



IEEE
JOURNAL
OF
PHOTOVOLTAICS

4
JAN-MAY
2014
1-3

TK 1087
.I335
Set 1

IEEE JOURNAL OF PHOTOVOLTAICS

A PUBLICATION OF THE IEEE ELECTRON DEVICES SOCIETY,
THE IEEE INDUSTRIAL ELECTRONICS SOCIETY, THE IEEE NANOTECHNOLOGY COUNCIL,
THE IEEE PHOTONICS SOCIETY, THE IEEE POWER & ENERGY SOCIETY,
THE IEEE POWER ELECTRONICS SOCIETY, AND THE IEEE RELIABILITY SOCIETY

JANUARY 2014

VOLUME 4

NUMBER 1

IJPEGB

(ISSN 2156-3381)

PAPERS

Amorphous, Nanostructured, and Film Si PV

- Structural Order and Staebler–Wronski Effect in Hydrogenated Amorphous Silicon Films and Solar Cells..... *F. Köhler, T. Zimmermann, S. Muthmann, A. Gordijn, and R. Carius* 4
- Implications of TCO Topography on Intermediate Reflector Design for a-Si/ μ c-Si Tandem Solar Cells—Experiments and Rigorous Optical Simulations..... *S. Kirner, M. Hammerschmidt, C. Schwanke, D. Lockau, S. Calnan, T. Frijnts, S. Neubert, A. Schöpke, F. Schmidt, J.-H. Zollondz, A. Heidelberg, B. Stannowski, B. Rech, and R. Schlatmann* 10
- Light-Trapping and Interface Morphologies of Amorphous Silicon Solar Cells on Multiscale Surface Textured Substrates..... *A. Tamang, A. Hongsingthong, P. Sichanugrist, V. Jovanov, M. Konagai, and D. Knipp* 16
- Optical and Electrical Simulation of μ c-Si:H Solar Cells: Effect of Substrate Morphology and Crystalline Fraction..... *D. Y. Kim, R. A. C. M. M. van Swaaij, and M. Zeman* 22
- Silicon Nanowire Solar Cells With Radial p-n Heterojunction on Crystalline Silicon Thin Films: Light Trapping Properties..... *G. Jia, A. Gawlik, J. Bergmann, B. Eisenhawer, S. Schönherr, G. Andrä, and F. Falk* 28

Crystalline Silicon PV

- Progress in Laser-Crystallized Thin-Film Polycrystalline Silicon Solar Cells: Intermediate Layers, Light Trapping, and Metallization..... *J. Dore, D. Ong, S. Varlamov, R. Egan, and M. A. Green* 33
- Local Shunting in Multicrystalline Silicon Solar Cells: Distributed Electrical Simulations and Experiments..... *D. Giaffreda, P. Magnone, M. Meneghini, M. Barbato, G. Meneghesso, E. Zanoni, E. Sangiorgi, and C. Fiegna* 40
- Fully Ion Implanted and Coactivated Industrial n-Type Cells With 20.5% Efficiency..... *T. S. Böske, D. Kania, C. Schöllhorn, D. Stichtenoth, A. Helbig, P. Sadler, M. Braun, M. Dupke, M. Weiß, A. Grohe, J. Lossen, and H.-J. Krokoszinski* 48
- Application of ion Implantation Emitter in PERC Solar Cells..... *J. Wu, Y. Liu, X. Wang, and L. Zhang* 52
- Fully Ion-Implanted and Screen-Printed 20.2% Efficient Front Junction Silicon Cells on 239 cm² n-Type CZ Substrate..... *Y. Tao, Y.-W. Ok, F. Zimbardi, A. D. Upadhyaya, J.-H. Lai, S. Ning, V. D. Upadhyaya, and A. Rohatgi* 58
- Effect of Boron Codoping and Phosphorus Concentration on Phosphorus Diffusion Gettering..... *S. P. Phang and D. Macdonald* 64
- Improving the Quality of Epitaxial Foils Produced Using a Porous Silicon-based Layer Transfer Process for High-Efficiency Thin-Film Crystalline Silicon Solar Cells..... *H. S. Radhakrishnan, R. Martini, V. Depauw, K. Van Nieuwenhuysen, M. Debucquoy, J. Govaerts, I. Gordon, R. Mertens, and J. Poortmans* 70

(Contents Continued on Page 1)



IEEE JOURNAL OF PHOTOVOLTAICS

Electron Devices Society
PAUL YU, *President*
Univ. California, San Diego

SAMAR SAHA, *VP of Publications*
SuVolta Inc., Los Gatos, CA

Industrial Electronics Society
G. A. P. CAPOLINO, *President*
Valle de Passee-Temps

MARCO LISERRE, *VP of Publications*
Politecnico di Bari

Nanotechnology Council
STEPHEN M. GOODNICK, *President*
Arizona State Univ.

ARISTIDES A. REQUICHA, *VP of Publications*
Univ. Southern California

Cosponsors

Photonics Society
HIDEO KUWAIARA, *President*
Fujitsu Labs Ltd.

RODNEY S. TUCKER, *VP of Publications*
Univ. Melbourne

Power & Energy Society
NOEL SCHULZ, *President*
Mississippi State Univ.

SAIFUR RAHMAN, *VP of Publications*
Virginia Tech.

Power Electronics Society
DUSHAN BOROVICH, *President*
Virginia Tech.

JOHN SHEN, *VP of Publications*
Univ. Central Florida

Reliability Society
DENNIS HOFFMAN, *President*
Lockheed Martin Aeronautics

ROBERT J. LOOMIS, *VP of Publications*
ManTech, Inc.

J-PV Steering Committee

Electron Devices Society

NARAIN D. ARORA
Silerra, Inc.

ENRICO SANGIORGI
Università di Bologna

CHENNUPATI JAGADISH (CHAIR)
The Australian National Univ.

RAJENDRA SINGH
Clemson Univ.

SANTOSH K. KURINEC
Rochester Inst. of Technol.

YUAN TAUR
Univ. California, San Diego

ANTHONY OATES
Taiwan Semiconductor Mfg. Co.

DOUG VERRET
Texas Instruments

EDS Executive Director
CHRISTOPHER JANNUZZI
IEEE Operations Center
Piscataway, NJ

Industrial Electronics Society
GIOVANNI SPAGNUOLO
Università di Salerno

Nanotechnology Council
GUANGYONG LI
Univ. Pittsburgh

Photonics Society
ROBERT MERTENS
IMEC

ALAN KOST (SECRETARY)
Univ. Arizona

Power & Energy Society
SAIFUR RAHMAN
Virginia Tech

Power Electronics Society
PATRICK CHAPMAN
SolarBridge Technologies

Reliability Society
PRASAD CHAPARALA
Alta Devices

Editor-in-Chief
TIMOTHY J. ANDERSON
Univ. of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA

Administrative Contact:
JO ANN MARSH
445 Hoes Lane, Piscataway, NJ 08854
Tel: +1 732 562 6855 E-mail: j.marsh@ieee.org

Please submit all manuscripts to <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jpv>

Editors

Crystalline Silicon PV
STEFAN GLUNZ
Fraunhofer Inst. Solar Energy Sys.

