

# 14<sup>th</sup> Workshop on Crystalline Silicon Solar Cells & Modules: Materials and Processes

## Summary of Discussion Sessions

Bhushan Sopori, Editor

Prepared by:

T. Tan, R. Sinton, D. Swanson, and B. Sopori

*Workshop held at Winter Park Mountain Lodge  
Winter Park, Colorado  
August 8–11, 2004*



# **NREL**

**National Renewable Energy Laboratory**  
1617 Cole Boulevard, Golden, Colorado 80401-3393  
303-275-3000 • [www.nrel.gov](http://www.nrel.gov)

Operated for the U.S. Department of Energy  
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy  
by Midwest Research Institute • Battelle

Contract No. DE-AC36-99-GO10337

# 14<sup>th</sup> Workshop on Crystalline Silicon Solar Cells & Modules: Materials and Processes

## Summary of Discussion Sessions

Bhushan Sopori, Editor

Prepared by:

T. Tan, R. Sinton, D. Swanson, and B. Sopori

*Workshop held at Winter Park Mountain Lodge  
Winter Park, Colorado  
August 8–11, 2004*

Prepared under Task No. WO97D000



# NREL

**National Renewable Energy Laboratory**  
1617 Cole Boulevard, Golden, Colorado 80401-3393  
303-275-3000 • [www.nrel.gov](http://www.nrel.gov)

Operated for the U.S. Department of Energy  
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy  
by Midwest Research Institute • Battelle

Contract No. DE-AC36-99-GO10337

## NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States government. Neither the United States government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or any agency thereof.

Available electronically at <http://www.osti.gov/bridge>

Available for a processing fee to U.S. Department of Energy and its contractors, in paper, from:

U.S. Department of Energy  
Office of Scientific and Technical Information  
P.O. Box 62  
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-0062  
phone: 865.576.8401  
fax: 865.576.5728  
email: <mailto:reports@adonis.osti.gov>

Available for sale to the public, in paper, from:

U.S. Department of Commerce  
National Technical Information Service  
5285 Port Royal Road  
Springfield, VA 22161  
phone: 800.553.6847  
fax: 703.605.6900  
email: [orders@ntis.fedworld.gov](mailto:orders@ntis.fedworld.gov)  
online ordering: <http://www.ntis.gov/ordering.htm>



# **The 14th Workshop on Crystalline Silicon Solar Cells and Modules: Materials and Processes**

## **Executive Summary**

The 14th Workshop on Crystalline Silicon Solar Cells and Modules: Materials and Processes, was held in Winter Park, Colorado, on August 8 – 11, 2004. Representing many different countries, there were 118 scientists and engineers, from 28 international PV and semiconductor companies and 22 research institutions, participating in this workshop. The theme of the workshop, Crystalline Silicon Solar Cells: Leapfrogging the Barriers, was selected to reflect the astounding progress in Si-PV technology during last three decades, despite a host of barriers and bottlenecks. A combination of oral, poster, and discussion sessions addressed recent advances in crystal growth technology, new cell structures and doping methods, silicon feedstock issues, hydrogen passivation and fire-through metallization, and module issues/reliability. The following oral/discussion sessions were conducted:

- Technology Update
- Defects and Impurities In Si/Discussion
- Rump Session
- Module Issues and Reliability/Discussion
- Silicon Feedstock/Discussion
- Novel Doping, Cells, and Hetero-Structure Designs/Discussion
- Metallization/Silicon Nitride Processing/Discussion
- Hydrogen Passivation/Discussion
- Characterization/Discussion
- Wrap-Up

This year's workshop lasted three and a half days and, for the first time, included a session on Si modules. A rump session was held on the evening of August 8, which addressed efficiency expectations and challenges of c-Si solar cells/modules. Richard King of DOE and Daren Dance of Wright Williams & Kelly (formerly of Sematech) spoke at two of the luncheon sessions.

Eleven students received Graduate Student Awards from funds contributed by the PV Industry.

The workshop addressed funding needs for Si research and for R&D to enhance U.S. PV manufacturing. The wrap-up session specifically addressed topics for the new university silicon program.

## SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION SESSIONS

### SESSION 3: DEFECTS AND IMPURITIES IN SI

Discussion Leader: Kim Kimerling, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

#### **The discussion leader posted four general topics for discussion:**

- Shunt paths—Precipitates and leakage current
- Recombination centers—Solubility, energy levels and capture cross-sections; boron, hydrogen
- Contacts—BSF uniformity, interfacial reactions, stress, morphology
- Coatings—Light trapping

#### **Shunt Paths**

Shunting in solar cells typically occurs because of two mechanisms: (1) dislocation clusters decorated by metallic impurity precipitates, and (2) shorts produced by metal punching through the junction, especially in shallow junction cells\*. Self-doping pastes for metallization can overcome the punch-through type of shunts by pushing the junction forward. To treat the dislocation/precipitates type of shunts, a general consensus is to use high-temperature gettering together with slow cooling. Only at high temperatures will the metal dissolution process from precipitates be effective, and slow cooling avoids the precipitate re-nucleation problem, which can adversely influence the gettering results. It is desirable and may be possible to avoid the introduction of metals into Si by cleaning up the feedstock.

(\*Another reason for shunting has typically been breakage of texture peaks prior to metallization, which subsequently were covered by metallization. Current automation techniques have greatly reduced this failure mechanism.)

#### **Recombination Centers**

Carrier recombination in current commercial solar cells is primarily dominated by impurities and defects. As the wafer gets thinner, the dependence of cell efficiency on dissolved impurities becomes less important. It is believed that for a 100- $\mu\text{m}$ -thick cell, a metallic impurity concentration of  $10^{14} \text{ cm}^{-3}$  can be tolerated. Such a concentration would be too high for current 250- $\mu\text{m}$ -thick wafers. However, if the impurities form precipitates, they can cause junction shunts. It is generally believed that grain boundaries are less harmful than dislocations decorated by metallic precipitates, because the former can seemingly be passivated by hydrogen whereas the latter cannot be. Oxygen, carbon, and nitrogen might be able to hinder dislocation generation. There is the interesting suggestion of self-doping the grain boundaries to become non-recombination regions by repelling the minority carrier away, but it is not known how to do this.

Ga doping improves light degradation in CZ cells but not mc-Si cells.

Hydrogen passivation may need just the right amount of H. Too little may not have much effect, whereas too much may cause hydrogen to form compounds, which would decrease the solubility of dissolved hydrogen and hence its effectiveness. A PECVD nitridation process provides a hydrogen source and the concurrent ion damage to the Si surface absorbs hydrogen, leading to passivation. On the other hand, the LPCVD deposition process does not provide a hydrogen source, and the nitride is a barrier to hydrogen diffusion.

**Contacts**

Contact formation renders no effect on stress and dislocation generation. We need to improve the uniformity of back contacts, to produce a uniform back surface field, e.g., via RTA.

**Coatings**

Is today’s antireflection coating enough? Lots of light is still lost. Reflection from the wafer backside is only about 20%.

**SESSION 4: MODULES AND RELIABILITY**

Discussion Leaders: Jack Hanoka, Evergreen Solar  
 Michael Quintana, Sandia National Laboratories

Planned discussion topics:

- Module considerations for a better cell design
- Thin cell compatibility with current module design

The majority of the discussion was directed to addressing module reliability from a marketability standpoint. Solar panels should be market driven. When buying goods, consumers judge availability, performance, reliability, and cost, all of which are mutually dependent. However, when buying electricity, consumers do not have such choices.

For the next generation of panels, we must improve compatibility with market demands. The main factor is cost. Cost reduction must be through better cell design, better performance, and better packaging. It might not be necessary to further improve the panel reliability (currently set at 20-25 years and expected to extend to 30 years). In the next 5 years, the following improvements can be expected:

	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Reliability</b>
<b>Devices</b>	H	H	M
<b>Materials</b>	M	M	M
<b>Packaging</b>	M	L-M	M
<b>Processes</b>	M	M	M

H = probability high; M = probability medium; L = probability low



about by ever increasing efficiency. Any new technology will have to go through the same learning process and, hence, will have a difficulty entering the market.

Sopori's summary:

1. c-Si will dominate in the next 10-20 years.
2. Cell efficiency >17% has already been reported commercially. Higher efficiency is already happening.
3. SoG Si essential. The up graded MG-Si (SoG-Si) is the best solution for feedstock.
4. New ideas/concepts in modules: interconnects, contacts.
5. What is SoG Si? How different is it from micro-electronic-grade Si?
6. The community has a clear view—c-Si will dominate!
7. Any new technology will have difficulty penetrating the existing market of c-Si.

But there are challenges. The industry must:

1. Reduce the cost of equipment
2. Improve wafer handling
3. Increase long-term reliability
4. Improve light trapping in mc-Si.
5. Understand that going thin is not easy, e.g., handling, passivating the surfaces, etc.

