

Solar cell efficiency divergence due to solar spectrum variation

Geoffrey S. Kinsey
Zuva Energy

Abstract

The performance of nine solar cell types (single-junction and multijunction) has been evaluated using solar spectra generated by the National Solar Radiation Database applied to confirmed record-efficiency cell parameters. Global spectra at forty-five locations, spanning 65° of latitude and 150° of longitude, were used to calculate cell efficiencies at hourly intervals over a year. Relative to test efficiency, increases in operating efficiency are seen in cadmium telluride and (single-junction) perovskite designs. Silicon exhibits the least variation, while efficiency decreases are observed in two-terminal multijunction structures. This divergence in operating efficiencies indicates that evaluation using a single spectrum is not a sufficient basis for comparison or prediction of energy yield. Application of additional “operating spectra,” to supplement the standard test spectrum, is proposed.




Fig. 1. Source locations for spectra in this study. Each marker represents about 4000 hourly spectra, for wavelengths from 280 nm to 4000 nm. In six locations, hourly spectra were generated for direct normal irradiance (DNI) using inputs from the Typical Meteorological Year 3⁵³ database to generate spectra using the SMARTS⁵² model. Map courtesy of NREL’s NSRDB.

Introduction

While remarkable change has swept across the solar photovoltaics industry in the last four decades, there has been at least one constant: efficiency of cells and modules is determined using a single standard spectrum^{1–10}. To obtain repeatable measurements, solar cells and modules are tested under indoor solar simulators that are calibrated to deliver a given irradiance and spectrum¹¹. Use of a single spectrum value has delivered valuable continuity over the years and consistency across academia and industry. Single-value testing cannot, of course, provide insight into the impact of spectrum variation on solar operations worldwide. When comparing devices with different spectral responses, the results of single-spectrum testing, if not representative of operating spectra, are potentially misleading^{12–32}.

Synthetic spectra (Fig. 1) have been obtained from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory’s (NREL’s) National Solar Radiation Database (NSRDB)^{33,34}. Spectra are generated via the Fast All-sky Radiation Model for Solar applications with Narrowband Irradiances on Tilted surfaces (FARMS-NIT) model^{35,36}. These “global” spectra (including scattered sunlight from the hemisphere of the sky) are generated by the model at hourly intervals for fixed-tilt and single-axis panel orientations (Figure 1). For the fixed-tilt configuration, the site latitude was chosen as the tilt angle. III-V multijunctions are part of this study, so six hourly “direct” spectra (for sunlight coming directly from the vicinity of the solar disc, derived separately²¹) are included. Each dataset

represents about 4000 hourly spectra for which the model calculated a non-zero irradiance, with a wavelength range of 280 nm to 4000 nm (Supplemental Table S1).




Fig. 2. Annual summations of seventy-six hourly global spectra from forty-five locations for NSRDB spectrum year 2018. For comparison with AM1.5G (gray) and the extraterrestrial standard (AM0, black), the global spectra amplitudes have been normalized to that of AM0 at 1050 nm.

Analysis focuses on the global spectra provided by the NSRDB (Fig. 2). Relative to AM1.5G, the annual global spectra exhibit more power density in the visible wavelengths (400-700 nm). Since single-axis trackers follow the sun from/to the horizons, the resulting aggregated spectral content appears less “blue” than for the latitude-tilt (fixed) orientations.




Fig. 3. Quantum efficiencies for seven of the nine cell types in this study, digitized at 5-nm intervals from figures in the *Solar Cell Efficiency Tables*: (a) silicon (Si)³⁷, cadmium telluride (CdTe)³⁸, and CIGS³⁹; (b) perovskite (PVSK)⁴⁰, perovskite-CIGS tandem (PVSK-CIGS)⁴¹, perovskite-silicon tandem (PVSK-Si)⁴¹ and a III-V three-junction cell⁴². The quantum efficiencies for the III-V four-junction and III-V six-junction cells are shown in Supplemental Fig. S3.

Performance data for nine confirmed current-best solar cells, chronicled in the *Solar Cell Efficiency Tables*² and displayed on NREL’s [Best Research-Cell Efficiency Chart](#), were used for comparison. Four single-junction cells (silicon³⁷, cadmium telluride³⁸, CIGS³⁹, and perovskite⁴⁰) were included, as well as five two-terminal multijunctions (perovskite-CIGS⁴¹, perovskite-silicon⁴¹, and three-, four- and six-junction III-Vs^{42,43,44}). Multijunctions use two or more semiconductor junctions to convert solar energy. Stacking the junctions increases the cell voltage, but the two-terminal configuration implies a series connection, so the device current is limited by whichever junction is producing the least current. Two-terminal multijunctions are therefore more sensitive to spectrum variation.

In calculation of the operating efficiencies at 25° C, the open-circuit voltage (V_{oc}) and fill factor (FF) are those confirmed under Standard Test Conditions⁷. Second-order effects, such as changes to voltage or fill factor with changing irradiance⁴⁵ or increases in fill factor due to current mismatch⁴⁶ (in multijunctions) are neglected. Spectrum variations (and their integral, the irradiance) are assumed to affect only the cell short-circuit current. The short-circuit current is derived from a cell's quantum efficiency, which is a measure of the percentage of incoming photons at each wavelength that are converted by a solar cell into current. Quantum efficiencies provided in the *Solar Cell Efficiency Tables* were digitized at 5-nm wavelength intervals (Fig. 3). Since the amplitude of the published quantum efficiencies is often normalized, the amplitudes were re-normalized to deliver the short-circuit current confirmed under the standard spectrum, AM1.5G (AM1.5D, for the III-V multijunctions).