Organic PV
ALEX K.-Y. JEN
Univ. of Washington

**Amorphous, Nanostructured,
and Film Si PV**
MICHIO KONDO
AIST

**Thin Film and
PV Characterization**
ANGUS ROCKETT
Univ. of Illinois

Fundamentals and New Concepts
STEVEN RINGEL
Ohio State Univ.

PV Characterization
KEITH EMERY
NREL

III-V, Concentrator and Space PV
RICHARD R. KING
Spectrolab, Inc.

**Amorphous, Nanostructured,
and Film Si PV**
CHRISTOPHER WRONSKI
Pennsylvania State Univ.

Photovoltaic Balance of Systems
ANGÈLE H. M. E. REINDERS
Delft Univ. Tech.

PV Systems-Grid Interactions
BENJAMIN KROPSKI
NREL

PV Characterization
CLEMENS HESKE
Univ. of Nevada

III-V, Concentrator and Space PV
FRANK DIMROTH
Fraunhofer ISE

Thin Film PV
ROMMEL NOUFI
NREL

Fundamentals and New Concepts
RICHARD CORKISH
Univ. of New South Wales

PV Systems Control
GIOVANNI SPAGNUOLO
Univ. Salerno

Associate Editors

HARRY ATWATER
California Inst. of Technol.

NEELKANTH DHIRE
Univ. of Central Florida

SETH HUBBARD
Rochester Inst. of Technol.

MICHAEL POWALLA
Zentrum für Sonnenenergie-
und Wasserstoff-Forschung

FRANKY SO
Univ. of Florida

ALLEN BARNETT
The Univ. of New South Wales

REBEKAH FEIST
Dow Chemical Co.

SYLVAIN MARSILLAC
Old Dominion Univ.

MIKE SCARPULLA
Univ. of Utah

WILHELM WARTA
Fraunhofer ISE

ANDREAS BETT
Fraunhofer ISE

ALEX FREUNDLICH
Univ. of Houston

ANTONIO MARTI
Instituto de Energia Solar-ETSIT,
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid

WILLIAM SHAFARMAN
Univ. of Delaware

JIANGENG XUE
Univ. of Florida

DAVID CAHEN
Weizmann Inst. of Science

DAVID GINGER
Univ. of Washington

SHIGERU NIKI
AIST

RONALD SINTON
Sinton Instruments

YANG YANG
Univ. of California, Los Angeles

ANDRES CUEVAS
Australian National Univ.

IVAN GORDON
IMEC

GIOVANNI PETRONE
Univ. of Salerno

JIM SITES
Colorado State Univ.

ARMED F. ZOBA
Brunel Univ.

VIKRAM DALAL
Iowa State Univ.

L. JAY GUO
Univ. of Michigan

NIKOLAS PODRAZA
Univ. of Toledo

ARNO SMETS
Technische Universiteit Delft

IEEE Officers

ROBERTO DE MARCA, *President*
HOWARD E. MICHEL, *President-Elect*
MARKO DELIMAR, *Secretary*
JOHN T. BARR, *Treasurer*
PETER W. STAECKER, *Past President*

SAURABH SINHA, *Vice President, Educational Activities*
GIANLUCA SETT, *Vice President, Publication Services and Products*
RALPH M. FORD, *Vice President, Member and Geographic Activities*
KAREN BARTLESON, *President, Standards Association*
JACEK M. ZURADA, *Vice President, Technical Activities*
GARY L. BLANK, *President, IEEE-USA*

ELLEN J. YOFFA, *Director, Division I*

IEEE Executive Staff

THOMAS SIEGERT, *Business Administration*
MATTHEW LOEB, *Corporate Strategy*
DOUGLAS GORHAM, *Educational Activities*
EILEEN LACH, *General Counsel & Corporate Compliance*
BETSY DAVIS, *SPHR, Human Resources*
CHRIS BRANTLEY, *IEEE-USA*

DR. E. JAMES PRENDERGAST, *Executive Director & Chief Operating Officer*
ALEXANDER PASIK, *Information Technology*
PATRICK MAHONEY, *Marketing*
CECELIA JANKOWSKI, *Member and Geographic Activities*
ANTHONY DURNIAK, *Publications*
KONSTANTINOS KARACHALIOS, *Standards Activities*
MARY WARD-CALLAN, *Technical Activities*

IEEE Periodicals Transactions/Journals Department

Senior Director: FRAN ZAPPULLA
Editorial Director: DAWN MELLE *Production Director:* PETER M. TUOHY
Senior Managing Editor: WILLIAM COLACCHIO *Journals Coordinator:* CHRISTOPHER PERRY

IEEE JOURNAL OF PHOTOVOLTAICS (ISSN 2156-3381) is published quarterly by The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. Responsibility for the contents rests upon the authors and not upon the IEEE, the Society/Council, or its members. **IEEE Corporate Office:** 3 Park Avenue, 17th Floor, New York, NY 10016-5997. **IEEE Operations Center:** 445 Hoes Lane, Piscataway, NJ 08854-4141. **NJ Telephone:** +1 732 981 0060. **Price/Publication Information:** Individual copies: IEEE Members \$20.00 (first copy only), nonmembers \$165.00 per copy. (Note: Postage and handling charge not included.) Member and non-member subscription prices available upon request. **Copyright and Reprint Permissions:** Abstracting is permitted with credit to the source. Libraries are permitted to photocopy for private use of patrons, provided the per-copy fee indicated in the code at the bottom of the first page is paid through the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. For all other copying, reprint, or republication permission, write to Copyrights and Permissions Department, IEEE Publications Administration, 445 Hoes Lane, Piscataway, NJ 08854-4141. Copyright © 2014 by The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. All rights reserved. Periodicals Postage Paid at New York, NY and at additional mailing offices. **Postmaster:** Send address changes to IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON ELECTRON DEVICES, IEEE, 445 Hoes Lane, Piscataway, NJ 08854-4141. GST Registration No. 125634188. CPC Sales Agreement #40013087. Return undeliverable Canada addresses to: Pitney Bowes IMEX, P.O. Box 4332, Stanton Rd., Toronto, ON M5W 3J4, Canada. IEEE prohibits discrimination, harassment and bullying. For more information visit <http://www.ieee.org/nondiscrimination>. Printed in USA.