General discussions:

- (i) Some believe that thin-film Si can catch up with c-Si, but the ideas did not get a warm reception.
- (ii) The most promising alternative technology may use the tandem cell structure with a lower cell of c-Si cell and an upper cell of a material of higher-efficiency.
- (iii) To meet the challenges, the United States should increase research and development funding for c-Si solar cells.

<b>SESSION 5: SILICON FEEDSTOCK</b>
-------------------------------------

Discussion Leader: Jim Rand, GE Energy

Panel Members: Vishu Dosaj, Dow Corning  
Bart Geerligs, ECN  
Elias Macalalad, Solar Grade Silicon

Ragnar Tronstad, ElkemSolar AS  
Satoru Wakamatsu, Tokuyama

The discussion focused on how to produce feedstock for SoG-Si.

With regard to solar grade silicon: Will it happen this time? Worldwide demand on Si is outstripping supply. We are living off inventory. Prices are increasing.

Discussion topics:

- Knowledge on impurities has reached an unprecedented level—Is it time to develop new specifications?
- Can the Siemens process fulfill the multi-MW market need?



- Is the industry forced to a single grade Si?
- As efficiency increases, will it play down the cost issue?
- Are we too late?

Macalalad: Solar Grade Silicon, LLC, has completed its development of producing granular Si by a fluid-bed process, and is setting up a 200-ton/Y plant. Will commercialize their product at a price in the low \$20/kg range.

Wakamatsu: Tokuyama uses a vapor-liquid-deposition (VLD) method, starting from SiH<sub>4</sub>. The material is clumped together particulates that are continuously produced at a high rate. Pilot plant development is completed. Will complete feasibility studies of a 200-ton/Y plant. Will start large-scale commercial plant (1000 ton/Y) by 2008. Material is highly pure, with total metal content of around 100 ppba. The target is in the <10 ppba range.

Geerligs: ECN took the direct route to SoG Si using ultra-pure SiO<sub>2</sub>+ C. Uses plasma reactor to remove C. The process has the potential of achieving low cost.

Tronstad: Elkem uses MG Si, which involves the following sequence —slagging/alloying—trapping/solidifying—crushing/sizing—leaching/classifying—refining/casting—sizing QC/QA—SoG Si. Lab-size ingot cell efficiency is 13.4%; targeting for 15% or better.

Dosaj: Dow Corning is a major player in chemical-grade Si (better than MG Si) and is the largest supplier of SG Si. It is two years into development of SoG Si, with a total metal in the <25ppm range. The goal is for B, P, and M all in the <1 ppm range. Expect to have tons by the end of 2004 for evaluations.

Some general points:

Different solar cell Si may need different SoG Si specs. This is technically feasible, but may not be economically feasible for any one SoG Si feedstock supplier. Most SoG Si feedstock suppliers just want to make their Si as clean as possible.

- The Siemens process cannot fulfill all the needs, nor is it desirable.
- Even with cell efficiency increases, Si cost is still a major cost factor.
- It is not yet known how much C can be tolerated in the SoG Si feedstock. 10ppm? 1ppm?
- It is inevitable that SoG Si feedstock for CZ must have a different spec from that for mc-Si.

<p><b>SESSION 6: NOVEL DOPING, CELLS, AND HETERO-STRUCTURE DESIGNS</b></p>
--

<p>(The discussion session was in two parts following each of the split oral sessions)</p>
--

**Part I** – Discussion Leader: Steve Shea, Solar Manufacturing Consulting

This discussion followed an earlier presentation on Organic Photovoltaics by Aaron Wadell, Global Photonic Energy Corporation, who introduced it as a “disruptive technology.”

How to recognize a disruptive technology?

- PV may be viewed as a global disruptive technology for the power market, if oil prices stay above \$40/barrel. However, different solar cells cannot be disruptive to each other, if they compete for the same market.
- Disruptive technology goes for the niche market, e.g., a-Si for consumer electronics.
- Perhaps a true disruptive technology is one that does not rely on the same kind of learning experience as the mainstream technology it is to replace, so that it does not suffer from the very large initial start-up cost while in the meantime offering improved and/or added functions and performances.
- Organic PV has some markets, e.g., for its use on flexible roofs.

Is a-Si coming back to disrupt c-Si? No. It looks like a-Si will have a place in enhancing c-Si cells, as in the hetero-structure cells.

**Part II** – Discussion Leader: Vijay Yelundur, Georgia Tech

Are n-type Si wafers and n-base cells viable for PV?