Fig. 4. Current densities for the silicon cell derived from its quantum efficiency combined with spectral irradiances for the standard spectrum (AM1.5G) and the annual global spectrum for single-axis tracking in Montreal. The purple line indicates the relative increase in integrated current density for Montreal with respect to AM1.5G. Spectral irradiances in the background are not shown to scale.




Fig. 5. Annual operating efficiencies under variable spectra at 25° C, compared against the values under standard test conditions (AM1.5G or AM1.5D, largest icons). Symbols for operating spectra are arranged in order of increasing annual site irradiance; lateral positions are adjusted to improve visibility. The rightmost data (smallest symbols, separated by a gap) are for the six direct normal irradiance datasets. [Best Research-Cells Efficiency](#) chart courtesy of NREL.

To determine the short-circuit current under a given spectrum, the hourly spectra were converted to 5-nm intervals, to pair with the digitized quantum efficiencies. Fig. 4 illustrates the relationship between spectral

irradiance and a cell's spectral current density. Spectral current density is integrated across all wavelengths to give the short-circuit current density, J_{sc} [A/cm^2]. The product $V_{oc} \cdot FF \cdot J_{sc}$ is then the cell power density [W/cm^2]. Dividing by the irradiance [W/cm^2] gives the efficiency.

Resulting annual operating efficiencies (at 25° C) are shown in Fig. 5, against a backdrop of the confirmed values under AM1.5G (AM1.5D, for the III-V multijunctions). The corresponding relative efficiencies are given in Fig. 6. While the efficiencies for silicon and CIGS are clustered around their values under the standard spectrum, those of the other cell types diverge. Cadmium telluride and the single-junction perovskite deliver higher efficiencies at most locations, while the multijunctions deliver lower. As might be expected, sensitivity to spectrum variation increases with the number of junctions, leading to decreased efficiency and greater variation across the different locations. Researchers recognize this limitation of two-terminal (series-connected) multijunctions; the search for practical three- or four-terminal alternatives is underway⁴⁷.




Fig. 6. Efficiencies under annual global spectra at 25° C, relative to that confirmed under a standard spectrum. Data grouped by cell type in (a) is shown as a function of site daily irradiation in (b). Linear regressions to the data are included in (b) solely as guides to the eye. Abbreviations: silicon (Si); cadmium telluride (CdTe); perovskite (PVSK).

Two locations, Montreal, Canada and Alamosa, USA, are highlighted in Fig. 6 to illustrate the varying impact of given spectral conditions across different cell designs: as cell spectral sensitivity increases from left to right in Fig. 6(a), the higher efficiencies found in Montreal (for single-junctions) shift to Alamosa (for multijunctions). Efficiencies as a function of site latitude are shown in Supplemental Fig. S6.

Relative to silicon, the higher efficiency of cadmium telluride³¹ and single-junction perovskite is notable in sites like Montreal. It can be understood with reference to the integrated current density represented in Fig. 4, obtained by summing the spectral current density in the direction of increasing wavelength. Quantum efficiency goes to zero above 915 nm for cadmium telluride and 840 nm for the perovskite single junction (Fig. 3); for silicon it extends to 1200 nm. The increase in integrated current density for silicon in Montreal (with respect to AM1.5G) is 4.1% at 840 nm, 3.9% at 915 nm, and 3.4% at 1200 nm. The peak benefits are therefore with the perovskite and cadmium telluride cells, while silicon receives a lower proportional benefit. The 3.4% gain in current density for silicon is partly offset by a corresponding rise in irradiance (2.4%, not shown) for a net efficiency gain of 1.0%, relative.

Cell (junctions)	η_{STC} [%]	$\eta_{25^\circ C}$ [%]	median $\eta_{25^\circ C}$		$\frac{\eta_{25^\circ C} - \eta_{STC}}{\eta_{STC}}$	η_T	$\frac{\eta_T - \eta_{STC}}{\eta_{STC}}$
			1-axis	lat.-tilt			
Silicon (1)	26.7	25.8-27.1	26.7	26.7	-3% to +2%	24.5-26.5	-8% to -1%
CdTe (1)	22.1	21.3-23.1	22.5	22.5	-4% to +4%	20.8-22.5	-6% to +2%
CIGS (1)	23.4	22.3-23.6	23.2	23.1	-5% to -1%	20.9-23.0	-11% to -2%
PVSK (1)	25.2	24.5-26.7	25.8	25.9	-3% to +6%	23.8-25.9	-5% to +3%
PVSK-CIGS (2)	24.2	23.0-23.9	23.5	23.5	-5% to +1%	21.2-23.4	-12% to -3%
PVSK-Si: (2)	29.2	26.7-28.1	27.6	27.4	-9% to -4%	24.8-27.5	-15% to -6%
III-V (3)	44.4	39.5-42.3	41.7	41.2	-11% to -5%	39.0-41.9	-12% to -6%
III-V (4)	46.0	36.6-41.8	40.3	39.6	-20% to -9%	35.7-41.1	-22% to -11%

