Mechanisms for Enhanced Packaging and/or Burn-in Total Dose Sensitivity in Microelectronics

Ronald L. Pencse, R.L. Research
Marty Shapcufeld, Peter Winokur and Dan Fleetwood, Sandia National Labs*
Jerry Gartlick and Steve McClure, Hughes Space and Communication
Steve Clark, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Division
Dave Alexander, Mission Research Corporation
Lee Cohn, Defense Special Weapons Agency

Abstract: The ionizing radiation response of several semiconductor process technologies has been shown to be enhanced by plastic packaging and/or pre-conditioning (burn-in). Potential mechanisms for this effect are discussed and data on bipolar linear circuits are presented.

Introduction. In 1994 [1] it was shown that the total dose degradation of both a radiation hardened (Sandia CMOS IIIA) and a radiation tolerant (National Semiconductor Corp. NSC, FACT) bulk CMOS technology was enhanced by an elevated temperature burn-in. The static power supply current exceeded the specification value at the rated total dose level on parts which had been subjected to burn-in, whereas parts without burn-in easily passed. In another study of the NSC FACT process [2] the total dose effects of packaging (ceramic and plastic), in addition to the effects of burn-in, were characterized. For both high and low dose rates, where the failure mechanisms were different (n-channel edge leakage at high rate and field oxide leakage at low rate), the plastic package greatly enhanced the effect of burn-in. The mechanism for the burn-in effect was studied on the radiation hardened technology [1, 3] using both gate and field oxide MOSFETs. Charge separation analysis performed on the gate oxide transistors showed that burn-in had very little effect on the irradiation induced increase in oxide trapped charge, ΔNt, but it significantly reduced the buildup of interface traps, ΔNi. No charge separation analysis was possible in the field oxide transistors because of their design. However, the field oxide transistors were studied for the effects of temperature and bias during burn-in using the irradiation induced threshold shift at 10 nA drain current [3]. It was shown that the mechanism was a function of time and temperature, with no bias dependence. The shift in the subthreshold region was nearly parallel and much larger in the burn-in devices, suggesting that the enhanced effect was due to larger ΔNo. The activation energy for the process was determined to be 0.38 eV, which is similar to that of hole compensation (0.41 eV) [4] and molecular hydrogen diffusion in bulk fused silica (0.45 eV) [5].

In the packaging/burn-in study on NSC FACT [2], the burn-in effect was shown to be greatly enhanced by the plastic package, whereas for the non-burned-in parts there was little effect of packaging. Additional testing, previously unpublished, showed that the burn-in effect was not sensitive to bias, indicating that the same mechanism observed in the Sandia CMOS IIIA may be at work in the NSC FACT technology. It is not known whether the n-channel edge or the field oxide leakage is a result of ΔNo alone or ΔNo compensated by ΔNi, since field oxide test structures were not available. However, since the plastic alone has little effect, it appears that the plastic accelerates the burn-in effect. Additional tests are planned to vary the time and temperature of the plastic molding process to see if greater time and/or temperature causes more burn-in effect. Also tests will be performed to isolate potential plastic effects such as mobile ion charging and stress.