Leveraging Silicon Epitaxy to Fabricate Excellent Front Surface Regions for Thin Interdigitated Back Contact Solar Cells	S. C. Baker-Finch and P. A. Basore	78
Mono-Like Silicon Growth Using Functional Grain Boundaries to Limit Area of Multicrystalline Grains	K. Kutsukake, N. Usami, Y. Ohno, Y. Tokumoto, and I. Yonenaga	84
Advanced Bulk Defect Passivation for Silicon Solar Cells	B. J. Hallam, P. G. Hamer, S. R. Wenham, M. D. Abbott, A. Sugianto, A. M. Wenham, C. E. Chan, G. Xu, J. Kraiem, J. Degoulange, and R. Einhaus	88
24.7% Record Efficiency HIT Solar Cell on Thin Silicon Wafer	M. Taguchi, A. Yano, S. Tohoda, K. Matsuyama, Y. Nakamura, T. Nishiwaki, K. Fujita, and E. Maruyama	96
Assessing the Performance of Surface Passivation Using Low-Intensity Photoluminescence Characterization Techniques	C. E. Chan, M. D. Abbott, M. K. Juhl, B. J. Hallam, B. Xiao, and S. R. Wenham	100
Sensitivity Analysis of Industrial Multicrystalline PERC Silicon Solar Cells by Means of 3-D Device Simulation and Metamodeling	M. Müller, P. P. Altermatt, H. Wagner, and G. Fischer	107
An Analytical Model for Interdigitated Back Contact Solar Cells	P. Saint-Cast, M. Padilla, A. Kimmerle, and C. Reichel	114
Solar Cell Efficiency Losses Due to Impurities From the Crucible in Multicrystalline Silicon	F. Schindler, B. Michl, J. Schön, W. Kwapil, W. Warta, and M. C. Schubert	122
High-Efficiency Full Back Contacted Cells Using Industrial Processes	J. Dong, L. Tao, Y. Zhu, Z. Yang, Z. Xia, R. Sidhu, and G. Xing	130
Investigation of the Mechanism Resulting in low Resistance Ag Thick-Film Contact to Si Solar Cells in the Context of Emitter Doping Density and Contact Firing for Current-Generation Ag Paste	I. B. Cooper, K. Tate, J. S. Renshaw, A. F. Carroll, K. R. Mikeska, R. C. Reedy, and A. Rohatgi	134
Gettering of Iron in Silicon Solar Cells With Implanted Emitters	V. Vähänissi, A. Haarahiltunen, M. Yli-Koski, and H. Savin	142
High Efficiency Multi-busbar Solar Cells and Modules	S. Braun, R. Nissler, C. Ebert, D. Habermann, and G. Hahn	148
Scanning Laser-Beam-Induced Current Measurements of Lateral Transport Near-Junction Defects in Silicon Heterojunction Solar Cells	M. G. Deceglie, H. S. Emmer, Z. C. Holman, A. Descoeudres, S. De Wolf, C. Ballif, and H. A. Atwater	154
Aluminum-Based Rear-Side PVD Metallization for nPERT Silicon Solar Cells	K. Katkhouda, A. Martinez-Limia, L. Bornschein, R. Koseva, T. Geppert, A. Grohe, H.-J. Krokoszinski, and P. Schaaf	160
Electrical and Microstructural Analysis of Contact Formation on Lightly Doped Phosphorus Emitters Using Thick-Film Ag Screen Printing Pastes	V. Shanmugam, J. Cunnusamy, A. Khanna, P. K. Basu, Y. Zhang, C. Chen, A. F. Stassen, M. B. Boreland, T. Mueller, B. Hoex, and A. G. Aberle	168
<i>Fundamentals and New Concepts</i>		
Light Trapping Textures Designed by Electromagnetic Optimization for Subwavelength Thick Solar Cells	V. Ganapati, O. D. Miller, and E. Yablonovitch	175
Upconverter Silicon Solar Cell Devices for Efficient Utilization of Sub-Band-Gap Photons Under Concentrated Solar Radiation	S. Fischer, A. Ivaturi, B. Fröhlich, M. Rüdiger, A. Richter, K. W. Krämer, B. S. Richards, and J. C. Goldschmidt	183
Lattice-Mismatched 0.7-eV GaInAs Solar Cells Grown on GaAs Using GaInP Compositionally Graded Buffers	R. M. France, I. García, W. E. McMahon, A. G. Norman, J. Simon, J. F. Geisz, D. J. Friedman, and M. J. Romero	190
Photogenerated Current By Two-Step Photon Excitation in ZnTeO Intermediate Band Solar Cells with n-ZnO Window Layer	T. Tanaka, M. Miyabara, Y. Nagao, K. Saito, Q. Guo, M. Nishio, K. M. Yu, and W. Walukiewicz	196
High-Bandgap Solar Cells for Underwater Photovoltaic Applications	P. P. Jenkins, S. Messenger, K. M. Trautz, S. I. Maximenko, D. Goldstein, D. Scheiman, R. Hoheisel, and R. J. Walters	202
Tandem Solar Cells Based on High-Efficiency c-Si Bottom Cells: Top Cell Requirements for >30% Efficiency	T. P. White, N. N. Lal, and K. R. Catchpole	208
Micrometer-Thin Crystalline-Silicon Solar Cells Integrating Numerically Optimized 2-D Photonic Crystals	V. Depauw, X. Meng, O. El Daif, G. Gomard, L. Lalouat, E. Drouard, C. Trompoukis, A. Fave, C. Seassal, and I. Gordon	215
Strain Effects on Radiation Tolerance of Triple-Junction Solar Cells With InAs Quantum Dots in the GaAs Junction	C. Kerestes, C. D. Cress, B. C. Richards, D. V. Forbes, Y. Lin, Z. Bittner, S. J. Polly, P. Sharps, and S. M. Hubbard	224
Designing Photonic Materials for Effective Bandgap Modification and Optical Concentration in Photovoltaics	Y. Xu and J. N. Munday	233
Evaluation of Carrier Collection Efficiency in Multiple Quantum Well Solar Cells	H. Fujii, K. Toprasertpong, K. Watanabe, M. Sugiyama, and Y. Nakano	237