III-V (6)	47.1	35.5-42.4	40.1	39.2	-25% to -10%	34.6-41.4	-27% to -12%
-----------	------	-----------	------	------	--------------	-----------	--------------

Divergence in cell response to spectrum variation is further evident when plotted as a function of irradiance in Fig. 6(b). The atmospheric conditions that determine the spectrum are complex, so a simple linear relationship between cell efficiency and site irradiation is not expected. However, site conditions are frequently covariant; a dry, high-altitude site such as Alamosa, USA will often have less clouds, fewer aerosols, and less water in the atmosphere. Across the highland plateaus of South America, spectra can approach the shape of the extraterrestrial spectrum (Supplemental Fig. S8). In contrast, lower daily irradiance levels in sites such as Montreal often imply a wider range of atmospheric conditions leading to divergence in the spectra and the cell efficiencies.

The output files from the NSRDB's *Spectral on Demand* include hourly ambient temperature, so temperature corrections to open-circuit voltage, fill factor, and the short-circuit current densities were applied (temperature coefficients in Supplemental Table S2). Table 1 includes annual summaries of the spectrum- and temperature-corrected data. For single junctions, the effects of operating spectral variation are comparable in magnitude to the effects of temperature. Silicon shows the least sensitivity to spectral variation, yet its ~5% variation range is equivalent to 20° C of temperature excursion. For cadmium telluride, which exhibits larger spectral variation and has a smaller temperature coefficient, the ~8% range is equivalent to over 30° C of temperature excursion.

If not accounted for, such variation leads to miscalculations of solar power generation capability that impact project economics and climate change mitigation. For a notional 100-MW solar project commissioned at €1/W, generating 1500 kWh/kW/year and selling into the electrical grid at €0.05/kWh, a 2% difference between predicted and actual output translates to a project cost difference of €2 million and an annual revenue difference of €150,000. If this solar plant displaces fossil fuel generating carbon dioxide at 0.5 kg/kWh⁴⁸, the annual difference in greenhouse gases would be 75,000 tons in the first year, the equivalent of around 500 flights from New York to Paris⁴⁹ (Supplemental discussion D3).




Fig. 7. Daily relative efficiencies at 25° C for Alamosa, USA (latitude-tilt) and Montreal, Canada (one-axis tracking). Results for other sites are in Supplemental Table S4.

The value of solar to the grid depends on the season and time of day that it is generated. The hourly granularity of NSRDB spectral irradiance outputs enables investigation of these variations (Fig. 7 and Supplemental Table S4). Along with the greater daily fluctuations seen in the Montreal climate, there are also differences in the seasonal curvatures in cell performance. The seasonal curvatures of silicon, cadmium telluride, and CIGS cells are more pronounced in Montreal; the May-August peak seen in the performance of the perovskite single junction in Alamosa is more of a trough in Montreal. Seasonal variation of silicon across multiple sites is shown in Supplemental Fig. S7.

Discussion

In 1992, Keith Emery of NREL, ever a champion of rigorous testing standards, co-authored a paper addressing the many discrepancies between then-standard testing and outdoor performance. Regarding spectrum, the authors observed:

...There are changes in the relative spectral distribution which lead to higher or lower efficiencies compared to the efficiency under the AM1.5 reference spectrum... With a few exceptions, all PV-modules have been overrated because the single-value specification of efficiency under standard reporting conditions is a more favorable specification than that measured outdoors under real conditions. This discrepancy, however, should occur between measurements and rating, but not between rating and customer.¹³

In the decades since, multiple values for other variations that affect performance (temperature, irradiance, degradation, e.g.) have been standardized and incorporated into product data sheets^{9,10} and warranty coverage terms, so that the link between standard testing and outdoor operation is understood. Measurement under a single spectrum has become the outlier.

Today's international standard for energy rating of photovoltaic modules (IEC 61853⁷) defines four temperatures, four irradiances... And one spectrum. An impediment to defining additional "operating spectra," consistent with what is now required for temperature and irradiance, has been the uncertainty around what those operating spectra should be. Results presented here and in the literature¹¹⁻³¹ indicate that this concern is subordinate to the uncertainty arising from use of a single-value spectrum standard. Any additional standard spectrum will convert the single-value specification into a performance range that, however limited, will enable interpolation and/or extrapolation to conditions of interest to the "customer".

One candidate for a "standard operating spectrum" might be something like the composite of seventy-five annual spectra shown in Fig. 2. However, two other candidates are already qualified as standards and can therefore be implemented immediately: AM1.5D⁵ and AM0⁵⁰ (Supplemental Fig. S1). While AM0, the standard for space, would be an extreme choice for most terrestrial conditions (Supplemental Fig. S5), when paired with AM1.5G, it would bracket most operating spectral conditions worldwide and serve as a lower bound for predicting cell and module operating efficiencies.

Conclusion

Nine cell types have been evaluated under operating spectra obtained from the NSRDB. The resulting variation in cell operating efficiencies is comparable to that resulting from temperature variations. Efficiencies diverge for cells with different spectrum sensitivities, so testing under a single spectrum is not a sufficient basis for comparison. Implementation of one or more standard operating spectra to complement the standard test spectrum will reduce uncertainty in the costs and benefits of deployments of solar photovoltaics.

