






# Quality Handbook




*Advanced Signal Processing Products*

Cirrus Logic Quality Handbook

# First Choice in Quality



Quality Policy	3
Quality Management System	4
Environmental and Social Responsibilities	5
Global Quality Network	6
Product Development Process	8
Software Quality	18
Supplier Quality Management	21
Customer Quality Management	24
Product Analysis	26
Appendix A: <i>Product Reliability Operations</i>	32
Appendix B: <i>ESD Latch-Up Testing</i>	35
Appendix C: <i>Moisture Sensitivity Levels</i>	37
Appendix D: <i>White Papers</i>	38



# At Cirrus Logic, Quality is Built In

Cirrus Logic is a world leader in the design of innovative custom, semi-custom and general market high precision analog and digital signal processing products for the mobile, consumer and automotive audio market. The best known electronics OEMs rely on Cirrus Logic's superior engineering innovation and execution of highly specialized, cutting-edge design, software and manufacturing technology to meet their rapid, ultra high volume product introductions.

Cirrus Logic has become a valued, strategic partner by weaving quality into the processes and systems used at every level of the organization. Cirrus Logic's Quality Management System (QMS) provides an all encompassing focus on quality that flows throughout the company's Product Development Process (PDP). From the initial stages of product concept, all the way through high volume production, the Cirrus Logic team stands behind our track record of exceeding the expectations of our customers by delivering proven results every day.

## Corporate Vision

First choice in signal processing products.

For our customers • For our shareholders • For our employees

## Corporate Mission

Cirrus Logic provides innovative, high performance analog and digital signal processing products that "rock" (advances our customers, benefits our shareholders and rewards our employees).

- To exceed our customers' expectations
- Deliver solid value to our shareholders
- Build confidence and pride in our company

## Corporate Values

- Continuous Improvement
- Innovation
- Integrity
- Communication
- Job Satisfaction



Cirrus Logic's flagship  
Quality Product Development,  
Reliability and Analysis Lab,  
Austin, Texas

# Quality Policy

Cirrus Logic is committed to deliver innovative signal processing solutions, exceed our customers' expectations, drive continual improvement and comply with regulatory requirements.

In support of our Quality Policy we strive to achieve the following objectives:

- Understand the needs of our customers and strive to constantly meet or exceed their expectations
- Continually improve the effectiveness of our Quality Management System and integrate into critical processes, projects and systems
- Partner with customers and suppliers to establish quality guidelines and to ensure they are met



# Quality Management System

The Cirrus Logic Quality Management System (QMS) defines how quality is built into every facet of the company's design and development processes, as well as the systems that govern the manufacturing supply chain through fabrication, test and delivery. It is through our QMS that Cirrus Logic delivers innovative solutions that are built with quality to exceed our customers' expectations.

Cirrus Logic is compliant to the requirements set forth by ISO 9001:2015. It is through our QMS that we not only maintain this compliance, but we also actually drive quality beyond expectation. Cirrus Logic measures and continually improves the degree to which customer requirements and the quality policy are satisfied. Senior management establishes goals for product conformity and business process effectiveness. Effectiveness is measured by comparing actual results to expected results.


The efficiency and effectiveness of the QMS is reviewed on a regular basis. The Quality department participates in each Quarterly Data Review (QDR) where metrics are reviewed by senior management to assess the relevance and progress of the quality system. Actions pertaining to the quality system are assigned and documented at this review. An annual summary of internal audits is published by the Quality department and distributed to senior management. Findings are reviewed with each department manager for necessary corrective actions.

## Change Management

Cirrus Logic follows JEDEC standards (JESD46) for customer notification of product/process changes. Prior to customer notification, changes to datasheet, wafer fabrication, assembly, or test undergo a rigorous internal change management process. Evaluation and implementation plans are developed by a cross-functional team of technical content experts and then reviewed and approved by a board of management representatives from several different areas within the company.

## Quality Certifications

Cirrus Logic maintains an ISO 9001:2015 certification and requires all suppliers to be both ISO 9001:2015 and ISO/TS 16949 certified. Cirrus Logic also maintains a Sony Green Partner certification for environmental standards.



# Environmental and Social Responsibilities

Cirrus Logic is actively committed to protecting the environment by reducing the amount of hazardous substances in our products. Cirrus Logic is working with customers and suppliers to exemplify industry standards of environmental and social responsibility.

## RoHS (Restricted Use of Hazardous Substances)

The European Union has enacted legislation (Directive 2002/95/EC) effective July 1, 2006, that restricts the use of lead, cadmium, mercury, hexavalent chromium, poly-brominated bi-phenyls (PBB), and poly-brominated di-phenyl ethers (PBDE) in a wide variety of electronic products and applications that are put on the market in EU member countries. Its replacement, Directive 2011/65/EU (RoHS-II) entered into force in 2011. Cirrus Logic offers Pb-free product versions which fully meet the definition of RoHS compliance: (1) restricted substances are not intentionally added to the product and (2) the presence of the restricted substances does not exceed the maximum stated concentration per homogeneous material as defined by the RoHS directive.



Cirrus Logic products use a “CS” prefix in their part numbers and are designated with a “Z” suffix if they are also RoHS compliant. Products acquired through the 2014 acquisition of Wolfson Microelectronics use a “WM” prefix and all are RoHS compliant if manufactured after 2007.

## REACH (Registration, Evaluation, Authorization and Restriction of Chemical Substances)

REACH is the European Union (EU) regulation on chemicals and their safe use (EC 1907/2006). It covers the Registration, Evaluation, Authorization and Restriction of Chemical Substances. The law went into force in the EU on July 1, 2007. The REACH regulation identifies substances of very high concern (SVHC).



Substances of very high concern are not intentionally added to Cirrus Logic products. For this reason, Cirrus Logic has determined that its IC products are non-emitting articles as defined by the REACH regulation. This means that SVHC are not intended to be released under normal or reasonably foreseeable conditions of use. Consequently, Cirrus Logic products do not emit any SVHC in concentrations greater than 0.1% by weight. Because the SVHC list is updated several times per year, Cirrus Logic does take the necessary steps to monitor REACH regulations. If there are any material changes, this disclosure will be updated as warranted.

## Conflict Materials

Cirrus Logic takes very seriously the worldwide concerns that the use of certain minerals that originated in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) or an adjoining country may be directly or indirectly financing human rights violations or benefiting armed groups within those countries. In addition, Cirrus Logic is committed to complying with all reporting requirements relating to these “conflict minerals (3TG)” as adopted by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) on August 22, 2012.



Section 1502 of the 2010 Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act (US HR-4173) requires SEC reporting companies to make an annual disclosure of any gold, tin, tantalum, and tungsten that originates from conflict mines in the region of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Annual disclosure is necessary for the ongoing production or sale of manufactured products.

As a member of the CFSI organization, Cirrus Logic expects its suppliers to obtain materials through environmentally and socially responsible supply chains. In support of that effort, Cirrus Logic uses the Conflict Free Sourcing Initiative (CFSI), formerly known as Electronic Industry Citizenship Coalition (EICC), the Global e-Sustainability Initiative (GeSI), the Conflict Free-Smelter (CFS) program, and the Conflict Minerals Reporting Tool.

Each year, all Cirrus Logic suppliers must use the industry standard Conflict Minerals Reporting Template to report the origin of the metals they use. In addition, they are required to report:

- Written evidence of a Corporate Policy on the use of metals from the DRC
- Written acknowledgment of Cirrus Logic’s Conflict Minerals Policy Statement
- Verification of the procedure in place to demonstrate compliance with this policy

# Global Quality Network

Cirrus Logic maintains an extensive network of facilities strategically located to support our global design centers, supply chain partners and customer base. It is within this network where new products come to life. Reliability labs are utilized to test the robust nature of product designs, and product analysis labs are tasked with identifying the root causes of performance limitations once a product is deployed. In addition, Cirrus Logic has strategically placed software development centers that support the development, testing and implementation of our SoundClear® software.





Cirrus Logic's Flagship  
Quality Product Development,  
Reliability and Analysis Lab  
in Austin, Texas



The Cirrus Logic Product Development, Reliability and Analysis Lab encompasses more than 13,000 square feet and houses the industry's most advanced, state-of-the-art analytical equipment to support our quality management initiatives. Located near the Cirrus Logic headquarters in downtown Austin, Texas, this lab facilitates collaboration between our design engineering and support teams in the development and debugging of new product designs, product qualification and product analysis. In addition, the state-of-the-art equipment is utilized to accelerate environmental and product life cycle testing.

# The Product Development Process

Cirrus Logic's Product Development Process (PDP) defines the company's process for IC product development. The PDP is the systematic execution of product development from concept through production release. The PDP is tailored to fit each new project so there is flexibility to support the needs of multiple product lines. It is through the PDP that Cirrus Logic integrates all the essential phases of product realization to achieve a rapid and error-free ramp to production.



Quality is built in from the beginning. It cannot be added in later.

The PDP is the process of building in quality.

Phase gates are management checkpoints within the PDP. These checkpoints define the required deliverables that must be evaluated at each phase. The decision is then made whether or not to proceed to the next phase. PDP reviews are held at phase exits and within phases to help management make informed decisions for product success. Continuous improvement is facilitated and corrective actions are driven as needed. All elements of product development are coordinated to enable successful release to production. Corporate quality specifications apply to all products and are woven into the PDP. Any custom products or sustained engineering activities designed to enhance products already in the marketplace also follow the PDP.

## PHASE 0

### Product Concept and Business Case Review

Phase 0 serves as the “think tank” for identifying potential new product concepts. It is during this phase that a business case is developed and the strategic fit of the project is determined taking into consideration its alignment with the company’s current technology, markets and customers.

The key objectives of Phase 0:

- Product marketing identifies key customers and works to build the business case. First pass requirements for technical and financial milestones are defined.

- Product features and performance requirements are identified and evaluated, as well as any software requirements.

- Preliminary intellectual property (IP) blocks are summarized for both analog and digital design elements.

- Quality and support requirements are specified with respect to temperature grade, characterization and all necessary qualification requirements.

- Product support materials are defined by the applications group. The product development schedule and a preliminary product launch plan are drafted.



## PHASE 1

### Engineering Response and Project Planning

Phase 1 takes the product concepts approved at Phase 0 and defines the key feature sets and the circuit architecture for the new IC.

