

IPC-4552A

2017 - August

Performance Specification for Electroless Nickel/Immersion Gold (ENIG) Plating for Printed Boards

Supersedes IPC-4552 with Amendments 1 & 2
December 2012

An international standard developed by IPC

Association Connecting Electronics Industries



The Principles of Standardization

In May 1995 the IPC's Technical Activities Executive Committee (TAEC) adopted Principles of Standardization as a guiding principle of IPC's standardization efforts.

Standards Should:

- Show relationship to Design for Manufacturability (DFM) and Design for the Environment (DFE)
- Minimize time to market
- Contain simple (simplified) language
- Just include spec information
- Focus on end product performance
- Include a feedback system on use and problems for future improvement

Standards Should Not:

- Inhibit innovation
- Increase time-to-market
- Keep people out
- Increase cycle time
- Tell you how to make something
- Contain anything that cannot be defended with data

Notice

IPC Standards and Publications are designed to serve the public interest through eliminating misunderstandings between manufacturers and purchasers, facilitating interchangeability and improvement of products, and assisting the purchaser in selecting and obtaining with minimum delay the proper product for his particular need. Existence of such Standards and Publications shall not in any respect preclude any member or nonmember of IPC from manufacturing or selling products not conforming to such Standards and Publication, nor shall the existence of such Standards and Publications preclude their voluntary use by those other than IPC members, whether the standard is to be used either domestically or internationally.

Recommended Standards and Publications are adopted by IPC without regard to whether their adoption may involve patents on articles, materials, or processes. By such action, IPC does not assume any liability to any patent owner, nor do they assume any obligation whatever to parties adopting the Recommended Standard or Publication. Users are wholly responsible for protecting themselves against all claims of liabilities for patent infringement.

IPC Position Statement on Specification Revision Change

It is the position of IPC's Technical Activities Executive Committee that the use and implementation of IPC publications is voluntary and is part of a relationship entered into by customer and supplier. When an IPC publication is updated and a new revision is published, it is the opinion of the TAEC that the use of the new revision as part of an existing relationship is not automatic unless required by the contract. The TAEC recommends the use of the latest revision. Adopted October 6, 1998

Why is there a charge for this document?

Your purchase of this document contributes to the ongoing development of new and updated industry standards and publications. Standards allow manufacturers, customers, and suppliers to understand one another better. Standards allow manufacturers greater efficiencies when they can set up their processes to meet industry standards, allowing them to offer their customers lower costs.

IPC spends hundreds of thousands of dollars annually to support IPC's volunteers in the standards and publications development process. There are many rounds of drafts sent out for review and the committees spend hundreds of hours in review and development. IPC's staff attends and participates in committee activities, typesets and circulates document drafts, and follows all necessary procedures to qualify for ANSI approval.

IPC's membership dues have been kept low to allow as many companies as possible to participate. Therefore, the standards and publications revenue is necessary to complement dues revenue. The price schedule offers a 50% discount to IPC members. If your company buys IPC standards and publications, why not take advantage of this and the many other benefits of IPC membership as well? For more information on membership in IPC, please visit www.ipc.org or call 847/597-2872.

Thank you for your continued support.



IPC-4552A

Performance Specification for Electroless Nickel/ Immersion Gold (ENIG) Plating for Printed Boards

Developed by the Plating Processes Subcommittee (4-14) of the
Fabrication Processes Committee (4-10) of IPC

Supersedes:

IPC-4552 with Amendments
& 2 – December 2012
IPC-4552 – October 2002

Users of this publication are encouraged to participate in the
development of future revisions.

Contact:

IPC
3000 Lakeside Drive, Suite 105N
Bannockburn, Illinois
60015-1249
Tel 847 615.7100
Fax 847 615.7105

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Currently in preview, click buy full version

Acknowledgment

Any document involving a complex technology draws material from a vast number of sources across many continents. While the principal members of the Plating Processes Subcommittee (4-14) of the Fabrication Processes Committee (4-10) are shown below, it is not possible to include all of those who assisted in the evolution of this standard. To each of them, the members of the IPC extend their gratitude.