Methods

Synthesized spectra

Sophisticated models for solar spectral irradiance have been developed to enable synthesis of spectral using input atmospheric conditions. Inputs include site pressure, aerosol, water vapor, ozone, and CO₂ levels. The outputs are corroborated with a growing body of measurements from both satellite ([NOAA/NASA GOES-R](#)) and ground-based spectroradiometer data. The National Solar Radiation Database at NREL hosts *Spectral on Demand*, a tool accessible online as part of the satellite-derived data in the [NSRDB Data Viewer](#). *Spectral on Demand* generates synthetic spectra for points within the area defined by NREL's Physical Solar Model: longitude: -25°E to -175°W, latitude: -20°S to 60°N). Spectral data is generated at one-hour intervals using the Fast All-sky Radiation Model for Solar applications with Narrowband Irradiances on Tilted surfaces (FARMS-NIT)^{35,36}. Within FARMS-NIT, clear-sky irradiance is first calculated using SMARTS (Simple Model of the Atmospheric Radiative Transfer of Sunshine)^{51,52}. SMARTS has demonstrated predictive power for the operation of spectrum-sensitive solar cells²¹. A previous version of SMARTS (v. 2.9.2) is the basis for defining the current American Society for Testing and Materials standards for AM1.5G and AM1.5D (ASTM G173-03), as well as the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) standard for AM1.5 (IEC 60904-03). The NSRDB spectrum year used is 2018.

For direct normal irradiance, the Typical Meteorological Year 3 database⁵³ (a predecessor to NREL's Physical Solar Model) was used for inputs to the SMARTS model.

Standard Test Conditions

Standard Test Conditions (STC) require a 25° C cell temperature, 1000W/m² irradiance, and the AM1.5G spectrum for cells and modules. An exception is made for components under optical concentration and using the ASTM standard (III-V multijunctions, e.g.), for which the irradiance is 900 W/m² and the spectrum is AM1.5D.

Standard operating conditions are defined for sets of temperature and irradiance. An example is IEC 61853, "Photovoltaic (PV) module performance testing and energy rating":

	Irradiance	Temperature (point of reference)	Spectrum
Standard Test Conditions	1000 W/m ²	25° C (cell)	AM1.5
Nominal Operating Cell Temperature	800 W/m ²	20° C (ambient)	AM1.5
Low Irradiance Condition	200 W/m ²	25° C (cell)	AM1.5
High Temperature Condition	1000 W/m ²	75° C (cell)	AM1.5
Low Temperature Condition	500 W/m ²	15° C (cell)	AM1.5

The "AM1.5" spectrum in IEC 61853 is defined in IEC 60904-03 and is consistent with (though not quite identical to) AM1.5G, as defined by ASTM G173-03.

Quantum efficiency and calculation of current density

Quantum efficiencies are measured under short-circuit conditions, where the cell is expected to produce the maximum amount of current. To obtain the current generated under a given spectrum, the spectral irradiance is divided by the photon energy at each wavelength, to give the number of photons in that interval (5-nm intervals were used in this study). Multiplying by the quantum efficiency gives the "spectral current density" [mA/cm²/nm] that would be converted at that wavelength. Multiplying by the wavelength interval yields current density [mA/cm²] for each interval; integrating over all wavelengths obtains the short-circuit current density.

Supplemental Materials

Discussion D1: standard spectra

Three standard spectra are in use for space and terrestrial solar applications: AM0, AM1.5D, and AM1.5G. “AM” is short for “air mass” and represents the hypothetical column of air between the sun and the incident surface. AM0 (established in 1974), is used for solar cells under extraterrestrial radiation, in earth orbit above the atmosphere (zero air mass). An air mass of one (“AM1”) would represent the conditions when the sun is directly overhead. When a standard for the terrestrial spectrum was first established by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) in 1982, AM1.5 was selected to represent a “typical” solar module tilted at a fixed angle of 37° (mid-latitude USA) and pointed due south³. The geometry of AM1.5 implies a sun zenith angle of 48.2°. For forty-four sites with one-axis tracking data, the annual, irradiance-weighted zenith angles were obtained (Table S1); the median irradiance-weighted sun zenith angle for this group is 46.6°.

AM1.5D is the “direct” spectrum for this orientation, intended to represent only the sunlight coming directly from the sun (or its near vicinity). AM1.5D finds practical application in systems using two-axis trackers and optical concentration (lenses or mirrors) to boost solar cells’ power and efficiency. These optical concentrators are effective in concentrating only the collimated rays that come directly from the solar disc. The “global” spectrum, AM1.5G, consists of these direct rays, as well as sunlight that has been scattered by the atmosphere and is arriving on the tilted surface from the hemispherical dome of the sky. Though solar panels in 2020 are at least as likely to be found on trackers as on fixed racks (and even more likely to be installed distant from 37° northern latitudes), use of AM1.5G has remained the convention throughout academia and industry.

Discussion D2: III-V multijunctions & global vs. direct normal irradiance

Direct spectra are relevant for solar systems using optical concentration and two-axis tracking; these systems typically employ III-V multijunction cells. The trend in III-V multijunction efficiencies notable in Fig. 5, where the efficiencies in the global spectra rise (or fall) to approach those for the direct spectra, is consistent with their design. The III-V multijunctions are tuned for operation under a direct spectrum (AM1.5D).