- Will we have cells in which low-temperature emitter formation processes (deposited, plasma immersion, etc.) replace P-diffusion?
- Does Ga doping (CZ and mc Si) yield higher stabilized cell efficiency than B-doping?
- Does Ga ingot resistivity variations increase cost?
- Other.

Si and Si cells that are n-type may or may not be a viable alternative. Whereas n-type multicrystalline Si appears to be more tolerant to defects and impurities than p-type, as observed in lifetimes and diffusion lengths. Cells fabricated up to now do not seem to show a definitive higher efficiency. The reason is that the junction shunt resistance is low, leakage current is large, and  $V_{oc}$  is low, which is probably caused by the fire-through junction formation process in making contact to the p<sup>+</sup> emitter.

One reason for going to n-type is that a large quantity (2000 tons) of scrap n-Si is available. But this is beginning to be depleted.

In early days, n-based cells did not become the mainstream device, because in earlier times (1970s) the availability of n-type Si was a problem. Also, n-based cells are less resistant to radiation damage, and space applications were the main driver at the time.

If oxygen is low in concentration, n-cell is not necessarily more resistant to LID than a p-cell.

Ga ingot resistivity probably will increase the cost.

## SESSION 7: METALLIZATION/SILICON NITRIDE PROCESSING

Discussion Leader: Jalal Salami, Ferro Corporation

**Discussion topics:** Fire-through metallization  
Effect of SiN:H thickness on fire-through contacts

### Fundamental research of fire-through mechanisms

- Glass chemistry
- Optimizing contact firing
  - Effect of SiN:H thickness and index variation
  - Single step vs. multi-step firing
  - Printing
- Improved metallurgy
  - Lead-free platform
  - Lead-free back silver
  - Lead-free front contact
  - Thin wafers
    - Low bow lead-free Al paste
    - Hot melt paste: reduce handling, high aspect ratio metallurgy
  - Low-temperature firing paste?
  - High sheet resistance (70-100 ohm-cm) textured wafers?
  - Printing vs.....?

Firing through of Ag paste is important for shallow emitters with high sheet resistance- one must be careful not to shunt the junction.

Frit (“eats” through SiN) chemistry is important, but is not understood.  
Is doing metallurgy before AR coating a viable alternative?  
A fire-through method for p-type contact?  
Develop a frit that attacks SiN but not Si?  
Losing  $V_{oc}$  might be due to loss of H.  
Can the paste be cheaper?

Using Cu metallurgy is not an alternative for cheap solar cells. Cu needs to be isolated by diffusion barriers, for which the cost will be quite high.

There is some un-reacted glass surrounding silver particles. This increases contact resistance, but it may also provide adhesion for the particles contacting Si.

Much of the characterization of firing processes uses  $V_{oc}$  and FF as a measure of performance. A better set of parameters would be the  $V_{oc}$  at  $1/10^{th}$  sun, or the dark voltage at  $1/10^{th}$   $J_{sc}$ , since this voltage is close to the  $V_{mp}$  and is very sensitive to shunting and recombination effects at the maximum power point.  $V_{oc}$  at one sun is not very sensitive to shunting effects.

## **SESSION 8: HYDROGEN PASSIVATION**

Discussion Leader: Bhushan Sopori, NREL  
Panel Members: Mike Stavola, Lehigh University  
Juris Kalejs, RWE Schott Solar  
Giso Hahn, University of Konstanz

Discussion Topics:

What is being passivated?  
Does fire-through process maximize impurity/defect passivation?  
Surface passivation  
SiN:H composition vs. passivation

It is obvious that H passivates defects and impurities, but no details are known. It is known that H ties up dangling bonds and thus removes levels from the gap, e.g., at metal-precipitate-decorated dislocations.

For the PECVD SiN:H process, Si surface is damaged (probably in the form of plate type bubbles containing H<sub>2</sub>) and serves as a source of H. However, some believe that HWCVD does not cause damage (?) but perhaps yields Si-rich, SiN:H.

There seems to be reason to believe that we do not know how H diffuses through the n<sup>+</sup> region.

The fire-through process is a single step serving three functions: to form BSF, to form front contact, and to passivate the bulk. Optimization for passivation requires lower temperature. For the present paste, this is done at about 800 °C for the formation of good front contact. If appropriate paste is available, this temperature may be lowered.

Surface passivation seems to become better after fire-through.

Will stress influence H diffusion? Probably not.