The key objectives of Phase 1:

#### Feasibility Assessment

An engineering pre-architectural analysis is used to determine if the requested requirements are achievable. Architectural scoping is used to identify any potential limitations and the necessary corrective actions.

#### Target IC Data Sheet

A draft product data sheet is generated that outlines the preliminary product specifications and describes the function of the IC in relation to the system level requirements. A block diagram is used to capture the main functionality of the IC. It shows all major components of the design, and an effort is made to make each block open to future developments and extensions. For a mixed-signal IC, the chip is divided into analog and digital domains. The test strategy is elaborated and the preliminary characterization and validation plan is defined, while the means to debug each block independently on the bench is identified. Test time reductions and methods to eliminate multiple test insertions are given consideration.

#### Systems Architecture Specification (SAS)

The SAS outlines the preliminary specifications covering components, software and required evaluation boards. The final SAS deliverable is a comprehensive description of the environment in which the IC will operate, as well as how the proposed solution meets market requirements.

#### Software Systems Architecture

The development of software architecture is used to define the necessary requirements to make the system operational. The proposed environment in which the software will operate is described with respect to the overall platform, operating system or RTOS, volatile memory, permanent storage, and primary input and output. The input and output of the software are described, including layouts and formats where applicable. Any significant impact that the software will have on the overall environment also is identified.

#### Platform Hardware Systems Architecture

This is a description of the printed circuit boards and other electrical circuits that require development in order to make the system operational. Typically, these boards are designed to meet system specifications for operating conditions and absolute maximum ratings for parameter, supply voltage and supply current, and any design constraints on the board are described and documented. Relevant electrical specifications for the board also are provided.

#### IC/Firmware Verification Plan

This plan outlines the firmware/software requirement specification which details the project's required hardware and software characteristics and functionality. Data types that must be available to the customer are identified, either by the use of application development tools, or by the use of forms, displays, reports, and printouts. The actual application development environment is created so that control structures can be made available to the customer.

#### Qualification Plan

The "Qual Plan" is used for demonstrating field reliability. All required stresses, number of lots, units per lot, and pre-conditioning requirements are specified. All necessary process and device qualification data (including reliability results) is documented.

#### Initial Risk Assessment

This assessment evaluates the technical, schedule and market risks that could impact the project. Impact analysis and mitigation plans are made.



## PHASE 2

### Design Development and First Silicon Readiness

During Phase 2, the design architecture of the product is completed and its readiness for fab release is validated. Hardware manufacturing also is supported in this phase, along with identifying and resolving environmental compliance issues.

The key objectives of Phase 2:

#### IC Sub-System Specifications

The IC sub-system specifications identify the initial top level schematics and system verilog (SV) behavioral models. All

known block IOs are created and the expected block area for the IC is determined. The layout team works to create a block abstract view and the process is completed with an architectural review and the closure of all action items. Analog blocks go through five phases: (1) verify, (2) planning, (3) layout, (4) design, and (5) architecture. This results in complete block specifications, determination of how specifications will be tested and enumeration of all required block interfaces. Digital blocks go through three phases: (1) architect, (2) design, and (3) planning. This results in the completions of the IP block design, including block specifications, determination of how specifications will be tested at block and chip level, and enumeration of all required block interfaces.

#### IC Verification

The verification review provides an audit of design results to assure compliance to the design methodology standards and is held prior to the layout review. The layout review validates the physical design of the IC and addresses any design issues, such as cross talk and digital noise management. Manufacturing issues in need of validation include metal migration, ESD and latch-up.

Hardware schematic and layout reviews for the engineering evaluation board (EEB) and the customer demo board (CDB) are then completed. A quality readiness review organizes all the supporting documentation needed to proceed with the qualification.




## Quality Built In

The emphasis on quality at this phase of product development is critical.

# Product Qualification

## BATHTUB CURVE

Failure Rates During the Lifetime of a Product



The emphasis on quality at this phase of product development is accomplished through a series of design and peer reviews that are performed throughout this phase to verify and validate. Verification is performed versus the design rules. Validation is performed versus the customer's expectations.

In support of our quality initiative, qualification and reliability testing is used to ensure all products are below targets set for "early failure rates" in PPM and "wear out failures" in FITs. The bathtub curve shown here is a standard way to picture the types of failures during a device's lifetime.

There are two basic types of failures, "early failures" and "wear out failures." During the normal operation of the device, that is the section of time between early failures and wear out, the failure rate is normally constant and at an extremely low rate.

The reliability tests conducted by Cirrus Logic can be divided into two categories: qualification and monitoring. Qualification evaluates new products for their manufacturability. Monitoring assures that manufacturability remains at a high standard of reliability and quality.

## PHASE 3

### Silicon Bring-Up and Initial Customer Samples

Phase 3 sets the stage for a successful product launch. All applicable hardware is finalized and has been tested for stable performance. The product data sheet is released to production.

The key objectives of Phase 3:

- The product launch plan is presented to the product development and management teams.

- The design phase lessons learned is completed based on the knowledge gained in Phases 1 and 2, with key actions taken.

- The Qualified Parts List (QPL) level 2 checklist is completed. Any issues are identified and resolved.

- The preliminary validation and characterization reports are completed. Any issues are identified and resolved.

- First customer samples are delivered (up to 10K parts) and the stage is set for a successful product launch.

At the Phase 3 Exit meeting, the decision whether to advance to Phase 4 is made. But regardless of the “go or no go” decision, an *Engineering Postmortem* is conducted as part of the Cirrus Logic continuous improvement philosophy. This postmortem is conducted by a cross-functional team that evaluates the PDP process for each individual product and assesses the project in terms of what went well and what could be improved. Any identified improvements can then be implemented and fanned out to subsequent projects.

## PHASE 4

### Internal Productization Efforts

Phase 4 involves the limited release of product that has been qualified and evaluated. All validation, qualification, and characterization plans are completed in preparation for the full ramp to high volume production. Customer parts can be shipped according to corporate quality specifications.

The key objectives of Phase 4:

- The Customer Reference Design (CRD) datasheet is released to production.


- The preliminary data sheet for the IC is frozen. New content updates in this phase are limited to changes in specification values to reflect new characterization data or production test limits, as well as the addition of new information to the applications section that addresses new issues or routine customer questions. Other revisions also may involve corrections to any inaccurate information from the previous release of the data sheet and updates to the part ordering information. Incorporation of any known errata that the team decides will not be fixed at the time of sign-off can be added at this time.

- The final results of IC validation, characterization and matrix lot reviews are examined. Detailed analyses of sightings and resulting actions are performed, documented and presented.


- The final production test methodology, characterization and hardware investigations are reviewed. The status of the production test program is compared to the original test plan. Test coverage and yield to date are reviewed for all program releases.







Product qualification is important for determining field reliability



Product qualification is performed in-house as part of the design validation process

## PHASE 5

### Full Production Release

Phase 5 is full production release. All package and silicon qualification, validation and characterization is completed.

The key objectives of Phase 5:

The post-silicon phase lessons are completed based on the knowledge gained during phases 3, 4 and 5, with key actions taken.

Upon completion of all activities, a Phase 5 Exit meeting is held and the decision is made whether to release to full production.

A *Business Postmortem* is conducted as part of Cirrus Logic's continuous improvement philosophy. A postmortem allows the team to evaluate the PDP process for each individual product and assess the project in terms of what went well

and what could be improved. Any identified improvements can then be implemented and fanned out to subsequent projects.

The key business process issues to review are:

What went well?

What ideas/practices do we want to port to other projects (keep doing)?


What ideas/practices did we do that we did not see adding value (stop doing)?

What new ideas/practices should we add to improve the next project (try doing)?

What needs improvement?

What mistakes occurred that impacted quality or schedule that we could avoid on the next project?





Audio testing labs are used throughout the software development process

## Software Quality

### Development Process

As part of the PDP process, quality metrics are integrated into the development of software and firmware associated with specific Cirrus Logic IC products. This approach ensures the technology involved is of the highest standards.

A number of defined processes and methodologies are included in all firmware releases. Software for the company's wide range of "smart codecs" follows the multi-phase AGILE development process that encompasses a group of methods in which requirements and solutions evolve through collaboration between self-organizing, cross-functional teams. This approach uses adaptive planning, evolutionary development, early delivery and continuous improvement to promote rapid and flexible response to change.

The proprietary tools and drivers that support the software

modules follow a slightly different development flow. Each phase of development has associated reviews, usually at the end of each phase, to evaluate deliverables and determine what actions are required to progress.


A phase may contain a number of stages with an associated review meeting. In the early phases of the project, taking time to review ensures that the scope of the project, the commitment of resources, the budgetary considerations, and the scheduling for the proposed deliverables are all thoroughly outlined in the business case. An outline of the possible risks associated with the project versus the level of confidence regarding successful completion is also included. This activity leads to a viable development plan and a final agreement on the deployment schedule. Later in the project, having review stages within each phase allows incremental implementation, testing and release of the agreed upon feature set.

## Test Integration

Testing is carried out at all phases of code development. A number of levels of testing are utilized. Audio algorithms are initially developed and tested within MATLAB®, an interactive environment for algorithm development. Once the algorithm has been completed it is coded and simulated for the DSP embedded in the smart codec. Once hardware is available the firmware containing the algorithm is downloaded and tested on an evaluation board before being loaded into a form

factor demonstration platform, or a customer's device for final testing and tuning.

Tests may be derived from the initial test specification or may be added as a result of a defect that's been identified. Defects are submitted by developers, testers and early-adoption customers. All defects are subsequently tracked to resolution. As part of the development process, software solutions may be submitted to external agencies for independent testing and verification to ensure industry compliance.



Customer devices are tested in application specific lab settings to ensure delivery of a quality product

Tool development typically follows an AGILE development process using an iterative life cycle of prioritize/plan/do/release/review.

## Deployment Tools and Support

SoundClear® Studio, CirrusLink™ CLIDE™ and WISCE™ are the main tool sets developed and supported by Cirrus Logic for deployment of firmware into a customer's device. Work items are broken down into features, stories and tasks that are agreed upon. Once development work commences, any resulting defects are monitored by regular stakeholder meetings.