Fabrication Processes Committee	Plating Processes Subcommittee	Technical Liaison of the IPC Board of Directors
Co-Chair George Milad Uyemura International Corp.	Co-Chair George Milad Uyemura International Corp.	Bob Neves Microtek (Changzhou) Laboratories
Co-Chair Gerard O'Brien Solderability Testing & Solutions, Inc.	Co-Chair Gerard O'Brien Solderability Testing & Solutions, Inc.	
Plating Processes Subcommittee		
Wallace Ables, Dell Inc.	Dock Brown, DfR Solutions	Caitlin Devey, Crane Electronics
Glenn Ames, TTM Technologies	Vanja Bukva, Teledyne Dalsa	Michael DiCicco, Northrop Grumman Corporation
Martin Anselm, Ph.D., Rochester Institute of Technology	Martin Bunce, MacDermid Enthone Electronics Solutions	Earl Dietz, Karl Dietz Consulting LLC
Craig Bachman, Molex Copper Flex Products	Lee Burger, OM Group Electronics Chemicals, LLC	Miguel Dominguez, Continental Temic SA de CV
Donald Banks, Abbott Laboratories	Matthew Byrne, BAE Systems	Steven Dunford, Schlumberger Well Services
Tina Barclay, TAS Consulting	Christopher Carrillo, TTM Technologies	Don Dupriest, Lockheed Martin Missiles & Fire Control
Bill Barthel, Plexus	Yudy Cetina, TTM Technologies	Richard Edgar, Tec-Line Inc.
John Bauer, Rockwell Collins	Srinivas Challa, Ph.D., Stryker Instrumentation	Theodore Edwards
Martin Bayes, Ph.D., TE Connectivity	Alexander Chen, Celestica	Julie Ellis, TTM Technologies
Elizabeth Benedetto, Hewlett-Packard Company	Emmanuel Chevalier, Amphenol Printed Circuits, Inc.	Dave Esler, GE Global Research
Jon Bengston, Uyemura International Corp.	Peter Chiang, MSI Micro-Star International Co., Inc.	Steven Ethridge, Dell Inc.
Beatriz Bennett, Lockheed Martin Missiles & Fire Control	Joshua Civiello, DLA Land and Maritime	Robert Farfan, TTM Technologies
Wendi Boger, TTM Technologies	Lenora Clark, MacDermid Enthone Electronics Solutions	John Fendrock, Raytheon Missile Systems
Jim Bogert, Fischer Technology Inc.	Horst Clauberg, Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc.	Ellen Finch, Anaren Microwave Inc.
Mumtaz Bora, Perceptron Semiconductor	David Corbett, DLA Land and Maritime	Sandra Fortune, Northrop Grumman Corporation
William Boverman, OM Group Electronics Chemicals, LLC	Donald Cullen, MacDermid Enthone Electronics Solutions	Dennis Fritz, MacDermid Enthone Electronics Solutions
Trent Bowers, Adtran Inc.	Edward Cuneo, EC Consulting	Hiroyuki Fukuda, Shikoku Chemicals Corporation
Scott Bowles, L-3 Fuzing and Ordnance Systems	Christopher Daczkowski, Atotech USA Inc.	Lionel Fullwood, WKK Distribution Ltd.
Peter Bratin, Ph.D., ECI Technology, Inc.	Richard Davidson, Honeywell Aerospace	Gerald Gagnon, Extech Instruments Corporation
Jerry Brewer, Atotech USA Inc.		Thomas Gahagan, Anaren Microwave Inc.
Carl Brooks, Northrop Grumman Corporation		

Arturo Garcia, MicroConnex Corporation

Cynthia Gomez, Continental Temic SA de CV

Constantino Gonzalez, ACME Training & Consulting

Robert Gordon, Amonix, Inc.

Albin Gruenwald, Uyemura International Corp.

Donald Gudeczaukas, Uyemura International Corp.

Michael Haller, Fischer Technology Inc.

Vicka Hammill, Honeywell Inc. Air Transport Systems

Philip Henault, Raytheon Company

David Hillman, Rockwell Collins

Charles Hirbour, Technic Inc.

Joanne Hohman, Lockheed Martin Missiles & Fire Control

Cory Holda, Northrop Grumman Corp.

Helen Holder, Hewlett-Packard Company

Shunsaku Hoshi, Uyemura International Corp.

Jay Huang, Wistron Corp.

Werner Huegel, Ph.D., Robert Bosch GmbH

Jim Huff, Dell Inc.

Bruce Hughes, AMRDEC MS&T EPPT

Joe Hughes, Hughes Circuits, Inc.

