

General Disclaimer


One or more of the Following Statements may affect this Document

- This document has been reproduced from the best copy furnished by the organizational source. It is being released in the interest of making available as much information as possible.
- This document may contain data, which exceeds the sheet parameters. It was furnished in this condition by the organizational source and is the best copy available.
- This document may contain tone-on-tone or color graphs, charts and/or pictures, which have been reproduced in black and white.
- This document is paginated as submitted by the original source.
- Portions of this document are not fully legible due to the historical nature of some of the material. However, it is the best reproduction available from the original submission.

83SRC22

Unclas
G3/44 03685

**SPECTROPHOTOVOLTAIC
ORBITAL POWER GENERATION
(PHASE III)
FINAL REPORT
MARCH 31, 1983**



for
GEORGE C. MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER
Contract NAS 8-33511
by

Honeywell

Systems and Research Center
2600 Ridgway Parkway
P.O. Box 312
Minneapolis, MN 55440



CONTENTS

Section		Page
1	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY	1
	Summary of Phase I	1
	Summary of Phase II	2
	Phase III Objectives and Summary	3
2	DESIGN	4
3	MODELING	13
	Introduction	13
	Solar Spectral Data	13
	Concentrator Component Properties	15
	Introduction	15
	Mirrors	16
	Beamsplitters	18
	Compound Parabolic Concentrators	33
	Solar Cells	34
4	TEST RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	39
	Test Description	39
	Test Results	40
	Comparison of Calculated and Measured System Output	54
	Conclusions	61
	Recommendations	62
	References	63
	APPENDIX A. SAMPLE SYSTEM ANALYSIS LISTING	65
	APPENDIX B. OPTICAL AND ELECTRICAL COMPONENT DRAWINGS	69

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure		Page
1	f/3.5 Optical System	5
2	Subscale Test Model Cutaway	8
3	Subscale Test Model, Mount, and Data Logger	9
4	Close-Up of Test Model Solar Cell Mounts	10
5	Subscale Test Model During Outdoor Testing	11
6	Solar Spectral Intensity Distribution	14
7	Air Mass for Various Test Sites	15
8	Spectrophotovoltaic Concentrator Layout	16
9	Concentrator Component Geometry	17
10	Primary Mirror Reflectance (coupon measurement at 13° angle of incidence; an aluminum reference shown for comparison)	17
11A	Reference Mirror Calibration	19
11B	Telescope Mirror Reflectance Measurement	19
12	Newport Research Corporation Reflective Coatings	20
13	Solar Cell Quantum Efficiency Comparison	20
14	Calculated System Efficiency as a Function of Beamsplitter Cutoff	22
15	Measured Beamsplitter Transmission (22.5°, BS #1)	23
16	Beamsplitter Reflectance (Coating Side Toward Beam, BS #1)	24
17	Beamsplitter Reflectance (Glass Side Toward Beam, BS #1)	25
18	Multiple Surface Reflectance From the Beamsplitter	26

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS (continued)

Figure		Page
19	Measured Beamsplitter Transmission (22.5° BS #2)	28
20	Reflectance, Coating Side Toward Beam (BS #2)	29
21	Measured Reflectance, Glass Side Toward Beam (BS #2)	30
22	Beamsplitter Transmission as a Function of Incident Angle (BS #1)	31
23	Beamsplitter Transmission as a Function of Incident Angle (BS #2)	32
24	Compound Parabolic Concentrator Cross Section	34
25	Solar Cell Quantum Efficiency Comparison	36
26	Comparison of Cell Power Output	37
27	Spectral Power Output for Three Solar Cells at AM0	37
28	Spectral Power Output for Three Solar Cells at AM2	38
29	SPV System Test Configuration	41
30	Gallium Arsenide I-V Curve	42
31	Silicon Cell I-V Curve	42
32	GaAs Cell I-V Curve	44
33	Si Cell I-V Curve	44
34	Silicon Cell Tested Without the Beamsplitter	45
35	Concentrator Field-of-View Measurement	47
36	Thermal Response of the GaAs Cell as the Sun's Image Moves Off From the Cell	49
37	Pyrheliometer Field-of-View Verification	51
38	Pyrheliometer Filter Characteristics	52

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS (concluded)

Figure		Page
39	Temperature Rise Rate for the Solar Cells	55
40	Spectral Intensity vs Air Mass	56

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	System Design Parameter for Subscale Model	7
2	Measured Spectral Flux Distribution	53
3	Comparison of Measured and Calculated Power Output	58
4	Calculated Cell and System Efficiencies	59
5	SPV Component Optical Properties	61

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

This is the final report for work performed under Contract NAS8-33511 by the Honeywell Systems and Research Center for NASA's George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Alabama. This is the third phase of this contract. The work in this and previous phases of the contract is summarized below.

SUMMARY OF PHASE I

During Phase I of the program, a spectral splitting photovoltaic concept was defined. In this concept, the energy spectrum is split into different bands in which photon energy is effectively converted into electrical energy via photovoltaic cells that have matching spectral responses. The efficiency of the system also increases with the concentration ratio if the temperature of the cell is maintained constant $\sim 300\text{K}$. Assuming this condition was met, a system with 1000:1 concentration ratio was defined, using a Cassegrain telescope as the first-stage concentration (270 x), and compound parabolic concentrators (CPC) for the second-stage concentration of 4.7 x for each spectral band. Using reported state-of-the-art solar cell parameters and considering losses due to optics and beamsplitters, the calculated efficiencies of one- to four-cell systems varied from $\sim 22\%$ to $\sim 30\%$. When the cost of optics, beamsplitter, radiator, and the cost of developing new cells are considered, the most cost-effective system was the two-cell gallium arsenide/silicon (GaAs/Si) system.

The advantages of the spectrophotovoltaic (SPV) concept are: 1) the increase in photoelectric conversion efficiency without development of new materials and cells; 2) intrinsic particle radiation hardness, since the

cells are not directly exposed to particle radiation; and 3) intrinsic resistance to laser damage, since the acceptance angle of the concentrator system is only $\pm 0.5^\circ$, pointing at the sun. Thus, the spectrophotovoltaic concept is especially suitable for space power generation.

SUMMARY OF PHASE II

In Phase II of the program, the objective was to define and design a subscale model which would demonstrate the hardware feasibility of selected components of the full-scale spectrophotovoltaic orbital power generation system up to a concentration ratio of 1000:1. The design for ground-based testing would be in sufficient detail to produce a subscale model capable of demonstrating the performance characteristics of the major components and the integrated system.

The subscale model defined was a 10-in. aperture system with an effective concentration ratio up to 1000:1, similar to that defined in Phase I. The partially concentrated solar spectrum was divided into two bands by a beamsplitter and then focused onto two selected cells. The chosen cells were well-developed GaAs and Si solar cells. Both reflective and transmitting mode to GaAs (denoted by GaAs/Si and Si/GaAs, respectively) would be tested, since each configuration had its own merits. The model would demonstrate the high conversion efficiency, due to both spectrum splitting and high concentration ratio of the defined concept. In addition, thermal data on various system components would be taken; these data would shed light on system losses and thus lead to an optimal design. The ability of the system components to withstand such high concentration would also be tested.

The optical design for the subscale model was a scaled-down version of the Phase I design with an increase of the back focal length from 3 in. to 6 in. to allow room for thermal measurement at the CPC solar cell closest to the primary. This caused the secondary obscuration to increase from 7% to 10%. Three manufacturing methods for the optical components were explored. Among these, electroforming, a version of electroplating, was the most economical for the CPCs. Diamond turning and conventional glass grinding appeared best for the primary and secondary. Optical tolerance analysis of the mirror included three other mirror combinations. The most critical alignment was the separation between the primary and secondary mirrors, which had to be maintained within ± 0.015 in.

PHASE III OBJECTIVES AND SUMMARY

The objective of building and testing the subscale model of the spectrophotovoltaic system was to demonstrate the efficiency gains attainable by splitting the spectrum and directing the energy to spectrally matched solar cells and to take advantage of cell efficiency gains resulting from operating at high solar concentration ratios.

The test results presented in this report show that there is a small advantage to be gained by implementing the spectrophotovoltaic concept. Component performance contributed to lower than anticipated system efficiency. The highest measured system efficiency was 14.2%, with the GaAs cell contributing 12% and the Si cell contributing 2.2% of the total conversion efficiency.