Fig. S1. Three standard spectra (AM0, AM1.5D, and AM1.5G) compared against seventy-six annual global spectra (one-axis and latitude-tilt) derived from the National Solar Radiation Database (NSRDB) hourly spectra, converted to 5-nm wavelength intervals. The NSRDB global spectra are normalized to the AM0 value at 1050 nm.

Discussion D3: Estimates of greenhouse gas equivalents in air travel

A Boeing 787-9 carries up to 289 passengers⁵⁴ and consumes approximately 2.9 litres per 100 km per passenger⁵⁵. The 5,800-km trip from Paris to New York will consume approximately 50,000 litres. A litre of jet fuel weighs about 0.8 kg and produces 3.2 kg of CO₂⁵⁶. 160 tons (0.5 tons per passenger) is released for one trip between New York and Paris.

Table S1. Site details: annual values for NSRDB year 2018

Location	Temp. [° C] (Irradiance-weighted)	Sun zenith angle [°] (Irradiance-weighted)	One-axis tracking		Latitude-tilt		Direct normal	
			Daily irradiation [kW- hr/m ² /day]	# of spectra	Daily irradiation [kW- hr/m ² /day]	# of spectra	Daily irradiation [kW- hr/m ² /day]	# of spectra
Azores-Ponta Delgada	17.0	48.9	5.1	4137				
Bolivia-Uyuni	14.0	44.9	10.3	4110	8.0	4110		
Brazil-Mariana			5.1	4207				
Brazil-Patos	32.3	41.1	9.0	4299	5.1	4137		
Brazil-Sao Desiderio	30.1	42.1			8.4	4183		
Cabo Verde-Praia	23.1	41.6	8.4	4156	6.9	4153		
Canada-Calgary	14.8	54.6	4.9	4032	4.2	3878		
Canada-Montreal	15.1	51.8	4.1	4010	5.0	4102		
Chile-Putre	15.4	43.8	9.5	4109	8.0	4222		
Colombia-Cali	24.7	39.0	6.3	4067	5.4	4066		
Costa Rica-Punta Arenas	30.7	39.8	7.5	4208	6.3	4182		
Ecuador-Galapagos	24.0	42.7	6.7	4036	5.3	4036		
Ecuador-Quito	15.5	39.9	5.3	4171	6.3	4171		
French Guiana-Kourou	27.9	39.5	7.3	4249	8.4	4183		
Haiti	22.6	45.3	6.7	4201				
Mexico-Mazatlan	28.9	43.7	8.2	4179	6.8	4159		
Mexico-Mexico City	22.4	41.5	7.6	4138	6.5	4138		
Mexico-Monterrey	30.7	43.4	6.6	4178	5.5	4133		
Peru-Cusco	12.9	42.1	6.9	4171	4.4	3969		
Peru-Puno	13.3	42.7	8.9	4123	7.3	4123		
Samoa-Apia	25.4	41.7	9.4	4174	7.6	4174		
USA-AK-Ketchikan	13.4	55.9	3.5	4013	2.9	3928		
USA-AR-Little Rock	23.9	47.7	5.1	4058	6.2	4127		
USA-AZ-Tucson							9.2	4426
USA-CA-Joshua Tree	24.4	49.0	8.9	4140	7.3	4028		
USA-CA-Palmdale	26.4	48.8	8.6	4117			8.8	4457
USA-CA-Sacramento	25.2	49.6	7.4	4139				
USA-CO-Alamosa	17.3	50.1	7.9	4119	6.7	4066	9.9	4259
USA-CO-Denver	20.5	50.7	6.7	4140	5.8	4076		
USA-FL-Cocoa	25.9	46.1	7.0	4178	6.3	4171		
USA-GA-Atlanta	22.9	47.0	5.2	4121	6.3	4182		
USA-HI-Hilo	27.9	40.7	5.0	4137				
USA-HI-Kona	23.6	45.7	5.1	4140				
USA-MA-Boston	16.6	51.0	5.2	4105	4.4	3969		
USA-MN-Rochester	15.3	52.1	5.3	4124	4.4	4015		
USA-MO-Kansas City	21.9	49.7	5.9	4138	4.9	4026		
USA-MT-Butte	14.5	52.9	5.7	4090				
USA-ND-Fargo	17.1	52.4	5.2	4079	6.3	4157		
USA-NM-Albuquerque	23.8	48.7	8.2	4112	6.8	4052	9.2	4433
USA-NM-Las Cruces							9.2	4429
USA-NV-Las Vegas	29.1	49.4	8.3	4157	6.8	4028	9.0	4307
USA-NY-New Paltz	17.4	50.5	5.0	4148	5.0	4102		
USA-OH-Xenia	19.3	48.9	5.1	4123	4.2	4038		
USA-OK-Yale	23.6	48.5			6.3	4157		
USA-TX-Austin	28.1	45.4	6.6	4211	5.4	4109		
USA-WA-Seattle	17.9	51.9	5.0	4088	4.2	3998		
Venezuela-Apure	31.2	41.0			8.0	4222		

*The irradiance used is the one-axis tracking irradiance.

Alamosa (latitude-tilt) & Montreal (one-axis tracking) data:




Fig. S2. Daily spectral irradiances for Alamosa (latitude-tilt) and Montreal (one-axis tracking). Amplitudes are normalized to the peak at each respective location.