Hot Carriers in Quantum Wells for Photovoltaic Efficiency Enhancement	244
..... L. C. Hirst, H. Fujii, Y. Wang, M. Sugiyama, and N. J. Ekins-Daukes	
Quantum-Well Solar Cells for Space: The Impact of Carrier Removal on End-of-Life Device Performance	253
..... R. Hoheisel, M. Gonzalez, M. P. Lumb, D. A. Scheiman, S. R. Messenger, C. G. Bailey, J. Lorentzen, T. N. D. Tibbits, M. Imaizumi, T. Ohshima, S. Sato, P. P. Jenkins, and R. J. Walters	
Organic PV	
A 12% Efficient Silicon/PEDOT:PSS Heterojunction Solar Cell Fabricated at $<100^{\circ}\text{C}$	260
..... K. A. Nagamatsu, S. Avasthi, J. Jhaveri, and J. C. Sturm	
Role of Electron- and Hole-Collecting Buffer Layers on the Stability of Inverted Polymer: Fullerene Photovoltaic Devices	265
..... E. Voroshazi, I. Cardinaletti, G. Uytterhoeven, S. Li, M. Empl, T. Aernouts, and B. P. Rand	
Applicability of the Suns- V_{OC} Method on Organic Solar Cells	271
..... S. Schiefer, B. Zimmermann, S. W. Glunz, and U. Würfel	
PV Balance of Systems	
Photovoltaic Investment Risk and Uncertainty for Residential Customers	278
..... E. Drury, T. Jenkin, D. Jordan, and R. Margolis	
PV Characterization	
Critical Points in the Band Structure of Absorber and Buffer Layers of $\text{CuIn}_{1-x}\text{Ga}_x\text{Se}_2$ Solar Cells by Electoreflectance Spectroscopy	285
..... O. Kiowski, W. Witte, M. Hetterich, and M. Powalla	
PV Reliability Development Lessons From JPL's Flat Plate Solar Array Project	291
..... R. G. Ross, Jr.	
Application and Characterization of an Artificial Grime for Photovoltaic Soiling Studies	299
..... P. D. Burton and B. H. King	
An Optical Model for Predicting the Quantum Efficiency of Solar Modules	304
..... J. Gjessing and E. S. Marstein	
Mapping the Local Photoelectronic Properties of Polycrystalline Solar Cells Through High Resolution Laser-Beam-Induced Current Microscopy	311
..... M. S. Leite, M. Abashin, H. J. Lezec, A. G. Gianfrancesco, A. A. Talin, and N. B. Zhitenev	
The Dark Horse of Evaluating Long-Term Field Performance—Data Filtering	317
..... D. C. Jordan and S. R. Kurtz	
In-Line Post-Process Scribing for Reducing Cell to Module Efficiency Gap in Monolithic Thin-Film Photovoltaics	324
..... S. Dongaonkar and M. A. Alam	
Real-Time, In-Line, and Mapping Spectroscopic Ellipsometry for Applications in $\text{Cu}(\text{In}_{1-x}\text{Ga}_x)\text{Se}_2$ Metrology	333
..... P. Aryal, P. Pradhan, D. Attygalle, A.-R. A. Ibdah, K. Aryal, V. Ranjan, S. Marsillac, N. J. Podraza, and R. W. Collins	
An Effective Single Solar Cell Equivalent Circuit Model for Two or More Solar Cells Connected in Series	340
..... A. Bauer, J. Hanisch, and E. Ahlswede	
Correlating Multicrystalline Silicon Defect Types Using Photoluminescence, Defect-band Emission, and Lock-in Thermography Imaging Techniques	348
..... S. Johnston, H. Guthrey, F. Yan, K. Zaunbrecher, M. Al-Jassim, P. Rakotoniaina, and M. Kaes	
High-Speed Imaging/Mapping Spectroscopic Ellipsometry for In-Line Analysis of Roll-to-Roll Thin-Film Photovoltaics	355
..... A. Shan, M. Fried, G. Juhász, C. Major, O. Polgár, Á. Németh, P. Petrik, L. R. Dahal, J. Chen, Z. Huang, N. J. Podraza, and R. W. Collins	
Comparison of Angular Reflectance Losses Between PV Modules With Planar and Textured Glass Under Singapore Outdoor Conditions	362
..... Y. S. Khoo, J. P. Singh, T. M. Walsh, and A. G. Aberle	
The Impact of Silicon CCD Photon Spread on Quantitative Analyses of Luminescence Images	368
..... D. Walter, A. Fell, E. Franklin, D. Macdonald, B. Mitchell, and T. Trupke	
Investigation of Carrier Recombination at the $\text{SiO}_2/\text{c-Si}$ Interface by Photoluminescence Imaging Under Applied Bias	374
..... H. Haug, Ø. Nordseth, E. Monakhov, and E. S. Marstein	
Spectral and Injection Level Dependence of Recombination Lifetimes in Silicon Measured by Impedance Spectroscopy	380
..... S. Kumar, Vandana, C. M. S. Rauthan, V. K. Kaul, S. N. Singh, and P. K. Singh	
PV Systems Control	
Oscillator-Based Inverter Control for Islanded Three-Phase Microgrids	387
..... B. B. Johnson, S. V. Dhople, J. L. Cale, A. O. Hamadeh, and P. T. Krein	
Performance of Mismatched PV Systems With Submodule Integrated Converters	396
..... C. Olalla, C. Deline, and D. Maksimovic	
A Simple Bipolar Transistor-Based Bypass Approach for Photovoltaic Modules	405
..... V. d'Alessandro, P. Guerriero, and S. Daliento	
Markovian Reliability Analysis of Standalone Photovoltaic Systems Incorporating Repairs	414
..... M. Theristis and I. A. Papazoglou	

<i>PV Systems Grid Interactions</i>	
Robust Partial Feedback Linearizing Stabilization Scheme for Three-Phase Grid-Connected Photovoltaic Systems	423
..... M. A. Mahmud, H. R. Pota, M. J. Hossain, and N. K. Roy	
A Complete Fully Thin-Film PV Harvesting and Power-Management System on Plastic With On-Sheet Battery Management and Wireless Power Delivery to Off-sheet Loads	432
..... W. Rieutort-Louis, L. Huang, Y. Hu, J. Sanz-Robinson, S. Wagner, J. C. Sturm, and N. Verma	
<i>Thin Film PV</i>	
CIGS Cells and Modules With High Efficiency on Glass and Flexible Substrates	440
..... M. Powalla, W. Witte, P. Jackson, S. Paetel, E. Lotter, R. Wuerz, F. Kessler, C. Tschamber, W. Hempel, D. Hariskos, R. Menner, A. Bauer, S. Spiering, E. Ahlswede, T. M. Friedlmeier, D. Blázquez-Sánchez, I. Klugius, and W. Wischmann	
The Comparison of (Ag,Cu)(In,Ga)Se ₂ and Cu(In,Ga)Se ₂ Thin Films Deposited by Three-Stage Coevaporation	447
..... L. Chen, J. Lee, and W. N. Shafarman	
Multilayer Broadband Antireflective Coatings for More Efficient Thin Film CdTe Solar Cells	452
..... P. M. Kaminski, F. Lisco, and J. M. Walls	
The Impact of Luminescent Down Shifting on the Performance of CdTe Photovoltaics: Impact of the Module Vintage ...	457
..... D. Ross, D. Alonso-Álvarez, E. Klampaftis, J. Fritsche, M. Bauer, M. G. Debije, R. M. Fifield, and B. S. Richards	
Zn(O, S) Buffer Layers and Thickness Variations of CdS Buffer for Cu ₂ ZnSnS ₄ Solar Cells	465
..... T. Ericson, J. J. Scragg, A. Hultqvist, J. T. Wätjen, P. Szaniawski, T. Törndahl, and C. Platzer-Björkman	
Failure Analysis Techniques for Microsystems-Enabled Photovoltaics	470
..... B. B. Yang, J. L. Cruz-Campa, G. S. Haase, E. I. Cole Jr., P. Tangyonyong, P. J. Resnick, A. C. Kilgo, M. Okandan, and G. N. Nielson	
Origin of Reduced Efficiency in Cu(In,Ga)Se ₂ Solar Cells With High Ga Concentration: Alloy Solubility Versus Intrinsic Defects	477
..... B. Huang, S. Chen, H.-X. Deng, L.-W. Wang, M. A. Contreras, R. Noufi, and S.-H. Wei	
High-Efficiency Devices With Pure Solution-Processed Cu ₂ ZnSn(S,Se) ₄ Absorbers	483
..... T. Todorov, H. Sugimoto, O. Gunawan, T. Gokmen, and D. B. Mitzi	
Improved Rear Surface Passivation of Cu(In,Ga)Se ₂ Solar Cells: A Combination of an Al ₂ O ₃ Rear Surface Passivation Layer and Nanosized Local Rear Point Contacts	486
..... B. Vermang, V. Fjällström, X. Gao, and M. Edoff	
<i>III-V, Concentrator, and Space PV</i>	
Direct Semiconductor Bonded 5J Cell for Space and Terrestrial Applications	493
..... P. T. Chiu, D. C. Law, R. L. Woo, S. B. Singer, D. Bhusari, W. D. Hong, A. Zakaria, J. Boisvert, S. Mesropian, R. R. King, and N. H. Karam	
REVIEW PAPERS	
<i>Crystalline Silicon PV</i>	
Paste Rheology Correlating With Dispensed Finger Geometry	498
..... M. Pospischil, J. Specht, M. König, M. Hörteis, C. Mohr, F. Clement, and D. Biro	
Analytical Modeling of Industrial-Related Silicon Solar Cells	504
..... T. Fellmeth, F. Clement, and D. Biro	
Review of Microcrack Detection Techniques for Silicon Solar Cells	514
..... M. Abdelhamid, R. Singh, and M. Omar	
<i>PV Characterization</i>	
Interlaboratory Study of Eddy-Current Measurement of Excess-Carrier Recombination Lifetime	525
..... A. L. Blum, J. S. Swirhun, R. A. Sinton, F. Yan, S. Herasimenka, T. Roth, K. Lauer, J. Haunschild, B. Lim, K. Bothe, Z. Hameiri, B. Seipel, R. Xiong, M. Dhamrin, and J. D. Murphy	

