NREL
NATIONAL RENEWABLE ENERGY LABORATORY

Modeling Thermal Fatigue in CPV Cell Assemblies



NREL PV Module Reliability Workshop

Nick Bosco
and Sarah Kurtz

February 16 2011

quantifying thermal fatigue


initial


500 cycles


1000 cycles


1500 cycles

- Thermal fatigue will cause die-attach failure.
- How can we model this failure?
- Will this model result in a lifetime prediction?

review: rainflow counting

1: CPV cell temperature modeling

$$T_{\text{mod}} = T_{amb} + E\exp(a + bW)$$

$$T_{cell} = \overline{T}_{\text{mod}} + \frac{E}{E_o}\Delta T$$

2: rainflow cycle counting



3: damage calculation

$$N_f = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\Delta\gamma_p}{2\varepsilon_f}\right)^{\frac{1}{c}}$$

$$c = -0.422 - 6\cdot10^{-4}T_{mean} + 1.74\cdot10^{-2}\ln\left(1+\frac{360}{t_d}\right)$$

$$\Delta\gamma_p = \frac{\sqrt{2}FL}{2h}\Delta\alpha\Delta T$$

$$D = \sum_i \frac{n_i}{N_i}$$

$$D = \sum_i \Delta T_i^{-\frac{1}{c_i}}$$

- Method can quickly analyze long time histories
- Several sources of error exist
- Not capable of differentiating between materials and designs*

review: rainflow counting







- Algorithm distills time history of temperature into discrete segments.
- Attempts to count only the “significant” segments.
- Damage is exponential with temperature change.

finite element modeling

FEM: CPV Cell Assembly



¼ model
1 cm^2 x 100 µm Ge die
50 µm eutectic Pb-Sn solder
650 µm DBC

simulation: IEC 62108 thermal cycles



finite element modeling

FEM output:

inelastic strain





stress-strain hysteresis



energy density



finite element modeling

damage calculation



crack initiation: $N_o = K_1 \Delta W_{ave}^{\alpha}$

crack growth: $\frac{da}{dN} = K_2 \Delta W_{ave}^{\beta}$

$$D = \frac{\Delta W_{acc}}{\Delta W_f}$$

finite element modeling

simulation: clear and partly cloudy days



FEM output: energy density



finite element modeling

Analysis:

Comparison of energy accumulated through thermal cycling and out door exposure provides for the calculation of equivalent times (acceleration factors)

$$t_{eq} = \frac{nD_{TCA}}{365D_{day}}$$



FEM

Standard	Option	n	t_{eq} clear	t_{eq} cloudy	N_{25} clear	N_{25} cloudy
IEC 62108	TCA-1	1000	33	6.5	750	3800
	TCA-2	500	26	5	480	2400
	TCA-3	2000	27	5.5	1800	9000

RFC

t_{eq} Golden years	t_{eq} Phoenix years	t_{eq} Miami Years
13.2	48	24
8.3	30	15
20.3	74	37

FEM vs. RFC



- All damage normalized with respect to the most damaging day.
- Only a 10% difference exists in the relative measurement.

RFC



- Bubble size: relative damage
- Bubble color: climate zone

thoughts and future work

- RFC method shows promise for comparative studies between locations.
- Algorithm is convenient to quickly handle long time histories.

- FEM is capable of accurately quantifying the damage that causes failure.
- Accuracy should not be dependent on stress level.
- Models can differentiate between materials and geometries.
- Simulations are slow and expensive.

- Use FEM as a tool to refine algorithm and damage analysis
- Understand sources and magnitudes of error
- Goal: a more accurate RFC method with life prediction capabilities.