All new and updated code and associated documentation is peer-reviewed using code collaboration tools. Manual and automated tests are carried out by Continuous Integration (CI). A test failure is considered a build failure, and a "stop-the-line" approach is taken to CI build breaks. No code is accepted except for fixes or back-out until the build is working again.

## OS Drivers

OS drivers allow the customer's operating system to manage Cirrus Logic software on Cirrus Logic enabled hardware. The most common drivers are those for the Linux and Windows® operating systems. Windows drivers are written to support a specific combination of host OS, host hardware platforms and Cirrus Logic devices. Testing is conducted on host hardware Reference Verification Platforms. Released drivers are required to pass Windows Hardware Certification Kit tests for 32-bit and 64-bit builds. Volume customization is done at the time of production to allow compliance with European Union (EU) regulations limiting headphone volume.

Linux drivers also are written to support a wide range of Cirrus Logic products and are submitted back into the Linux kernel in order to reduce the integration and maintenance costs for the user. The drivers use the standard Linux subsystems for the functionality provided by the Cirrus Logic device. Since standard APIs are used, the drivers will work with any processor using Linux support.

## General Quality Initiatives

Cirrus Logic's coding standards are intended to sustain the readability, consistency and maintainability of all source code. These standards are tailored for C family (C/C++/C#) coding as these are the primary languages used by Cirrus Logic. Our software development initiatives employ techniques across all modes of code development to maintain a consistently high quality both when developing code and when releasing code to customers.

Our build, integration and testing system (BITS) provides an infrastructure for automating builds and tests for all active software projects. BITS ensures the quality control and the quality assurance of our products by using a Continuous Integration (CI) server and a platform for managing and scheduling all builds. Whenever there is a code submission to a project, the CI system triggers an automatic build and runs a battery of tests to ensure that no faults have been introduced. Any build or test errors are reported to the development team immediately for quick resolution.

# Building Quality Through Supplier Relationships

## Supplier Quality Management

A key component to the Cirrus Logic commitment to quality is an underlying foundation of integrity in our supplier relationships. To achieve this high standard, supplier performance is rated according to quality, delivery, provision of required certificates, and test reports.

Cirrus Logic follows a Supplier Code of Conduct for selecting and managing our network of suppliers. Within our organization, suppliers are managed in partnership with the supplier quality and supply chain operations. Suppliers are selected based on a number of criteria which include financial viability, ISO9001/TS16949 certifications and a manufacturing capability assessment audit. Various methods are then used to manage, measure and drive continuous improvement within these

relationships, including quarterly reviews, scorecards, annual audits, supplier development goals, process yields, and overall quality performance.

Cirrus Logic conducts regular audits that are more rigorous than ISO9001 requirements. These audits not only assess system compliance but also effectiveness and continuous improvement. Scorecards are reviewed with each supplier quarterly. These include a quality component based on effectiveness of corrective actions, frequency of customer returns, inline deviations, and yield. If a supplier fails to meet Cirrus Logic's requirements, resolution may involve corrective action or disqualification, depending on the nature and severity of the problem.



## A Systematic Approach

Based on a commitment to continuously improve our supplier base, Cirrus Logic provides engineering and statistical support to each supplier to help them effectively utilize traditional improvement tools such as statistical process control and design of experiments. Additionally, innovative techniques like ISTAB, smart sampling and statistical bin limits are created and shared. Cirrus Logic utilizes this systematic approach to achieve higher quality and better performance at each point



of the supply chain. This approach consists of three sub-processes that are mutually supportive: audit, feedback and development.

The audit process consists of self-audits in advance preparation for on-site audits. Annual (or biennial) on-site audits provide the supplier with Cirrus Logic's perspective on the efficiency and effectiveness of the supplier's operations. These audits cover the supplier's quality management system, corrective action follow-up and targeting of specific areas of the operation to improve quality through best practices.

The feedback portion of this process is the quarterly business reviews (QBR) which are held at each supplier's site. In the QBR, the quality and operational performance of the supplier are examined and goals are set. Finally, the development process consists of setting and tracking annual development goals. Performance to goal is reviewed monthly with the expectation of continued supplier improvement.







## Manufacturing Continuous Improvement

The Continuous Improvement Process (CIP) is an ongoing effort applied to the products, processes, services, and systems at Cirrus Logic's supply chain partners. These efforts drive improvement over time or breakthrough improvement all at once. Among the most widely used tools for continuous improvement: PDCA (plan-do-check-act) cycle, Six Sigma and TQM (Total Quality Management). These tools emphasize employee involvement and teamwork, measuring and systematizing processes, and reducing variation, defects and cycle times.

## Supplier Code of Conduct


As part of Cirrus Logic's commitment to the highest standards of product quality, the company's Supplier Code of Conduct guides the business integrity in all third party supplier relationships. This code is comprised of five sections covering labor, health and safety, environment, business ethics and managing conformity to the code. Based on this code, Cirrus Logic commits to ensuring that working conditions across our



supply chain are safe; that workers are treated with respect and dignity; and that manufacturing processes are environmentally and socially responsible.

To ensure our relationships with suppliers meet and support these expectations, the Cirrus Logic Supplier Code of Conduct exceeds the Electronic Industry Code of Conduct. As a condition of doing business with Cirrus Logic, suppliers are expected to conform to these requirements and communicate the basics of the code to their suppliers. Cirrus Logic representatives may visit supplier facilities with or without notice to assess compliance to these requirements and will consider a supplier's conformance when making sourcing and procurement decisions. Failure to comply with the standards and provisions set forth in the Cirrus Logic Supplier Code of Conduct may result in a supplier's disqualification.

The code also requires suppliers to commit to operate in full compliance with the laws, rules and regulations of the countries in which they operate. This encourages, and in some cases requires, suppliers to go even further, drawing upon internationally recognized standards in order to advance social and environmental responsibility and business ethics.



## Our Commitment To Quality

### Customer Quality Management, Keeping Customers First

Cirrus Logic's commitment to quality extends beyond product quality to the integrity across all of our business relationships. Cirrus Logic's Customer Quality Management Program focuses on providing world-class support to our customers. Customer Quality Engineering teams are located strategically around the globe to ensure the delivery of immediate support to our customers through a coordinated effort between our business units and technical teams.

### Customer Change Management

Within our Customer Quality Management Program, activities involving product change notifications (PCNs) and product discontinuations (End of Life, EOLs) represent one of the most compelling drivers of customer communications. Cirrus Logic acknowledges the importance and priority of helping our customers navigate these changes. Cirrus Logic follows generally accepted industry standards for notifying customers of any changes that are classified as "Major" and provide a 90-day review period. Major changes are classified as any change that affects product form, fit, function or reliability.

Customers are notified of product EOLs through our PCN system. Customers have a minimum of 180 days from the date of notification to place final orders and 360 days from the date of notice to accept final shipments. In the rare situation Cirrus Logic is not able to meet these notification timelines for an EOL situation, every effort is made to provide customers with as much advanced notice as possible.

### Product Return Process

Reports of product non-compliance are treated seriously by Cirrus Logic. Our global customer quality and field sales teams can be contacted directly to begin determining the best path for solving an issue. If it is determined that the best course of action is to return the effected parts to Cirrus Logic, then the company's standard customer return process flow will be followed. The customer return process flow is adapted as needed in order to address the specific product issue and to provide the most efficient resolution for our customer.


Throughout this process, customers receive ongoing communications to keep them current on investigation efforts and the resultant findings. This can include verification of the specific problem, recommendations on containment, root cause, and the final corrective and preventative actions that are applicable.

Customer returns are tracked in a corporate-wide system that gathers metrics regarding incidents, processing cycle times and failure mechanisms. These metrics are reviewed monthly and quarterly with our business and operations teams to drive continuous improvement throughout the product design, manufacturing fabrication, assembly, test, and shipping processes.

### Product Traceability

The customer return process flow is brought full circle through the use of unique package markings which enables material traceability for all Cirrus Logic products. This information is retained within a central storage database and can be used as a part of material containment in case of an issue.

# Customer Return Process Flow



# Product Analysis

Once a part is entered into the Cirrus Logic customer return process flow, a product analysis is initiated to determine the exact cause of the failure. Often times this work is conducted at one of Cirrus Logic's Product Development, Reliability and Analysis laboratories dedicated to electrical and physical product analysis. As noted in the customer return process flow diagram, communications with the customer regarding any findings is paramount at each stage of this product analysis process.




Nano-probing is a critical step in fault isolation analysis

## Replicating the Failure

The first step in the product analysis process is to reproduce and verify the exact nature of the failure to determine if it matches the reported symptom. The laboratory utilizes ATE testers for verifying functional failures, engineering evaluation boards (EEB's) for verifying analog failures, and a switchboard matrix board for verifying DC parametric failures.

## Package Level Analysis

Optical 2D and 3D microscopes with various imaging modes are used for incoming inspections. Non-destructive board level solder ball or lead joints and plastic package bond wire integrity checks are performed on the X-ray tool. Acoustic microscopy is also performed to inspect the package for delamination and other package level failure mechanisms.





**A package x-ray is performed to verify the condition of the package integrity**

## Package Conditioning

For WLCSP packages, Cirrus Logic uses defined processes to remove the part from the customer board and to remove the underfill and re-ball the device. For plastic packages, a toolset consisting of hot and cold acid de-capsulators and laser assisted de-capsulators are used to expose the die for further analysis. A backside sample polishing tool is utilized to expose or thin down samples for subsequent electrical fault isolation analysis.


## Electrical Fault Isolation

Cirrus Logic's in-house developed FA hardware designs support a multitude of package types and pin counts ranging from QFN and TSSOP, to WLCSP and BGA. The setups are geared towards topside and backside electrical fault isolation techniques. A locking thermography system for dynamic infrared (IR) thermal emission analysis is utilized to accurately and efficiently narrow down the location of the failure, often emitting power levels as low as microwatts. A near IR optimized light emissions analysis (LEM) tool coupled with an IR laser overlay is used to detect and isolate IC defect categories including junction leakage, gate defects, latch up, ESD, and floating nodes. Laser-based techniques such as TIVA, OBIRCH, OBIC, LIVA, and LADA are most frequently used for through silicon point emission analysis. FIB assisted partitioning, passive voltage contrast and access point creation are used to further isolate the failing node.