Although the burn-in effect has been observed in two CMOS process technologies, to date it has not been reported in any bipolar technologies. In this paper we will show new data demonstrating the burn-in effect in a bipolar linear circuit. We will also present a summary of all of the studies (to our knowledge) on the burn-in and packaging effect on total dose response.
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Experimental Details and Discussion. Characterization testing was performed on LT1014 bipolar linear quad operational amplifiers to study the effect of burn-in on the total dose response in plastic packaged parts. No comparison was made to parts in ceramic packages. All parts in the study were from the same date code (9603) and no burn-in had been performed by the manufacturer. One group of samples was burn-in prior to irradiation at 125 °C for 160 hours under static de bias. Eight samples from the burned-in group and 8 non burn-in samples were irradiated at 90 rad (Si)5 in a Co-60 source, under static de bias, to cumulative dose levels of 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, and 40 krad (Si). All of the specification electrical parameters were measured before and after burn-in and after each irradiation level. No significant changes in preirradiation parameters were observed as a result of the burn-in alone. The total dose response of four sensitive parameters is shown in Figures 1-4 as the average value of the parameter for 4 op amp #1 for the quad (all 4 op amps in the package showed similar response) vs. dose for the 8 burned-in (BI) and 8 non burn-in (NBI) parts. Data are not shown in the figures past the onset of functional failure, where parameter shifts become large and erratic. For the BI parts this occurred between 20 and 25 krad and for the NBI parts it occurred between 10 and 40 krad. However, even though the BI parts failed at a lower dose level, many of the electrical parameters showed less degradation than the NBI parts at dose levels below failure as discussed below. Figures 1-3 show the positive supply current (Is+), the positive input bias current (Ib+) and the input offset voltage (Vos), respectively. The negative Is and Ib showed the same qualitative response as the positive Is and Ib. For each of these parameters the BI parts degraded substantially less than the NBI parts. The mechanism for this behavior is related to the excess base current in the critical transistors. For the LT1014, the input transistors are substrate pnp's and the current sources use lateral pnp's. A recent study on the mechanism for excess base current in lateral and substrate pnp transistors [6] shows that the dominant parameter is an interface trap induced increase in surface recombination velocity. Increases in oxide trapped charge, on the other hand, offset the effect of increased surface recombination velocity, resulting in less excess base current. Thus the better performance of Is+, Ib+ and Vos in the BI parts may be the result of both a reduction in ΔNIT and an increase in ΔNIT. However, even though these parameters showed less effect from burn-in, other parameters, e.g. voltage gain, showed much more degradation from burn-in, which leads to earlier onset of functional failure of the BI parts. The voltage gain depends on npn transistor gain, which is more affected by ΔNIT [7]. In npn transistors the total dose dependence on ΔNIT is exponential, whereas the dependence on ΔNIT is linear.

Based on the LT1014 results, it appears that the mechanisms which explain the CMOS burn-in effect are consistent with the bipolar linear response. Data are currently being taken on NSC LM111 voltage comparators. Results will be presented in the full paper.

Summary of Data on Packaging/Burn-in Effect on Total Dose Response. In addition to the studies discussed above, the effects of packaging and/or burn-in on total dose response have been studied in bipolar transistors [8-11], power MOSFETs [11] and additional CMOS microcircuit technologies [12]. Also, previously unpublished data have been taken at NSWC Crane on the effects of both packaging and burn-in on an NSC LM119 bipolar dual voltage comparator. Table 1 is a list of all of the part types and process technologies that have been studied to date (to our knowledge) along with whether or not a sensitivity was observed for either packaging, burn-in or both. Two of the studies looked at discrete bipolar junction transistors, BJTs [8-11]. In the more recent work by Dowling and West [10] the study was performed on a single process lot of material for each of two npn BJT part types, looking at gain degradation. Die were packaged in four package types, metal can (TO5), epoxy potted in metal can, and both ceramic and plastic surface mount (SOIC23). The only major effect seen for package type was that the ceramic SOIC23 part degraded more than the others for both BJT types. In all package types the effect of burn-in was a 10% greater gain degradation. In the ERA study [11], two npn BJT types were characterized as a function of burn-in for both ceramic and plastic packages. Unfortunately the ceramic and plastic parts were from different process lots. Considering the spread in the data, the only clear effect of burn-in was that for one type in plastic, the burn-in resulted in significantly less degradation. For the other three groups there was no significant effect. In the same study [11] both n and p channel power MOSFETs were characterized for the burn-in effect in both ceramic and plastic. No packaging or burn-in effects were observed. In the NSWC study on the NSC LM119, the plastic parts degraded about a factor
of two more than the ceramic parts, but there was only a small effect of burn-in. However, the burn-in alone resulted in a significant change in the plastic parts. All die were from the same wafer intended for space and military parts, which did not have a silicon nitride overcoat. The nitride overcoat is always used for commercial plastic parts at NSC. Thus the plastic package results are not representative of available packaged product but may provide insight into effect of plastic alone on the total dose response. In a recent study by Hash, et al., [12] four additional CMOS microcircuit technologies were evaluated for the burn-in effect. Only one demonstrated a significant effect as shown in Table I. No details of the process are available, nor are there tests structures for evaluation.

