



HAL
open science

Prediction bands for solar energy: New short-term time series forecasting techniques

Michel Fliess, Cédric Join, Cyril Voyant

► To cite this version:

Michel Fliess, Cédric Join, Cyril Voyant. Prediction bands for solar energy: New short-term time series forecasting techniques. *Solar Energy*, 2018, 166, pp.519-528. 10.1016/j.solener.2018.03.049 . hal-01736518

HAL Id: hal-01736518

<https://polytechnique.hal.science/hal-01736518>

Submitted on 17 Mar 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Prediction bands for solar energy: New short-term time series forecasting techniques

Michel Fliess^{a,d,*}, Cédric Join^{b,d,e}, Cyril Voyant^{c,f}

^a*LIX (CNRS, UMR 7161), École polytechnique, 91128 Palaiseau, France.*
`Michel.Fliess@polytechnique.edu`

^b*CRAN (CNRS, UMR 7039), Université de Lorraine, BP 239,
54506 Vandœuvre-lès-Nancy, France*
`cedric.join@univ-lorraine.fr`

^c*SPE (CNRS, UMR 6134), Università di Corsica Pasquale Paoli, 20250 Corte, France*
`voyant@univ-corse.fr`

^d*AL.I.E.N. (Algèbre pour Identification & Estimation Numériques),
7 rue Maurice Barrès, 54330 Vézelize, France.*

`{michel.fliess, cedric.join}@alien-sas.com`

^e*Projet Non-A, INRIA Lille – Nord-Europe, France*

^f*Hôpital de Castelluccio, Unité de Radiothérapie, BP 85, 20177 Ajaccio, France*

Abstract

Short-term forecasts and risk management for photovoltaic energy is studied via a new standpoint on time series: a result published by P. Cartier and Y. Perrin in 1995 permits, without any probabilistic and/or statistical assumption, an additive decomposition of a time series into its mean, or trend, and quick fluctuations around it. The forecasts are achieved by applying quite new estimation techniques and some extrapolation procedures where the classic concept of “seasonalities” is fundamental. The quick fluctuations allow to define easily prediction bands around the mean. Several convincing computer simulations via real data, where the Gaussian probability distribution law is not satisfied, are provided and discussed. The concrete implementation of our setting needs neither tedious machine learning nor large historical data, contrarily to many other viewpoints.

Keywords: Solar energy, short-term forecasts, prediction bands, time series, mean, quick fluctuations, persistence, risk, volatility, normality tests.

*Corresponding author.

1. Introduction

Many scientific works and technological issues (see, *e.g.*, Hagenmeyer *et al.* (2016)) are related to the *Energiewende*, *i.e.*, the internationally known German word for the “transition to renewable energies.” Among them weather prediction is crucial. Its history is a classic topic (see, *e.g.*, Lynch (2008) and references therein). Reikard (2009) provides an excellent introduction to our more specific subject, *i.e.*, short-term forecasting: “The increasing use of solar power as a source of electricity has led to increased interest in forecasting radiation over short time horizons. Short-term forecasts are needed for operational planning, switching sources, programming backup, and short-term power purchases, as well as for planning for reserve usage, and peak load matching.” Time series analysis (see, *e.g.*, Antonanzas *et al.* (2016)) is quite popular for investigating such situations: See, *e.g.*, Bacher *et al.* (2009); Behrang *et al.* (2010); Boland (1997, 2008, 2015a,b); Diagne *et al.* (2013); Duchon *et al.* (2012); Fortuna *et al.* (2016); Grantham *et al.* (2016); Hirata *et al.* (2017); Inman *et al.* (2013); Lauret *et al.* (2015); Martín *et al.* (2010); Ordiano *et al.* (2016); Paoli *et al.* (2010); Prema *et al.* (2015); Reikard (2009); Trapero *et al.* (2015); Voyant *et al.* (2011, 2013, 2015); Wu *et al.* (2011); Yang *et al.* (2015); Zhang *et al.* (2015), . . . , and references therein. The developed viewpoints are ranging from the rather classic setting, stemming from econometrics to various techniques from artificial intelligence and machine learning, like artificial neural networks.

No approach will ever rigorously produce accurate predictions, even *nowcasting*, *i.e.*, short-term forecasting. To the best of our knowledge, this unavoidable uncertainty, which ought to play a crucial rôle in the risk management of solar energy, starts only to be investigated (see, *e.g.*, David *et al.* (2016); Ordiano *et al.* (2016); Rana *et al.* (2015, 2016); Scolari *et al.* (2016); Trapero (2016)). As noticed by some authors (see, *e.g.*, David *et al.* (2016); Trapero (2016), this lack of precision might be related to *volatility*, *i.e.*, a most popular word in econometrics and financial engineering. Let us stress however the following criticisms, that are borrowed from the financial engineering literature:

- 31 1. Wilmott (2006) (chap. 49, p. 813) writes: *Quite frankly, we do not know*
32 *what volatility currently is, never mind what it may be in the future.*
- 33 2. According to Mandelbrot *et al.* (2004), the existing mathematical defini-
34 tions suffer from poor probabilistic assumptions.
- 35 3. Goldstein *et al.* (2007) exhibits therefore multiple ways for computing
36 volatility which are by no means equivalent and might even be contradic-
37 tory and therefore misleading.

38 A recent conference announcement (Join *et al.* (2016)) is developed here. It is
39 based on a new approach to time series that has been introduced for financial
40 engineering purposes (Fliess *et al.* (2009, 2011, 2015a,b)). A theorem due to
41 Cartier *et al.* (1995) yields under very weak assumptions on time series an
42 additive decomposition into its *mean*, or *trend*, and *quick fluctuations* around
43 it. Let us emphasize the following points:

- 44 • The probabilistic/statistical nature of those fluctuations does not play any
45 rôle.¹
- 46 • No modeling via difference/differential equations is necessary: it is a
47 *model-free* setting.²
- 48 • Implementation is possible without arduous machine learning and large
49 historical data.

50 A clear-cut definition of volatility is moreover provided. It is inspired by the

¹This fact should be viewed as fortunate since this nature is rather mysterious if real data are involved.