Gettering of Iron in Silicon Solar Cells With Implanted Emitters

Ville Vähänissi, Antti Haarahiltunen, Marko Yli-Koski, and Hele Savin

Abstract—We present here experimental results on the gettering of iron in Czochralski-grown silicon by phosphorus implantation. The gettering efficiency and the gettering mechanisms in a high resistivity implanted emitter are determined as a function of both initial iron level and gettering anneal. The results show that gettering in implanted emitters can be efficient if precipitation at the emitter is activated. This requires low gettering temperatures and/or high initial contamination level. The fastest method to getter iron from the bulk is to rapidly nucleate iron precipitates before the gettering anneal. Here, this was achieved by a fast ramp to the room temperature in between the implantation anneal and the gettering anneal.

Index Terms—Gettering, ion implantation, iron, photovoltaic cells, silicon.

I. INTRODUCTION

ION implantation has been widely used in integrated circuit processing. However, it has not raised much interest in the photovoltaic community until recently. The benefits of implantation, such as better process control and fewer processing steps compared with conventional doping techniques [1]–[3], have started to intrigue also the silicon solar cell industry. After all, implantation could provide a great opportunity to reach the ultimate goal: fabrication of low-cost high-efficiency solar cells.

Because of economic reasons, the purity of the silicon feedstock used in photovoltaics is much lower than in integrated circuit industry [4]. Therefore, the high gettering efficiency (GE) [5]–[8] provided by the conventional diffused phosphorus emitter is a great benefit in solar cell processing. There are not many studies on the GE obtained by implanted emitters [9] and even fewer where the GEs of diffused and implanted emitters are directly compared. Implanted emitters have typically lower phosphorus concentration, which is likely to decrease the GE. However, more interesting is the possible role of the electrically inactive phosphorus [10]–[12], which is present after diffusion but not after implantation.

Our goal here is to study the gettering behavior of iron in silicon by phosphorus implantation with well-defined iron

TABLE I
TEMPERATURES AND TIMES OF THE GETTERING ANNEALS AND THE RESULTING SHEET RESISTANCES

Group	Temperature profile	R_s [$\Omega/\square$]
A	2 h at 800°C	96
B	3.5 h at 750°C	94
C	8 h at 620°C	94
D	pullout at 895°C + 8 h at 620°C	85

concentration levels and varying gettering anneals. In addition to determining the obtainable GE with an implanted emitter, we also study the prevailing mechanisms behind the implantation gettering and compare both the GE and the mechanisms with conventional diffused emitters with higher phosphorus concentration.

II. EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

In the experiments, p-type silicon wafers with a thickness of 400 μm , a resistivity of 2.7–3.0 $\Omega\cdot\text{cm}$, and a low initial oxygen level (7–9 ppma) were intentionally contaminated to two different iron levels: 1) $1 \times 10^{13} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ (medium) and 2) $2 \times 10^{14} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ (high). The samples are noted as *medium-Fe* and *high-Fe* later on. The contamination was done by a procedure which is described in more detail in [5]. After contamination a 31-nm-thick screen oxide was grown on the wafers at 1000 °C to protect the wafers from low energy debris and to reduce implantation induced damage and channeling [13]. Next, phosphorus with a dose of $1 \times 10^{15} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ and energy of 50 keV was implanted on one side of the wafers to form the emitter. Then, the screen oxide was removed in diluted hydrofluoric acid solution and the wafers were cleaned in a sequence of SC-1, SC-2, and HF-dip.

After cleaning, the wafers were annealed at 1000 °C for 30 min to activate the implant and to remove the implantation damage, oxidized at 1000 °C for 10 min to passivate the back surface, and cooled at the rate of 4 K/min down to the gettering anneal temperature. Four different gettering anneals were used. Gettering anneals A through C followed the implantation anneal directly. In gettering anneal D, the wafers were rapidly cooled down to the room temperature, i.e., pulled out from the furnace at 895 °C, after the implantation anneal and then loaded again into the furnace at the gettering temperature 620 °C. Temperatures and times of the gettering anneals are presented in Table I.

After gettering anneals, the back side of the wafers was protected by photoresist. This was followed by the removal of the front side oxide in buffered HF. Then, the sheet resistance of the emitter was measured with four-point probe. The obtained sheet resistance values are presented in Table I.

Manuscript received June 9, 2013; revised August 2, 2013 and September 15, 2013; accepted October 8, 2013. Date of publication October 30, 2013; date of current version December 16, 2013. This work was supported by the Finnish National Technology Agency, Academy of Finland, Okmetic Oyj, and Semilab Inc. The work of V. Vähänissi was supported by the Walter Ahlström Foundation and the Graduate School in Electronics, Telecommunications, and Automation.

The authors are with the Department of Micro and Nanosciences, Aalto University, 02150 Espoo, Finland (e-mail: ville.vahanissi@aalto.fi; antti.haarahiltunen@aalto.fi; marko.yli-koski@aalto.fi; hele.savin@aalto.fi).

Color versions of one or more of the figures in this paper are available online at <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org>.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/JPHOTOV.2013.2285961




Fig. 1. Measured interstitial iron concentration in the bulk after different gettering anneals. The error estimate of the interstitial iron concentration value is $\pm 2\%$ when iron concentration is below $1 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ and $\pm 4\%$ when iron concentration is above $1 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3}$. The solid solubility of iron at the gettering anneal temperature [14], [15] is marked with a dotted line.

Interstitial iron concentration in the wafer bulk was measured using the surface photovoltage (SPV) method, which is well known to measure accurately interstitial iron at low concentrations. The measurement procedure is described in more detail in [5]. In addition, total iron concentration in the phosphorus-doped layer was measured by secondary ion mass spectrometry (SIMS) in selected samples.

Finally, the following supplementary experiments were performed in order to obtain more information about the whereabouts of the gettered iron and the prevailing gettering mechanisms. In the first experiment, some wafers were processed identically to the sample set D but excluding the phosphorus implantation. This means that the samples had no emitter but they experienced the implantation anneal and gettering anneal D. In the second experiment, from some wafers, both the front and back surfaces were removed by etching approximately $23 \mu\text{m}$ of silicon. The etching was done in a $\text{CH}_3\text{COOH}:\text{HF}:\text{HNO}_3$ solution. Then, the wafers were annealed at 1000°C , which is higher than the applied iron in-diffusion temperature, for 20 min, followed by fast cooling. The purpose of the anneal was to dissolve the possible remaining iron in the bulk to the interstitial form. After the dissolution, the interstitial bulk iron concentration was again measured by SPV.