The effect of packaging on the total dose response has been studied independently of burn-in, but few studies have had adequate controls to isolate effects to package alone. Because of the potentially large variation in total dose response from process lot to lot and even wafer to wafer within the same lot, it is necessary to have die from a single wafer to assure that package is the main variable. Another variable which is introduced in a packaging study is the determination of total dose in the sensitive dielectric. Many package configurations cause significant dose enhancement in sensitive regions. Only one of the studies cited [10] show a significant package effect without a burn-in effect, and this occurred in a ceramic package.

**Conclusion.** Many studies have been performed to look at the effects of packaging and/or burn-in on total dose response. We have presented a summary of these studies to date (to our knowledge). Only 4 process technologies (3 CMOS and 1 bipolar) show a significant burn-in effect to date. The mechanisms for this effect appears to be consistent with that reported earlier [1, 3] for the Sandia CMOS IIA process. Additional testing with appropriate test devices and structures will be conducted to determine the universality of these mechanisms.
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**Figure 1. Average Is+ vs. Dose**

**Figure 2. Average Ib+ vs. Dose**

**Figure 3. Average Vos vs. Dose**

**Figure 4. Average Gain vs. Dose**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device/ Description</th>
<th>Manuf.</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Package(s)</th>
<th>Test Agency</th>
<th>Package Effect</th>
<th>Burn-in Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1k8 SRAM</td>
<td>SNL</td>
<td>CMOS IIIA</td>
<td>rad hard</td>
<td>CDIP*</td>
<td>SNL</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>line driver</td>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>FACT</td>
<td>rad tol</td>
<td>CDIP</td>
<td>SNL</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-bit counter</td>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>FACT</td>
<td>rad tol</td>
<td>CDIP</td>
<td>SNL</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC240</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>CMOS/SOS</td>
<td>rad hard</td>
<td>CDIP</td>
<td>SNL</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mbit SRAM</td>
<td>LMSC</td>
<td>HMCMOS</td>
<td>rad hard</td>
<td>CDIP</td>
<td>SNL</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256k SRAM</td>
<td>Cypress</td>
<td>0.5 um CMOS</td>
<td>rad tol</td>
<td>CDIP</td>
<td>SNL</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256k SRAM</td>
<td>Pramid</td>
<td>0.8 um CMOS</td>
<td>rad tol</td>
<td>CDIP, PDIP*</td>
<td>SOP</td>
<td>SNL significant</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S44C02</td>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>FACT</td>
<td>rad tol</td>
<td>CDIP, PDIP</td>
<td>NSWC</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM110</td>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>FACT</td>
<td>rad tol</td>
<td>CDIP, PDIP</td>
<td>NSWC</td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC103</td>
<td>ZETEX</td>
<td>bipolar linear</td>
<td>comm</td>
<td>TO18, E-line</td>
<td>ERA</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT-04</td>
<td>PMI</td>
<td>bipolar</td>
<td>comm</td>
<td>CDIP, SOIC (P)</td>
<td>ERA</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU29800</td>
<td>Siemens</td>
<td>DMOS</td>
<td>rad tol</td>
<td>TO3, TO247(P)</td>
<td>ERA</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU29805</td>
<td>Siemens</td>
<td>DMOS</td>
<td>rad tol</td>
<td>TO3, TO247(P)</td>
<td>ERA</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRF5303</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>DMOS</td>
<td>rad tol</td>
<td>TO220 (P)</td>
<td>ERA</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT1014</td>
<td>Lin Tech</td>
<td>bipolar linear</td>
<td>comm</td>
<td>plastic</td>
<td>HAC</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT1021</td>
<td>Lin Tech</td>
<td>bipolar linear</td>
<td>rad tol</td>
<td>Hermetic</td>
<td>HAC</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCW60</td>
<td>ZETEX</td>
<td>bipolar</td>
<td>comm</td>
<td>TO5, SOT22(C,P)</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC887</td>
<td>ZETEX</td>
<td>bipolar (SIN)</td>
<td>comm</td>
<td>TO5, SOT22(C,P)</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* CDIP- ceramic dual in-line, PDIP- plastic dual in-line