²At least two other wordings, namely “nonparametric” or “data-driven,” instead of “model-free” would have been also possible. The first one however is almost exclusively related to the popular field of *nonparametric statistics* (see, *e.g.*, Härdle *et al.* (2004); Wasserman (2006)), that has been also encountered for photovoltaic systems (see, *e.g.*, Ordiano *et al.* (2016)). The second one has also been recently used, but in a different setting (see, *e.g.*, Ordiano *et al.* (2017)). Let us highlight the numerous accomplishments of *model-free control* (Fliess *et al.* (2013)) in engineering. See for instance renewable energy Bara *et al.* (2017), Jama *et al.* (2015), Join *et al.* (2010), and agricultural greenhouses Lafont *et al.* (2015).

51 *mean absolute error (MAE)* which has been proved already to be more con-
52 venient in climatic and environmental studies than the *root mean square error*
53 (*RMSE*) (Willmott *et al.* (2005)). This fact is to a large extent confirmed by
54 Chai *et al.* (2014) by Section 3.2, which shows that the fluctuations are not
55 Gaussian. See, *e.g.*, (Hyndman (2006)) for further theoretical investigations.
56 *Confidence intervals, i.e.*, a well known notion in statistics (Cox *et al.* (1974);
57 Willink (2013)), do not make much sense since the probabilistic nature of the
58 uncertainty is unknown. We are therefore replacing them by *prediction bands*.³
59 They mimic to some extent the *Bollinger bands* (Bollinger (2001)) from *technical*
60 *analysis, i.e.*, a widespread approach to financial engineering (see, *e.g.*, Béchu
61 *et al.* (2014); Kirkpatrick *et al.* (2010)). To pinpoint the efficiency of our tools,
62 numerical experiments via real data stemming from two sites are presented.

63 Our paper is organized as follows. Time series are the core of Section 2,
64 where algebraic nowcasting and prediction bands are respectively presented in
65 Sections 2.4 and 2.7. The numerical experiments are presented and discussed in
66 Section 3. Considerations on future investigations are presented in Section 4.

67 2. Time series

68 2.1. Nonstandard analysis: A short introduction

69 Robinson (1996) introduced *nonstandard analysis* in the early 60's (see, *e.g.*,
70 Dauben (1995)). It is based on mathematical logic and vindicates Leibniz's
71 ideas on "infinitely small" and "infinitely large" numbers. Its presentation by
72 Nelson (1977) (see also Nelson (1987) and Diener *et al.* (1995, 1989)), where
73 the logical background is less demanding, has become more widely used. As
74 demonstrated by Harthong (1981), Lobry (2008), Lobry *et al.* (2008), and several
75 other authors, nonstandard analysis is a marvelous tool for clarifying in a most
76 intuitive way various questions from applied sciences.

³We might also employ the terminology *confidence bands*. To the best of our knowledge,
it has been already employed elsewhere but with another definitions (see, *e.g.*, Härdle *et al.*
(2004)).

77 2.2. Time series and nonstandard analysis

78 2.2.1. A nonstandard definition of time series

Take a time interval $[0, 1]$. Introduce as often in nonstandard analysis the infinitesimal sampling

$$\mathfrak{T} = \{0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_\nu = 1\} \quad (1)$$

79 where $t_{i+1} - t_i$, $0 \leq i < \nu$, is *infinitesimal*, i.e., “very small.” A time series X
80 is a function $\mathfrak{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

81 **Remark 2.1.** *The normalized time interval $[0, 1]$ is introduced for notational*
82 *simplicity. It will be replaced here by a time lapse from a few minutes to one*
83 *hour. Infinitely small or large numbers should be understood as mathematical*
84 *idealizations. In practice a time lapse of 1 second (resp. hour) should be viewed*
85 *as quite small when compared to 1 hour (resp. month). Nonstandard analysis*
86 *may therefore be applied in concrete situations.*

87 2.2.2. The Cartier-Perrin theorem

The *Lebesgue measure* on \mathfrak{T} is the function ℓ defined on $\mathfrak{T} \setminus \{1\}$ by $\ell(t_i) = t_{i+1} - t_i$. The measure of any interval $[c, d] \subset \mathfrak{T}$, $c \leq d$, is its length $d - c$. The *integral* over $[c, d]$ of the time series $X(t)$ is the sum

$$\int_{[c,d]} X d\tau = \sum_{t \in [c,d]} X(t)\ell(t)$$

88 X is said to be *S-integrable* if, and only if, for any interval $[c, d]$ the integral
89 $\int_{[c,d]} |X| d\tau$ is *limited*, i.e., not infinitely large, and, if $d - c$ is infinitesimal,
90 $\int_{[c,d]} |X| d\tau$ is also infinitesimal.

91 X is *S-continuous* at $t_i \in \mathfrak{T}$ if, and only if, $f(t_i) \simeq f(\tau)$ when $t_i \simeq \tau$.⁴ X is
92 said to be *almost continuous* if, and only if, it is *S-continuous* on $\mathfrak{T} \setminus R$, where
93 R is a *rare* subset.⁵ X is *Lebesgue integrable* if, and only if, it is *S-integrable*
94 and almost continuous.

⁴ $a \simeq b$ means that $a - b$ is infinitesimal.

⁵The set R is said to be *rare* (Cartier *et al.* (1995)) if, for any standard real number $\alpha > 0$, there exists an internal set $A \supset R$ such that $m(A) \leq \alpha$.

95 A time series $\mathcal{X} : \mathfrak{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *quickly fluctuating*, or *oscillating*,
 96 if, and only if, it is S -integrable and $\int_A \mathcal{X} d\tau$ is infinitesimal for any *quadrable*
 97 subset.⁶

Let $X : \mathfrak{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a S -integrable time series. Then, according to the
 Cartier-Perrin theorem (Cartier *et al.* (1995)),⁷ the additive decomposition

$$\boxed{X(t) = E(X)(t) + X_{\text{fluctuat}}(t)} \quad (2)$$

98 holds where

- 99 • $E(X)(t)$, which is called the *mean*, or *trend*,⁸ is Lebesgue integrable;
- 100 • $X_{\text{fluctuat}}(t)$ is quickly fluctuating.

101 The decomposition (2) is unique up to an additive infinitesimal quantity. Let
 102 us stress once again that the above mean is independent of any probabilistic
 103 modeling.⁹

104 2.3. Volatility

105 According to

- 106 • our discussion about mean absolute errors (MAE) in Section 1,
- 107 • the fact, which follows at once from the Cartier-Perrin theorem, that $|X -$
 108 $E(X)|$ is S -integrable,

define the *volatility* $\text{vol}(X)(t)$ of $X(t)$ by

$$\boxed{\text{vol}(X)(t) = E(|X - E(X)|)(t)} \quad (3)$$

109 $E(|X - E(X)|)(t)$ in Equation (3) is nothing else than the mean of $|X(t) -$
 110 $E(X)(t)|$.