Ingrid Swenson, TTM Technologies Inc.

Lei Jin, Ph.D., MacDermid Enthone Electronics Solutions

William Johannes, Sandia National Labs Albuquerque

Christopher Kous, GE Global Research

Karl Sauer, Oracle America, Inc.

Jordan Kologe, MacDermid Enthone Electronics Solutions

John Konrad, i Electronics

Kelly Kovalovsky, i Electronics

John Kraus, Bourns Inc.

Matthew Kreiner, Oxford Instruments

Rajesh Kumar, TTM Technologies

April Labonte, TTM Technologies

Henry Lajoie, MacDermid Enthone

Kevin Lamelin, TTM Technologies, Inc.

Joseph LaRoche, BAE Systems

Brigitte Lawrence, Brigiflex Inc.

Paul Lomax, Fischer Technology Inc.

Harry Lucas, TTM Technologies

Clifford Maddox, Boeing Company

Brian Madsen, Ph.D., Continental Automotive Systems

Chris Mahanna, Robisan Laboratory Inc.

Guenther Mayr, AT&S Austria Technologie & Systemtechnik AG

Martin McDaniel, NSWC Crane

Joe McGurran, Atotech USA Inc.

Mike McKeown, Hesse Mechatronics, Inc.

Tim McKliget, Holaday Circuits Inc.

Stephen Meeks, ViaSat

Peter Menuiez

Renee Michalkiewicz, NTS

William Miller, Panasonic Automotive Systems Company of America

James M. Manalao, TTM Technologies, Inc.

Allen Moore, Raytheon Company

Michael Moore, U.S. Army Aviation & Missile Command

Denis Morrissey, MacDermid Enthone

Ted Myers, ECI Technology, Inc.

Dave Nelson, Adtran Inc.

Jeff Nelson, Ph.D., MicroConnex Corporation

Keith Newman, Hewlett-Packard Company

Thi Nguyen, Lockheed Martin Missile & Fire Control

Gary Nicholls, Metalor Technologies USA

Rick Nichols, Atotech Deutschland GmbH

Bob Noland, Daktronics

Sean Oflaherty, Oxford Instruments

Patrick O'Keefe, Holaday Circuits Inc.

Jose Servin Olivares, Continental Temic SA de CV

Wim Ongenae, EC Europe

William Ortloff, Raytheon Company

Michael Paddack, Boeing Company

Michael Pavlov, ECI Technology, Inc.

John Palmer, TTM Technologies

J. Lee Parker, JLP

Dan Parquet, TTM Technologies

Gerry Parta, Summit Interconnect

Anders Pedersen, Harris Corporation

Robert Peterson, Alternate Finishing Inc.

Michael Petrantonio, Ph.D., GE Aviation

Deborah Pledger, Vivint, Inc.

Michael Pomeroy, Continental Automotive Systems

Gnyaneshwar Ramakrishna, Cisco Systems Inc.

Gustavo Ramos, Atotech Deutschland GmbH

Robert Reid, Technic Inc.

Randy Reed, R. Reed Consultancy LLC

Henry Rekers, Schneider Electric

Curtis Ricotta, Lockheed Martin Space Systems Company

Jose Rios, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Hugh Roberts, Atotech USA Inc.

Gary Roper, Roper Resources, Inc.

Mario Rosin, Atotech Deutschland GmbH

Brian Rowden, GE Global Research

Stan Sappington, S/G Electronics Inc.

Daryl Sato, Intel Corporation

Tom Saven, Ticer Technologies

Stefan Schmitz, Fraunhofer IZM Branch Lab Microsystem Engineering

Michael Schneer, ECI Technology, Inc.