III. RESULTS

A. Gettering Efficiency

Fig. 1 shows a summary of the measured interstitial iron concentration in the bulk after different gettering anneals. At the medium initial iron level (blue columns), the GE is really low with the anneals A and B, but a clear improvement is obtained with the anneal C at lower temperature. Intriguingly, anneal D results in remarkably higher GE than the other anneals.

At the high initial iron level (red columns), the GE is high even with the anneal A and strongly increases with lowering gettering temperature (anneals B and C). Already with the anneal B, the remaining interstitial iron concentration in the high-Fe wafer is below the level of the medium-Fe wafer, and with the anneal C,




Fig. 2. Measured minority carrier diffusion length prior to dissociating the Fe_iB_s -pairs in the same samples as in Fig. 1.

the inversion gets even bigger. With the high initial iron level, the difference between anneal C and anneal D is not as high as with the medium initial level. Nonetheless, also with the high initial iron level, anneal D is the most efficient one, and again, there is less interstitial iron left than in the similarly treated medium-Fe wafer.

Fig. 2 presents the minority carrier diffusion length prior to dissociating the Fe_iB_s -pairs in the corresponding samples. Note that the wafers are not standard lifetime references, but they still have the emitter present when they are measured by SPV. After anneals A through C the diffusion length behavior is in agreement with the measured interstitial iron concentration, i.e., the lower the interstitial iron concentration in the bulk, the longer the diffusion length. However, after anneal D, the diffusion length is in contradiction with the interstitial iron concentration. In the high-Fe wafer, the diffusion length is clearly worse after anneal D, even though the interstitial iron concentration is lower than after anneal C. With the medium iron level the diffusion length after anneal D is significantly better than after anneal C, but it is not as high as one might expect. The measured interstitial iron concentration after anneal D in medium-Fe wafer is equal to high-Fe wafer after anneal C, but the diffusion length is almost a factor of 2 lower.

B. Phosphorus and Iron Profiles

Phosphorus and iron profiles near the wafer surface measured by SIMS from the high-Fe and medium-Fe wafers after gettering anneal C are depicted in Fig. 3. The phosphorus profile is roughly identical in all of our samples since phosphorus diffusion is negligible during the low-temperature gettering anneals, and the ion implantation and the implantation anneal parameters were kept constant. The measured sheet resistance values after the anneals are also in the same range. The peak P concentration is approximately $2 \times 10^{19} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, which is well below the solid solubility value [16] at 1000°C .

SIMS profiles of the iron show that after gettering anneal C, iron is not collected only right at the emitter surface, but there is a concentration peak that has a maximum approximately at the depth of 60 nm from the wafer surface. A similar iron peak




Fig. 3. Phosphorus and iron profiles near the wafer surface measured by SIMS from the high-Fe and medium-Fe wafers after gettering anneal C.

has also been reported by Saga [17] after phosphorus implantation. In that study, the peak was attributed to the gettering by the end of range defects. In our SIMS profiles, there is a clear difference in the measured iron concentrations between the high-Fe and medium-Fe wafer. The peak iron concentration is a decade larger in the high iron level sample. The amount of gettered iron calculated from the profiles is roughly in agreement with the measured decrease in the interstitial iron concentrations presented in Fig. 1. However, there was some lateral variation observed in the SIMS results in the highly contaminated sample.

IV. DISCUSSION

A. Gettering Mechanisms

The obtained low GE in the medium-Fe wafers with the anneals A and B could be explained by segregation to the emitter. With the given temperatures and phosphorus concentration, the segregation coefficient is so low that the GE due to segregation to the emitter is also small. However, with lower temperature (anneal C) a significant improvement is seen, which cannot be explained by pure segregation, indicating the presence of another gettering mechanism. The GE seems to have a steep temperature dependence. Similar steep temperature dependence is seen also in the high-Fe wafers. This, together with the facts that 1) in the high-Fe wafers gettering takes place at higher temperatures, 2) gettering is faster, and 3) “inversion” occurs, supports the conclusion that the enhanced gettering in medium-Fe wafer with anneal C and in high-Fe wafers with anneals A to C takes place due to iron precipitation. It seems that in the medium-Fe wafer, the bulk iron reduction rate in anneal C is limited by the iron precipitation rate. In the case of high-Fe wafers, the iron reduction rate seems to be limited either by the precipitation rate (anneal A) or the diffusion and segregation of iron to the precipitation sites (anneals B and C). To determine the location of the precipitated iron, more information is needed.

The iron precipitation behavior with anneal C seems to be directly linked to the iron supersaturation level at the emitter. Most likely, iron nuclei are already formed at the emitter during the ramp down from the implant anneal to the gettering temperature. Since this is a slow cooling, only a few iron precipitates

form, which then grow further in size when the amount of gettered iron increases. Thus, after the gettering anneal, there are only a few iron precipitates at the emitter, but they are large in size. The nucleation takes place mainly at the emitter due to the implantation induced damage and segregation. This is also supported by the SIMS results: The amount of gettered iron calculated from the profile matches roughly with the measured decrease in the interstitial iron concentration.

Even though the anneal D is almost identical to the anneal C, the results are quite different. The only difference in processing is the fast cooling to the room temperature between the implantation anneal and the gettering anneal in the case of D samples. With the medium-Fe wafers, the GE is significantly higher in case of anneal D, which implies that the prevailing gettering mechanism in anneal D must be precipitation. In anneal D, the rapid cool down to the room temperature allows iron to nucleate fast creating a higher density of iron precipitates [18] than compared with anneal C. Subsequently, the higher density of iron precipitates results in faster precipitation rate during the following anneal at 620 °C. In the best case, the precipitation rate or the gettering of iron can be limited only by diffusion of iron from the bulk. However, it is not clear if the precipitation takes place only at the emitter, and thereby, further experiments are needed.

B. Role of the Electrically Inactive Phosphorus

Previously, we have made corresponding gettering anneals with diffused emitters [6]. In that study, the emitter was formed by in-diffusing phosphorus from a spin-on dopant source for 30 min at 870 °C followed by the gettering anneal. Gettering anneals A and B were identical to this study, but the temperature of the anneal C was 650 °C instead of 620 °C used here. The resulting sheet resistance was $\sim 45 \Omega/\text{sq}$. In those experiments, the prevailing gettering mechanism was found to be segregation in all anneals (A–C). Now, in Fig. 4(a), we compare the GE of the implanted and diffused emitters after gettering anneals A, B, and C and, in Fig. 4(b), the phosphorus profiles of the implanted and diffused emitters measured by SIMS. The GE is naturally lower in implanted emitters due to the lower phosphorus concentration. However, this difference cannot be entirely explained by the lower electrically active phosphorus concentration ($\sim 95 \Omega/\text{sq}$ versus $\sim 45 \Omega/\text{sq}$). We can take into account the phosphorus concentration difference using the segregation coefficient from [6] and the measured phosphorus profile presented in Figs. 3 and 4(b). After anneals A and B, the calculated interstitial iron concentration in the bulk is about $7 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ and $2 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, respectively. These values are significantly lower than the concentrations measured here as demonstrated in Fig. 4(a).