⁶A set is *quadrable* Cartier *et al.* (1995) if its boundary is rare.

⁷The presentation in the article by Lobry *et al.* (2008) is less technical. We highly recom-
 mend it. Note that it also includes a fruitful discussion on nonstandard analysis.

⁸“Trend” would be the usual terminology in technical analysis (see, *e.g.*, Béchu *et al.*
 (2014); Kirkpatrick *et al.* (2010). It was therefore used by Fliess *et al.* (2009).

⁹Let us mention that Cartier *et al.* (1995) also introduced the notion of *martingales* (see,
e.g., Williams (1991)) without using any probabilistic tool.

111 *2.4. Forecasting via algebraic estimation techniques*

112 In order to forecast via the above setting, new estimation tools have to be
 113 summarized (see, *e.g.*, Fliess *et al.* (2003, 2008a,b); Mboup *et al.* (2010); Sira-
 114 Ramírez *et al.* (2014)).¹⁰

115 *2.4.1. First calculations*

Start with a polynomial time function

$$p_1(t) = a_0 + a_1 t, \quad t \geq 0, \quad a_0, a_1 \in \mathbb{R},$$

of degree 1. Rewrite thanks to classic operational calculus (see, *e.g.*, Yosida (1984))¹¹ p_1 as

$$P_1 = \frac{a_0}{s} + \frac{a_1}{s^2}$$

Multiply both sides by s^2 :

$$s^2 P_1 = a_0 s + a_1 \tag{4}$$

Take the derivative of both sides with respect to s , which corresponds in the time domain to the multiplication by $-t$:

$$s^2 \frac{dP_1}{ds} + 2s P_1 = a_0 \tag{5}$$

The coefficients a_0, a_1 are obtained via the triangular system of equations (4)-(5). We get rid of the time derivatives, *i.e.*, of sP_1 , $s^2 P_1$, and $s^2 \frac{dP_1}{ds}$, by multiplying both sides of Equations (4)-(5) by s^{-n} , *i.e.*, $n \geq 3$ (resp $n \geq 2$) for Equation (4) (resp. (5)). The corresponding iterated time integrals are *lowpass filters* (see, *e.g.*, Shenoï (2006)): they attenuate the corrupting noises, which are viewed as highly fluctuating phenomena (Fliess (2006)). A quite short time

¹⁰Those techniques have already been successfully employed in engineering. In signal processing, see, *e.g.*, the recent publications by Beltran-Carbajala *et al.* (2017) and Morales *et al.* (2016).

¹¹The computations below are often presented via the classic *Laplace transform* (see, *e.g.*, Doetsch (1976)). Then s is called the *Laplace variable*.

window $[0, t]$ is sufficient for obtaining accurate estimates \hat{a}_0, \hat{a}_1 , of a_0, a_1 , where $n = 2, 3$:

$$\hat{a}_0 = \frac{2}{t^2} \int_0^t (2t - 3\tau)p(\tau)d\tau$$

and

$$\hat{a}_1 = -\frac{6}{t^3} \int_0^t (t - 2\tau)p(\tau)d\tau$$

116 This last formula shows that a derivative estimate is obtained via integrals.
 117 Lanczos (1956) was perhaps the first author to suggest such an approach. In
 118 practice, the above integrals are of course replaced by straightforward *linear*
 119 *digital filters* (see, *e.g.*, Shenoï (2006)).

120 2.5. Back to time series and short-term forecasts

Assume that the following rather weak assumption holds true: the mean $E(X(t))$ may be associated with a differentiable real-valued time function. Then, on a short time lapse, $E(X(t))$ is well approximated by a polynomial function of degree 1. The above calculations yield via sliding time windows numerical estimates $E(X)_{\text{estim}}(t)$ and $\frac{d}{dt}E(X)_{\text{estim}}(t)$ of the mean and its derivative. Causality is taken into account via backward calculations with respect to time. As in (Fliess *et al.* (2009, 2011)), forecasting the time series $X(t)$ boils down to an extrapolation of its mean $E(X)(t)$. If $T > 0$ is not ‘too large,’ *i.e.*, a few minutes in our context, a first order Taylor expansion yields the following extrapolation for prediction at time $t + T$

$$\boxed{X_{\text{predict}}(t + T) = E(X)_{\text{estim}}(t) + \left(\frac{d}{dt}E(X)_{\text{estim}}(t) \right) \times T} \quad (6)$$

121 2.6. Forecasting for a larger time horizon

122 With forecasts for a time horizon equal to 1 hour, Equation (6) would provide
 123 poor results. *Seasonalities*, *i.e.*, a more or less periodic pattern, which is classic
 124 in time series analysis (see, *e.g.*, Brockwell *et al.* (1991); M elard (2008)) will
 125 be used here. A single day is an obvious season with respect to photovoltaic
 126 energy. Figures 7, 10 show that the corresponding pattern may be reasonably
 127 well approximated by a parabola $D(t) = \alpha_2 t^2 + \alpha_1 t + \alpha_0$. Standard least

128 square techniques permit to obtain such a suitable parabola, that is the set
 129 of parameters $\{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$, only with the data collected during a single day.
 130 Replace Equation (6) by

$$\boxed{X_{\text{predict}}(t+T) = E(X)_{\text{estim}}(t) + \left(\dot{D}(t-1.\text{day})\right) \times T} \quad (7)$$

131 where

- 132 • $T > 0$ is the time horizon, here between 30 minutes and 1 hour;
- 133 • $D(t-1.\text{day})$ is estimated via the data from the day before;
- 134 • $\dot{D}(t-1.\text{day})$ is its derivative.

135 This formula is useful since the parabola is erasing the bumps and the hollows
 136 on the trend. Taking derivatives around such bumps and holes leads obviously
 137 to a wrong forecasting for a larger time horizon.