Quantum efficiencies




Fig. S3. Quantum efficiencies of the III-V four- and six-junction cells.

Table S2. Cell parameters

Cell (# junctions)	Si (1)	CdTe (1)	CIGS (1)	PVSK (1)	PVSK- CIGS (2)	PVSK-Si (2)	III-V (3)	III-V (4)	III-V (6)
V_{oc} (25° C) ⁴¹	0.738	0.8872	0.734	1.1805	1.897	1.768	3.555	4.23	6.286
FF (25° C) ⁴¹	0.849	0.785	0.804	0.848	0.778	0.729	0.872	0.85	0.872
dV_{oc}/dT [%/°C]	-0.00241 ⁹	-0.0027 ¹⁰	-0.00300 ⁵⁷	-0.0012 ⁵⁸	-0.00167*	-0.0020*	-0.00135 ⁵⁹	-0.00135 ⁵⁹	-0.00135 ⁵⁹
dI_{sc}/dT [%/°C]	0.00055 ⁹	0.0004 ¹⁰	0.0001 ⁵⁷	-0.00054 ⁵⁸	-0.00012*	-0.00027*	0.0006 ⁵⁹	0.0006 ⁵⁹	0.0006 ⁵⁹
dFF/dT [%/°C]	-0.00072 ⁹	-0.0002 ¹⁰	-0.00020 ⁵⁷	-0.00094 ⁵⁸	-0.00086*	-0.00063*	-0.00053 ⁵⁹	-0.00053 ⁵⁹	-0.00053 ⁵⁹
dP/dT [%/°C]	-0.00258 ⁹	-0.0025 ¹⁰	-0.0031 ⁵⁷	-0.0027 ⁵⁸	-0.0026*	-0.0029*	-0.0013 ⁵⁹	-0.0013 ⁵⁹	-0.0013 ⁵⁹

*The temperature coefficients of perovskites are not yet well understood; the temperature coefficient for perovskite fill factor was taken as a mean from the range of values shown in the supplement to [58]. Temperature coefficients for PVSK-CIGS and PVSK-Si are calculated as the V_{oc} -weighted averages of the coefficients of the two materials.

Efficiencies under operating spectra and temperatures:




Fig. S4. Efficiencies under operating spectra and temperatures.

Efficiencies under operating spectra and AM1.5G, AM1.5D, AM0






Fig. S5. Efficiencies under operating spectra (at 25° C), AM1.5G, AM1.5D, and AM0. Some lateral positions are adjusted to improve visibility.

Table S3. Efficiencies under three standard spectra (at 25° C).

Cell (# junctions)	AM0	AM1.5G	AM1.5D
Silicon (1)	24.2%	26.7%	26.7%
CdTe (1)	20.9%	23.4%	23.5%
CIGS (1)	19.7%	22.1%	21.8%
PVSK (1)	22.8%	25.2%	24.7%
PVSK-CIGS (2)	22.0%	24.2%	23.5%
PVSK-Si: (2)	25.5%	29.2%	28.6%
III-V (3)	36.5%	44.6%	44.4%
III-V (4)	37.6%	43.8%	46.0%
III-V (6)	38.0%	44.0%	47.1%




(a)





(b)


Fig. S6. Relative efficiency (at 25° C) under annual operating spectra (one-axis tracking) as a function of (a) site latitude and (b) site elevation.

Table S4. Select daily efficiencies (25° C)









Global spectrum variation: silicon




Fig. S7. Variation of a silicon cell under the global spectra compiled for sites in Table S4 (25° C).

High irradiance on South American highland plateaus




Fig. S8. The three highest hourly irradiances in the data, obtained for Uyuni, Bolivia and Putre, Chile. Amplitudes are normalized to AM0 at 1050 nm.