**Hotspot observed on the device**

# Typical Product Analysis Flow




## Atomic Force Microscopy


Atomic Force Microscopy (AFM) uses a scanning probe microscope (SPM) to measure local properties of the element under examination, such as height, friction, and magnetism. To acquire an image, the SPM raster scans a probe over a small area of the sample, measuring the local property simultaneously. In the field of semiconductor physics, for example, (a) an identification of atoms at a surface, (b) an evaluation of an interaction between a specific atom and its neighboring atoms, and (c) a change in physical properties arisen from a change in an atomic arrangement through the atomic manipulation have been studied.

## Advanced Electrical Analysis

Isolating the failing node based on emission data, and sometimes lack of abnormal emissions, requires exhaustive and time intensive functional microprobing. This step requires developing a CAD layout and schematic review; creating probe points to die level metalization; and probing identified nodes to pinpoint the failure. Scanning electron microscope (SEM) based nanoprobng is utilized to handle small feature process geometries in addition to fault isolation methods such as EBAC. Atomic Force Microscopy (AFM) is used for nano scale electrical characterization including conductive and tunneling imaging to produce a map of P, N and resistive characteristics of the sample area. Focused ion beam (FIB) tools that support gas chemistries to selective etch or deposit metals, polymers and insulators are used to perform circuit edits for design debugs.








Nanoprober





Nanoprober

## Use of Focus Ion Beam (FIB) Tools to Debug Circuit Designs



## Physical Analysis

The optical inspection toolset consists of various microscopes that support 3D, dark field, confocal, and bright field imaging. A combination of plasma dry etching and chemical assisted wet etching is used to deprocess the sample, layer by layer. Mechanical cross sections of packages, qualification vehicles and layer removal in the area of interest are conducted on industry standard polishing tools. Precision cross sectioning and high resolution images of the defects is achieved on the dual beam FIB tools. This toolset also supports SEM based TEM imaging required for nanoscale defects. SEM/EDS X-ray elemental analysis is used to identify the defects for subsequent corrective actions at the foundry or assembly.









Appendix A: <i>Product Reliability Operations</i>	32
Appendix B: <i>ESD Latch-Up Testing</i>	35
Appendix C: <i>Moisture Sensitivity Levels</i>	37
Appendix D: <i>White Papers</i>	38

# Appendix A

## Product Reliability Operations

Reliability test conditions follow Cirrus Logic Integrated Circuit Qualification Specifications, applicable JEDEC standards, or AEC Q100. When conflicts arise, JEDEC standards are followed for commercial products and AEC is followed for automotive products.

Devices which undergo stress tests are required to pass the same electrical and functional tests from start to finish. Analysis of non-conforming units is required; root causes are identified and corrective actions are taken as necessary.

### Pre-conditioning

Applicable JEDEC standard: J-STD-020


Pre-conditioning consists of a bake, soak and reflow, and is used to simulate the PC board assembly process. This assures that the units going into an accelerated test would have survived the assembly process.

### Early Life Failure Rate (ELFR)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-A108

ELFR is considered a reliability measure of the manufacturing process used for the product. This is because the failure rate can depend on age due to latent defects introduced by the process. Early life testing is performed to estimate this failure rate, usually quoted in defects per million opportunities (DPM) in the first three to six months of life. If unacceptable early failure rates are encountered, they can be mitigated by production burn-in or wafer level stress screens until the manufacturing process is made more robust.

Device specific conditions of maximum VSSs, I/O loading and clock rate are applied to exercise the maximum amount of digital circuitry while full scale ranges are applied to exercise the analog circuitry. The failure rate is calculated for +125°C conditions and the failure rate is de-rated to use conditions. The need for production stress screening is determined based on the predicted failure rate under use conditions.



### High Temperature Operating Life (HTOL)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-A108

HTOL is an intense stress test performed to thermally and electrically accelerate failure mechanisms through the application of extreme temperature and dynamic biasing conditions. Typically it is performed at +125°C with bias levels at the maximum data sheet specifications. HTOL performance is considered to be a measure of the intrinsic reliability of the design and manufacturing process taken together. HTOL results are quoted in failures per billion device hours, aka “failures in time” (FIT).

### Temperature Humidity Bias (THB)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-A101

THB assesses device and package resistance to prolonged temperature, humidity and electrical stresses. Devices are stressed under extreme temperature and humidity conditions. The devices are dynamically subjected to maximum differential bias on alternating pins while under stress conditions.

Stress conditions are:

Temperature = +85°C  
Humidity = 85% RH  
Time = 1000 hours with interim read points at 100 and 500 hours

Voltage bias levels are product dependent.

Results are quoted as the percentage of tested units that are defective.

### Biased Highly Accelerated Stress Test (HAST)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-A110

Like THB, HAST simulates extreme operating conditions. Devices are stressed in a chamber at an extreme level of temperature and humidity for various periods of time. The devices are dynamically biased while under stress.

Stress conditions are:

Temperature = +110°C  
Humidity = 85% RH  
Time = 264 hours

Voltage bias levels are product dependent.

Results are quoted as the percentage of tested units that are defective.

### Pressure Pot (PPOT)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-A102

PPOT (also known as Autoclave) assesses the moisture resistance of plastic encapsulated devices. Devices in a tray are stressed in an autoclave at extreme levels of temperatures and humidity for an extended period of time. Failed devices are checked for delamination, shorts, broken wires, etc.

Stress conditions are:

Temperature = +121°C  
Pressure = 15 psi  
Humidity = 100% RH  
Time = 96 hours

Results are quoted as the percentage of tested units that are defective.

### Temp Cycle (TMCL)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-104

TMCL accelerates the effects of thermal expansion mismatch among different components of the package and circuit. It is used to determine package tolerance to temperature variation extremes during transportation and use.

Devices are placed in a receptacle within a vertical tube with two chambers full of air. The top chamber is heated and the bottom is cooled. The devices are alternately moved from one chamber to the other. Failed devices are checked for stress cracks and delamination that can occur in the epoxy and injection molding used for die mounting and encapsulation. There are other conditions that are or can be used.

Stress conditions are:

Temperature = +150°C (top chamber) and -65° C (bottom chamber)  
Time = 10 minutes per chamber for 500 cycles between chambers

Results are quoted as the percentage of tested units that are defective.



### Unbiased Highly Accelerated Stress Test (UHAST)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-A118

Similar to Autoclave, UHAST simulates extreme operating conditions. Devices are stressed in a chamber at an extreme level of temperature and humidity for various periods of time.

Stress conditions are:

- Temperature = +110°C
- Humidity = 85% RH
- Time = 264 hours

Results are quoted as the percentage of tested units that are defective.

### Low Temperature Operating Life (LTOL)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-A108

LTOL is stress test performed to activate failure mechanisms that are accelerated by lower temperature (e.g. Hot carrier degradation). Typically it is performed at ambient temperatures of -40°C with bias levels at the maximum data sheet specifications. LTOL performance is considered to be a measure of the intrinsic reliability of the design and manufacturing process taken together. LTOL results are quoted in failures per billion device hours, a.k.a. FIT (failures in time).

### High Temperature Storage Life (HTSL)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-A103

HTSL determines the effect of time and temperature under controlled storage conditions for thermally activated failure mechanisms. Devices are stressed in a chamber at extreme levels of temperature and humidity for various periods of time.

Stress conditions are:

- Temperature = +150°C
- Time = 1000 hours

Results are quoted as the percentage of tested units that are defective.

### Solderability

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-B102

This test determines the solderability of terminals after transportation and storage. Devices are dipped in a solder bath for a pre-determined time. Units are pre-conditioned with steam or hot aging, or both.

Stress conditions are:


- Solder bath
- Temperature = +245°C/-5°C
- Dip Time = +5/-0.5 seconds

Solder composition: Pb:Sn = 4:6, used with rosin flux.

Lead-free alloys are used with lead-free packages.

At least 95% of the immersed area must be coated with solder in order to pass the test.

## Equipment in Reliability Flowchart



# Appendix B

## Electro Static Discharge Latch-Up Testing

Electrical Static Discharge (ESD) testing is used to determine a semiconductor's level of ESD sensitivity. Cirrus Logic's ESD laboratory performs in-house, multi-system JEDEC compliant ESD and latch-up testing. All three of the commonly used ESD test models are supported. This allows for rapid design feedback and complete debug capability.

### Human Body Model (HBM)


Applicable JEDEC standards:

JS-001 HBM models the discharge of electricity into a pin on a device through contact with a human body that has been charged with static electricity. Equivalent capacitance of the discharge circuit is 100pF and resistance is 1.5K ohm.

The typical flow for HBM testing is as follows (the device is not powered up during ESD testing):

- Flow: room and hot ATE test
- Pre-stress I/V, supply current check
- HBM stress
- Post stress I/V, supply current check
- Room and hot ATE test

The standard HBM ESD stress setup is depicted here:




### Charged Device Model (CDM)

Applicable JEDEC standard:

JESD22-C101, JS-002 models the discharge of electricity that occurs when part of the device package or lead frame becomes charged due to handling and a pin on the device then contacts a metal apparatus or fixture. This model shows good correlation to the typical breakdown mode of an automatic assembly line.


The typical flow for CDM testing:

- Perform room and hot product acceptance test
- Perform pre-stress check of I/V and supply current
- Apply CDM stress
- Verify CDM pulse waveform with small target for  $\pm 500V$
- Stress each pin for  $> \pm 500V$
- Monitor discharge pulse during each pulse
- Monitor environment temperature and humidity
- Perform post stress check of I/V and supply current
- Perform room and hot product acceptance test
- Compare pre and post pin I/V and supply currents on the tester




## CDM Waveform Characteristics

Test Number		1	2	3	4
Standard Test Module		Small	Small	Large	Large
Test voltage (V)		500 ( $\pm 5\%$ )	1000 ( $\pm 5\%$ )	200 ( $\pm 5\%$ )	500 ( $\pm 5\%$ )
Peak current magnitude (A)	Ip	5.75 ( $\pm 15\%$ )	11.5 ( $\pm 15\%$ )	1.5 ( $\pm 15\%$ )	11.5 ( $\pm 15\%$ )
Rise time (ps)	tr	<400	<400	—	—
Full width at half height (ns)	Td	1.0 $\pm$ 0.5	1.0 $\pm$ 0.5	—	—
Undershoot (A, max)	U-	<50% Ip	<50% Ip	<50% Ip	<50% Ip
Overshoot	U+	<25% Ip	<25% Ip	<25% Ip	<25% Ip



The standard CDM ESD stress setup



Device on charging plate with alignment tool

### ESD Induced Latch-Up

Applicable JEDEC standard: JEDEC 78

Latch-up testing is performed to ascertain whether a device can sustain SCR latch-up due to DC current injected into the input and I/O pins. Cirrus Logic requires testing of both current injections and power supply over voltage conditions.