138 2.7. Prediction bands

Equation (3) yields the prediction $\text{Vol}_{\text{predict}}(X)(t+T)$ of the volatility at
 time $t+T$ via the following persistence law (Lauret *et al.* (2015)):

$$\text{Vol}_{\text{predict}}(X)(t+T) = \text{Vol}(X)(t) = E(|X - E(X)|)(t) \quad (8)$$

Define via Equation (8) the first *prediction band*

$$\boxed{\begin{aligned} \underline{\text{CB}}_1(t+T) &= X_{\text{predict}}(t+T) - \text{Vol}_{\text{predict}}(X)(t+T) \\ &\leq \text{CB}_1(t+T) \leq \\ X_{\text{predict}}(t+T) + \text{Vol}_{\text{predict}}(X)(t+T) &= \overline{\text{CB}}_1(t+T) \end{aligned}} \quad (9)$$

In order to improve it, set

$$\boxed{\begin{aligned} \underline{\text{CB}}_2(t+T) &= X_{\text{predict}}(t+T) - \alpha_{t+T} \text{Vol}_{\text{predict}}(X)(t+T) \\ &\leq \text{CB}_2(t+T) \leq \\ X_{\text{predict}}(t+T) + \alpha_{t+T} \text{Vol}_{\text{predict}}(X)(t+T) &= \overline{\text{CB}}_2(t+T) \end{aligned}} \quad (10)$$

139 where the coefficient $\alpha_{t+T} > 0$ may be chosen in various ways. If, for instance,
 140 $\alpha_{t+T} = 1$, we are back to Equation (9). Here we select α_{t+T} such that the band
 141 (10) contains during the 3 previous days 68% of the available data.¹²

Taking into account the global and diffuse radiations under clear sky will obviously improve the above band (10). Note that clear sky models played already some rôle in solar irradiation and irradiance forecasting via time series (see, *e.g.*, Cros *et al.* (2013); Inman *et al.* (2013)). This is achieved here by using the quite famous *solis* model (Mueller *et al.* (2004); Ineichen (2008)). The clear sky global horizontal irradiance $I_{g,clsk}$ reaching the ground and the clear sky beam radiation $I_{b,clsk}$ are defined by (Ineichen (2008)):

$$I_{g,clsk} = I_0 \exp\left(-\frac{\tau_g}{(\sin h)^g}\right) \sin h \quad (11)$$

$$I_{b,clsk} = I_0 \exp\left(-\frac{\tau_b}{(\sin h)^b}\right) \quad (12)$$

142 where

- 143 • I_0 is the extraterrestrial radiation (depending of the day of the year),
- 144 • h is the solar elevation (depending of the hour of the day),
- 145 • τ_g and τ_b are respectively the global and beam total atmospheric optical
 146 depths,
- 147 • g and b are fitting parameters.

Diffuse radiation $I_{d,clsk}$ is defined by

$$I_{d,clsk} = I_{g,clsk} - I_{b,clsk}$$

¹²The quantity 68% is obviously inspired by the theory confidence intervals with respect to Gaussian probability distributions.

It yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 \underline{\text{CB}}_3(t+T) &= \max(I_{d,clsk}(t), X_{\text{predict}}(t+T) - \alpha_{t+T} \text{Vol}_{\text{predict}}(X)(t+T)) \\
 &\leq \text{CB}_3(t+T) \leq \\
 \overline{\text{CB}}_3(t+T) &= \min(1.1 \times I_{g,clsk}(t), X_{\text{predict}}(t+T) + \alpha_{t+T} \text{Vol}_{\text{predict}}(X)(t+T)) = \overline{\text{CB}}_3(t+T)
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{13}$$

148 where $\min(\square(t), \triangle(t))$ and $\max(\square(t), \triangle(t))$ are respectively the minimum and
 149 maximum values of the arguments $\square(t)$ and $\triangle(t)$ at time t .

150 The safety margin corresponding to the multiplicative factor 1.1 takes into
 151 account a modeling error on $I_{g,clsk}$ (Ineichen (2008)), whereas $I_{d,clsk}$ does not
 152 necessitate such a correction (Ineichen (2008)).

153 3. Computer experiments via real data

154 Three time horizons are considered: 1, 15 and 60 minutes. The following
 155 points should be added:

- 156 • no exogenous variable,
- 157 • no need of large historical data,
- 158 • unsupervised method.

159 3.1. Data

160 The full year data were collected from two sites in 2013 by means of CMP11
 161 pyranometer (Kipp & Zonen):

- 162 • Nancy in the East of France. It has usually a relatively narrow annual
 163 temperature range.
- 164 • Ajaccio in Corsica, a French island in the Mediterranean sea. This coastal
 165 town has hot and sunny summers and mild winters.




Figure 1: Global irradiation profile for the two sites in February

166 The time granularity of our solar irradiance measurements is 1 minute. Missing
 167 values for the sites are less than 2%.¹³ See Figures 1 and 2 for excerpts. The
 168 numerical values of the parameters in Equations (11) and (12), are:¹⁴

- 169 • Nancy: $\tau_g = 0.49, g = 0.39, \tau_b = 0.66, b = 0.51$;
- 170 • Ajaccio: $\tau_g = 0.43, g = 0.33, \tau_b = 0.64, b = 0.51$.

171 3.2. Normality tests

172 To better justify our definitions of volatility in Section 2.3 and of prediction
 173 bands in Section 2.7, we show that, if the fluctuations around the trends are
 174 viewed as random variables, they are not Gaussian. Three classic tests (see,
 175 *e.g.*, Jarque *et al.* (1987); Judge *et al.* (1988); Thode (2002)) are used:

- 176 • Jarque-Bera,
- 177 • Kolmogorov-Smirnov,

¹³The data are cleaned as in David *et al.* (2016).

¹⁴See, *e.g.*, the WEB site of AERONET Data Synergy Tool.




Figure 2: Global irradiation profile for the two sites in June

178 • Lilliefors.

179 Figures 3, 4, 5 and 6 show most clearly that the Gaussian property is not sat-
 180 isfied.

181

182 3.3. Presentation of some results

183 Figures 1 and 2 present global irradiation during 1 month. Figure 1 displays
 184 an irregular radiation behavior during winter. As shown by Figure 1-(a) this
 185 is especially true for Nancy. During summer, Figure 2, exhibits a nice daily
 186 seasonality even if some deteriorations show up for Nancy.

187 The red line in Figures 7, 8, 10, 11 on the one hand, and in Figures 9, 12 on the
 188 other hand, show the forecasts according respectively to Equations (6) and (7).

189

190 **Remark 3.1.** We follow a common practice by removing night hours, i.e.,
 191 hours where the solar elevation h in Equations (11)-(12) is less than 10 de-
 192 grees.