Measured and manufacturers' data on all of the components were input to a computer model of the system. Good agreement was found between the measured and calculated parameters for the GaAs solar cell. The model and computer printout are given in Appendix A.

SECTION 2

DESIGN

The objective of the design was to provide a solar concentrator for testing solar cells under very high concentration ratios while employing spectral beamsplitting to increase the net solar to electrical energy conversion efficiency. In addition, the subscale test model would closely model the optical features of the concentrator concept designed in Phase I of this contract.* Additional requirements on the test model were that it be large enough to provide readily measurable electric and thermal output from each solar cell. The upper limit on model size was constrained by the need for portability and by component costs.

The optical design only required one departure from linear scaling. To provide more clearance between the back of the primary mirror and the solar cells and for instrumentation and thermal insulation, the back focal length of the optics was increased slightly. This required a larger diameter secondary mirror with an accompanying increase in obscuration from 7.3% to 10%. Figure 1 is a cross-sectional drawing which identifies the optical components.

*Although the Phase I design considered only a single concentrator system with a 100 kW electric output, the optimum aperture size for most efficient fabrication and energy conversion is not clear. Each size of concentrator will require different manufacturing techniques, alignment tolerances, and materials to achieve an optimum design. Determining the best solution will require a series of complete system designs.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 1. $f/3.5$ Optical System

The double-width rays trace out the path of rays originating from the edges of the 0.5° wide sun. The beamsplitter is placed at a 22.5° angle to the optical axis to redirect the short wavelength portion of the spectrum to the solar cell having the higher bandgap. The longer wavelength portion of the spectrum passes through the beamsplitter to the lower bandgap solar cell.

The optical concentration at the aperture of the compound parabolic concentrator is approximately 270:1, and an additional concentration of 4.66 occurs in the CPC for a total concentration of 1256:1. Obscuration losses due to the secondary mirror surfaces bring the net concentration down to approximately 1000:1.

This particular optical configuration was the result of an optimization study performed in Phase I of the contract. The tradeoffs considered surface accuracy requirements, space deployment concepts, beamsplitter heat loads, and cell-to-beamsplitter geometry. The results were that the most economical system performed the solar concentration in two stages, as shown, using an $f/3.5$ primary concentrator and a CPC secondary concentrator.

Table 1 summarizes the subscale model optical design parameters. The characteristic optical surface radii, focal lengths and separations, and the theoretical concentration ratios are listed. The tradeoffs and rationale for selecting a 10-in. aperture design were presented in the Phase II design study report. The main driving issues were that a 10-in. aperture was large enough to collect easily measured quantities of energy, while being small enough to be easily portable and have minimum component costs.

Figure 2 is a cross-sectional cutaway view of the subscale test model showing the physical size, shape, and layout of various optical components. The primary is an $f/0.7$ diamond-turned elliptical mirror made from aluminum. The secondary is a spherical quartz mirror bolted to the spider mount, the two together forming what is referred to as a Dall-Kirkham telescope system. The beamsplitter is a multilayer coating deposited on Infrasil (fused quartz) substrate. It is mounted in an aluminum holder which in turn is bolted to the primary mechanical structure of the concentrator. The two solar cells and CPCs are each mounted in their own separate housing which provides the mechanical support and thermal insulation. Electric power leads, thermocouples, and coolant lines are also supported by the solar cell mounts. Complete detailed mechanical drawings of the various components are provided in Appendix B.

TABLE 1. SYSTEM DESIGN PARAMETER FOR SUBSCALE MODEL

Primary Diameter =	10.0"
Primary Focal Length =	7.0"
Primary F/# =	0.70
Secondary Magnification =	5.0
System Back Focal Length =	6.0"
Source Angular Subtense =	$\pm 0.5^\circ$
System Focal Length =	35.00
System F/# =	3.50
Secondary Focal Length =	-2.71"
Secondary Diameter =	3.18"
Primary-Secondary Separation =	4.83"
Secondary Obscuration =	0.10
Obscuration Efficiency =	0.90
CPC Entrance Aperture Dia. =	0.61"
Concentration of Cassegrain =	269.63
Solar Cell Diameter =	0.28"
Concentration of CPC =	4.66
Length of CPC =	0.85
System Concentration =	1256

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 2. Subscale Test Model Cutaway

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 3 is a photograph of the assembled mechanical structure, tracking drive, and data logger. It shows the mounting relationship of the test model, two Epply normal incidence pyr heliometers, and the drive mechanism. Two adjustable counterweights are provided to minimize the unbalanced loads both on the declination adjustment and the polar rotation axis. The drive mechanism is a standard Epply pyr heliometer drive modified to accept the greater weight and higher center of gravity of the test model. All components are either anodized aluminum, stainless steel, or plexiglass except for the drive mechanism, which is baked enamel on steel.

The data logger used for recording the cell current, voltage, temperatures, and solar intensity was a 30-channel Fluke Model 2240C data logger having a 40,000-count dual-slope integration. It was capable of resolving differences of 1 mV or 1 part in 40,000, whichever is larger. Temperature measurements were resolved to 0.1°C.




Figure 3. Subscale Test Model, Mount, and Data Logger

Figure 4 is a close-up view of the back of the test model showing the beamsplitter mount, the CPC and cell holders, and the electric signal and coolant feedthroughs. The CPC/cell holders are bolted to the mounting plate with single bolts placed in oversized holes to permit rotation and translation for the fine alignment. Height adjustment was provided by shims. (In the final assembly, no shimming was required to achieve optical alignment.) The back and top of the cell mounting compartment was covered with plexiglass to reduce convection losses and dust contamination of the intensely illuminated optical components. The dust covers are shown installed in Figure 3 but are removed in Figure 4.

Figure 5 shows the assembled concentrator while it was being tested in sunlight. The cabling so predominate in the photograph consists of voltage and current leads for each solar cell, thermocouples, pyrheliometer leads, tracker drive power, and cell coolant lines. The coolant used was water with approximately 15% alcohol to prevent freezing.




Figure 4. Close-Up of Test Model Solar Cell Mounts



Figure 5. Subscale Test Model During Outdoor Testing

Preliminary alignment of the concentrator to the sun was performed using the pinhole and target alignment sight on the pyrheliometers. Fine alignment was performed by fine adjusting the declination and hour angles to maximize the short-circuit current from each of the solar cells.

The one-degree field of view of the concentrator while tracking a half-degree wide sun provided an acceptably wide margin of error such that once aligned, the concentrator would track for an hour or more without requiring fine adjustment. Improving the alignment of the polar axis to the earth axis would have increased this accurate tracking time to several hours. Measurements and geometric calculations showed that the pyrheliometers were very insensitive to alignment errors of $\pm 1^\circ$. Hence, the concentrator-to-pyrheliometer alignment did not have to be changed with small adjustments of the concentrator to sun alignment.

In the following section, the numerical modeling performed during this program will be discussed. Test data measured for various components and the system performance will be presented in Section 4.

SECTION 3

MODELING

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation of the test model required an analytic model for performance comparison and predictions. A detailed analytic model of the concentrator was created by spectrally integrating the component performance data. Spectral measurements of component reflectance, transmission, and conversion efficiency were made for each component and integrated with the solar spectral intensity within the 0.29- to 1.1- μm spectral range. The conversion efficiency is the quotient of electrical output divided by solar energy input. In the following paragraphs, all of the parameters which went into the analysis will be discussed, starting from the solar spectral data and ending with the predicted performance.

SOLAR SPECTRAL DATA

The solar spectral data used in this analysis were taken from a 1978 paper by Mecherikunnel and Richmond.¹ This paper presents spectral irradiance data over the wavelength range 290 to 4000 nanometers (0.29 to 4.0 μm) for air masses 0 to 10 (AM0 to AM10). (For sea-level observations the air mass is approximately $1/\sin\theta$, where θ is the altitude angle of the sun.)