Dieter Scholz, Materials Evaluation and Engineering	Guhan Subbarayan, Ph.D., Juniper Networks	Paul Vianco, Ph.D., Sandia National Labs Albuquerque
Randy Schueller, Ph.D., DfR Solutions	Richard Sullivan, Analog Devices Inc.	Joe Vo, Broadcom Corporation
Michael Schwaemmlein, Atotech Deutschland GmbH	Donald Susan, Sandia National Labs Albuquerque	Donald Walsh, Uyemura International Corp.
Martin Scionti, Raytheon Missile Systems	Magnus Svensson, Multi-Teknik Monsterkort AB	Andreas Wippel, AT&S Austria Technologie & Systemtechnik AG
Jeff Seekatz, Raytheon Company	John Swanson, MacDermid Enthone Electronics Solutions	Michael Wolverton, Raytheon Systems Company
Keith Sellers, NTS	Royce Taylor, Raytheon Company	Glenn Woodhouse, All Flex
Dave Shaddock, GE Global Research	Stephen Tisdale, Tisdale Environmental Consulting LLC	Chen Xu, Ph.D., Nolia
Gordon Simmons, Superior Processing	Michael Toben, Dow Electronic Materials	Yung-Herng Yau, MacDermid Enthone Electronics Solutions
Atamjit Singh, Unitech Industries Inc.	James Trainor, MacDermid Enthone	William Yelton, Sandia National Labs Albuquerque
Polina Snugovsky, Ph.D., Celestica	Kristen Troxel, Hewlett-Packard Company	Joshua Young, Maxwell Technologies Inc.
Dave Sommervold, The Bergquist Company/Henkel Electronic Materials LLC	Patrick Valentine, Uyemura International Corp.	Joseph Zhu, Oxford Instruments X-ray Fluorescence Analytik GmbH
Young Song, Teledyne Dalsa	Dave Van Booven, Continental Automotive Systems	Steve Zimmer, Viasystems Toronto, Inc.
Eric Stafstrom, Technic Inc.		
Thomas Stewart, TTM Technologies		

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Currently in preview, click buy full version

Table of Contents

1 SCOPE	1	3.1.5.2.1 Instrument Calibration for Phosphorus Content	13
1.1 Statement of Scope	1	3.1.6 Gold Stripping of Plated Deposits for Evaluation of Hyper-Corrosion	13
1.1.1 Feature Size for Thickness Measurement	1	3.1.6.1 Recognized Methods for Gold Stripping	14
1.2 Description	1	3.1.6.1.1 Chemical Stripping Solution Dwell Times and Process Steps	14
1.2.1 Electroless Nickel Reducing Agents – Phosphorus Content	1	3.1.6.1.2 Evaluation Using SEM	14
1.3 Objective	1	3.1.6.1.3 Grain Boundary Enhancement via Hyper-Corrosion	14
1.3.1 Order of Precedence	2	3.1.6.1.4 Verification of Hyper-Corrosion	14
1.3.1.1 Appendices	2	3.2 Performance Functions	16
2 APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS	2	3.2.1 Shelf Life	16
2.1 IPC	2	3.2.1.1 Solderability	16
2.2 ASTM International (ASTM)	2	3.2.1.2 Gold Embrittlement	16
2.3 JEDEC	2	3.2.2 Aluminum and Copper Wire (Wedge) Bonding	17
2.4 Defense Standardization Program	2	3.2.2.1 Gold Wire Bonding	17
2.5 Telcordia Technologies, Inc.	3	3.2.3 Contact Surface	17
2.6 International Organization for Standardization (ISO)	3	3.2.3.1 Soft Membrane Switches	17
2.7 Terms, Definitions and Acronyms	3	3.2.3.2 Metallic Dome Contacts	17
2.7.1 Metal Turnover (MTO)	3	3.2.4 EMI Shielding	17
2.7.2 Hyperactive Corrosion Deposit	3	3.2.5 Conductive and/or Anisotropic Adhesive Interface (Replacement for Solder)	17
2.7.3 Selective Annular Ring Dewetting (SAD)	3	3.2.6 Connectors	17
3 REQUIREMENTS OF ENIG DEPOSIT	4	3.2.6.1 Press Fit Connectors	17
3.1 Printed Board Fabrication Supplier Process Requirements	5	3.2.6.2 Edge Tab	17
3.1.1 General Plating Line Requirements	5	3.2.7 Limitations of ENIG	17
3.1.1.1 ENIG Deposit Thickness Measurement	5	3.2.7.1 Creep Corrosion/Chemical Resistance	17
3.1.1.2 Gauge Capability – Gauge R&R Type 1 Study	5	3.2.7.2 High Frequency Signal Loss	18
3.1.1.3 Collimator Size and Measurement Times	10	3.3 Visual	18
3.1.1.4 Guard Bands and L ₁ Conformance Testing	10	3.4 Selective Annular Ring Dewetting (SAD)	19
3.1.2 ENIG XRF Calibration Standards	10	3.5 Finish Thickness	20
3.1.3 XRF Zero Offset Acceptability	10	3.5.1 Electroless Nickel Thickness	20
3.1.4 Process Qualification Measurement Requirements	11	3.5.1.1 Electroless Nickel for Rigid Printed Boards	20
3.1.5 Measuring Phosphorus Content in an ENIG Deposit	12	3.5.1.2 Deposits More Than the Upper Limit	20
3.1.5.1 Measurement of % Phosphorous (P) Content in Electroless Nickel (EN) Layers with Energy Dispersive X-Ray Spectroscopy (EDS)	12	3.5.1.3 Deposits Less Than the Minimum Thickness Limit	20
3.1.5.2 Measurement of % Phosphorous (P) Content in Electroless Nickel (EN) Layers with Energy Dispersive X-Ray Fluorescence (EDXRF)	13	3.5.1.4 Electroless Nickel for Flexible Circuits	20
		3.5.1.5 Modifications to the Base Structure of the Electroless Nickel Deposits with Flexible Circuits	20
		3.5.2 Immersion Gold Thickness	21
		3.5.2.1 ENIG – Category B Coating Durability per IPC J-STD-003	21