Stress conditions are:

Temperature = +25°C, or maximum specified temperature on data sheet

Sample size is six devices from each lot.

Current injection = ±100 mA on all input and I/O

Stress conditions are:

Power supply = 1.5 V<sub>DD</sub> MAX

Temperature = +25°C, or maximum specified temperature on data sheet


Sample size is six devices from each lot.

The typical flow for latch-up testing:

- Perform room and hot product acceptance test
- Perform pre-stress check of I/V and supply current
- Apply latch-up stress (with device biased appropriately)
- I/O ±current injection stress:
  - Stress on 5 V I/O Domain pins w/inputs all low, repeat w/inputs all high
  - Stress on 1.8 V I/O Domain pins w/inputs all low, repeat w/inputs all high
- Supply overvoltage stress:
  - Stress on 5 V supply rail w/inputs all low, repeat w/inputs all high
  - Stress on 1.8 V supply rail w/inputs all low, repeat w/inputs all high
- Perform post-stress check of I/V and supply current
- Perform room and hot product acceptance test



Latch-up stress setup



10 Positive 500 V pulse verifications with test target

# Appendix C

## Moisture Sensitivity Levels

JEDEC levels are the industry standard for pre-conditioning flows used to simulate a customer’s PCB attachment process.

Pre-conditioning flows are performed on all plastic surface mount devices before specific qualification testing. This establishes the moisture sensitivity level (MSL) under which the device will be released to production and determines whether dry pack is required or not. This testing determines the level of moisture absorption by the product package for a set period of time. Defects that can result are delamination of the package interfaces (and/or a "popcorn effect") during the customer assembly process. This popcorn effect was noticed several years ago as the industry began migrating from primarily pin-through-hole packages and dual-in-line power packages, to surface mount devices. A popping sound was heard on assembly lines as packages were mounted on PCB boards. The cause of this phenomenon was isolated to moisture ingress into the device package which in turn generated a rapid expansion during reflow, causing packages to crack. This cracking happened so rapidly that an audible “pop” was observed and thus the nickname “popcorn” effect was coined. Generally, devices below 22-pins are qualified to  $MSL \leq 2$  and devices of 24-pins and greater are usually qualified to a less stringent level 3 and dry packed to prevent a popcorn effect issue during PCB attachment (e.g. IR reflow)..

### Solder Reflow Profiles for Cirrus Logic Products

Cirrus Logic Quality and Assembly Engineering Departments receive frequent customer inquiries asking for recommended reflow soldering profiles for our IC devices. Providing such

recommendations poses quite a considerable challenge given the wide variety of available reflow equipment models and the unique factors related to each piece of equipment, such as PCB board size and mass and the specific solder chemistry used by the customer. Given all of these variables, customers are best served to create custom, optimized reflow solder profiles for each assembly scenario.

For non-hermetic plastic and wafer level chip scale packages (WLCSP), Cirrus Logic devices are qualified and rated using the joint industry specification J-STD-020. Using this specification to both rate the susceptibility of ICs to moisture and to guide customers towards proper reflow exposure parameters helps ensure compatibility between the Cirrus Logic device and the customer’s soldering application.

This specification also is useful in understanding the limits and preferred practices for reflow soldering for both eutectic and lead-free chemistries. The standard defines a target reflow profile and explains the acceptable limits for time and temperature during reflow soldering. Proper interpretation of this document will assist customers in developing solder reflow profiles for their manufacturing process which provide repeatable high quality solder joints in a reliable and efficient manner.

Solder paste manufacturers should also be consulted for any additional requirements to facilitate a successful application of their products. The standard may be downloaded free of charge by JEDEC registered individuals using this link: <https://www.jedec.org/standards-documents/docs/j-std-020e>. There is no cost or obligation associated with registering for access to this information.

Level	Floor Life		Soak Requirements				
			Standard		Accelerated Equivalent		
	Time (hours)	Condition			eV 0.40-0.48 Time (hours)	eV 0.30-0.39 Time (hours)	Condition
1	Unlimited	$\leq 30^{\circ}\text{C}/85\% \text{ RH}$	168 + 5/-0	85°C/85% RH	NA	NA	NA
2	1 year	$\leq 30^{\circ}\text{C}/60\% \text{ RH}$	168 + 5/-0	85°C/60% RH	NA	NA	NA
2a	4 weeks	$\leq 30^{\circ}\text{C}/60\% \text{ RH}$	696 <sup>2</sup> + 5/-0	30°C/60% RH	120 + 1/-0	168 + 1/-0	60°C/60% RH
3	168 hours	$\leq 30^{\circ}\text{C}/60\% \text{ RH}$	192 <sup>2</sup> + 5/-0	30°C/60% RH	40 + 1/-0	52 + 1/-0	60°C/60% RH
4	72 hours	$\leq 30^{\circ}\text{C}/60\% \text{ RH}$	96 <sup>2</sup> + 5/-0	30°C/60% RH	20 + 0.5/-0	24 + 0.5/-0	60°C/60% RH
5	48 hours	$\leq 30^{\circ}\text{C}/60\% \text{ RH}$	72 <sup>2</sup> + 5/-0	30°C/60% RH	15 + 0.5/-0	20 + 0.5/-0	60°C/60% RH
5a	24 hours	$\leq 30^{\circ}\text{C}/60\% \text{ RH}$	48 <sup>2</sup> + 5/-0	30°C/60% RH	10 + 0.5/-0	13 + 0.5/-0	60°C/60% RH
6	Time on Label (TOL)	$\leq 30^{\circ}\text{C}/60\% \text{ RH}$	TOL	30°C/60% RH	NA	NA	NA

# Predictive Maintenance

## Abstract

An overview of predictive maintenance (PdM) is presented and contrasted with preventive maintenance (PM). Examples of PdM methods used in wafer fab are given.

## I. Introduction

Cirrus Logic quality management believes that predictive maintenance is a key factor in preventing quality disasters. The essential difference between traditional *preventive* maintenance (PM) and *predictive* maintenance (PdM) is that PM activity depends on the *history* of the tool and PdM activity depends on the *current condition* of the tool. This is why PdM is sometimes called “condition-based” maintenance.

PdM not only prevents disasters, it also improves equipment uptime. Tools go down for maintenance when warranted by their current condition, not because they are simply “due.” To the degree that maintenance events are predictable they can be planned. Planned maintenance takes less time, has less variability and can be performed when the tool is not in demand.

The central concept of PM is the *bathtub curve*. The bathtub curve is the failure rate as a function of age. We take a tool down because we think that enough time since the last renewal of the tool has accumulated for the bathtub curve to rise to an intolerable level. This strategy is consistent with the belief that failure mechanisms are time-dependent.

The central concept of PdM is *anomaly detection*. An anomaly detector is an annunciator that is a function of measured variables. We take a tool down because we think that the current condition of the tool inferred from measured variables is anomalous. This strategy is consistent with the belief that failure mechanisms have precursors that are observable.

PdM and PM are not antagonistic in any way. In fact, PM is a special case of PdM wherein *cycles of time* are an observable precursor to wear-out failure mechanisms.

## II. Examples

Preventive maintenance: Change oil every 3,000 miles. Oil is changed every 3,000 miles, no matter what—summer or winter, hard miles or easy miles, dirt roads or asphalt, etc.

Predictive maintenance: Change oil because the current spectrographic analysis says that the oil is degraded to the point that its lubrication properties are barely sufficient. Better still, use a sequence of recent spectrographic data to predict when lubrication properties will become insufficient, if ever.

In this example, the spectrometer plays the role of *sensor suite* and *processor*. The user specifies a *detection threshold* in terms of spectrometer output that when breached, triggers an *annunciation* that maintenance is required.

## III. Infrastructure Requirements

Preventive maintenance requires little more than a clock. Various ways of reckoning time may be relevant depending on the nature of the wearout mechanism to be intercepted. The PM clock may account for calendar



time, operational time, duty cycles, number of units of production, or raw material use. In any case, PM activity is triggered by the accumulation of cycles of time.

Predictive maintenance requires more elaborate infrastructure. An anomaly detector must be devised and implemented. The detector consists of a sensor suite, processor, detection threshold and annunciator.

The sensor suite is the means by which relevant characteristics of the tool are measured and transmitted to the processor. In wafer fab applications the term SVID (system variable identification) is used to refer to a generic sensor and FDC (Fault Detection and Classification) is used to refer to the suite. In other contexts, the term SCADA (Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition) is used to refer to monitoring as well as control infrastructure. The term condition monitor (CM) is sufficiently general to refer to a sensor suite that is compatible with PdM.

Considered individually, the output of each sensor is a univariate random variable. Taken together, the output of a sensor suite is a multivariate random variable. Early-stage PdM implementations treat each sensor in isolation, much like traditional SPC. This mode is called univariate analysis (UVA). More mature PdM implementations consider the joint behaviour of the sensors in the suite as a vector. This mode is called multivariate analysis (MVA). MVA of the sensor suite will always out-perform UVA because MVA exploits the correlation structure between sensors. This makes it possible to achieve a higher degree of sensitivity to anomalies than is possible by responding to sensors individually through UVA.



For a depiction of the UVA for two variables, X1 and X2, see Figure 1.

The process is deemed to be “in control” as long as both variables remain inside their respective limits. When we treat X1 and X2 as elements of a 2 x 1 vector, the correlation structure becomes apparent: see Figure 2.

The MVA limit reclaims a substantial portion of the factor space *simply by virtue of its shape* thereby improving the sensitivity of the detector. The more correlated the variables are, the larger the reclaimed region and the more sensitive the detector will be relative to the corresponding UVA.

The processor is the means by which raw sensor output is transformed so that it is compatible with a detection threshold. For example, CM data may be output as a multi-channel, time-varying signal that is on from the start to finish of a production run. In wafer fab applications this is called trace data.