SiN:H composition does influence passivation. It seems to be optimized at a lean NH<sub>4</sub>-to-SiH<sub>4</sub> ratio, i.e., for a Si-rich SiN:H film.

## **SESSION 9: CHARACTERIZATION**

Discussion Leader: Dieter Schroder, Arizona State University

In general, it is desirable to characterize material and cells as little as possible.

- For materials, want to measure/characterize (1) impurity, (2) resistivity, (3) stress, and (4) structure.
- For impurities:  $\mu$ WPCD, SPV, PL, FTIR (O, C, H, N), TXRF, SIMS, TOF-SIMS, ICP-MS, EBIC, LBIC, XBIC, XRF, EDS, DLTS, neutron-activation.

Cheaper tools are becoming available.

- For resistivity: 4-point probe (Hg 4-point probe), eddy current (QSSPC)

Still no automated 4-point/ Hg-4-point probes.

- For stress: Raman, acoustic vibrations, optical polariscopy, IR transmission

Not routinely measured by PV industry. Not needed, only interested in avoiding wafer breakage, and diagnosing cracks, etc. An optical means for doing this is on the way.

- For structure: ellipsometry, reflectance, SEM, TEM, AFM.
- For cells, wants to measure/characterize (1) efficiency, (2) impurities, (3) sheet resistance, and (4) contacts.
- Contact mapping tool is becoming available.
- How much inline control and how many diagnostic tools can the industry afford? A guideline is that it should reduce the cost due to the realized benefits.
- No inline junction-depth and surface concentration measurement tools yet.
- Measurements/diagnoses can improve PECVD machine utilities, e.g., by providing data for adjusting operation parameters. Need in-situ capability to do this.

## WRAP-UP

Moderators: Dick Swanson, SunPower Corporation and Ron Sinton, Sinton Consulting

### Topics:

1. 14<sup>th</sup> Workshop Assessment: good and bad
2. Inputs for 15<sup>th</sup> Workshop
3. Input for NREL University Initiative
4. Input for DOE White Paper

### **Good and bad aspects of the organization of the 14<sup>th</sup> Workshop and suggestions for the 15<sup>th</sup>.**

There was general consensus that the new schedule starting on Sunday morning worked very well. The Saturday-night stay gave low-cost flights, and this allowed for more breaks in the schedule. Having part of Monday afternoon available for meetings between the various attendees was very valuable for promoting collaborations. A bit later start on Sunday morning would have advocates (registration was at 7:30 a.m. this year).

Some thought that discussion sessions worked better when there was a panel at the front of the room instead of simply a moderator. This should include the speakers on that topic as well as folks from industry. It was suggested that panels of workers from industry work well and are complementary to University presentations that can generally go into more detail than an industrial speaker would usually venture.

Some suggestions were made for the 15<sup>th</sup> workshop. These included better food, especially some fruit in the morning. Real towns such as Breckenridge or Beaver Creek are preferred to isolated conference sites. We could pay more attention to having wireless microphones available throughout

the room, and to encouraging the discipline to talk at the microphones during questions and discussion sessions.

A contingent believes that fast Internet access is a requirement for a prime meeting site.

An interesting idea was proposed that would really put the “work” back into this workshop. This was to collect questions that need answers, and break up into groups to “work” on them, before reporting results to the entire workshop. One example of the type of problem that our workshop has not been addressing is how an industrial person can maintain multiple cell testers in order to “guarantee” a minimum acceptable cell performance to the customer. Questions to work on could span from the very practical to the very fundamental.

Along the same lines, perhaps it would be useful to invite tutorial talks on topics now becoming familiar in the PV industry, such as six-sigma equipment qualifications and design of experiment (DOE) methodologies.

Perhaps we could entice manufacturers to attend the workshop by having a manufacturer’s night defined in the program.

### **Input for the NREL University Initiative**

The current set of DOE/university contracts in the silicon area is coming to a close. A new RFP is going out in the next month or so. We had an open discussion on potential topics and priorities where those remaining at this last session (about 60 of 120 that had registered) saw the greatest potential of university contributions. At the end of the discussion, votes were taken, with three votes per person in the room.

Table 1. Suggestions for potential University research contributions. Columns add to 100%. Last time, only six areas were voted on.