3.5.3	Exceptions to the Required Thickness Ranges	23	APPENDIX 3	XRF Thickness Measurements of Thin Au (ENIG): Recommendations for Instrumentation (Detectors) and Their Limitations	35
3.5.3.1	Immersion Gold Thicker Than Specification by Design	23	APPENDIX 4	ENIG PWB Surface Finish Wetting Balance Testing	37
3.5.3.2	Production Conformance Testing	23	APPENDIX 5	IPC 4-14 SC ENIG Round Robin Solder Spread Testing	55
3.5.3.3	Production Measurement Exceptions	23	APPENDIX 6	Wire Bonding to ENIG	61
3.5.3.4	Statistical Process Control	23	APPENDIX 7	Through Hole Solderability Testing	62
3.5.3.5	Lot Sizes of Ten Printed Boards or Less	23	APPENDIX 8	Evaluation of Electroless Nickel Corrosion Due to Immersion Gold Plating, Using 3000X Magnification After Gold Stripping	77
3.5.3.6	Production Overruns and/or Inventory Items	24	APPENDIX 9-A	Cyanide Gold Stripping for ENIG	82
3.5.3.7	Reworking/Repair of ENIG	24	APPENDIX 9-B	Test Method for Potassium Iodide/Iodine (Non-Cyanide) ENIG Gold Stripping Procedure	83
3.6	Nickel Hyper-Corrosion	24	APPENDIX 9-C	Method for Stripping Gold Plating from ENIG Finished PCBs by Broad Beam Argon Ion Milling	85
3.6.1	Evaluation of the ENIG Deposit by Cross Section	24	APPENDIX 10	Determination of Thickness and Phosphorus Content in Electroless Nickel (EN) Layers X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF) Spectrometry [IPC-TM-650, Method 2.3.44]	90
3.6.1.1	25	APPENDIX 11	Phosphorus Content Measurement in ENIG Using Electron Dispersive Spectroscopy EDS – Initial Testing	97
3.6.1.1.1	Normal ENIG Free of Hyper-Corrosion Defects	25	APPENDIX 12	Standard Developments Efforts of Electroless Nickel Immersion Gold	102
3.6.1.1.2	Acceptable Conditions with Some Evidence of Hyper-Corrosion	25	APPENDIX 13	Using Guard Bands or a Gauge Correction Factor to Accommodate Type 1 Gauge Study Measurement Uncertainty	102
3.6.1.1.3	Acceptable Conditions with End User Sign-Off/Acceptance	25			
3.6.1.1.4	Rejectable Conditions	26			
3.6.1.2	Hyper-Corrosion Rating Level Table	26			
3.6.2	Additional Non-Failure Analysis Testing to Determine Acceptance or Rejection for Level 2 Hyper-Corrosion	27			
3.7	Porosity	28			
3.8	Adhesion	28			
3.9	Solderability	29			
3.9.1	Stressing of the Deposit Prior to Solderability Testing	29			
3.9.2	Force Measurement Testing (Wetting Balance Testing)	29			
3.10	Cleanliness	29			
3.11	Electrolytic Corrosion	29			
3.12	Chemical Resistance	29			
4	QUALITY ASSURANCE PROVISIONS	30			
4.1	General Quality Assurance Provisions	30			
4.1.1	Qualification Recommendations	30			
4.1.2	Sample Test Coupons	30			
4.2	Quantitative Conformance Testing	30			
4.2.1	Frequency of Thickness Measurements	30			
4.2.2	Established Qualified Process	30			
APPENDIX 1	Terms and Definitions Not Currently in IPC-T-50	33			
APPENDIX 2	ENIG Process Sequence	34			
				Figures	
			Figure A	Example of Repeat Measurement Data from Three Different XRF Tools	6
			Figure B	Graphical and Statistical Evaluation of Data from XRF Tool # 1	7
			Figure C	Graphical and Statistical Evaluation of Data from XRF Tool # 2	8
			Figure D	Graphical and Statistical Evaluation of Data from XRF Tool # 3	9
			Figure 3-1	Potassium Iodide/Iodine (KI / I ₂) at 15 sec. dwell (left) vs. 60 sec. dwell (right)	14