Depending on how the detection threshold is defined, various operations may need to be performed on the trace data. These may be simple, like limit checking or computation of summary statistics. More complex operations like



feature extraction or discrete Fourier transforms may be required from the processor. In any case, processor output must be directly comparable to the detection threshold.

The detection threshold is the decision rule that governs the annunciator. If the threshold is exceeded, the annunciator is turned on, indicating the detection of an anomaly. Various procedures for setting the detection threshold may be used depending on the specifics of the particular PdM implementation.

The annunciator is the means by which the detector communicates the inferred presence or absence of an anomaly to the outside world. A flashing red light, automated text message and tool logging event are examples of common annunciators.

## IV. Optimal Detector Design

Optimal detector design strongly depends on the context of the PdM implementation. There are two generic paradigms to consider: *supervised* and *unsupervised*.

In supervised design, we have the benefit of knowing which CM data is associated with “good” and “bad” tools. A good tool is defined to be one which we would like to use because we trust it to make quality product. A bad tool is one that we would like to put down for maintenance and restore to good status.

CM data is noisy in the sense that it sometimes misclassifies tools as good or bad. Optimal supervised design adjusts the detection threshold to achieve the best trade off between putting a good tool down and letting a bad tool run.

In unsupervised design, we do not know which CM data is associated with good and bad tools. All we have to go on is the possibility that the CM data organizes itself into “clouds.” A statistical procedure for discerning the presence of data clouds is called *cluster analysis*. There are many algorithms for cluster analysis and the most common in PdM applications is called “k-means clustering.” In this concept, clusters are defined such that there is more variation between clusters than within.

Optimal unsupervised design adjusts the cluster definitions to achieve the sharpest distinction between clusters. In this paradigm, the threshold function is the distance from a new CM vector to the center of each cluster. The new CM vector is assigned to the closest cluster. Instead of declaring the presence or absence of an anomaly, the annunciator communicates the cluster membership of the new CM vector.

For a depiction of a 2-means cluster analysis of three variables, Prin1, Prin2 and Prin3, see Figure 3.

Unsupervised detectors are sometimes called tool health metrics. The good cluster is often taken to be the one with the most members; especially when all others have much smaller membership. CM vectors are like multiple heart rate and pulse measurements from the same patient. Measurements that are not assigned to the large cluster of typical values are taken to be anomalous.

Supervised design is always preferred to unsupervised whenever it is possible. This is because the annunciator has an unambiguous interpretation: act or do not act. Unsupervised design requires the additional effort of discerning the nature of each cluster. Often there is very little to go on to make this determination.

If it is possible to relabel clusters from their generic labels {C1, C2...Ck} to actionable labels {Bad1, Good2...Badk} (say), then we can advance our PdM application to the next level of maturity.

In supervised design we are given both the true condition of the tool and the CM vector that is associated with that condition. In unsupervised design we are only given CM vectors and must discern the nature of the CM data. In all cases, we seek the PdM solution that has the most unambiguous and accurate annunciator.

## V. PdM in the Wafer Fab: Supervised Learning

Special wafers with an array of embedded thermocouples (TC wafers) are used to measure chuck temperature uniformity in plasma processes. These TC wafers are very expensive and their use interrupts normal production. We would like to eliminate the TC wafer without giving up the information it provides. To do this, we establish a reliable connection between TC wafer behaviour (assumed to portray the true condition of the tool) and CM data.

The solution is to run calibration experiments where we simultaneously measure a TC wafer and record the corresponding CM data. We use the experimental data to build a model to predict what the TC would have been based on the CM data that we actually have. This is called virtual metrology and it works amazingly well using the PLS procedure in JMP. Through the model, the CM data has virtually become a TC wafer, eliminating the need for its routine use. The calibration experiment is repeated periodically, based on a recall interval that is not unlike traditional metrology. For example, see Figure 4.


$$\text{TC Wafer uniformity} = 4.9922316 + 1.5403795 \cdot \text{SVID}$$

The calibration equation can be solved for the limits of SVID that keep TC wafer uniformity in control. The PLS procedure can comprehend multiple SVID and multiple channels of output.

## VI. PdM in the Wafer Fab: Unsupervised Learning

Suppose that we have the results of a cluster analysis that assigns membership to one of five clusters based on CM data. We would like to discern the true nature of each cluster so that we can advance beyond tool health metrics and obtain an accurate annunciator for PdM.

Tool logging events reflect our best understanding of the true condition of the tool at the time. A model that predicts logging event as a function of the corresponding CM data could be used to relabel generic cluster labels to more actionable labels. For example, if the probability of the PROD event being logged is maximized when C4 is observed, then we relabel C4 as “Good4” and so on. The Multinomial Logistic Regression procedure in JMP can be used to obtain the model that relates logging event (dependent variable) to cluster label (independent




variable). We can account for the imperfect nature of logging events by processing them with a Hidden Markov Model (HMM). In this concept, the true state of the tool {Fit, Broken, Degraded} is hidden and logging events provide noisy information about the true state. For example, see Figure 5.

The HMM model yields a prediction of the true state of the tool at each point in time as a function of the logging events leading up to that time. The Multinomial Logistic Regression is used as previously to obtain a model that relates predicted true state (dependent variable) to cluster label (independent variable).

The HMM model provides additional insights as well. Objective evaluation of the consistency of event logging is obtained through analysis of the emission matrix. A new way to evaluate tool matching is available by comparing the steady-state distributions of tools running the same processes. The existence of an undocumented degraded state for which there is no logging event is evidenced by the transition matrix.

## VII. Conclusions

**Figure 5**



Predictive Maintenance is a generalization of traditional Preventive Maintenance. Observable precursors to failure mechanisms may be measured by a sensor suite deployed for a tool. These condition monitors can be used to predict the present and future states of the tool. Depending on the context of the PdM implementation, we may or may not know the true condition of a tool. In either case, a detector can be devised to make an inference about the true state of the tool. The maturity of a PdM implementation depends on how accurately the annunciator communicates the true state of the tool.

**Contributing Authors:**

- Chris Alanis**, *Supplier Quality Engineer, Cirrus Logic, Inc.*
- Max Hsieh**, *Supplier Quality Engineer, Cirrus Logic, Inc.*
- Yi-Rong Meng**, *Supplier Quality Engineer, Cirrus Logic, Inc.*
- Rodel Reyes**, *Supplier Quality Engineering Manager, Cirrus Logic, Inc.*
- Hung-Chi Su**, *Supplier Quality Engineer, Cirrus Logic, Inc.*
- Jeff Weintraub**, *Corporate Statistician, Cirrus Logic, Inc.*

# A New Metric for SPC Performance

## Abstract

An index of process instability (ISTAB) is presented that compares the observed average run length to the expected run length (ARL) of a statistical process control (SPC) scheme. Excessively long run lengths relative to expectation are associated with one kind of defect in a particular implementation of a scheme and inordinately short run lengths are associated with another kind of defect. The probability distribution of run length is given as the basis for establishing ARL. A sampling distribution is introduced as a way to quantify excessively long and inordinately short observed run lengths. An SPC management system based on ISTAB is presented as an alternative to more conventional approaches.

## I. Introduction

Statistical process control (SPC) has attained nearly universal acceptance as a tool to achieve stability and control. It is not unusual for a microelectronics factory to employ tens of thousands of SPC charts (30,000 is not an unusually high number). These charts encompass the entire spectrum of criticality. Some are for customer-critical product characteristics. Others are simply for data collection in anticipation of a future need. Still others are for supplier-critical process characteristics.

We define an SPC *scheme* to be the set of charts, statistics and rules that are used to achieve stability and control. An instance is a particular implementation of a scheme. Multiple instances of the same scheme may or may not have the same numerical values of control limits.

From the point of view of the producer, *run length* is a basic measure of performance. It is natural to think in terms of run length in various manufacturing contexts. For example, it may be the number of product units moved from one operation to the next in the course of a shift. It may be the number of repetitions of an operation between maintenance events. In the context of an SPC instance, it is the number of points plotted (subgroups) until an out-of-control (OOC) condition is indicated. In each of these examples, the interpretation of observed run length is the same.

It is meaningful to speak of *observed average run length* ( $\overline{RL}$ ) as a measure of typical performance. The reciprocal of observed average run length is the observed percentage of trials in which a particular event occurred.

McTurk (2001) proposed a Stability Index<sup>1</sup> (Index of STABILITY) as a way to manage SPC in an extensive (many process) and intensive (many variable) control environment.

McTurk defines the ISTAB index for an SPC instance as:

$$ISTAB = \frac{(\text{count of } \bar{X} \text{ limit violations in reporting period})}{(\text{count of subgroups in reporting period})} = 1/\overline{RL}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\overline{RL} + 1}$$

Where  $\overline{RL}$  is the observed average run length until an OOC event, not counting the OOC event itself.

In our concept,  $ISTAB = \bar{RL} - ARL$ . This modification is made in order to make use of the considerable body of knowledge concerning the random nature of run length.

ISTAB has three generic behaviours that are indicative of defects in an SPC instance.

Case 1: The observed average run length is excessively long relative to expectation.  $ISTAB > 0$  is indicating the possibility that the limits are too wide due to errors in estimating the in-control values of the process parameters. An appropriate action is to re-estimate the process parameters and compare them to the estimates in use.

Case 2: The observed average run length is consistent with expectation.  $ISTAB$  near zero is indicating that the process is stable. The SPC rules are violated at the expected rate and no defects in the instance are evident.

Case 3: The observed average run length is inordinately short relative to expectation.  $ISTAB < 0$  is indicating that the limits are too tight or the process is unstable or both. An appropriate action is to investigate the nature of the apparent instability and re-examine the assumptions of the scheme.

In our experience, fundamental process instability is by far the most plausible explanation for short run lengths rather than any defect in the instance. However, we have found examples where new sources of *stable* process variation have been introduced subsequent to the initialization of an instance. For example, early in the product lifecycle, low production volumes are processed on a few machines. As volumes increase, more machines are brought on line. Depending on the characteristics of the expanded fleet of machines, this change in the nature of *previous* processing is manifested as increased variation at a given step. In other cases, short runs are caused by gross errors in estimating the in-control values of the process parameters.

We now turn to the problems of determining the distribution of an individual run length and the sampling distribution of observed run lengths for an SPC scheme. The first is needed to compute the  $ISTAB$  statistic, the second for establishing decision rules for distinguishing between the three cases.