One possible reason for the difference in the measured and calculated values is the role of the electrically inactive phosphorus [10]–[12]. In [6], the phosphorus layer was made by diffusion, and the phosphorus concentration near the emitter surface exceeded the solid solubility value, leading to the formation of electrically inactive phosphorus, whereas here at the implanted emitter, there is no electrically inactive phosphorus




Fig. 4. (a) Comparison of interstitial iron concentration in the bulk after gettering with implanted and diffused emitter. The red lines show the calculated interstitial iron concentration in the bulk obtained using the segregation coefficient from [6] and the measured phosphorus profile. (b) Phosphorus profiles of the implanted and diffused emitters measured by SIMS.

present [see Fig. 4 (b)]. This raises the question if the presence of the dead layer is important at least for the segregation based gettering. Another possibility is that the segregation coefficient scales down much faster with decreasing electrically active phosphorus concentration than assumed in [6].

C. Destination of Gettered Iron

The relatively low minority carrier diffusion length value in high-Fe sample after anneal D was surprising (see Fig. 2). It could indicate that not all of the disappeared interstitial iron was actually gettering to the emitter, but some of the iron was precipitated either in the wafer bulk and/or on the nonimplanted back surface of the wafer due to the aforementioned rapid cooling down to the room temperature. In order to verify the hypothesis, the supplementary experiments mentioned in Section II, i.e., gettering without the presence of an emitter and the combination of surface etching and dissolution anneal, were performed. Fig. 5 presents the interstitial iron concentration in the bulk obtained from these experiments.

We can see from Fig. 5 that the interstitial iron concentration in the medium-Fe sample with the emitter drops approximately a decade lower than without the emitter. This is a clear indication that the iron precipitation rate at the emitter is faster than




Fig. 5. Interstitial iron concentration in the bulk obtained from the supplementary experiments. Single-colored columns represent the values obtained after gettering anneal D in wafers, which have the implanted emitter (left columns) and in wafers with identical thermal anneals but without implantation (right columns). Striped columns represent the values obtained from the same wafers after they have experienced surface etching and dissolution anneal.

at the oxide surface and that segregation and the possible residual damage from the implantation enhance the process. Similar significant difference is also seen in the minority carrier diffusion lengths: 321 μm with the emitter versus 140 μm without the emitter. Thereby, it seems that at the medium contamination level the iron precipitation rate at the emitter is so high that the iron is mostly collected there. Similar strong gettering effect of an implanted layer was observed also in our previous experiments [9], even with a high bulk defect density [19].

In the high-Fe wafers, the results are quite the opposite. The final interstitial iron concentration in the bulk is even a bit smaller without the emitter than with the emitter. This means that high density of iron precipitates, comparable with the density at the emitter, is also formed to the oxide surface in the high-Fe samples. This behavior is clearly different than seen in the medium-Fe samples. The minority carrier diffusion length prior to dissociating the Fe_iB_s-pairs is 188 μm with the emitter and 165 μm without the emitter. The most interesting part is that even though the bulk interstitial iron concentration in the high level wafer with an emitter is smaller than in the medium level wafer, the diffusion length is only approximately a half of the value obtained from the medium level wafer. Thus, the interstitial iron concentration is not limiting the diffusion length in the high-Fe wafer.

The supplementary experiments of surface etching and dissolution provide further information about the location of the gettering iron. In medium-Fe wafers, the interstitial iron concentration remains in the same level after surface etching and dissolution (see the blue-striped columns in Fig. 5) confirming that the gettering iron has not been precipitated in the bulk but has been gettering mainly to the emitter. Again, in the high-Fe wafers, the situation is different. Both with and without an emitter, the bulk interstitial iron concentration increases by approximately two decades as a consequence of the dissolution anneal. In addition, the diffusion length drops down to the vicinity of 70 μm in both cases. This is a clear indication that in the high-Fe wafers, both with and without the emitter, a significant amount of iron

($7 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3}$) is precipitated in the bulk as well. However, the majority of the gettered iron is still out-diffused and precipitated to the surfaces.

The bulk and surface precipitation in high-Fe samples means that the interstitial iron concentrations or the GE after anneal C and D cannot be directly compared. In addition, in anneal D, it is impossible to make a difference between the precipitation rate to the emitter and to the oxide surface. After both anneal C and anneal D, the iron concentration is close to the solubility value (see Fig. 1), indicating that the precipitation rate is no longer limiting the gettering process. We obtained a similar concentration of iron remaining in the bulk by simulations (iron precipitation in the bulk and ideal out-diffusion to the surfaces [20]) using a precipitate site density of $5 \times 10^6 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ with a 50-nm-fixed capture radius or alternatively using a density of $2 \times 10^7 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ and growing iron precipitates [21]. These values are in a reasonable range with crystal-originated particles, present in modern high quality Czochralski-grown silicon, which are most likely the nucleation sites for iron in the bulk in this study. Our values for precipitate site densities and capture radii are in agreement with [22].

D. Impact on Solar Cell Efficiency

One issue is whether the iron precipitation to the bulk in the high iron level case is desirable, like internal gettering in multicrystalline silicon [23], or mostly just a harmful effect. The minority carrier diffusion length in the high-Fe wafer after anneal C is approximately three times longer than after anneal D (544 μm versus 188 μm), even though the bulk interstitial iron concentrations of the wafers are almost the same after gettering. This can be explained by the differences in the gettered iron, especially in the location of iron precipitates. Our results have shown that in anneal C iron precipitation takes place mainly at the emitter, while in anneal D, some iron precipitates were formed in the bulk as well. Thereby, after anneal C, the minority carrier diffusion length is limited by the interstitial iron concentration, whereas after anneal D, the limit comes from the iron precipitates in the bulk. The calculated capture coefficient for electrons using the iron precipitate densities of $5 \times 10^6 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ and $2 \times 10^7 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ is in the range of $4\text{--}15 \times 10^{-3} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$. This is roughly ten times higher than the values calculated from the physical surface area and the thermal velocity of the electrons. This apparent discrepancy between physical surface and capture cross section is in agreement with the theoretical results [24].

The GE obtained here for an implanted emitter is much lower than for a diffused emitter [6]. However, if the nucleation of iron precipitates takes place, the gettering is robust, and the iron concentration should always be reduced to the solubility limit. One drawback is that the iron concentration in the material may not be high enough to reach sufficient supersaturation for fast precipitation. Another thing to consider is the size of the precipitates at the emitter. By doing the implant anneal and the gettering anneal as separate steps, very fast emitter precipitation can be maintained. Thereby, the gettering process is limited only by the diffusion of iron from the bulk. This allows the size of the precipitates to be kept small, and thus, the possible problems

related to large iron precipitates, e.g., leakage currents at the emitter, could be avoided. However, it should be kept in mind that eventually the increasing amount of precipitated iron at the emitter starts to limit the operation of the solar cell.

V. CONCLUSION

We have experimentally studied the gettering of iron in Czochralski-grown silicon by phosphorus implantation. The prevailing mechanisms behind the implantation gettering, i.e., gettering with a low phosphorus concentration emitter, were found to differ from those present in typical conventional diffused emitters. In addition, the prevailing gettering mechanisms were found to be case sensitive, i.e., the activated mechanisms depend on the initial contamination level and the gettering anneal parameters. In the case of high initial iron concentration, gettering takes place mainly through precipitation, while in the case of lower iron concentration, precipitation becomes dominating only at relatively low temperatures. Iron precipitation takes place mainly at the emitter if iron level is lower than $1 \times 10^{13} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ and the bulk lifetime remains high. If the iron level is high, in the case of a temperature profile that allows iron to form a high density of precipitate nuclei, and thus results in fast gettering, a significant amount of iron can also precipitate in the bulk deteriorating the bulk lifetime, even in high-quality Czochralski-grown silicon. Thus, to reach the best solar cell efficiency, the gettering anneal should be designed to activate the most effective mechanism within the limits of the starting material.