Figure 3-2	Cyanide-Based Stripping at 15 sec. dwell (left) vs. 60 sec. dwell (right)	15	Figure A4-6	Example of Excellent and Consistent Wetting From Sample Group # 4 Tested as Received with SAC305 and Test Flux # 2 (this is a 1.6 μ m at - 4 σ I Au thickness sample)	41
Figure 3-3	Cyanide Stripping (left) vs. KI/I ₂ Stripping (right) Using Focused Ion Beam (FIB)	15	Figure A4-7	Wetting Curves From Sample # 8 Tested as Received Showing Again Excellent Wetting Consistency Intra Group (this is one of the control thickness samples)	41
Figure 3-4	25,000X FIB Images – Cyanide (left) vs. KI / I ₂ (right) – Same Dwell Time	15	Figure A4-8	Example of Some Very Inconsistent Wetting Seen with Sample Group 11, Again Tested As Received with No Stressing (this group was later identified to have had a plating issue and was withdrawn from further consideration for this specification revision effort)	42
Figure 3-5	Ion Mill Stripping of Defect-Free Nickel (left) vs. Hyper-Corroded Nickel (right)	16	Figure A4-9	Post 2X Reflows Using a SnPb Profile and SnPb Solder for Testing (good robustness) ..	42
Figure 3-6	Uniform Plating	18	Figure A4-10	Post 2X Reflows Using a Hotter Pb-Free Profile but Testing with SnPb Solder (FAIL)	43
Figure 3-7	Extraneous Plating or Nickel Foot	18	Figure A4-11	Post 8 Hours Exposure to 72 °C/85% R.H. (excellent robustness)	43
Figure 3-8	Skip Plating (No Ni plating)	18	Figure A4-12	Post 2X Exposures to a SnPb Profile Then Tested With SnPb (excellent robustness)	44
Figure 3-9	Edge Pull Back	19	Figure A4-13	Post 2X Exposures to a Pb-Free Profile and Tested with SnPb (shows some increased spread in the data but overall, very good robustness compared to the failures seen in Figure A4-7)	44
Figure 3-10	Example of SAD (Selective Annular ring Dewetting)	20	Figure A4-14	Post 8 hours @ 72 °C/85% R.H. (excellent robustness)	45
Figure 3-11	Another Example of the SAD Defect	20	Figure A4-15	Another Sample Group Post 2X Exposures to a SnPb Profile Then Tested with SnPb (slower rate of rise indicating some reducible oxide layers present with good robustness)	45
Figure 3-12	Selective Annular Ring Dewetting Defect	20	Figure A4-16	Post 2X Pb-Free Reflow Profile Exposure (good robustness)	46
Figure 3-13	Grain Structure of Conventional Nickel Deposit	21	Figure A4-17	Post 8 hours @ 72 °C/85% R.H. (excellent robustness)	46
Figure 3-14	Grain Structure of Nickel Deposit Modified for Dynamic Flex Applications	21	Figure A4-18	Post 2X SnPb Profile Exposure (good wetting times, increased spread in the data)	47
Figure 3-15	Example of Fracture in Conventional Nickel Deposit	21	Figure A4-19	Post 2X Pb-Free Profile Exposure (increasing spread in the data and some failures)	47
Figure 3-16	Modified Nickel Deposit of Cycles Showing No Fracture with Same Number	21	Figure A4-20	Post 8 Hours @ 72 °C/85% R.H. (excellent robustness)	48
Figure 3-17	Defect Free ENIG Deposit – Knee of Hole ...	25	Figure A4-21	Post 2X SnPb Reflow Exposures (excellent robustness)	48
Figure 3-18	Defect Free ENIG Deposit – SMT Feature ...	25	Figure A4-22	Post 2X Pb-Free Reflow Exposures (one outlier but overall, excellent robustness)	49
Figure 3-19	Level 1 Hyper-Corrosion – SMT Feature	25	Figure A4-23	Post 8 Hours @ 72 °C/85% R.H. (excellent robustness)	49
Figure 3-20	Level 1 Hyper-Corrosion – Knee of Hole	25	Figure A4-24	Post 2X SnPb Reflow Exposures From Another Supplier (excellent robustness)	50
Figure 3-21	Level 2 Hyper-Corrosion – Knee of Hole	25	Figure A4-25	Post 2X Pb-Free Reflow Exposures From Another Supplier (excellent robustness)	50
Figure 3-22	Level 2 Hyper-Corrosion – SMT Feature	25			
Figure 3-23	Level 3 Hyper-Corrosion – Knee of Hole	26			
Figure 3-24	Level 3 Hyper-Corrosion – SMT Feature	26			
Figure 3-25	Example of a Crack in the Nickel Deposit	26			
Figure 3-26	Decision Tree to Assist in Setting Rating Level of Hyper-Corrosion	27			
Figure 3-27	Example of an Acceptable Contiguous IMC Layer 1000X	28			
Figure 3-28	Example of a Rejectable Non-Contiguous IMC Layer 1000X	28			
Figure 3-29	Example – Rejectable with Little-to-No IMC Formation 1000X	28			
Figure 3-30	Example – Rejectable with Little-to-No IMC Formation 1000X	28			
Figure 3-31	Standard IPC Force Measurement Coupon .	29			
Figure A4-1	Example of the Wetting Balance Coupon Used for the Testing of ENIG	38			
Figure A4-2	Box Plot of the 1 μ m Samples From All Suppliers	39			
Figure A4-3	Box Plot of the 1.5 μ m Samples From All Suppliers	39			
Figure A4-4	Box Plot of the 2.0 μ m Samples From All Suppliers	40			
Figure A4-5	The Metronelec ST88 Wetting Balance Used for the Testing	40			