Figure 3: Nancy, February : Signal distribution (blue) and the Gaussian distribution (red)




Figure 4: Nancy, June : Signal distribution (blue) and the Gaussian distribution (red)




Figure 5: Ajaccio, February : Signal distribution (blue) and the Gaussian distribution (red)




Figure 6: Ajaccio, June : Signal distribution (blue) and the Gaussian distribution (red)

193 The prediction bands defined in Section 2.7 are also displayed in the previous
 194 figures. Note the following points:

- 195 1. by construction, CB_2 yields larger bands than CB_1 ,
- 196 2. the mean interval length is reduced with CB_3 ,
- 197 3. the widths of the bands increase with the time horizon,
- 198 4. Daily profiles, Figures 7, 8, 9 on the one hand, and 10, 11, 12 on the other
 199 hand demonstrate that forecasts are better in June than in February.

200 In order to quantify comparisons, introduce the following quantities:

- The *Mean Interval Length*, or *MIL* stems from the Mean Relative Error (MRL) (Rana *et al.* (2015, 2016); Scolari *et al.* (2016)). It is given by

$$MIL_i = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N BW_i(t_k)}{\sum_{k=1}^N X(t_k)} \quad i = 1, 2, 3$$

201 where

- 202 – N is the number of measurements,
- 203 – $BW_i = \overline{CB_i}(t_k + T) - \underline{CB_i}(t_k + T) \geq 0$, is the band width,
- 204 – $X(t_k) \geq 0$ the irradiance measurement.

- The *Prediction Interval Coverage Probability*, or *PICP*, (Rana *et al.* (2015, 2016); Scolari *et al.* (2016)) is defined by

$$PICP_i = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^M c_k}{M} \quad i = 1, 2, 3$$

205 where

- 206 – M is the number of predictions,
- 207 – $c_k = 1$ if the prediction is inside the bands, *i.e.*, $\underline{CB}_i(t_k + T) \leq$
208 $X(t_k + T) \leq \overline{CB}_i(t_k + T)$,
- 209 – $c_k = 0$ otherwise.

210 A quite large MIL_i with a $PICP_i$ close to 1 is inefficient for grid management.
211 Our objective is a large $PICP_i$ and a low MIL_i . Consequently, a compromise is
212 required. Figures 13, 14, 15 and 16 present MIL_i vs $PICP_i$ for all forecasting
213 horizons.

214 On these Figures, four areas characterise the CB qualities. Thus, if a bound
215 is in the “good” area, the result is more interesting than in the “bad” and even
216 more than in the “very bad” areas but less interesting than in the “very good”
217 zone. According to the clear sky concept and to the ad-hoc computing method-
218 ologies Mueller *et al.* (2004); Ineichen (2008), the measured global irradiance is
219 between the computed irradiance under clear sky and under totally cloudy sky.
220 So 100% of the predictions, *i.e.*, $PICP_i = 1$, should be included between the
221 bounds defined by the global radiation $I_{g,clsk}$ and the diffuse radiation $I_{d,clsk}$.
222 Uncertainties and Solis modeling errors explain why it is not always the case.

223 The space is divided in four zones. The blue line is the vertical limit. It
224 corresponds to a $PICP$ of 0.5: it means that 50% of predictions are in the band.
225 The green line is the horizontal limit. It defines the limit of relevance: all the
226 intervals with a $MIL > 1$ are not really interesting since the bands are too
227 large. For case 1 (CB_1) and 2 (CB_2), we find coherent results because the
228 $PICP$ are respectively close to 70% and 50%. Regarding case 2, the MIL is
229 too important. Regarding case 3 (CB_3), the best compromise between low MIL
230 and high $PICP$ is obtained thanks to the clear sky model.

231 3.4. Some preliminary comments on comparisons

232 Comparing our results with the huge set of numerical calculations in the
233 whole academic literature is obviously beyond the reach of a single journal pub-




Figure 7: Nancy, February, 5min forecasting: irradiance (blue), its prediction (red) and prediction band (black - -)




Figure 8: Nancy, February, 15min forecasting: irradiance (blue), its prediction (red) and prediction band (black - -)




Figure 9: Nancy, February, 60min forecasting: irradiance (blue), its prediction (red) and prediction band (black - -)




Figure 10: Nancy, June, 5min forecasting: irradiance (blue), its prediction (red) and prediction band (black - -)




Figure 11: Nancy, June, 15min forecasting: irradiance (blue), its prediction (red) and prediction band (black - -)




Figure 12: Nancy, June, 60min forecasting: irradiance (blue), its prediction (red) and prediction band (black - -)




Figure 13: Nancy, February: Performance evaluation




Figure 14: Nancy, June: Performance evaluation




Figure 15: Ajaccio, February: Performance evaluation




Figure 16: Ajaccio, June: Performance evaluation

234 lication. Let us nevertheless summarize the observations in Join *et al.* (2014);
235 Voyant *et al.* (2015) on short-term forecasting with respect to *artificial neural*
236 *networks*:

- 237 1. the performances of the “algebraic” setting, that is presented here, are
238 perhaps slightly better than those via neural nets. For the irradiance
239 (resp. irradiation), the mean absolute error (MAE) between the forecasts
240 and the true values is 26.6% (resp. 23.9%) *vs* 35.44% (resp. 22.36%).
- 241 2. When looking at big data and machine learning, the behavior of the al-
242 gebraic setting looks much better. Neural nets need data during 3 years
243 whereas the algebraic viewpoint only 1 day.

244 With respect, for instance, to Grantham *et al.* (2016); David *et al.* (2016); Trap-
245 ero (2016), note that time-consuming and cumbersome calibrations to obtain
246 a convincing probability law, a time series modeling via a difference equation,
247 and a suitable *autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity (ARCH)* or *gener-*
248 *alized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity (GARCH)*¹⁵ become quite
249 irrelevant.

250 4. Conclusion

251 The positive results obtained in this paper ought of course to be verified
252 by considering more diverse situations and by launching more thorough com-
253 parisons than in Section 3.4. For future researches, let us emphasize the two
254 following directions:

- 255 • The possibility of extending our techniques to larger time horizons is an-
256 other key point.
- 257 • Asymmetric prediction bands might be useful in practice for energy man-
258 agement.

¹⁵The popular concepts of ARCH and GARCH were respectively introduced by Engle (1982) and Bollerslev (1986). Everyone should read the harsh comments by Mandelbrot *et al.* (2004).

259 • Is the causality analysis by Fliess *et al.* (2015a) useful to improve our fore-
260 casting techniques if other facts are taken into account (see, *e.g.*, Badosa
261 *et al.* (2015))?