References

- ¹ Green, M. A., Emery. Solar cell efficiency tables (version 2), *Prog. Photovolt: Res. Appl.* **1** 225-227 (1993).
- ² Green, M. A., et al. Solar cell efficiency tables (version 56). *Prog Photovolt Res Appl.* **28** 629– 638 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1002/pip.3303>
- ³ Myers, D. Review of consensus standard spectra for flat plate and concentrating photovoltaic performance. National renewable energy laboratory. *Technical Report NREL/TP-5500-51865* (2011).
- ⁴ Myers, D. R., Emery, K., Gueymard, C.C. Revising and validating spectral irradiance reference standards for photovoltaic performance evaluation. *ASME. J. Sol. Energy Eng.* **126** 567–574. (2011). doi:10.1115/1.1638784
- ⁵ ASTM G173-03. Standard tables for reference solar spectral irradiances: direct normal and hemispherical on 37° tilted surface. (2008).
- ⁶ IEC 61215-1. Terrestrial photovoltaic (PV) modules - Design qualification and type approval - Part 1: Test requirements. (2016).
- ⁷ IEC 61853-1: Photovoltaic (PV) module performance testing and energy rating – Part 1: Irradiance and temperature performance measurements and power rating. (2011).
- ⁸ IEC 60904-9. Photovoltaic devices - Part 9: Solar simulator performance requirements. (2007).
- ⁹ Data sheet for SunPower mono-Si modules. Available: <https://us.sunpower.com/products/solar-panels>
- ¹⁰ Data sheet for First Solar CdTe modules. Available: <http://www.firstsolar.com/Resources/Technical-Documents>
- ¹¹ Fraunhofer ISE. Tests for PV Module Certification Available: www.ise.fraunhofer.de/en/rd-infrastructure/accredited-labs/testlab-pv-modules/power-measurements.html
- ¹² Faine, P., Kurtz, S. R., Riordan, C., Olson, J. M. The influence of spectral solar irradiance variations on the performance of selected single junction and multijunction solar cells. *Sol. Cells* **31** 259–278 (1991).
- ¹³ Nann, S. and Emery, K. Spectral effects on PV-device rating. *Solar Energy Mater. Sol. Cells.* **27**, pp. 189–216, Aug. 1992.
- ¹⁴ Gottschalg, R.; Infield, D.G.; Kearny, M.J. Experimental study of variations of the solar spectrum of relevance to thin film solar cells. *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells* **79**, 527–537 (2003).
- ¹⁵ Gottschalg, R., Betts, T. R.; Williams, S. R., Sauter, D., Infield, D. G.; Kearny, M. J. A critical appraisal of the factors affecting energy production from amorphous silicon photovoltaic arrays in a maritime climate. *Solar Energy* **77**, 909–916 (2004).
- ¹⁶ Minemoto, T., Nagae, S., Takakura, H. Impact of spectral irradiance distribution and temperature on the outdoor performance of amorphous Si photovoltaic modules. *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells* **91** 919–923 (2007).
- ¹⁷ Philipps, S.P., et al. Energy harvesting efficiency of III–V triple junction concentrator solar cells under realistic spectral conditions. *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells*, **94**, 869–877 (2010).
- ¹⁸ Monokroussos, C., et al. Effects of spectrum on the power rating of amorphous silicon photovoltaic devices. *Prog. Photovoltaics* **19** 640–648 (2011).
- ¹⁹ Simon, M., Meyer, E.L., The effects of spectral evaluation of c-Si modules. *Prog. Photovoltaics Res. Appl.* **19** 1–10 (2011). doi:10.1002/pip.973
- ²⁰ Ishii, T., Otani, K., Takashima,, T., Xue, Y.Q. Solar spectral influence on the performance of photovoltaic (PV) modules under fine weather and cloudy weather conditions. *Prog. Photovoltaics* **21** 481–489 (2013).
- ²¹ Kinsey, G. S., et al. "Advancing Efficiency and Scale in CPV Arrays. *IEEE J. Photovolt.* **3** 873-878 (2013). doi: 10.1109/JPHOTOV.2012.2227992.
- ²² Cornaro, C., Andreotti, A. Influence of average photon energy index on solar irradiance characteristics and outdoor performance of photovoltaic modules. *Prog. Photovolt. Res. Appl.* **21** 996–1003 (2013).

-
- ²³ Ye, J. Y., Reindl, T., Aberle, A. G., Walsh, T. M. Effect of solar spectrum on the performance of various thin-film PV module technologies in tropical Singapore. *IEEE J. Photovolt.* **4** 1268–1274 (2014).
- ²⁴ Alonso-Abella, M., Chenlo, F., Nofuentes, G., Torres-Ramirez, M. Analysis of spectral effects on the energy yield of different PV (photovoltaic) technologies: The case of four specific sites. *Energy* **67** 435–443 (2014).
- ²⁵ Dirnberger, D. Blackburn, G., Müller, B., Reise, C. On the impact of solar spectral irradiance on the yield of different PV technologies. *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells* **132** 431–442 (2015).
- ²⁶ Fernández, E. F., Cruz, F. A., Mallick, T. K., Sundaram, S. Effect of spectral irradiance variations on the performance of highly efficient environment-friendly solar cells. *IEEE J. Photovolt.* **5** 1150–1157 (2015). doi: 10.1109/JPHOTOV.2015.2434593.
- ²⁷ Gracia Amillo, A. M., Huld, T., Vourlioti, P., Müller, R., Norton, M. Application of satellite-based spectrally resolved solar radiation data to PV performance studies. *Energies* **8** 3455–3488 (2015).
- ²⁸ Kinsey, G. S. Spectrum sensitivity, energy yield, and revenue prediction of PV modules. *IEEE J. Photovolt.* **5** 258–262 (2015). doi: 10.1109/JPHOTOV.2014.2370256
- ²⁹ Huld, T., Gracia Amillo, A.M. Estimating PV module performance over large geographical regions: The role of irradiance, air temperature, wind speed and solar spectrum. *Energies* **8** 5159–5181 (2015).
- ³⁰ Marzo, A., Ferrada, P., Beiza, F. Alonso-Montesinos, J., Ballestrín, J., Roman, R. Comparison of Atacama desert solar spectrum vs. ASTM G173-03 reference spectra for solar energy applications. *EuroSun 2016, ISES Conf.* (2016). doi: 10.18086/eurosun.2016.09.01.
- ³¹ Schweiger, M. Impact of spectral irradiance on energy yield of PV modules measured in different climates. *4th PV Performance Modelling and Monitoring 17 Workshop*, (2015). doi: 10.13140/RG.2.2.33591.73122
- ³² Peters, I. M., Buonassisi, T. Energy yield limits for single-junction solar cells. *Joule* (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joule.2018.03.009>
- ³³ NSRDB Data Viewer. Available: <https://maps.nrel.gov/nsrdb-viewer/>
- ³⁴ Habte, A. Sengupta, M., Lopez, A. Evaluation of the National Solar Radiation Database (NSRDB Version 2): 1998–2015. *Technical Report NREL/TP-5D00-67722*. (2017).
- ³⁵ Xie, Y., Sengupta, M., Wang, C.. A Fast All-sky Radiation Model for Solar applications with Narrowband Irradiances on Tilted surfaces (FARMS-NIT): Part II. The cloudy-sky model. *Sol. Energy* **188** 799–812 (2019).
- ³⁶ Xie, Y., Sengupta, M., A Fast All-sky Radiation Model for Solar applications with Narrowband Irradiances on Tilted surfaces (FARMS-NIT): Part I. The clear-sky model. *Sol. Energy* **174** 691–702 (2018).
- ³⁷ Green, M. A., et al. Solar cell efficiency tables (version 50). *Prog Photovolt Res Appl.* **25** 668– 676 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1002/pip.2909>
- ³⁸ Green, M. A., Emery, K., Hishikawa, Y., Warta, W., and Dunlop, E. D. Solar cell efficiency tables (version 45), *Prog. Photovolt: Res. Appl.* **23** 1– 9 (2014). doi: 10.1002/pip.2573.
- ³⁹ Green, M. A., et al. Solar cell efficiency tables (version 54). *Prog Photovolt Res Appl.* **27** 565– 575 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1002/pip.3171>
- ⁴⁰ Green, M. A, et al. Solar cell efficiency tables (version 55). *Prog Photovolt Res Appl.* **28** 3– 15 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1002/pip.3228>
- ⁴¹ Green, M. A., et al. Solar cell efficiency tables (version 56). *Prog Photovolt Res Appl.* **28** 629– 638 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1002/pip.3303>
- ⁴² Green, M.A., Emery, K., Hishikawa, Y., Warta, W. and Dunlop, E.D. Solar cell efficiency tables (version 42). *Prog. Photovolt: Res. Appl.* **21** 827–837 (2013). doi:10.1002/pip.2404
- ⁴³ Green, M. A., Emery, K., Hishikawa, Y., Warta, W., and Dunlop, E. D. Solar cell efficiency tables (version 45), *Prog. Photovolt: Res. Appl.* **23** 1– 9 (2014). doi: 10.1002/pip.2573.
- ⁴⁴ Green, M. A., et al. Solar cell efficiency tables (version 54). *Prog Photovolt Res Appl.* **27** 565– 575 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1002/pip.3171>