The paper further presents correction factors for various levels of atmospheric moisture, ozone, and turbulence. In all of the following analyses, it was assumed that the atmosphere was clear, with Angstrom turbidity coefficients $\alpha = 0.66$ and $\beta = 0.170$, 20 mm of precipitable water vapor and 3.4 mm of ozone.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

Figure 6 is a plot of solar spectral irradiance for AM0 and an AM2 spectrum with the atmospheric conditions given above. The atmospheric attenuation is stronger at the shorter wavelengths but shows very strong water-absorption bands at the longer wavelengths. The overall effect on a two-color photovoltaic conversion system is to shift a greater percentage of the energy from the shorter wavelength solar cell to the longer wavelength cell. A system optimized for space applications will not have the maximum efficiency when tested at AM2 conditions.

Atmospheric attenuation can be minimized by testing at higher altitudes and when the sun is most nearly overhead. Figure 7 is a plot of apparent air mass as a function of solar zenith angle and test-site elevation. The test sites plotted include several high-altitude observations plus Minneapolis, and Leadville, Colorado. Table Mountain, California, provides the best compromise in terms of accessibility, working facilities, and reduction in air mass.




Figure 6. Solar Spectral Intensity Distribution

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 7. Air Mass for Various Test Sites

In all of the following analyses the air mass and turbidity assumed was that for average clear sky conditions with either an AM1 or AM2 condition. Should further testing be performed, testing at a high-altitude site such as Table Mountain would be recommended.

CONCENTRATOR COMPONENT PROPERTIES

Introduction

Before the performance of the spectrophotovoltaic system can be predicted, the performance of each of its components must be characterized. The SPV concentrator system has a large number of components in the optical path, all of which impact the net conversion efficiency. Figure 8 is a cross-sectional drawing of the concentrator showing the relative size and

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 8. Spectrophotovoltaic Concentrator Layout

locations of the mirrors, beamsplitter, compound parabolic concentrators, and solar cells. Figure 9 provides the critical geometric dimensions of all the components in the optical system. In the following paragraphs the optical properties data for each of the components will be presented.

Mirrors

The primary and secondary mirror system together form what is known as a Dall-Kirkham telescope. The primary is an elliptical diamond-turned aluminum mirror; the secondary is a spherical quartz mirror. Both mirrors are overcoated with silver for maximum short-wave reflectance. Figure 10 is a plot of reflectance versus wavelength for a witness coupon overcoated with silver at the same time as the primary mirror. The integrated average solar reflectance (AMO) over the 0.4- to 1.1- μm spectral range was 86%. This

ORIGINAL FILE NO
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 9. Concentrator Component Geometry




Figure 10. Primary Mirror Reflectance (coupon measurement at 13° angle of incidence; an aluminum reference shown for comparison)

would increase slightly for an AM2 spectrum because of the higher reflectance at longer wavelengths. An accurate reflectance measurement from a large, steeply curved mirror is difficult to perform. An approximate measurement of reflectivity was made using a double bounce technique as illustrated in Figure 11A and B. The reflectance measured at $0.63 \mu\text{m}$ was 0.86 ± 0.02 per surface. The large uncertainty was due to the relatively small detector collection aperture of the detector and the amount of surface scattering from the diamond-turned primary mirror. It is suspected that, had a larger aperture detector been available, the measured reflectance would have approached the 90% shown in Figure 10 ($\lambda = 0.63 \mu\text{m}$). The measurement scheme shown in Figure 11 had an acceptance angle of approximately 0.2° , whereas the acceptance angle of the solar cell is near 1° . In calculating the mirror reflectance it was assumed that the primary and secondary had the same reflectance. From a practical standpoint, it makes no difference whether one mirror has 100% reflectance and the other 74% or whether they both have 86%. From the limited amount of data available, the latter case appears to be a good approximation.

The reflectance requested from the vendor was 98% or greater over the 0.45- to 1.1- μm range. Coatings of this high reflectance and broadband are commercially available (Figure 12), without pushing the state-of-the-art. Increasing the reflectance of each mirror from 86% to 98% would increase the system conversion efficiency by 29.9%.

Beamsplitters

The spectral beamsplitter is the unique feature of this solar electric conversion system. Solar cells characteristically have a very steep long-wave cutoff (Figure 13). Since the solar cells having shorter wavelength cutoff characteristics operate at higher voltages, the electric power output is maximized by splitting the solar spectrum and directing portions of the spectrum to the spectrally matching solar cells.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 11A. Reference Mirror Calibration




Figure 11B. Telescope Mirror Reflectance Measurement




Figure 12. Newport Research Corporation Reflective Coatings




Figure 13. Solar Cell Quantum Efficiency Comparison

To determine the sensitivity of the conversion efficiency to the cutoff wavelength of the beamsplitter, a series of calculations were made for GaAs and Si cells using both AMO and AM2 solar spectra. Figure 14 shows a plot of efficiency versus beamsplitter cutoff wavelength. The curves indicate that the cutoff wavelength can vary $\pm 0.3 \mu\text{m}$ with less than a 5% reduction in net electrical power output. In the modeling an assumption was made that the reflected portion of the spectrum was totally reflected, and 1% of the remainder was absorbed. Depending on whether the short-wave portion of the spectrum, which contains more than 70% of the energy, was reflected or transmitted, the peak of the efficiency curve is shifted slightly. Since more energy is produced by the GaAs cell than by the Si cell, the system efficiency is slightly higher with a short-wave reflective beamsplitter.

Two sets of beamsplitters were purchased from Broomer Research, Inc.--one set for the AlGaAs/Si solar cell combination, and one for the GaAs/Si cell combination. Figures 15 and 16 show the GaAs/Si beamsplitter transmission and reflectance, respectively. Figure 17 shows the effect of turning the multilayer coated mirror over and measuring reflectance with the glass side toward the incident beam. The presence of harmonics in one orientation and not in the other is the result of the walk-off of the multiply reflected beam from the collection aperture of the spectrometer. The total reflectance is the sum of an infinite series of reflections, but since the spectrometer beam strikes the sample of an 8° angle the multiple reflections between the front and back surfaces are displaced from the principal reflection and do not reach the detector.

Figure 18 diagrams the reflection of the beam striking the surface at an angle. The total reflection from the beamsplitter is the infinite sum of the multiple reflections, given by the following equation:

$$\bar{R} = \frac{R_1 - 2R_1R_2 + R_2}{1 - R_1R_2} \quad (1)$$




Figure 14. Calculated System Efficiency as a Function of Beamsplitter Cutoff

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY.




Figure 15. Measured Beamsplitter Transmission (22.5°, BS #1)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY.




Figure 16. Beamsplitter Reflectance (Coating Side Toward Beam, BS #1)

ORIGINAL FILED BY
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 17. Beamsplitter Reflectance (Glass Side Toward Beam, BS #1)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 18. Multiple Surface Reflectance From the Beamsplitter

The equation is totally symmetric in terms of front and back surface reflectances R_1 and R_2 ; hence, the total reflectance is independent of whether the beam strikes the higher or lower reflectance surface first.

When a reflectance measurement is made with an instrument having a narrow aperture slit, the walk-off of the beam limits the number of reflected rays that can be collected by the aperture. For a double bounce measurement having an 8° incident angle and a 0.1-in. thick substrate, the beam reflected from the back surface is displaced laterally 0.0373 in., the second reflection 0.0745 in., etc. If only the primary reflection and one reflection from the second surface are summed, the reflectance is given by

$$\bar{R} = R_1 + (1 - R_1)^2 R_2 \quad (2)$$

Since the beamsplitter can be oriented with the coated side ($R \approx 0.95$) toward the beam or the uncoated glass ($R = 0.04$) side toward the beam, the net collected energy can be different. In Case 1, coating toward the beam, $R_1 = 0.95$, $R_2 = 0.04$ the net reflectance measured would be $\bar{R}_1 = 0.95010$. In Case 2, $R_1 = 0.04$, $R_2 = 0.95$, the net reflectance is $\bar{R}_2 = 0.91552$. This explains why the average reflectance measured with the glass side toward the spectrometer beam (Figure 17) is 3% to 4% lower than when measured with the coated side toward the beam (Figure 16).

It is suspected that the high frequency modulation of the reflectance that appears in Figure 16 and not in Figure 17 is due to interference between layers within the coating since it stops abruptly at $0.7 \mu\text{m}$. The reflective coating appears to contain two discrete reflective stacks, one covering 0.4 to $0.7 \mu\text{m}$, the other the $0.7-$ to $0.9-\mu\text{m}$ range.