262 The concrete implementation of our approach should be rather straightforward.
263 Finally, if our standpoint encounters some success, the probabilistic techniques
264 (see, *e.g.*, Appino *et al.* (2018); Gneiting *et al.* (2014); Hong *et al.* (2016); Lauret
265 *et al.* (2017)), which are a today mainstay in all the fields of energy forecasting,
266 price included, might become clearly less central.

267 **Acknowledgements.** The authors thank warmly the anonymous reviewers for
268 their most helpful comments.

269 **References**

- 270 Antonanzas, J., Osorio, N., Escobar, R., Urraca, R., Martinez-de-Pison, F.J.,
271 Antonanzas-Torres, F., 2016. Review of photovoltaic power forecasting. *Solar*
272 *Ener.* 136, 78–111.
- 273 Appino, R.R., Ordiano, J.Á.G., Mikut, R., Faulwasser, T., Hagenmeyer, V.,
274 2018. On the use of probabilistic forecasts in scheduling of renewable energy
275 sources coupled to storages. *Appl. Ener.* 210, 1207–1218.
- 276 Bacher, P., Madsen, H., Nielsen, H.A., 2009. Online short-term solar power
277 forecasting. *Solar Ener.* 83, 1772-1783.
- 278 Badosa, J., Haeffelin, M., Kalecinski, N., Bonnardot, F., Jumaux, G., 2015. Re-
279 liability of day-ahead solar irradiance forecasts on Reunion Island depending
280 on synoptic wind and humidity conditions. *Solar Ener.* 115, 315-321.
- 281 Bara, O., Olama, M., Djouadi, S., Kuruganti, T., Fliess, M., Join, C., 2017.
282 Model-free load control for high penetration of solar photovoltaic generation.
283 49th North Amer. Power Symp., Morgantown.

- 284 Behrang, M.A., Assareh, E., Ghanbarzadeh, A., Noghrehabadi, A.R., 2010.
285 The potential of different artificial neural network (ANN) techniques in daily
286 global solar radiation modeling based on meteorological data, *Solar Ener.* 84,
287 1468–1480.
- 288 Béchou , T., Bertrand, É., Nebenzahl, J., 2014. *L'analyse technique (7^e éd.)*.
289 *Economica*.
- 290 Beltran-Carbajala, F., Silva-Navarro, G., 2017. A fast parametric estimation
291 approach of signals with multiple frequency harmonics, *Elec. Power Syst.*
292 *Res.* 144, 157–162.
- 293 Boland, J., 1997. Time series analysis of climatic variables. *Solar Ener.* 55,
294 377–388.
- 295 Boland, J., 2008. Time series modelling of solar radiation. In Badescu, V. (Ed.):
296 *Modeling Solar Radiation at the Earth's Surface: Recent Advances*, Springer,
297 283–326.
- 298 Boland, J., 2015a. Spatial-temporal forecasting of solar radiation. *Renew. Ener.*
299 75, 607–616.
- 300 Boland, J., 2015b. Additive versus multiplicative seasonality in solar radiation
301 time series. *21st Int. Congr. Model. Simu., Gold Coast*.
- 302 Bollerslev, T., 1986. Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity,
303 *J. Economet.* 31, 307–327.
- 304 Bollinger, J., 2001. *Bollinger on Bollinger Bands*. McGraw-Hill.
- 305 Brockwell, P.J., Davis, R.A., 1995. *Time Series: Theory and Methods*, (2nd
306 ed.). Springer.
- 307 Cartier, P., Perrin, Y., 1995. Integration over finite sets, in F. & M. Diener,
308 Eds: *Nonstandard Analysis in Practice*, Springer, 195–204.

- 309 Chai, T., Draxler, R.R., 2014. Root mean square error (RMSE) or mean absolute
310 error (MAE)? – Arguments against avoiding RMSE in the literature. *Geosci.*
311 *Model Dev.* 7, 1247–1250.
- 312 Cox, D.R., Hinkley, D.V., 1974. *Theoretical Statistics*. Chapman & Hall.
- 313 Cros, S., Liandrat, O., Sébastien, N., Schmutz, N., Voyant, C., 2013. Clear
314 sky models assessment for an operational PV production forecasting solution.
315 28th Europ. Photovolt. Solar Energy Conf. Exhib., Villepinte.
- 316 Dauben, J.W., 1995. *Abraham Robinson – Nonstandard Analysis: A Personal*
317 *and Mathematical Odyssey*. Princeton University Press.
- 318 David, M., Ramahatana, F., Trombe, P.J., Lauret, P., 2016. Probabilistic fore-
319 casting of the solar irradiance with recursive ARMA and GARCH models.
320 *Solar Ener.* 133, 55–72.
- 321 Diagne, M., David, M., Lauret, P., Boland, J., Schmutz, N., 2013. Review of
322 solar irradiance forecasting methods and a proposition for small-scale insular
323 grids. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* 27, 65–76.
- 324 Diener, F., Diener, M., 2013. Tutorial. In F. & M. Diener (Eds): *Nonstandard*
325 *Analysis in Practice*, Springer, 1–21.
- 326 Diener, F., Reeb, G., 1989. *Analyse non standard*, Hermann.
- 327 Doetsch, G., 1976. *Einführung in Theorie und Anwendung der Laplace-*
328 *Transformation (3. Auflage)*, Springer.
- 329 Duchon, C., Hale, R., 2012. *Time Series Analysis in Meteorology and Clima-*
330 *tology: An Introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- 331 Engle, R.F., 1982. Autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity with estimates
332 of the variance of United Kingdom Inflation. *Econometrica* 50, 987–1007.
- 333 Fliess, M., 2006. Analyse non standard du bruit. *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris* 342,
334 797–802.