<b>Last prioritization, 3 years ago (%)</b>	<b>% Votes, 2004</b>	<b>Topic</b>
10	15	Hydrogenation, low-cost tools and improved understanding
10	14	Handling and processing thin wafers
20	13	Neutralize bad regions in wafers
10	8	Rear surface passivation
20	7	New emitters; selective, heterojunction
	7	Other fundamentals
	6	Alternatives to sawing wafers
30	5	Improved screen printing
	5	Metrology
	5	New cell structures (such as n-based)
	4	Feedstock
	4	Materials (interconnects and contacts).
	3	Heterojunction emitters on multicrystalline wafers
	2	Techniques specific to large-area cells
	1	Inline diffusion
	1	Cassette-less processes

Interestingly, the priorities seem a bit different than the last time that we did this. In particular, improved screen-printing moved down from the top of the list into the pack, and hydrogenation moved up to the top.

### **Input for the DOE White Paper**

Some comments on the white paper contents.

1. Don't hesitate to think big, but justify the numbers by being very specific about the potential payoff. For example, an investment of \$50M would cut the time in half until solar electric reached 20% of power generation (or whatever).
2. Detail the reasons why silicon will be around for a while.
3. The white paper should address the compelling reasons for strengthening the university programs. What could be done with 2X funding, 5X funding, etc.?
4. Emphasize what is new and different in the current situation.

# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

*Form Approved*  
OMB No. 0704-0188

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Executive Services and Communications Directorate (0704-0188). Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

**PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ORGANIZATION.**

<b>1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)</b> October 2004		<b>2. REPORT TYPE</b> Workshop Summary		<b>3. DATES COVERED (From - To)</b> 8-11 August 2004		
<b>4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE</b> 14 <sup>th</sup> Workshop on Crystalline Silicon Solar Cells & Modules: Materials and Processes; Summary of Discussion Sessions, 8-11 August 2004, Winter Park, Colorado			<b>5a. CONTRACT NUMBER</b> DE-AC36-99-GO10337			
			<b>5b. GRANT NUMBER</b>			
			<b>5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER</b>			
<b>6. AUTHOR(S)</b> Bhushan Sopori, Editor Prepared by: T. Tan, R. Sinton, D. Swanson, and B. Sopori			<b>5d. PROJECT NUMBER</b> NREL/CP-520-36923			
			<b>5e. TASK NUMBER</b> WO97D999			
			<b>5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER</b>			
<b>7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> National Renewable Energy Laboratory 1617 Cole Blvd. Golden, CO 80401-3393				<b>8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER</b> NREL/CP-520-36923		
<b>9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b>				<b>10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)</b> NREL		
				<b>11. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER</b>		
<b>12. DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY STATEMENT</b> National Technical Information Service U.S. Department of Commerce 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, VA 22161						
<b>13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</b>						
<b>14. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 Words)</b> The 14th Workshop discussion sessions addressed funding needs for Si research and for R&D to enhance U.S. PV manufacturing. The wrap-up session specifically addressed topics for the new university silicon program. The theme of the workshop, Crystalline Silicon Solar Cells: Leapfrogging the Barriers, was selected to reflect the astounding progress in Si-PV technology during last three decades, despite a host of barriers and bottlenecks. A combination of oral, poster, and discussion sessions addressed recent advances in crystal growth technology, new cell structures and doping methods, silicon feedstock issues, hydrogen passivation and fire-through metallization, and module issues/reliability. The following oral/discussion sessions were conducted: (1) Technology Update; (2) Defects and Impurities in Si/Discussion; (3) Rump Session; (4) Module Issues and Reliability/Discussion; (5) Silicon Feedstock/Discussion; (6) Novel Doping, Cells, and Hetero-Structure Designs/Discussion; (7) Metallization/Silicon Nitride Processing/Discussion; (8) Hydrogen Passivation/Discussion; (9) Characterization/Discussion; and (10) Wrap-Up. This year's workshop lasted three and a half days and, for the first time, included a session on Si modules. A rump session was held on the evening of August 8, which addressed efficiency expectations and challenges of c-Si solar cells/modules. Richard King of DOE and Daren Dance of Wright Williams & Kelly (formerly of Sematech) spoke at two of the luncheon sessions. Eleven students received Graduate Student Awards from funds contributed by the PV industry.						
<b>15. SUBJECT TERMS</b> PV; crystalline silicon (c-Si); solar cells; module; materials and processes; impurities; device process; manufacturing; heterostructure; metallization; silicon nitride process; hydrogen passivation;						
<b>16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:</b>			<b>17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT</b>  UL	<b>18. NUMBER OF PAGES</b>	<b>19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON</b>	
<b>a. REPORT</b> Unclassified	<b>b. ABSTRACT</b> Unclassified	<b>c. THIS PAGE</b> Unclassified			<b>19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code)</b>	