Figures 19, 20, and 21 are the transmission and two reflectances measurements for the $0.70-\mu\text{m}$ cutoff filter. These curves show characteristics very similar to those of the long-wave cutoff filter previously discussed. In all cases, the transmission portion of the band shows approximately 90% transmission and the reflectance band approximately 95% reflectance.

Multilayer coated filters show an angle of incidence dependence. The filter was designed to operate at a 22.5° angle of incidence, but transmission is customarily measured at normal incidence and reflectance at a fixed angle between 8° and 30° , depending on reflectometer design. To determine the effect of incidence angle on transmission, the sample holder was rotated and transmission measured at 0° , 22.5° , and 30° for each of the beamsplitters. The results are shown in Figures 22 and 23 for the long-wave and short-wave cutoff filters. Increasing the angle of incidence from 0° to 22.5° shifts the cutoff to approximately $0.2 \mu\text{m}$ shorter wavelength. All other transmission and reflectance features are shifted with no significant changes in total reflectance or transmission.




Figure 19. Measured Beamsplitter Transmission (22.5° BS #2)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY.




Figure 20. Reflectance, Coating Side Toward Beam (BS #2)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 21. Measured Reflectance, Glass Side Toward Beam (BS #2)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 22. Beamsplitter Transmission as a Function of Incident Angle (BS #1)

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 23. Beamsplitter Transmission as a Function of Incident Angle (BS #2)

Compound Parabolic Concentrators

The compound parabolic concentrators perform the final stage of optical concentration. Using two stages of optical concentration allows the beamsplitter to function in a relatively collimated beam at moderate concentration ratios. Low concentration at the beamsplitter reduces the temperature rise on this passively cooled component. Further, by functioning in a more nearly collimated beam, the beamsplitter cutoff wavelength can be more sharply defined.

The CPC aperture is oversized sufficiently to collect the light from a 1° wide field of view. This permits the system to function with small pointing and tracking errors and compensate for spreading of the beam due to mirror imperfections. The mirrors will have small slope errors and a small amount of beam spreading due to nonspecular reflectance.

Figure 24 is a cross-sectional drawing of the CPC showing the geometry of the electroformed nickel structure. With the solar disk centered, only 38% of the energy strikes the CPC and makes only one bounce before reaching the solar cell. As the tracking error increases, more of the energy is incident on the CPC wall. The angle of incidence ranges from 45° to near 0° . For a perfect tracking system, 38% of the total energy is incident on the CPC walls and the angles of incidence change from 45° to 62° from the normal. The reflectance of polished nickel integrated over the solar spectral range appears to be in the 70% range with no strong angular dependence for the operating range.

The maximum energy loss due to CPC absorption is the product of incident energy times one minus the reflectance ($2.38 \times (1 - .7)$), or 11%. Coating the inside of the CPC with a high-reflectance multilayer coating could improve the reflectance to 95% and cut the CPC losses to near 2%. The small size and poor aspect ratio--i.e., great depth-to-diameter ratio--made this impractical. A

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 24. Compound Parabolic Concentrator Cross Section

possible way of increasing coating uniformity would be to cut the CPC lengthwise into three or more sections. These are areas for further evaluation and system improvement.

Solar Cells

The solar cells form the last and most important link in the SPV conversion system. The choice of solar cells was restricted to those that were currently available and that would meet the 1000:1 concentration ratio requirements. Three cell types were available: silicon, gallium arsenide, and aluminum gallium arsenide (AlGaAs). The nominal open-circuit operating voltages of the three cells were 0.7, 1.1, and 1.3 volts, respectively. Varian Associates of Palo Alto, California, was able to provide all three types of cells designed and packaged to operate at 1000:1 solar concentration.

To compare solar cell performance, two common comparisons were used--quantum efficiency and power output. Quantum efficiency is the ratio of electrons collected per incident or absorbed photons. Given cells of the same output voltage, quantum efficiency is a good measure of relative efficiency and is a good diagnostic tool for evaluating cell performance. When comparing solar cells having different output voltages--e.g., Si, GaAs, and AlGaAs--power output is a better measure for comparison. At a given wavelength, the quantum efficiency of an Si cell may be 20% higher than that of an AlGaAs cell, but the output voltage of the Si cell is only 54% of the AlGaAs cell. Hence, at that wavelength, AlGaAs will have a higher power output. For photovoltaic systems employing multiple solar cells of different output voltages, power output is a better basis of comparing cell performance.

Figure 25 is a plot of the quantum efficiency versus wavelength for the three types of cells. The AlGaAs exhibits a lower peak quantum efficiency and a significant fall-off as the wavelength approaches the long wavelength cutoff value. When these same data are multiplied by the output voltage, the relative areas under the curves change significantly. Figure 26 plots the relative power output determined by multiplying spectral quantum efficiency by open-circuit voltage. In this plot, the higher output voltage of the AlGaAs and GaAs cells show their importance.

Multiplying the power output by the AMO and AM2 solar spectral energy provides the final basis of comparison of the solar cells (Figures 27 and 28). Because the AlGaAs cell quantum efficiency rolls off too much before the long-wave cutoff, the AlGaAs/Si cell combination power output is less than that contributed by the GaAs/Si cell combination. Thus, of available cells, the GaAs/Si combination was selected for testing.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 25. Solar Cell Quantum Efficiency Comparison

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY,




Figure 26. Comparison of Cell Power Output




Figure 27. Spectral Power Output for Three Solar Cells at AMO

ORIGINAL PAGE 13
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 28. Spectral Power Output for Three Solar Cells at AM2

When comparing individual cells, the Si cells are more efficient than the available AlGaAs cells at all air masses, and the GaAs cells are significantly better than either. When comparing two cell system performance (AlGaAs/Si and GaAs/Si), the differences are not quite as great but are significant and increase with increasing air mass. If the AlGaAs cell quantum efficiency did not roll off so rapidly at long wavelengths, the AlGaAs/Si combination would be better at AMO.

The GaAs solar cell provides significantly greater efficiency by all of the comparison methods. Although it is claimed that better AlGaAs cells are available, there are also slightly better GaAs cells available.

Since the GaAs/Si solar cells exhibited the best performance, this combination was the only combination tested and is reported in Section 4.

SECTION 4

TEST RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

TEST DESCRIPTION

The main objective of the tests was to evaluate the SPV system performance under natural sunlight. Tests were conducted to evaluate system performance, individual cell performance, field of view, thermal response, and instrumentation.

Most of the theoretical calculations were based on clear sky AM2 spectrum or an AMO spectrum. Because of the low solar-declination angle during the late November test period, most of the tests were conducted between AM2 and AM3. The high air mass tends to shift the solar spectrum toward longer wavelengths, with a resulting decrease in overall system efficiency. This will be discussed further when comparing the calculated and measured system output.

The tests were conducted on the Honeywell Systems and Research Center roof top which provided an unobstructed solar view, access to electric power and heat, and restricted personnel access. The geographic coordinates of the test site were 45°00'N, 93°13'W with an elevation of approximately 850 feet above mean sea level. The longitude was such that solar time was within two minutes of central standard time (CST); hence, data reported for CST are essentially corrected for apparent solar time.

The procedure used to obtain the current-voltage (I-V) curves for the solar cells was to align the concentrator to the sun to maximize the short-circuit current output and then vary the series resistance from 0 Ω to ∞ (short circuit to open circuit) in steps from which the complete I-V curve could be plotted. Due to a small mechanical misalignment of one of the solar cells, measurements for each cell exhibited maximum power output at a slightly different alignment. Hence, the I-V curves for the two cells were measured sequentially rather than simultaneously.

Figure 29 shows the system in its test configuration on the roof top. The picture shows the SPV concentrator on an Epply equatorial drive unit with the variable resistance box and cooling water system placed on the lower shelves of the laboratory cart. The data logger, not shown, was located indoors. Tests were conducted on November 16 and 18, 1982, during the morning hours. Near noon on each day high cirrus clouds moved in and prevented further testing.

TEST RESULTS

The test results presented in this section are the I-V curves for each solar cell, the I-V curve for the silicon cell without the beamsplitter, the system thermal response, and the field-of-view tests. Each of the test results is presented graphically, with a discussion of the results and test conditions. Comparisons between the measured results and the modeling predictions will be made in the following section.