- 335 Fliess, M., Join, C., 2009. A mathematical proof of the existence of trends in
336 financial time series. In A. El Jai, L. Afifi, E. Zerrik (Eds): Systems Theory:
337 Modeling, Analysis and Control, Presses Universitaires de Perpignan, 43–62.
- 338 Fliess, M., Join, C., 2013. Model-free control, *Int. J. Contr.* 86, 2228–2252.
- 339 Fliess, M., Join, C., 2015a. Towards a new viewpoint on causality for time
340 series. *ESAIM ProcS* 49, 37–52.
- 341 Fliess, M., Join, C., 2015b. Seasonalities and cycles in time series: A fresh look
342 with computer experiments. *Paris Finan. Manag. Conf.*, Paris.
- 343 Fliess, M., Join, C., Hatt, F., 2011. A-t-on vraiment besoin d’un modèle prob-
344 abiliste en ingénierie financière ? *Conf. Médit. Ingén. Sûre Syst. Compl.*,
345 Agadir.
- 346 Fliess, M., Join, C., Sira-Ramírez, H., 2008a. Non-linear estimation is easy. *Int.*
347 *J. Model. Identif. Contr.* 4, 12-27.
- 348 Fliess, M., Sira-Ramírez, H., 2003. An algebraic framework for linear identifi-
349 cation. *ESAIM Contr. Optimiz. Calc. Variat.* 9, 151–168.
- 350 Fliess, M., Sira-Ramírez, H., 2008b. Closed-loop parametric identification for
351 continuous-time linear systems via new algebraic techniques. H. Garnier & L.
352 Wang (Eds): *Identification of Continuous-time Models from Sampled Data*,
353 Springer, 362–391.
- 354 Fortuna, L., Nunnari, G., Nunnari, S., 2016. *Nonlinear Modeling of Solar Ra-
355 diation and Wind Speed Time Series*. Springer.
- 356 Gneiting, T., Katzfuss, M., 2014. Probabilistic forecasting. *Ann. Rev. Stat.*
357 *Appl.* 1, 125–151.
- 358 Goldstein, D.G., Taleb, N.N., 2007. We don’t quite know what we are talking
359 about when we talk about volatility. *J. Portfolio Manage.* 33, 84–86.

- 360 Grantham, A., Gel, Y.R., Boland, J., 2016. Nonparametric short-term proba-
361 bilistic forecasting for solar radiation. *Solar Ener.* 133, 465–475.
- 362 Hagenmeyer, V., Çakmak, H.K., Döpmeier, C., Faulwasser, T., Isele, J., Keller,
363 H.B., Kohlhepp, P., Kühnapfel, U., Stucky, U., Waczowicz, S., Mikut, R.,
364 2016. Information and communication technology in energy lab 2.0: Smart
365 energies system simulation and control center with an open-street-map-based
366 power flow simulation example. *Energy Technol.* 4, 145-162.
- 367 Härdle, W., Müller, M., Sperlich, S., Werwatz, A., 2004. Nonparametric and
368 Semiparametric Models. Springer.
- 369 Harthong, J., 1981. Le moiré. *Adv. Appl. Math.* 2, 21–75.
- 370 Hirata, Y., Aihara, K., 2017. Improving time series prediction of solar irradiance
371 after sunrise: Comparison among three methods for time series prediction.
372 *Solar Ener.* 149, 294–301.
- 373 Hong, T., Pinson, P., Fan, S., Zareipour, H., Troccoli, A., Hyndman, R. J.,
374 2016. Probabilistic energy forecasting: Global energy forecasting competition
375 2014 and beyond. *Int. J. Forecast.* 32, 896-913.
- 376 Hyndman, R.J., 2006. Another look at forecast accuracy metrics for intermittent
377 demand. *Int. J. Applied Forecast.*, 4, 43–46.
- 378 Ineichen, P., 2008. A broadband simplified version of the Solis clear sky model.
379 *Solar Ener.* 82, 758–762.
- 380 Inman, R.H., Pedro, H.T.C., Coimbra, C.F.M., 2013. Solar forecasting methods
381 for renewable energy integration. *Progr. Ener. Combust. Sci.* 47, 2479–2490.
- 382 Jama, M.A., Noura, H., Wahyudie, A., Assi, A, 2015. Enhancing the perfor-
383 mance of heaving wave energy converters using model-free control approach.
384 *Renew. Energy* 83, 931–941.
- 385 Jarque, C.M., Bera, A.K., 1987. A test for normality of observations and re-
386 gression residuals. *Int. Stat. Rev.* 55, 163-172.

- 387 Join, C., Voyant, C., Fliess, M., Muselli, M., Nivet, M.-L., Paoli, C., Chaxel,
388 F., 2014. Short-term solar irradiance and irradiation forecasts via different
389 time series techniques: A preliminary study. 3rd Int. Symp. Environ. Friendly
390 Energy Appl., Paris.
- 391 Join, C., Fliess, M., Voyant, C., Chaxel, F., 2016. Solar energy production:
392 Short-term forecasting and risk management. 8th IFAC Conf. Manufact.
393 Model. Manage. Contr., Troyes.
- 394 Join, C., Robert, G., Fliess, M., 2016. Vers une commande sans modèle pour
395 aménagements hydroélectriques en cascade. 6^e Conf. Internat. Francoph. Au-
396 tomat., Nancy.
- 397 Judge, G.G., Griffiths, W.E., Hill, R.C., Lütkepohl, H., Lee, T.-C., 1988. Intro-
398 duction to the Theory and Practice of Econometrics (2nd ed.), Wiley.
- 399 Kirkpatrick II, C.D., Dahlquist, J.A., 2010. Technical Analysis: The Complete
400 Resource for Financial Market Technicians (2nd ed.). FT Press.
- 401 Lafont, F., Balmat, J.-F., Pessel, N., Fliess, M., 2015. A model-free control
402 strategy for an experimental greenhouse with an application to fault accom-
403 modation. *Comput. Electron. Agricult.* 110, 139–149.
- 404 Lanczos, C., 1956. *Applied Analysis*. Prentice Hall.
- 405 Lauret, P., David M., Pedro H.T.C., 2017. Probabilistic solar forecasting using
406 quantile regression models. *Energies* 10, 1591, doi:10.3390/en10101591
- 407 Lauret, P., Voyant, C., Soubdhan, T., David, M., Poggi, P., 2015. A bench-
408 marking of machine learning techniques for solar radiation forecasting in an
409 insular context. *Solar Ener.* 112, 446–457.
- 410 Lobry, C., 2008. La méthode des élucidations successives. *ARIMA* 9, 171–193.
- 411 Lobry, C., Sari, T., 2008. Nonstandard analysis and representation of reality.
412 *Int. J. Contr.* 39, 535–576.