## II. Probability Distribution of Run Length

If the probability that an *individual* subgroup triggers a false OOC is  $\alpha$ , subgroups are independent and have the *same* value of  $\alpha$ , then the random number of subgroups ( $X$ ) until the first false alarm is a geometric random variable:

$X = \text{run length}$

$$f_x(x|\alpha) = (1-\alpha)^x \alpha$$

$$x = 0, 1, \dots$$

$$0 < \alpha \leq 1$$

For example, if an SPC scheme consists of an  $\bar{X}$  &  $S$  chart with an OOC indicated by a breach of limits by  $\bar{X}$  or  $S$  or both, the false alarm probability for the scheme is:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= P(LCL > \bar{X} \text{ or } UCL < \bar{X} \text{ or } UCLs < S \mid \text{stable process}) \\ &= P(LCL > \bar{X}) + P(UCL < \bar{X}) + P(UCLs < S) \\ &\quad - P(LCL > \bar{X})P(UCLs < S) \\ &\quad - P(UCL < \bar{X})P(UCLs < S) \end{aligned}$$

by the independence of  $(\bar{X}, S)$  when sampling from a Gaussian distribution.

If  $p = P(LCL > \bar{X}) = P(UCL < \bar{X}) = P(UCLs < S)$   
 $= 0.00135$  by design, then  $\alpha = 0.004$  and the expected run length of the scheme when the process is stable is  $ARL = (1-\alpha)/\alpha = 249$  subgroups (not counting the one that triggers the OOC).

The ISTAB index for this scheme is equal to  $\bar{RL} - 249$ . (See Figure 1.)

If a randomly selected stable run length is a geometric random variable with parameter  $\alpha$ , then the random sum of run lengths (T) until the  $n^{\text{th}}$  false alarm is a negative binomial random variable with parameters  $(\alpha, n)^2$ .

$T = \text{sum of } n \text{ run lengths}$

$$T = n \cdot (\bar{RL})$$

$$g_r(t | a, n) = \binom{n+t-1}{t} \alpha^n (1-\alpha)^t$$

$$t = 0, 1, \dots$$

$$0 < a \leq 1$$

$$n > 0$$

$$P(T \leq t) = \sum_{i=0}^t \binom{n+i-1}{i} \alpha^n (1-\alpha)^i$$

$$= P(n \cdot \bar{RL} \leq t) = P(\bar{RL} \leq t/n)$$

We interpret this negative binomial distribution as the sampling distribution of the statistic T. It can be used to define a rule for deciding if an observed value of  $(\bar{RL})$  is consistent with Case 1, 2 or 3.


For example, consider a *hypothetical* history of an instance of the X & S scheme presented earlier in which  $n = 10$  OOC events were observed. The inherent randomness in run length under Case 2 (stability) would cause ~95% of such hypothetical histories to have observed average run lengths between 119 and 426. If we were to *actually* observe a value of  $(\bar{RL}) = 445$  with  $n = 10$ , we would be inclined to believe that the instance was defective because the observed average run length is excessively long relative to expectation.

### III. ISTAB as an Approach to SPC Management


The foundation of ISTAB is the control plan (CP). The minimum elements of a CP are specified by ISO/TS16949:2009E<sup>3</sup>. Control plans drive ISTAB reporting by establishing the level of criticality that merits review.

To the CP foundation we join the actual performance of the controls. These elements make the ISTAB report a quick and easy way to see how critical controls are implemented (like a control plan) and how they are performing (out-of-specification conditions, out-of-control conditions and individual rule violations).

**Figure 1** Run length distribution for the Xbar and S scheme



**Figure 2** Negative binomial sampling distribution of  $(RL)$  for  $n = 10$  OOC events



<sup>2</sup>Proof is given in the annex.

To create an ISTAB report for an SPC instance, use the CP to get:

- Process Name (STI, FG, Wire bonding, Molding, etc.)
- Characteristic (Tox, CD, ball shear, wire pull, etc.)
- Variable (Pre-polish Tox, strength, etc.)
- Recipe name
- Control statistics (Xbar, R, S, Uniformity, etc.)
- Specification limits (LSL, USL) for the variable
- Sample size (wafers per lot, bonds per tool, etc.)
- Sample frequency (every lot, every shift, etc.)
- Control limits (LCL, UCL) for statistics in the instance
- Control targets (CT) for statistics in the instance
- ARL derived from the stable run length distribution

Join the CP to the performance of the instances in the reporting period:

- Count of subgroups plotted
- Count of out-of-specification measurements
- Count of SPC rule #1 violations
- Count of SPC rule #2 violations
- Count of SPC rule #n violations
- Count of subgroups with one or more rule violations

Create a column for observed average run length:

$$\overline{RL} = \frac{S-g}{g}$$

Where S is the count of subgroups in reporting period for a given instance and g is the count of subgroups with one or more rule violations.

Create a column for  $ISTAB = \overline{RL} - ARL$ .

Where ARL is obtained from the run length distribution of the SPC scheme. The following considerations enhance the accuracy and usefulness of the ISTAB report.

Each instance of a requirement from the CP is a line item in the ISTAB report. This feature makes ISTAB a guide to SPC as implemented in the factory.

For example, there may be multiple instances of a process – variable combination because multiple machines are in use. In that case there will be multiple line items for the same scheme, one for each instance. This is sometimes necessary due to the heterogeneity of machines, the reason for separate instances in the first place. Conversely, if a process – variable combination is run on many machines and tracked in one instance (all data to one chart set) then there will be one line item on the ISTAB report to reflect that implementation.

If a rule is not used in a particular instance, the violation count for that rule is empty, not zero.

The ISTAB workbook contains a section that gives the definition of each supplemental SPC rule as implemented in the factory.

The ISTAB index for an instance of a scheme is re-initialized when the control limits, runs rules or reporting window are changed.



## IV. Conclusions

The ISTAB index is presented as a way to maintain an efficient and effective window on the manufacturing process. The characteristic behavior of ISTAB points to specific defects in an SPC instance. The sampling distribution of the observed run length facilitates a way to decide the health status of an SPC instance. ISTAB is a new way to efficiently and effectively manage large scale SPC implementations.

## V. References

1. L. McTurk, L. (2001) "Use of Control Rules and Stability Index to maintain an effective SPC system in a high volume fab" in *Process and Equipment Control in Microelectronic Manufacturing II*, Martin Fallon, Editor, Proceedings of SPIE Vol. 4405
2. A. M. Mood, F. W. Graybill, D. C. Boes (1974) *Introduction to the Theory of Statistics*, New York: McGraw-Hill
3. The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) (2000) *Quality management systems — Requirements ISO/TS16949:2009E*, Geneva: ISO

## VI. Annex

The moment generating function of the sum of n independently distributed random variables is equal to the product of the individual moment generating functions of the variables in the sum:

$$m_s(t) = \prod_{i=1}^n m_{x_i}(t)$$

The moment generating function of the geometric random variable is:

$$m_{x_i}(t) = \frac{p}{1-(1-p)e^t}$$

The moment generating function of the negative binomial random variable is:

$$m_s(t) = \left( \frac{p}{1-(1-p)e^t} \right)^n$$

This is exactly equal to the product of n identical geometric moment generating functions. Thus, we have proven that the sum of n independent and identically distributed geometric random variables with parameter p is a negative binomial random variable with parameters (p, n).

### Contributing Authors:

**Jeff Weintraub**, Corporate Statistician, Cirrus Logic, Inc.

**Scott Warrick**, Director, Quality and Control Management, Cirrus Logic, Inc.



# Test Escape Consequences of Low Yield

## Abstract

Although it is intuitive that variation in yield is linked to variation in test escapes, the assertion has not been rigorously proven. We use basic axioms to express the probability of test escape as a function of the operating characteristics of the test process, the incoming quality level and in turn, yield. Examples that demonstrate the practical application of the method are given. These feature sensitivity analyses that inform defect reduction efforts, improvements to the test process, and statistical control schemes.

## I. Introduction

It is widely believed that when test yield is decreasing, test escapes are increasing. Logically, low yield is indicative of the reduced quality of the input to the test process. Because the test process is not perfect, some of the reduced quality material survives the process. These units are called test escapes. What is not obvious is size of the effect.

Define the following random variables and their possible outcomes:

True State of a unit of product:  $S = \{good, bad\}$

Test Result for a unit of product:  $R = \{pass, fail\}$

The quality of the (untested) material input to the process is:

$$P(S = bad) = p$$

$$P(S = good) = 1 - p$$

The test result for a unit is not perfectly consistent with the true state of that unit for most test processes that we will encounter. The imperfect relationship between the test result ( $R$ ) and the true state ( $S$ ) of a tested unit gives rise to the *operating characteristics* of the process:

$$P(R = fail \mid S = good) = \alpha, \text{ also called "false positive"}$$

$$P(R = pass \mid S = bad) = \beta, \text{ also called "false negative"}$$

Sentences like these are read "the probability of A given B is p". Taken together,  $(p, \alpha, \beta)$  are the *fundamental quantities* of the test process. As we will see in the next section, these fundamental quantities are used to derive the quality characteristics of the tested product:

$$P(S = good \mid R = fail) = \text{overkill probability}$$

$$P(S = bad \mid R = pass) = \text{escape probability}$$

Note that, in general,

$$P(S = good \mid R = fail) \neq P(R = fail \mid S = good)$$

The former is the overkill probability, the latter is  $\alpha$ . Likewise for escape probability and  $\beta$ . An operating characteristic is the probability of a test result given the true state. As such, operating characteristics are properties of the test process. A quality characteristic is the probability of a state given the test result. As such, quality characteristics are properties of the tested product.

## II. Derivation of Product Quality Characteristics

In this section we use three probability axioms to obtain the relationship between product quality characteristics and the fundamental quantities of the test process. We will exploit our knowledge of these relationships to explore the sensitivity to variation in the fundamental quantities. This will illuminate the effect that we are seeking: the change in escape probability with respect to yield.