Figure 30 is a plot of the I-V curve for GaAs cell operating with the beamsplitter reflecting light onto it. The data were taken over a period of 18 minutes during which the solar intensity varied $\pm 1.3\%$. The maximum power point was determined by fitting a curve through the measured data and differentiating to determine the maximum power point. The cell efficiency of 12.68% was determined by dividing the maximum power output by the effective power input. The power input was taken as the product of net collector area, primary mirror area minus secondary mirror obscuration,* and solar flux measured with the calibrated pyrhelimeter.

The long wavelength energy, 0.9 to 1.1 μm in wavelength, was transmitted through the beamsplitter to the Si cell. The Si cell I-V curve is plotted in Figure 31. The voltage scales in Figures 30 and 31 are similar, but the

*Secondary mirror obstruction was 10.1% of the aperture area.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY.



Figure 29. SPV System Test Configuration

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 30. Gallium Arsenide I-V Curve




Figure 31. Silicon Cell I-V Curve

current scale was changed to provide a reasonably proportioned graph. Since 64% of the AM2 solar energy occurs at wavelengths less than 0.9 μm , a large difference in current output can be anticipated. The Si cell fill factor is higher than that of the GaAs cell because the cell is operating at a current considerably below its maximum current design point.

When the power output of the GaAs and Si cells (Figures 30 and 31) are combined, the system efficiency was 14.85%. This efficiency is considerably less than the 20% anticipated earlier in the program. The major causes of the poor performance are the low reflectance values for the two mirrors and the CPCs, with a minor contribution due to absorption in the beamsplitter. The effects of the components will be discussed further in the modeling discussion.

The I-V curves were generated a second time on November 18. Although the experiments were run later in the morning when the sun was higher and the intervening air mass lower, the sky was hazier. The result showed up as a slightly lower solar flux. The I-V curves measured on November 18 for the GaAs and Si cells are presented in Figures 32 and 33. The efficiency of the GaAs solar cell appears to be slightly higher--13.38% versus 12.68%. The differences between the two test results appear to be related to the solar flux levels. As the solar flux decreases, the cell current decreases and the internal resistive losses in the cell decrease. The result is that the fill factor increases. If, in the case where the spectral distribution of energy is approximately the same, the cell efficiency increases. The slope of the GaAs I-V curve from 0 to 3 A indicates that the cell and its mount had an internal resistance of approximately 0.0353 Ω . Assuming an initial condition of an open circuit voltage of 1.13 V, the fill factor would decrease by 3.5% per ampere of current draw. Within experimental error, this is the change exhibited between the two test runs (Figures 30 and 32).

ORIGINAL PAGE 13
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 32. GaAs Cell I-V Curve




Figure 33. Si Cell I-V Curve

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

The fill factors for the silicon cells for the two test days were nearly the same--78% and 77%. Since the change in current on the Si cell was a factor of 4 smaller than for the GaAs cell, the effect on fill factor was also reduced. In fact, the internal resistance of the Si cell circuit was also lower--0.0317 Ω versus 0.0353 Ω for the GaAs cell.

Figure 34 presents the I-V curve measured for the silicon cell with the beamsplitter removed from the system. The solar spectrum was concentrated on the single cell. The cell current increased by nearly a factor of 4, the efficiency increased by approximately 3.6, and the fill factor decreased from 77% to 70.9%. The fill factor change is very close to the decrease predicted by the voltage drop due to cell resistance.

With the full solar spectrum concentrated on the solar cell's 0.71-cm diameter, the incident flux was 23.7 W or 59.7 W/cm² (0.597 x 10⁶ W/m²).




Figure 34. Silicon Cell Tested Without the Beamsplitter

(The heat flux from the cell was not recorded during this test.) The cell temperature was proportionately higher than that of the GaAs cell, indicating that the cooling and temperature measurement systems were operating normally. The increase in cell temperature causes a decrease in output voltage. Data from Reference 2 indicate that silicon cell voltage will decrease at approximately $0.002 \text{ V}/^{\circ}\text{C}$ near ambient temperature while the current at the maximum power shows little change. The 20° rise in cell temperature could account for a 0.04-V decrease in cell voltage or approximately 0.53% in efficiency. Cooling the silicon cell to 26°C , as in Figures 31 and 33, would have raised the cell efficiency determined from the data in Figure 34 to 8.42%.

To estimate the field of view of the system, short-circuit cell current was recorded as the sun image moved out of the field of view. Note that short-circuit current is proportional to photon flux while open-circuit voltage is nearly independent of flux. Hence short-circuit current is better suited for detecting tracking errors. Figure 35 shows a plot of solar-cell short-circuit current as a function of time with the right ascension (RA) drive stopped. The sun's apparent position changes at a rate of 1° every four minutes. The design field of view was 1° . When a 0.5° sun is viewed, all of the sun's energy should be collected with a $\pm 0.25^{\circ}$ tracking error. Further, all energy should be rejected with a tracking error greater than 0.75° .

There was some difference in the way the two cell currents fell off with time. As observed earlier in testing, there was a small amount of misalignment between the two solar cells. In this test the Si cell was most accurately aligned to the sun, with the result that the GaAs exhibited a small decrease in output from the start of the test. The Si cell output remained relatively level for the first 0.25° (GaAs 91% of max and Si 97% of max), then started to decrease. At 0.5° both cells had an output that was 72% of the maximum; this then dropped off rapidly with a further increase in tracking error.

ORIGINAL PAGE
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 35. Concentrator Field-of-View Measurement

After three minutes, when all of the theoretical sun's image was falling outside the CPC, the cell current had dropped to 34% on the GaAs cell and 25% for the Si cell. The cell current did not reach 1% of the initial value until the sun image was 1.1° from centered. This could be attributed to a high sky brightness and nonspecular reflectance from the mirror. During the test the sky exhibited some haze due to high-altitude cirrus. The test was discontinued after 5.5 minutes due to excessive heating of the CPC/solar cell holder modules as the sun's image moved across them. The results of this test demonstrated that the CPCs provide a fairly uniform illumination of the solar cell over nearly a 1° field of view.

While the solar cell current as a function of tracking error was being measured, the system thermal response was also recorded. The results for the GaAs cell module are plotted in Figure 36. The module diagram in the upper right corner of Figure 36 indicates the location of the thermocouples. Thermocouples 13 and 14 can be used to estimate heat flux from the GaAs solar cell. The calculated thermal conductance between thermocouples 13 and 14 was $1.17 \text{ W}/^\circ\text{C}$. While the cell temperature monotonically declined as the sun's image moved off from the center of the CPC, the CPC temperature increased. During the first minute when the image moved within the CPC, its temperature change was small. The aperture of the cell holder module was larger than the CPC aperture, thus allowing energy to be absorbed directly by the CPC support ring as the sun's image moved outside the CPC. As the sun's image moved outside the CPC, the CPC temperature rose rapidly and then fell sharply as the image moved out onto the face of the aluminum module at about 3.5 minutes into the test.

The temperature of the solar cell and the apparent heat flux from it fell off significantly more slowly than the solar flux. This was due to a considerable mass of copper used in the cell holder and a lower than expected thermal conductance between the cell holder and the water-cooled support. In fact,




Figure 36. Thermal Response of the GaAs Cell as the Sun's Image Moves Off From the Cell

after the cover was placed on the system, the CPC and holder quickly cooled to a temperature below that of the solar cell. The total heat load into the module indicated by the sink temperature, thermocouple 12, rose slightly as the sun's image moved across the CPC and then dropped rapidly as the CPC temperature fell.

As the field of view of the concentrator was evaluated, the field of view of the pyrhelimeters was also checked. Figure 37 plots the output of the two pyrhelimeters as a function of time with the right ascension drive turned off. No significant change in signal level was observed until approximately seven minutes had elapsed or the sun had drifted 2° off center. The quoted field of view of the Epply pyrhelimeter is $5^\circ 43'$ but that is the field of view at the half-power point. The calculated field of view with no signal blockage is $3^\circ 31'$. Hence the output signal plotted in Figure 37 should be expected to start falling off after six minutes, reaching the half-power point after 11.4 minutes. The signal started falling off approximately a minute late (0.25°) and appeared to be approaching the half-power point at 11 minutes. The approaching clouds obscured the exact time. Other than a possible misalignment of the pyrhelimeter to the concentrator of $\pm 0.25^\circ$, the pyrhelimeter was functioning as predicted.