- 413 Lynch, P., 2008. The origins of computer weather prediction and climate mod-
414 eling. *J. Comput. Phys.* 227, 3431–3444.
- 415 Mandelbrot, N., Hudson, R.L., 2004. *The (Mis)Behavior of Markets: A Fractal*
416 *View of Risk, Ruin, and Reward.* Basic Books.
- 417 Martín, L., Zarzalejo, L.F., Polo, J., Navarro, A., Marchante, R., Cony, M.,
418 2010. Prediction of global solar irradiance based on time series analysis:
419 Application to solar thermal power plants energy production planning. *Solar*
420 *Ener.* 84, 1772–1781.
- 421 Mboup, M., Join, C., Fliess, M., 2009. Numerical differentiation with annihilators
422 in noisy environment. *Numer. Algor.* 50, 439–467.
- 423 Mélard, G., 2009. *Méthodes de prévision à court terme.* Ellipses – Presses
424 Universitaires de Bruxelles.
- 425 Morales, R., Segura, E., Somolinos, J.A., Núñez, L.R., Sira-Ramírez, H., 2016.
426 Online signal filtering based on the algebraic method and its experimental
427 validation. *Mechan. Syst. Signal Process.* 66-67, 374–387.
- 428 Mueller, R.W., Dagestad, K.F., Ineichen, P., Schroedter-Homscheidt, M., Cros,
429 S., Dumortier, D., Kuhlemann, R., Olseth, J.A., Piernavieja, G., Reise, C.,
430 Wald, L., Heinemann, D., 2004. Rethinking satellite-based solar irradiance
431 modelling: The SOLIS clear-sky module. *Remote Sensing Environm.* 91,
432 160–174.
- 433 Nelson, E., 1977. Internal set theory. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 83, 1165–1198.
- 434 Nelson, E., 1987. *Radically Elementary Probability Theory.* Princeton Univer-
435 sity Press.
- 436 Ordiano, J.À.G., Doneit, W., Waczowicz, S., Gröll, L., Mikut, R., Hagenmeyer,
437 V., 2016. Nearest-neighbor based non-parametric probabilistic forecasting
438 with applications in photovoltaic systems. *Proc. 26. Workshop Comput. Intel.,*
439 *Dortmund.*

- 440 Ordiano, J.À.G., Waczowicz, S., Reischl, M., Mikut, R., Hagenmeyer, V.,
441 2017. Photovoltaic power forecasting using simple data-driven models without
442 weather data. *Comput. Sci. Res. Develop.* 32, 237–246.
- 443 Paoli, C., Voyant, C., Muselli, M., Nivet, M.-L., 2010. Forecasting of prepro-
444 cessed daily solar radiation time series using neural networks. *Solar Ener.* 84
445 2146–2160.
- 446 Prema, J.L., Rao, K.U., 2015. Development of statistical time series models for
447 solar power prediction. *Renew. Ener.* 83, 100–109.
- 448 Rana, M., Koprinska, I., Agelidis, V.G., 2015. 2D-interval forecasts for solar
449 power production. *Solar Ener.* 122, 191–203.
- 450 Rana, M., Koprinska, I., 2016. Neural Network Ensemble Based Approach for
451 2D-Interval Prediction of Solar Photovoltaic Power. *Energies* 9, 829–846.
- 452 Reikard, G., 2009. Predicting solar radiation at high resolutions: A comparison
453 of time series forecasts. *Solar Ener.*, 83, 342–349.
- 454 Robinson, A., 1996. *Non-standard Analysis* (revised ed.). Princeton University
455 Press.
- 456 Scolari, E., Torregrossa, D., Le Boudec, J.-Y., Paolone, M., 2016. Ultra-short-
457 term prediction intervals of photovoltaic AC active power. *Int. Conf. Proba.*
458 *Meth. Appl. Power Syst.*, Beijing.
- 459 Sheno, B.A., 2006. *Introduction to Digital Signal Processing and Filter Design*,
460 Wiley.
- 461 Sira-Ramírez, H., García-Rodríguez, C., Cortès-Romero, J., Luviano-Juárez, A.,
462 2013. *Algebraic Identification and Estimation Methods in Feedback Control*
463 *Systems*, Wiley.
- 464 Thode, H.C., 2002. *Testing for Normality*, Marcel Dekker.

- 465 Trapero, J.R., 2016. Calculation of solar irradiation prediction intervals com-
466 bining volatility and kernel density estimates. *Energy* 114, 266–274.
- 467 Trapero, J.R., Kourentzes, N., Martin, A., 2015. Short-term solar irradiation
468 forecasting based on Dynamic Harmonic Regression. *Energy* 84, 289–295.
- 469 Voyant, C., Join, C., Fliess, M., Nivet M.-L., Muselli, M., Paoli, C., 2015. On
470 meteorological forecasts for energy management and large historical data: A
471 first look. *Renewable Energy Power Qualit. J.* 13, ISSN 2172-038 X
- 472 Voyant, C., Muselli, M., Paoli, C., Nivet, M.-L., 2011. Optimization of an
473 artificial neural network dedicated to the multivariate forecasting of daily
474 global radiation. *Energy* 36, 348–359.
- 475 Voyant, C., Paoli, C., Muselli, M., Nivet, M.-L., 2013. Multi-horizon solar
476 radiation forecasting for Mediterranean locations using time series models.
477 *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* 28, 44–52.
- 478 Voyant, C., Soubdhan, T., Lauret, P., David, M., Muselli, M., 2015. Statistical
479 parameters as a means to a priori assess the accuracy of solar forecasting
480 models. *Energy* 90, 671–679.
- 481 Wasserman, L., 2006. *All of Nonparametric Statistics*. Springer.
- 482 Williams, D., 1991. *Probability with Martingales*. Cambridge University Press.
- 483 Willink, R., 2013. *Measurement Uncertainty and Probability*. Cambridge Uni-
484 versity Press.
- 485 Wilmott, P., 2006. *Paul Wilmott on Quantitative Finance*, 3 vol. (2nd ed.). .
- 486 Willmott, C.J., Matsuura, K., 2005. Advantages of the mean absolute error
487 (MAE) over the root mean square error (RMSE) in assessing average model
488 performance. *Climate Res.* 30, 79–82.
- 489 Wu, J., Chan, C.K., 2011. Prediction of hourly solar radiation using a novel
490 hybrid model of ARMA and TDNN. *Solar Ener.* 85, 111–119.

- 491 Yang, D., Sharma, V., Ye, Z., Lim, L.I., Zhao, L., Aryaputer, A.W., 2015.
492 Forecasting of global horizontal irradiance by exponential smoothing, using
493 decompositions. *Energy* 85, 808–817.
- 494 Yosida, K., 1984. *Operational Calculus* (translated from the Japanese).
495 Springer.
- 496 Zhang, J., Florita, A., Hodge, B.-M., Lu, S., Banunarayanan, V., Brockway,
497 A.M., 2015. A suite of metrics for assessing the performance of solar power
498 forecasting. *Solar Ener.* 111, 157–175.