Figure A4-26	Post 8 Hours @ 72 °C/85% R.H. (some increased wetting times but overall excellent robustness)	51	Figure A7-5	Hole Fill Evaluation of the Non-Stressed Samples Tested Using Eutectic SnPb Solder	65
Figure A4-27	Post 2X SnPb Reflow Exposures From Another Supplier (excellent robustness)	51	Figure A7-6	The Impact of 2X Reflows on Samples Tested Subsequently with Eutectic SnPb Solder	66
Figure A4-28	Post 2X Pb-Free Reflow Exposures From Another Supplier (excellent robustness)	52	Figure A7-7	Impact on Hole Fill Defects When Samples Experience 2X Reflows + 8 Hours of 72 °C 85% R.H.	67
Figure A4-29	Post 8 Hours @ 72 °C/85% R.H. (excellent robustness)	52	Figure A7-8	Example of Complete Hole Fill and the Level of Inner Layer Interconnects from One Row of a Single Test Coupon from a Sample Tested with No Stressing with SnPb Solder	68
Figure A4-30	Post 2X SnPb Reflow Exposures From Another Supplier (increase in rate of rise time but overall excellent robustness)	53	Figure A7-9	Example of the Impact of Stressing on the Hole Fill Using 2X SnPb Reflows and Tested With SnPb Solder, the I Au Thickness was 1.71 μm"	69
Figure A4-31	Post 2X Pb-Free Reflow Exposures From Another Supplier (increase in rate of rise time but again overall excellent robustness)	53	Figure A7-10	Example of the Impact of Stressing on the Hole Fill Using 2X SnPb Reflows + 8 Hours of 72 °C/85% R.H. and Tested with SnPb Solder, the I Au Thickness was 2.96 μm"	70
Figure A4-32	Post 8 Hours @ 72 °C/85% R.H. (increased spread in the data but overall excellent robustness)	54	Figure A7-11	The Hole Fill Defects Seen with SAC305 Solder on Non-Stressed Samples	71
Figure A5-F-1	Flowchart for Process	56	Figure A7-12	The Impact of 2X Reflow Stressing on Samples Subsequently Soldered with SAC305 Solder	72
Figure A5-1	Image of the Solder Spread Test Vehicle Used by IPC for This Testing	56	Figure A7-13	The Impact on Hole Fill Defects When the Samples Experience 2X Reflows + 8 Hours of 72 °C 85% R.H.	73
Figure A5-2	Description of the Solder Spread Measurement Using the IPC Solder Spread Coupon	56	Figure A7-14	Example of the Impact of Stressing on the Hole Fill Using 2X Pb-Free Reflows and Tested with SAC305 Solder; the I Au Thickness was 1.77 μm"	74
Figure A5-3	PCB Solder Spread Versus Au Thickness for 4 ENIG Suppliers Using Pb-Free SAC Solder Paste	57	Figure A7-15	Example of the Impact of Stressing on the Hole Fill Using 2X Pb-Free Reflows + 8 Hours of 72 °C / 85% R.H. and Tested with SAC305 Solder; the I Au Thickness was 2.37 μm"	75