To characterize the solar spectrum, three filters were mounted on the pyrhelimeter filter wheel. Knowing the spectral transmission of the filters allows an estimation of the relative amounts of energy reaching each detector. The three Schott Glass filters on OG-530, on RG-695, and RG-780 were used. Their measured spectral characteristics are shown in Figure 38. The measured cut-on wavelengths were $530 \mu\text{m}$, $695 \mu\text{m}$, and $800 \mu\text{m}$, with 90% transmission out to $2 \mu\text{m}$ and then a sharp cutoff at $2.7 \mu\text{m}$. Table 2 lists the measured solar flux using each of the filters and compares it to the

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 37. Pyrheliometer Field-of-View Verification

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




Figure 38. Pyrheliometer Filter Characteristics

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

TABLE 2. MEASURED SPECTRAL FLUX DISTRIBUTION

	Filter	Spectral Range (μm)	Transmission %	Calculated Flux (W/m ²)	Measured Flux (W/m ²)	Scaled Calculated Flux	Measured Difference (%)
AM2 (Calculated)	None	0.3 to 4.0	100	563	---	623	--- + 10.7
Pyrheliometer (Measured)	None	0.3 to ~4.0	100	563	623	623	0.0
	OG-530	0.53 to 2.7	.90	403	484	446	+ 8.5
	RG-695	0.695 to 2.7	.90	281	363	311	+ 16.7
	RG-780	0.80 to 2.7	.90	223	295	246	+ 19.9

expected flux assuming an AM2 atmosphere and turbidity coefficients of $\alpha = 0.66$ and $\beta = 0.17$. Although the calculated air mass was 2.3, the measured intensity was 10.7% greater than the theoretical value for AM2. This can easily be accounted for by observing that if the turbidity coefficient β is cut in half, the AM2 flux increases from 563 to 691 W/m². Interpolating between AM2, AM3, and turbidity coefficient $\beta = 0.085$, and $\beta = 0.17$ ¹ indicates measured flux of 623 would require a turbidity coefficient of $\beta = 0.10$, which is representative of moderately clear air. The spectral shift toward longer wavelengths due to increased air mass only accounts for about two to three percentage points. The remainder of the measured spectral shift remains unexplained. In the final analysis, none of the spectral shifts or measured intensities has a strong effect on earlier system efficiency calculations. At the worst, the effect could be on the order of a fraction of a percentage point.

A final look at the thermal response of the solar cells is presented in Figure 39. The temperature rise of the GaAs cell is plotted as a function of time after exposure to the concentrated sunlight. In a period of 37 seconds the temperature rose to 50% of its final value. The initial temperature rise rate was approximately 17°C per minute. In the initial stages of heating, most of the heat goes into the heat of the cell and holder. As the temperature rises further, a gradient is established between the cell and the holder, and heat begins to flow into the water-cooled heat sink. The cell temperature continues to rise until thermal equilibrium is established and all heat is being conducted to the heat sink. The slow establishment of equilibrium--i.e., the last 5° temperature rise requiring 10 minutes--supports the earlier observation that on cooling (Figure 36), the slow decay in cell temperature when the sun moves off from the cell was due to removal of heat and not to a slow decrease in solar flux on the cell.

COMPARISON OF CALCULATED AND MEASURED SYSTEM OUTPUT

In this section the system analytic model will be described, the calculated power output for various operating conditions presented, and a comparison made between measured and calculated conversion efficiencies.

The solar spectral intensity profile for various air masses is plotted in Figure 40. It shows the rapid decrease in solar energy with increasing air mass, the shift toward longer wavelengths, and the strong effect of absorption in the 0.8- to 1.0- μm band. Considering the GaAs and Si solar cell combination, one sees that the relative area under the AM2 curve between 0.3 and 0.9 is much larger than the area between 0.9 and 1.1 μm . Further considering that the GaAs output voltage is 57% higher, 1.1 V versus 0.7 V, it




Figure 40. Spectral Intensity vs Air Mass

is apparent why the GaAs cell output is much greater than that of the Si cell. This observation is borne out in both the previously presented experimental data and the calculated values presented in the following paragraphs.

The method of calculating system performance was to piecewise integrate all system parameters over the 0.29- to 1.10- μm spectral range. The spectrum was broken into 82 finite bands each 0.01 μm or 10 nanometers in width and each component property input at the center wavelength. The solar spectrum, mirror reflectances, beamsplitter reflectance and transmission, and solar cell quantum efficiency were all entered into the model at 0.01- μm increments. Because of the large number of equal-width spectral bands, a simple summation of terms produces acceptably accurate results. The accuracy of the input data

does not justify more sophisticated curve fitting integration schemes. A sample listing of one computer run is presented in Appendix A. That particular calculation is for the nominal AM2 solar flux case using the measure property data and the best estimates where properties are unavailable. It forms the baseline for comparison of measured versus calculated performance in the following paragraphs.

Comparison of measured versus calculated system efficiency will be presented first. This will be followed by calculated efficiencies with various component modifications all for a nominal AM2 air mass.

The measured data were taken at various times during the day, with the result that, not only was the air mass varying, but the solar intensity varied considerably due to changes in atmospheric scattering and absorption. To place the comparisons on as nearly an equal basis as possible, the calculated cell output was scaled up and down by the ratio, and measured flux divided by AM2 solar constant. No attempt was made to further correct the calculated output based on variations in spectral content.

Table 3 presents the comparison of measured and calculated solar power output. Note that the basis of comparison is the current times voltage product and not the measured power output. The I-V product is nearly independent of the flux level, whereas the maximum power attainable depends on cell-internal resistance, cell temperature, and cell design and flux level. All but temperature can be lumped into one variable called "fill factor," which only depends on flux level, but the cells have not been sufficiently characterized to do that with any accuracy.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

TABLE 3. COMPARISON OF MEASURED AND CALCULATED POWER OUTPUT

Solar Cell	Measured Solar Flux (W/m ²)	Measured I x V (W)	Calculated I x V (W)	Difference (%)
16 NOV '82				
GaAs	569.5	4.67	4.294	+ 8.8
Si	586	0.74	0.477	+55
18 NOV' 82				
GaAs	508.5	4.17	3.834	+ 8.8
Si	536.5	0.68	0.437	+56
No Beam-splitter				
Si	520.5	2.64	3.050	-13.4

The model predicts the performance of the cells very consistently over a range of solar fluxes. The accuracy of predicted GaAs power output is quite good. The Si cell predicted output is much lower than measured. We suspect that a calibration error was undetected. A review of the raw data did not indicate any probable cause for the abnormal differences between measurements and calculations.

For the third case, where the entire sun was concentrated on the Si cell, the measured power was 13% below the calculated value. Five percent of that difference can be attributed to the heating of the cell, as previously mentioned. This close agreement tends to indicate that the large error in previous Si cell power measurements may be an electrical signal offset error, possibly noise, which is a much higher percentage error at low signal level.

ORIGINAL PAGE 19
OF POOR QUALITY

To determine possible system efficiencies with the existing solar cells, the maximum efficiencies from different conditions were calculated. These results are presented in Table 4 for A) the existing system, B) the existing system without the beamsplitter and only one solar cell, C) a system with perfect optical components, and D) a system with perfect optical components and without a beamsplitter. The Si cell contributes less than 10% of the output of the existing system. When compared to configuration, which has no

TABLE 4. CALCULATED CELL AND SYSTEM EFFICIENCIES*

		Wavelength (μm)		
		0.29-0.90 (%)	0.91-1.10 (%)	Total (%)
A) Existing System	GaAs	16.6	0	16.6
	Si	0.2	1.6	1.8
		Total		= 18.4
B) Existing System-- No Beamsplitter	GaAs	17.3	0	17.3
	or Si	11.03	1.8	12.9
C) Perfect Optics	GaAs	24.0	0	24.0
	Si	0	2.7	2.7
		Total		= 26.6
D) No Beamsplitter + Perfect Optics	GaAs	24.0	0	24.0
	Si	14.9	2.7	17.6

*Assumes a fill factor of unity. Fill factors are typically between 70% and 80%.

beamsplitter losses, the Si cell and beamsplitter only contribute 6% to the net power output. To determine the upper limit of performance, Case C was analyzed. Perfect optics and beamsplitter were assumed. In this case, the Si cell contributed 9.8% of the total output. If each cell was exposed to the sun with perfect mirrors and without beamsplitter, Case D, the GaAs cell would produce 36% more energy than the Si cell. Although the GaAs cell does not utilize the energy in the 0.9- to 1.1- μm range that the Si cell can convert, the 57% higher output voltage more than compensates over the 0.3- to 0.9- μm range. The quantum efficiencies are similar over the 0.3- to 0.9- μm spectral range.

