracking speed, accuracy, and adaptability, advanced algorithms increase energy yield while potentially reducing stress on power electronics and delaying maintenance needs.

The literature shows that no single algorithm dominates across all conditions. Conventional methods are robust and cheap but limited under dynamic and partially shaded conditions. Intelligent methods offer adaptability but introduce complexity and data requirements. Hybrid approaches provide a practical middle ground, combining baseline reliability with targeted adaptability.

The conceptual framework presented here positions MPPT optimization as a multi-objective, lifecycle-aware process. Success depends on balancing energy gain against computational cost, hardware stress, and interpretability. When done well, algorithm improvements translate directly into lower Levelized Cost Of Energy, without requiring changes to the physical array.

Future work should focus on developing standardized evaluation metrics that include economic and reliability impacts, not just tracking efficiency. It should also explore scalable architectures for distributed adaptive control and methods to make algorithmic decisions more interpretable to system operators. As solar continues to grow, the marginal gains from better control will become increasingly important for making solar competitive with conventional generation on cost alone.

REFERENCES

[1] A comprehensive comparison of different MPPT techniques for photovoltaic systems. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SOLENER.2014.11.010

[2] Eltamaly, Ali & Rezk, Hegazy. (2015). A comprehensive comparison of different MPPT techniques for photovoltaic systems. Solar Energy. 112. 1-11. 10.1016/j.solener.2014.11.010.

[3] Esram, Trishan & Chapman, P.L.. (2007). Comparison of Photovoltaic Array Maximum Power Point Tracking Techniques. Energy Conversion, IEEE Transactions on. 22. 439 – 449. 10.1109/TEC.2006.874230.

[4] Harrison, A. & Nfah Mbaka, Eustace & Nguimfack Ndongmo, Jean De Dieu & Alombah, Njimboh. (2022). An Enhanced P&O MPPT Algorithm for PV Systems with Fast Dynamic and Steady-State Response under Real Irradiance and Temperature Conditions. International Journal of Photoenergy. 2022. 10.1155/2022/6009632.

[5] Mohammed, Faiz & Hasan, Fattah & Kareem, Parween & Hasan, Raed & Saleh, Khalid & Ahmed, Ahmed. (2025). Optimization and Simulation of the Perturb and Observe Algorithm for Maximum Power Point Tracking in Photovoltaic Systems EISSN: 2788-9920 NTU Journal for Renewable Energy. NTU Journal of Renewable Energy. 9. 73-81. 10.56286/02qc5x54.

[6] Moradi, Mohammad & Reisi, Ali. (2011). A hybrid maximum power point tracking method for photovoltaic systems. Solar Energy – SOLAR ENERG. 85. 2965-2976. 10.1016/j.solener.2011.08.036.

[7] Sundareswaran, Kinattingal & Sankar, Pradeebha & Nayak, P.s.R. & Simon, Sishaj P & .P, Sathya. (2015). Enhanced Energy Output From a PV System Under Partial Shaded Conditions Through Artificial Bee Colony. Sustainable Energy, IEEE Transactions on. 6. 198-209. 10.1109/TSTE.2014.2363521.

[8] Daraban, Stefan & Petreus, Dorin & Morel, Cristina. (2014). A novel MPPT algorithm based on a modified genetic algorithm specialized on tracking the global maximum power point in photovoltaic systems affected by partial shading. Energy. 74. 374-388. 10.1016/j.energy.2014.07.001.

[9] Podder, Amit & Roy, Naruttam & Pota, Hemanshu. (2019). MPPT Methods for Solar PV Systems: A Critical Review Based on Tracking Nature. IET Renewable Power Generation. 13. 10.1049/iet-rpg.2018.5946.