-
- ⁴⁵ Kinsey, G. S., Concentrator multijunction solar cell characteristics under variable intensity and temperature. *Prog. Photovolt: Res. Appl.* **16** 503–508 (2008).
- ⁴⁶ Hörantner, M.T., Snaith, H.J. Predicting and optimising the energy yield of perovskite-on-silicon tandem solar cells under real world conditions. *Energy Environ. Sci.* **10** 1983–1993 (2017).
- ⁴⁷ Futscher, M.H., Ehrler, B. Modeling the performance limitations and prospects of perovskite/Si tandem solar cells under realistic operating conditions. *ACS Energy Lett.* **2** 2089–2095 (2017).
<https://doi.org/10.1021/acsenenergylett.7b00596>
- ⁴⁸ Foster, V., Bedrosyan, D. Understanding CO₂ emissions from the global energy sector. *World Bank Document* 85126 1-2 (2014).
- ⁴⁹ Facts and Figures. *Air Transport Action Group*. Available: <https://www.atag.org/facts-figures.html>
- ⁵⁰ ASTM E490 - 00a (2019). Solar constant and zero air mass solar spectral irradiance tables. doi:10.1520/e0490-00ar19
- ⁵¹ Myers, D. R., Gueymard, C. A. Description and Availability of the SMARTS Spectral Model for Photovoltaic Applications. *Int'l Symp. Opt. Sci. Tech.* (2004).
- ⁵² Gueymard, C. A. SMARTS, a simple model of the atmospheric radiative transfer of sunshine: algorithms and performance assessment. *Florida Solar Energy Center Tech. Rep. FSEC-PF-270-95* (2005).
- ⁵³ "Typical Meteorological Year 3 (TMY3) Database." Available: <https://nsrdb.nrel.gov/about/tmy.html>
- ⁵⁴ Boeing 787-9 specifications. Available: www.boeing.com/commercial/787/
- ⁵⁵ Lufthansa Group facts and figures. Available: www.lufthansagroup.com/media/themen/flottenbestellung-2019/A787-9_Daten_und_Fakten_ENG.pdf
- ⁵⁶ International Air Transport Association (IATA). IATA Carbon Offset Program. Available: www.iata.org/en/programs/environment/carbon-offset/
- ⁵⁷ Solar Frontier product data sheet. Available : <http://www.solar-frontier.com/eng/support/index.html>:
- ⁵⁸ Jošt, M., et al. Perovskite solar cells go outdoors: field testing and temperature effects on energy yield. *Adv. Energy Mater.* **10** 2000454 (2020). doi:10.1002/aenm.202000454
- ⁵⁹ Fernández, E. F., et al. Temperature coefficients of monolithic III-V triple-junction solar cells under different spectra and irradiance levels. *AIP Conf. Proc.* **1477** 189–193 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4753865>