To clarify where the losses occur in the SPV test model, the average optical properties for each of the components were calculated. These results are presented in Table 5. The spectrally weighted average reflectance and/or transmission of each component was calculated by integrating over the given spectral range and comparing the system output with the case having a perfect optical component. Because reflectance varies with wavelengths, it can be shown mathematically that the system performance is not degraded proportionally to the product of the component performance. But the component spectral characteristics do not vary widely over the spectrum, with the result that products of average values provide a good first estimate of performance. For the 0.29- to 0.90- μm band, the product of reflectances is 64%. In Table 4 the ratio of the GaAs cell output Case A, divided by Case C, is 69%, thus proving both points--that the product is useful, but not exact. From the data presented in Table 5, it is obvious that the mirrors and the CPC require improvement. The beamsplitter could also be improved by reducing its shortwave absorption. Considering the difficulties encountered achieving high component performances, every consideration should be given to reducing the number of components in the optical path.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

TABLE 5. SPV COMPONENT OPTICAL PROPERTIES*

	Wavelength (μm)		
	0.29 to 0.9	0.91 to 1.1	0.29 to 1.1
Primary Mirror Reflectance**	0.887	0.871	0.884
Beamsplitter Transmission	0.012	0.895	--
Beamsplitter Reflectance	0.926	0.091	--
Beamsplitter Absorption	0.062	0.014	0.555
CPC Reflectance [†]	0.88	0.90	

*Evaluated by integration over the solar spectrum,
AM2 $\alpha = 0.66$, $\beta = 0.17$

**Secondary mirror reflectance assumed identical to
primary mirror

[†]Estimated based on 40% of energy having one reflection
from CPC and handbook value of bright nickel reflectance

CONCLUSIONS

The SPV concept shows promise of making small improvements in solar-to-electric conversion efficiency. There cannot be any dramatic gains in conversion efficiency using GaAs and Si cells because the Si cell sees only 10% of the energy that the GaAs does not use. Should good blue-responding AlGaAs solar cells become available in the future, an AlGaAs and Si spectrophotovoltaic system may appear attractive, especially in an AMO environment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The SPV model should be further tested to quantify the fill factor roll-off with increasing solar flux. The heat rejection problem needs further investigation, particularly when considering larger aperture systems.

We recommend that a comprehensive series of high-altitude field tests and further system design work be performed when better AlGaAs solar cells become available (i.e., cells with higher quantum efficiency and better blue response).

REFERENCES

1. Mecherikunnel, Ann T. and Richmond, Joseph C., "Solar Spectral Irradiance at Ground Level," Proceedings of the Institute of Environmental Sciences Seminar on Testings Solar Energy Materials and Systems, May 22-24, 1978.
2. Kamath, S.; Knechtli, R.C.; Schwartz, S.; and Wolff, G., "GaAs Concentrator Photovoltaic Power System Feasibility Investigation," Contract No. F33615-76-C-2142, Hughes Aircraft Company, El Segundo, California, December 1977.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE SYSTEM ANALYSIS LISTING

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK NOT FILMED

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE SYSTEM ANALYSIS LISTING

The following computer output listing is a sample calculation of the SPV output based on the assumption of an AM2 atmosphere and the measured cell and concentrator component data. Table A-1 identifies the printout columns and their interrelationships.

At the bottom of the listing column summations and the spectral energy content applicable to the GaAs and Si cells are listed. The solar data are taken from Reference 1, assuming an AM2 spectrum with scattering and absorption coefficients of $\alpha = 0.66$ and $\beta = 0.17$.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

TABLE A-1. PRINTOUT COLUMNS AND THEIR INTERRELATIONSHIPS

Printout Column	Contents
A	Wavelength in nanometers
B	Spectral intensity in W/nm - m ²
C	Gallium arsenide solar cell spectral quantum efficiency (electrons per photon)
D	Silicon solar cell spectral quantum efficiency
E	Beamsplitter spectral transmission
F	Beamsplitter spectral reflectance
G	Primary mirror spectral reflectance
H	GaAs cell spectral current amp/nm - m ² (A x B x C x F x G ² x 0.88 x 0.0008065) Note: CPC effective reflectance is 0.88
I	Si cell spectral current amp/nm - m ² (A x B x D x E x G ² x 0.90 x 0.0008065)
J	Summation of GaAs cell current from λ ₁ = 290 nm to λ(n) in amp/m ² (J(n) = 10 x H(n) + J(n - 1))
K	Summation of Si cell current from λ ₁ = 290 nm to λ(n) in amp/m ² (K(n) = 10 x I(n) + K(n - 1))
L	Summation of GaAs cell power output from λ ₁ = 290 nm to λ(n) L(n) = 1.1 J(n)
M	Summation of Si cell power output from λ ₁ = 290 nm to λ(n) M(n) = 0.7 K(n)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
WAVE LENGTH	W/MM M2 AM2	GAAS Q-EFF	SI Q-EFF	BEAM- SPLT TRANS	BEAM- SFLT REFL	MIRRO REFL	GA-I /NM-M2	SI-I /NM-M2	GA-SUM I/M2	SI-SU I/M2	GAAS W/M2	SI W/M2
290	0	0	0	0	.4	.58	0	0	0	0	0	0
300	0	0	0	0	.4	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
310	.001	0	0	0	.4	.62	0	0	0	0	0	0
320	.034	0	0	0	.4	.64	0	0	0	0	0	0
330	.073	0	0	0	.4	.66	0	0	0	0	0	0
340	.123	0	0	0	.4	.68	0	0	0	0	0	0
350	.15	0	.0031	.0005	.4	.7	0	3.E-8	0	3.E-7	0	2.E-7
360	.177	0	.0016	.0354	.4	.72	0	1.E-6	0	1.E-5	0	9.E-6
370	.222	0	.0329	.0579	.3398	.74	0	6.E-5	0	6.E-4	0	4.E-4
380	.239	0	.0355	.0234	.5232	.76	0	3.E-5	0	10E-4	0	7.E-4
390	.258	.076	.0499	.0242	.765	.78	.0025	5.E-5	.0253	.0015	.0278	.0010
400	.37	.1	.101	.0091	.6969	.803	.0047	6.E-5	.0725	.0021	.0797	.0015
410	.485	.13	.138	.0723	.8666	.82	.0107	10E-4	.1794	.0118	.1973	.0083
420	.516	.119	.177	.0108	.9106	.834	.0116	2.E-4	.2953	.0139	.3248	.0097
430	.517	.163	.227	.0021	.8811	.83	.0156	5.E-5	.4514	.0144	.4965	.0101
440	.609	.226	.271	.0015	.8558	.84	.0260	6.E-5	.7109	.0150	.7820	.0105
450	.721	.278	.318	.0005	.8617	.84	.0389	3.E-5	1.100	.0153	1.210	.0107
460	.769	.364	.372	.0005	.9164	.84	.0591	3.E-5	1.691	.0156	1.860	.0109
470	.783	.417	.415	.0005	.926	.839	.0710	4.E-5	2.401	.0160	2.641	.0112
480	.827	.479	.456	.0005	.9396	.839	.0893	5.E-5	3.294	.0164	3.623	.0115
490	.805	.559	.494	.0005	.91	.839	.1002	5.E-5	4.296	.0169	4.726	.0119
500	.829	.641	.529	.0005	.9088	.84	.1209	6.E-5	5.505	.0175	6.056	.0123
510	.818	.707	.567	.0005	.9253	.847	.1390	6.E-5	6.895	.0181	7.584	.0127
520	.811	.742	.598	.0005	.9569	.853	.1546	7.E-5	8.441	.0188	9.285	.0131
530	.83	.756	.614	.0005	.8788	.86	.1534	7.E-5	9.975	.0195	10.97	.0137
540	.817	.76	.633	0	.9814	.866	.1751	0	11.73	.0195	12.90	.0137
550	.805	.762	.65	.0006	.9671	.87	.1753	9.E-5	13.48	.0205	14.83	.0143
560	.8	.764	.664	.0005	.9092	.875	.1691	8.E-5	15.17	.0213	16.69	.0149
570	.818	.775	.674	.0005	.9734	.883	.1946	9.E-5	17.12	.0222	18.83	.0155