The random variable  $Y_{\text{yield}}$  is derived from the fundamental quantities of the test process using the “total probability” axiom:

$$Y = P(R = \text{pass}) = P(R = \text{pass}, S = \text{good} \text{ or } R = \text{pass}, S = \text{bad}) \\ = P(R = \text{pass}, S = \text{good}) + P(R = \text{pass}, S = \text{bad})$$

By the “joint probability” axiom we can write this as

$$= P(S = \text{good}) \cdot P(R = \text{pass} \mid S = \text{good}) \\ + P(S = \text{bad}) \cdot P(R = \text{pass} \mid S = \text{bad}) \\ = (1 - p) \cdot (1 - \alpha) + p \cdot \beta$$

From this expression we see that there are two varieties of units that will yield: good and bad.

Fraction of units that will yield and be good:

$$P(R = \text{pass}, S = \text{good}) = (1 - p) \cdot (1 - \alpha).$$

Fraction of units that will yield and be bad:

$$P(R = \text{pass}, S = \text{bad}) = p \cdot \beta$$

This is our first indication that yield and test escapes are related.

However,  $Y = P(R = \text{pass})$  is predictive of the population of untested units. We are interested in the quality characteristics of units that have been dispositioned by the test process. From the axiomatic definition of conditional probability, we can obtain the quality characteristics of the tested product.

For escape probability:

$$P(S = \text{bad} \mid R = \text{pass}) = P(R = \text{pass}, S = \text{bad}) / P(R = \text{pass}) \\ = p \cdot \beta / [(1 - p) \cdot (1 - \alpha) + p \cdot \beta]$$

For overkill probability:

$$P(S = \text{good} \mid R = \text{fail}) = P(R = \text{fail}, S = \text{good}) / [1 - P(R = \text{pass})] \\ = (1 - p) \cdot \alpha / [1 - (1 - p) \cdot (1 - \alpha) + p \cdot \beta]$$

The improvement in quality attributable to the test process:

$$P(S = \text{bad}) - P(S = \text{bad} \mid R = \text{pass})$$

We have expressed the quality characteristics of the tested product in terms of the fundamental quantities of the test process. We can obtain sensitivities to the fundamental quantities by differentiation or by differencing.

### III. Practical Applications

Consider the following baseline test process:

		Fraction	PPM
<b>units to be tested</b>	N	–	1,000,000
<b>bad units in untested population</b>	p	0.0500	50,000
<b>“false positive” probability</b>	$\alpha$	0.0100	–
<b>“false negative” probability</b>	$\beta$	0.0500	–
<b>good units that will yield</b>	$(1-p)(1-\alpha)$	0.9405	940,500
<b>bad units that will yield</b>	$p\beta$	0.0025	2,500
<b>units (good and bad) that will yield</b>	$(1-p)(1-\alpha) + p\beta$	0.9430	943,000
<b>test escapes = P (bad   pass)</b>	$p\beta/Y$	0.0027	2,651
<b>test escapes = P (good   fail)</b>	$(1-p)\alpha/(1-Y)$	0.1667	166,667
<b>improvement in quality due to test</b>	$P(\text{bad}) - P(\text{bad}   \text{pass})$	0.0473	47,349

The poor quality characteristics produced by this process are being masked by the relatively low level of bad units in the untested population. That is, until an excursion causes an increase in  $P(S = \text{bad})$  from  $p = 0.05$  to  $p = 0.15$ .

		Fraction	PPM
<b>units to be tested</b>	N	–	1,000,000
<b>bad units in untested population</b>	p	0.1500	150,000
<b>“false positive” probability</b>	$\alpha$	0.0100	–
<b>“false negative” probability</b>	$\beta$	0.0500	–
<b>good units that will yield</b>	$(1-p)(1-\alpha)$	0.8415	841,500
<b>bad units that will yield</b>	$p\beta$	0.0075	7,500
<b>units (good and bad) that will yield</b>	$(1-p)(1-\alpha) + p\beta$	0.8490	849,000
<b>test escapes = P (bad   pass)</b>	$p\beta/Y$	0.0088	8,834
<b>test escapes = P (good   fail)</b>	$(1-p)\alpha/(1-Y)$	0.0563	56,291
<b>improvement in quality due to test</b>	$P(\text{bad}) - P(\text{bad}   \text{pass})$	0.1412	141,166

We see that this excursion causes yield to decrease from 94.3% to 84.9% and causes an increase in test escapes from 2651 to 8834 ppm. These results are a strong justification for a statistical yield limit of 85%.

Suppose that test program improvements reduce the  $\alpha$  –risk to 0.005 and the  $\beta$  –risk to 0.025:

		Fraction	PPM
<b>units to be tested</b>	N	–	1,000,000
<b>bad units in untested population</b>	$p$	0.0500	50,000
<b>“false positive” probability</b>	$\alpha$	0.0050	–
<b>“false negative” probability</b>	$\beta$	0.0250	–
<b>good units that will yield</b>	$(1-p)(1-\alpha)$	0.9453	945,250
<b>bad units that will yield</b>	$p\beta$	0.0013	1,250
<b>units (good and bad) that will yield</b>	$(1-p)(1-\alpha) + p\beta$	0.9465	946,500
<b>test escapes = P (bad   pass)</b>	$p\beta/Y$	0.0013	1,321
<b>test escapes = P (good   fail)</b>	$(1-p)\alpha / (1-Y)$	0.0888	88,785
<b>improvement in quality due to test</b>	$P(\text{bad}) - P(\text{bad}   \text{pass})$	0.0487	48,679

We see that these improvements cause yield to increase from 94.3% to 94.7%, test escapes to decrease from 2651 to 1250 ppm and overkill to decrease from 166667 to 88785 ppm.

## IV. Conclusions and Call to Action

We have derived the dependence of product quality characteristics on the fundamental quantities that characterize the test process ( $p$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ).

We can eliminate the need for hard data on  $p = P(S = \text{bad})$  if we treat it as a scenario parameter, varying  $p$  systematically so that we may evaluate the test process independently of the manufacturing process. This leaves us with the problem of determining the operating characteristics ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ) of the test process. The most direct way to obtain estimates of ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ) is to bench test samples of passed and failed units:

$\alpha'$  = failed units bench tested as good/number of failed units

$\beta'$  = passed units bench tested as bad/number of passed units

Some would advocate the use of FACR/RMA data to establish the value of  $\beta$ . RMA data is vulnerable to bias due to the fact that not all returned units are bad in the application. FACR data is vulnerable to bias due to the fact that not all application failures are returned on an FACR.

The guard-band yield loss may be a good indicator of the value of  $\alpha$  where guard bands are implemented. This may be biased when false fails are caused by factors like settling time that are not directly related to the accuracy or precision of the measurement.

Lastly, there are factors in the test process that drive ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ) in addition to measurement itself. For example, discrepancies between the data log file and wafer map can cause pick errors.

These results are a strong justification for including the measurement and improvement of ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ) in the development, deployment and control of test processes.

## V. References

1. A. M. Mood, F. W. Graybill, D. C. Boes (1974) *Introduction to the Theory of Statistics*, New York: McGraw-Hill

## VI. Mathematical Details

A and B are discrete random variables that happen together

$$A = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$$

$$B = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_m\}$$

Generic outcomes of A and B are  $(A_i, B_j)$

The “total” probability of the outcome  $A_i$  is obtained by summing over all possible values of B:

$$P(A_i) = P(A_i, B_1) + P(A_i, B_2) + \dots + P(A_i, B_m)$$

Likewise for the probability of outcome  $B_j$ :

$$P(B_j) = P(A_1, B_j) + P(A_2, B_j) + \dots + P(A_n, B_j)$$

The “joint” probability of  $(A_i, B_j)$  is the probability of a randomly selected unit manifesting outcomes  $A_i$  and  $B_j$ :

$$P(A_i, B_j) = P(A_i) \cdot P(B_j | A_i)$$

This sentence is read “probability of A and B.”

Alternatively,

$$P(A_i, B_j) = P(B_j) \cdot P(A_i | B_j)$$

The choice between these depends on the information available in a given context.

The “conditional” probability of outcome  $B_j$  given that outcome  $A_i$  has already been observed is:

$$\begin{aligned} P(B_j | A_i) &= \frac{P(A_i, B_j)}{P(A_i)} \\ &= \frac{P(A_i, B_j)}{P(A_i, B_1) + P(A_i, B_2) + \dots + P(A_i, B_m)} \end{aligned}$$

When this is equivalently written as

$$= \frac{P(B_j) \cdot P(A_i, B_j)}{P(A_i, B_1) + P(A_i, B_2) + \dots + P(A_i, B_m)}$$

The result is known as “Bayes’ Theorem”.

**Contributing Author:**

**Jeff Weintraub**, Corporate Statistician, Cirrus Logic, Inc.





Copyright © 2019 Cirrus Logic, Inc.  
All rights reserved. Printed in the USA.

The information contained in this document is provided for informational purposes only and represents the current view of Cirrus Logic, Inc. on quality, as of the date of publication. In specific circumstances, or with specific customers, procedures may differ from those outlined herein. Cirrus Logic makes no commitment to update the information contained in this document, and Cirrus Logic reserves the right to make changes at any time, without notice.

This document is provided "as is." Cirrus Logic does not warrant that this document is free from errors, or that any products or other technology developed in conformance with this document will perform in the intended manner, or will be free from infringement of third party proprietary rights, and Cirrus Logic disclaims all liability therefor.

Limited License Grant: Cirrus Logic hereby grants you a limited copyright license to copy this document for your use and internal distribution only. You may not distribute this document externally, in whole or in part, to any other person or entity.

Limited Liability: in no event shall Cirrus Logic have any liability to you or to any other third party, for any lost profits, lost data, loss of use or costs of procurement of substitute goods or services, or for any direct, indirect, special or consequential damages arising out of your use of this document or reliance upon the information contained herein, under any cause of action or theory of liability, and irrespective of whether Cirrus Logic, or any contributor has advance notice of the possibility of such damages. These limitations shall apply notwithstanding the failure of the essential purpose of any limited remedy.

Cirrus Logic, Cirrus, CLIDE (Cirrus Logic Integrated Development Environment), SoundClear, CirrusLink, WISCE, and the Cirrus Logic logo designs are among the trademarks of Cirrus Logic, Inc. and/or its subsidiaries. Other brand and product names in this document may be trademarks or service marks of their respective owners.





CORPORATE HEADQUARTERS  
800 West Sixth Street  
Austin, Texas 78701  
United States

T +1 512-851-4000  
Toll Free +1 800-888-5016

[cirrus.com](http://cirrus.com)