Generally, when the emitter phosphorus concentration is lowered below a certain value (as a result of, e.g., implantation), precipitation begins to dominate. In order to reach the best gettering result in this case, the low-temperature anneal at the end of the process is crucial, annulling the role of a slow cooling. This is the opposite of the diffused emitter, in which segregation dominates, emphasizing the role of the slow cooling to the actual gettering temperature.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors acknowledge the provision of facilities and technical support by Aalto University at the Micronova Nanofabrication Centre.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Rohatgi, D. Meier, B. McPherson, Y.-W. Ok, A. Upadhyaya, J.-H. Lai, and F. Zimbardi, "High-throughput ion-implantation for low-cost high-efficiency silicon solar cells," *Energy Procedia*, vol. 15, pp. 10–19, Apr. 2012.
- [2] M. Sheoran, M. Emsley, M. Yuan, D. Ramappa, and P. Sullivan, "Ion-implant doped large-area n-type Czochralski high-efficiency industrial solar cells," in *Proc. 38th IEEE Photovoltaic Spec. Conf. Rec.*, Jun. 2012, pp. 2254–2257.
- [3] V. Prajapati, T. Janssens, J. John, J. Poortmans, and R. Mertens, "Diffusion-free high efficiency silicon solar cells," *Prog. Photovoltaics: Res. Appl.*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 980–985, Aug. 2013.
- [4] A. Müller, M. Ghosh, R. Sonnenschein, and P. Woditsch, "Silicon for photovoltaic applications," *Mater. Sci. Eng. B*, vol. 134, no. 2–3, pp. 257–262, Oct. 2006.
- [5] V. Vähänissi, A. Haarahltonen, H. Talvitie, M. Yli-Koski, and H. Savin, "Impact of phosphorus gettering parameters and initial iron level on silicon"

- solar cell properties," *Prog. Photovoltaics: Res. Appl.*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 1127–1135, Aug. 2013.
- [6] H. Talvitie, V. Vähänissi, A. Haarahiltunen, M. Yli-Koski, and H. Savin, "Phosphorus and boron diffusion gettering of iron in monocrystalline silicon," *J. Appl. Phys.*, vol. 109, no. 9, pp. 093505-1–093505-5, May 2011.
 - [7] S. P. Phang and D. Macdonald, "Direct comparison of boron, phosphorus, and aluminum gettering of iron in crystalline silicon," *J. Appl. Phys.*, vol. 109, no. 7, pp. 073521-1–073521-6, Apr. 2011.
 - [8] P. Manshanden and L. J. Geerligs, "Improved phosphorous gettering of multi-crystalline silicon," *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells*, vol. 90, no. 7–8, pp. 998–1012, May 2006.
 - [9] A. Haarahiltunen, H. Talvitie, H. Savin, O. Anttila, M. Yli-Koski, M. I. Asghar, and J. Sinkkonen, "Gettering of iron in silicon by boron implantation," *J. Mater. Sci.—Mater. Electron.*, vol. 19, no. 1 (suppl.), pp. 41–45, Dec. 2008.
 - [10] V. Vähänissi, A. Haarahiltunen, H. Talvitie, M. I. Asghar, M. Yli-Koski, and H. Savin, "Effect of oxygen in low temperature boron and phosphorus diffusion gettering of iron in Czochralski-grown silicon," *Solid State Phenomena*, vol. 156–158, pp. 395–400, Oct. 2010.
 - [11] B. Tryznadlowski, A. Yazdani, R. Chen, and S. T. Dunham, "Coupled modeling of evolution of impurity/defect distribution and cell performance," *Proc. 38th IEEE Photovoltaic Spec. Conf. Rec.*, pp. 217–220, Jun. 2012.
 - [12] A. Cuevas, D. Macdonald, M. Kerr, C. Samundsett, A. Sloan, S. Shea, A. Leo, M. Mrcarica, and S. Winderbaum, "Evidence of impurity gettering by industrial phosphorus diffusion," *Proc. 28th IEEE Photovoltaic Spec. Conf. Rec.*, pp. 244–247, Sep. 2000.
 - [13] S. Wolf and R. N. Tauber, "Ion implantation for VLSI," in *Silicon Processing for the VLSI Era—Process Technology*, vol. 1, Sunset Beach, CA, USA: Lattice, 1987, pp. 323–325.
 - [14] M. Aoki, A. Hara, and A. Ohsawa, "Fundamental properties of intrinsic gettering of iron in a silicon wafer," *J. Appl. Phys.*, vol. 72, no. 3, pp. 895–898, Aug. 1992.
 - [15] J. D. Murphy and R. J. Falster, "Contamination of silicon by iron at temperatures below 800 °C," *Phys. Status Solidi—Rapid Res. Lett.*, vol. 5, no. 10–11, pp. 370–372, Nov. 2011.
 - [16] V. E. Borisenko and S. G. Yudin, "Steady-state solubility of substitutional impurities in silicon," *Phys. Status Solidi A*, vol. 101, no. 1, pp. 123–127, May 1987.
 - [17] K. Saga, "Gettering behavior of transition metals in low energy, high dose ion implanted silicon," *Solid State Phenomena*, vol. 187, pp. 283–286, Apr. 2012.
 - [18] A. Haarahiltunen, M. Yli-Koski, and H. Savin, "Effect of thermal history on iron precipitation in crystalline silicon," *Energy Procedia*, vol. 8, pp. 355–359, Apr. 2011.
 - [19] H. Talvitie, M. Yli-Koski, A. Haarahiltunen, V. Vähänissi, M. I. Asghar, and H. Savin, "Experimental study of iron redistribution between bulk defects and boron doped layers in silicon wafers," *Phys. Status Solidi A*, vol. 208, no. 10, pp. 2430–2436, Oct. 2011.
 - [20] H. Hieslmair, S. Balasubramanian, A. A. Istratov, and E. R. Weber, "Gettering simulator: Physical basis and algorithm," *Semicond. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 16, no. 7, pp. 567–574, Jul. 2001.
 - [21] H. Hieslmair, A. A. Istratov, T. Heiser, and E. R. Weber, "Evaluation of precipitate densities and capture radii from the analysis of precipitation kinetics," *J. Appl. Phys.*, vol. 84, no. 2, pp. 713–717, Jul. 1998.
 - [22] J. Murphy and R. Falster, "The relaxation behaviour of supersaturated iron in single-crystal silicon at 500 to 750 °C," *J. Appl. Phys.*, vol. 112, no. 11, pp. 113506-1–113506-7, Dec. 2012.
 - [23] R. Krain, S. Herlufsen, and J. Schmidt, "Internal gettering of iron in multicrystalline silicon at low temperature," *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, vol. 93, no. 15, pp. 152108-1–152108-3, Oct. 2008.
 - [24] P. S. Plekhanov and T. Y. Tan, "Schottky effect model of electrical activity of metallic precipitates in silicon," *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, vol. 76, no. 25, pp. 3777–3779, Jun. 2000.

Authors' photographs and biographies not available at the time of publication.