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

580	.829	.775	.685	0	.9516	.887	.1980	0	19.13	.0322	21.01	.0155
590	.831	.782	.696	0	.9559	.89	.2060	0	21.16	.0222	23.27	.0155
600	.824	.784	.701	.0005	.9734	.892	.2131	1.E-4	23.29	.0232	25.62	.0162
610	.827	.785	.701	.0005	.9183	.894	.2063	1.E-4	25.35	.0242	27.89	.0169
620	.828	.782	.716	0	.9814	.898	.2255	0	27.61	.0242	30.37	.0169
630	.83	.779	.738	.0005	.9815	.9	.2298	1.E-4	29.90	.0253	32.89	.0177
640	.834	.801	.759	.0053	.9322	.904	.2312	.0013	32.22	.0381	35.44	.0266
650	.834	.803	.762	.0005	.9645	.907	.2451	1.E-4	34.67	.0393	38.13	.0275
660	.833	.802	.771	.0007	.992	.908	.2559	2.E-4	37.23	.0411	40.95	.0288
670	.828	.79	.769	.0046	.9936	.91	.2559	.0012	39.79	.0529	43.76	.0370
680	.824	.792	.772	.0015	.958	.912	.2510	4.E-4	42.29	.0568	46.52	.0398
690	.821	.784	.766	.0005	.9568	.915	.2525	1.E-4	44.82	.0581	49.30	.0407
700	.814	.772	.776	.0007	.9777	.917	.2567	2.E-4	47.39	.0600	52.12	.0420
710	.805	.768	.765	.0005	.9751	.919	.2566	1.E-4	49.95	.0613	54.95	.0429
720	.794	.759	.77	.001	.9744	.922	.2551	3.E-4	52.50	.0641	57.75	.0448
730	.786	.753	.762	.001	.9762	.924	.2556	3.E-4	55.06	.0668	60.56	.0467
740	.773	.745	.76	.001	.9793	.926	.2540	3.E-4	57.60	.0695	63.36	.0486
750	.764	.737	.732	.001	.9755	.93	.2529	3.E-4	60.13	.0721	66.14	.0505
760	.536	.732	.723	.0001	.9797	.932	.1801	2.E-5	61.93	.0723	66.12	.0506
770	.745	.729	.723	.002	.9741	.936	.2533	5.E-4	64.46	.0776	70.91	.0543
780	.734	.729	.725	.0021	.98	.94	.2565	6.E-4	67.03	.0832	73.73	.0582
790	.723	.735	.722	.0022	.9745	.942	.2576	6.E-4	69.60	.0890	76.56	.0623
800	.713	.739	.728	.0078	.9761	.944	.2602	.0021	72.20	.1099	79.42	.0770
810	.625	.741	.728	.0188	.9749	.946	.2323	.0045	74.53	.1550	81.98	.1085
820	.664	.742	.734	.0241	.9739	.946	.2499	.0063	77.03	.2175	84.73	.1523
830	.677	.737	.728	.0297	.97	.945	.2546	.0079	79.57	.2963	87.53	.2074
840	.489	.736	.728	.041	.95	.942	.1809	.0079	81.38	.3752	89.52	.2627
850	.28	.729	.724	.0663	.93	.939	.1010	.0073	82.39	.4484	90.63	.3138
860	.301	.718	.722	.0887	.91	.934	.1047	.0105	83.44	.5533	91.78	.3873
870	.26	.691	.715	.1137	.88	.928	.0841	.0115	84.28	.6683	92.71	.4678
880	.259	.357	.714	.1544	.84	.921	.0411	.0155	84.69	.8230	93.16	.5761
890	.262	.081	.708	.2428	.75	.916	.0084	.0244	84.77	1.067	93.25	.7470
900	.265	.026	.706	.3373	.643	.909	.0023	.0341	84.80	1.408	93.28	.9854
910	.275	.004	.702	.4883	.492	.901	3.E-4	.0505	84.80	1.913	93.28	1.339
920	.208	0	.695	.6539	.326	.898	0	.0509	84.80	2.422	93.28	1.696
930	.1	0	.701	.7817	.198	.893	0	.0295	84.80	2.717	93.28	1.902
940	.164	0	.701	.8485	.132	.888	0	.0525	84.80	3.242	93.28	2.269
950	.153	0	.694	.8936	.086	.885	0	.0512	84.80	3.754	93.28	2.628
960	.182	0	.677	.924	.056	.884	0	.0620	84.80	4.374	93.28	3.062
970	.296	0	.658	.9331	.06	.88	0	.0991	84.80	5.365	93.28	3.756
980	.388	0	.639	.9298	.0553	.876	0	.1258	84.80	6.624	93.28	4.637
990	.385	0	.623	.9294	.0513	.874	0	.1224	84.80	7.847	93.28	5.493
1000	.407	0	.583	.9351	.0335	.872	0	.1225	84.80	9.072	93.28	6.350
1010	.429	0	.522	.9365	.06	.87	0	.1164	84.80	10.24	93.28	7.165
1020	.444	0	.452	.9149	.0788	.868	0	.1024	84.80	11.26	93.28	7.882
1030	.431	0	.391	.914	.0673	.867	0	.0866	84.80	12.13	93.28	8.488
1040	.417	0	.31	.9252	.0631	.864	0	.0674	84.80	12.80	93.28	8.960
1050	.403	0	.238	.937	.06	.863	0	.0510	84.80	13.31	93.28	9.317
1060	.389	0	.182	.936	.06	.861	0	.0378	84.80	13.69	93.28	9.581
1070	.375	0	.141	.932	.0449	.86	0	.0283	84.80	13.97	93.28	9.779
1080	.361	0	.111	.9305	.069	.858	0	.0215	84.80	14.19	93.28	9.930
1090	.343	0	.0649	.9246	.0719	.857	0	.0120	84.80	14.31	93.28	10.01
1100	.374	0	.0478	.9107	.059	.857	0	.0095	84.80	14.40	93.28	10.08

TOTAL= 429.4
.29-.9 364.2
.9-1.1 65.24

84.80 14.40 84.80 14.40 93.28 10.08

ALPHA= .66
BETA = .17

APPENDIX B


OPTICAL AND ELECTRIC COMPONENT DRAWINGS

APPENDIX B

OPTICAL AND ELECTRIC COMPONENT DRAWINGS

The six drawings in Appendix B define the optical surfaces, their relationship to each other, and the electrical wiring system. The wiring diagram identifies individual pin connections, lead wire lengths, and the solar cell variable resistance box.


ORIGINAL PACK IS
OF POOR QUALITY




HONEYWELL
PART NO.

Honeywell SYSTEMS AND RESEARCH CENTER MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN 53157	
OPTICAL LAYOUT - SOLAR CONCENTRATOR M.C.E. :	
DRAWING NO C 27327	SHEET NO SK13354
CONTRACT NO _____	SHEET _____
CONTRACTOR _____	DATE _____
PROJECT NO _____	SCALE _____
TITLE _____	DRAWN BY _____
CHECKED BY _____	APPROVED BY _____
MATERIAL _____	FINISH SEE NOTE _____
REFERENCE _____	APPLICATION _____

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY



ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY




$\frac{1}{C} = \text{RADIUS} = -.096397$

$K = \text{CONIC CONSTANT} = -.69978$


$$\text{SAG} = \frac{Cy^2}{1 + \sqrt{1 - (K+1)C^2y^2}}$$

- 2) CORNER SHARP AND FREE OF BURRS
- 1) REFLECTIVE COATING ENHANCED ALUMINIUM

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY



ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY



1. THERMOCOUPLES - B PAIRS C₁ CONSTRUCTION.
 2. INJECTOR: CINCH # DB 25 P.
 3. CONNECTOR: CINCH # DB 25 S.
 4. HOOD: CINCH # DB 51226-1A

Honeywell
WIRING SCHEMATIC - CPC
 CONTRACT NO. **C 27827**
 SKI33654