# Width optimization of laser patterning

October 18, 2014 | Bugra Turan, Stefan Haas



# Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft



#### current density $J_{FC}$ glass front-contact $\rightarrow$ absorber $\mathbf{V}$ $\mathbf{V}$ $\mathbf{V}$ $\mathbf{V}$ $\mathbf{V}$ $\mathbf{V}$ $\sqrt{}$ front-contact back-contact position x



**Motivation** 



site: pv-tech.org





# **Motivation**





site: pv-tech.org





# **Fabrication of a series connected module**





# **Motivation**

Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft



[1] Gupta et al. Proc. 16<sup>th</sup> PVSC (1982)

# **Scribe width minimization**



#### Approach: adaption of peak fluence $F_p$ and beam radius $\omega_0$





Distance from focal point z- $z_0$  [mm]

# Constraints:

- Deviations of threshold fluence and laser pulse
   → unstable processing
- Stronger focusing  $\rightarrow$  decreased depth of focus





# Front contact patterning (P1)



Thin scribes possible, but large amount of debris and/or HAZ 

# **Electrical width of front contact separation**



#### Detection of electrical properties by spatially resolved measurements



- Strong decrease of current flow, influence on active solar cell
  - $\rightarrow$  Electrical width >> geometrical width
  - $\rightarrow$  counterproductive for width minimization

# Heat affected zone or barrier layer formation



#### Wet chemical post treatment



# Front contact patterning (P1)



#### Summary after wet chemical treatment



- Thin scribes possible for both materials with good electrical quality
- For etched ZnO:Al width slightly increased
- Isolation of TCO in M $\Omega$ -range also after solar cell deposition

# **Absorber patterning (P2)**





- Thin scribes possible for 300nm thickness
- For 1.4µm thick absorber scribe width limit above laser beam diameter
- Mechanical properties most probably responsible for thickness/radius dependence





#### **Contact resistance: TLM setup**





- Gupta calculations: 10µm radius (R<sub>c</sub>~1Ω) counterproductive
- Change of specific contact properties?
- SEM: increased debris redeposition on TCO

# **Back contact patterning (P3)**





- Even stronger mechanical constraints with additional back contact
- Large irregularities at scribe etch, tilted silver layer







#### Current increase taken at -1 V





- Rather constant behavior as function of  $F_{p}$
- For 10µm radius always leads to highest shunting
- Similar behavior for 60µm and 20µm
  - $\rightarrow$  Just like for P2 usage of 10µm counterproductive with detrimental impact!

# Conclusion



- P1: scribe width mainly limited by depth of focus
  - $\rightarrow$  Post treatment removes redepositions
- P2/P3: ablation mech. sets strong constraints on the width minimization
  - $\rightarrow$  Thin scribes only possible for thin layers
- Electrical properties of are strongly influenced by scribe width
  - $\rightarrow$  Thinner lines lead to worse electrical properties



# Thank you for your attention!

# **Properties of Gaussian beams (P3)**







18. Oktober 2014

-80

-40

40

0 Radius r [µm] 80

slide 18

### **Influence of ambient pressure**



air

vacuum





Vacuum:

- → lower particle deposition on surface
- → decreased contact resistance

# **Electrical width of front contact separation**



Detection of electrical properties by spatially resolved measurements



Strong decrease of current conduction and current generation
→ counterproductive for width minimization

October 18, 2014

# Heat affected zone or barrier layer formation



#### Wet chemical post treatment





18. Oktober 2014





Gupta calculations: 10µm radius counterproductive for a-Si:H

October 18, 2014

slide 22

#### Current increase taken at -1 V





- Strong fluctuations detected
- Above onset fluence (dashed line) almost constant for a-Si:H
- 10µm radius always leads to highest shunting
- Tandem shunting always lower than a-Si:H

October 18, 2014