Figure A5-4	Interaction Plot and Regression Analysis for Parameters Influencing Solder Spread on ENIG-Finished Pcb's in This Study	58	Figure A7-16	Summary Graph on Hole Fill Defects as a Function of Stressing Pre-Testing	76
Figure A5-5	Back-Scattered SEM Image of a Solder Spread Dot From an OSP Board With a Solder Spread Value of 21%.	58	Figure A8-1	SEM/EDS/FIB Equipment Photo	77
Figure A5-6	Solder Spread Coupons Soldered With Pb-Free SAC Solder After 8 Hours Exposure to 72 °C, 85% R.H. Left - thinnest gold sample from supplier #2 with 34% average spread, Right - thinnest gold sample from supplier #3 with 21% average spread.	59	Figure A8-2	Sample VI (3000X)	78
Figure A5-7	Maximum Solder Deposit Line Count (1-18) for all Boards [4 ENIG Suppliers] in the DOE Soldered With Pb-Free SAC Solder (left) and SnPb Eutectic Solder (right) Pastes. Data in the red region indicate areas with almost no spread and would likely show dewetting under inspection. Dewetting is a concern in the yellow region.	59	Figure A8-3	Potassium Iodide/Iodine Gold Stripped EDAX Spectrum	78
Figure A7-1	An Example of a Test Vehicle and an Individual 20 – Hole Coupon That Is Showing Various Degrees of Hole Fill	63	Figure A8-4	FIB-SEM Cross Section 10,000X	79
Figure A7-2	Example of the Coupon Internal Construction, Copper Weight and Interconnect Method to Inner Layers as Applicable – This is for the J1 Coupon	63	Figure 8A-5	Sample VI, 3000X	79
Figure A7-3	XRF Measurements From the Fiducials of the 30 Test Vehicles and the Stressing Methods for Each Sample	64	Figure A8-6	Cyanide Gold Stripped EDAX Spectrum	79
Figure A7-4	The Wave Soldering Parameters Used at Adtran for Processing of the Test Vehicles ...	65	Figure A8-7	Cyanide Gold Stripped EDAX Spectrum	80
			Figure A8-8	FIB-SEM Cross Section (10,000X)	80
			Figure A8-9	Sample VI, 10,000X	80
			Figure A8-10	Sample VI, 10,000X	81
			Figure A9-C-A	Broad Beam Argon Ion Mill	85
			Figure A9-C-1	SEM Micrograph (BEI) of As-Finished ENIG Surface Prior to Broad Beam Ion Milling.	89

Figure A9-C-2 SEM Micrograph (BEI) of ENIG Surface After 30 Seconds of Ion Milling. Some Residual Gold Still Evident Indicating the Sample is Under-Milled.	89	Figure A11-6 The Most Consistent Wt.% Reported Regardless of Accelerating Voltage Being Used for Sample C Foil Group. The Same Two Test Sites Produced the Most Consistent Results for Sample B as Well. ..	101
Figure A9-C-3 SEM Micrograph (BEI) of ENIG Surface After 1 Minute of Ion Milling. The Nodular Morphology is Intact and No Residual Gold is Evident Indicating That the Sample is Properly Milled.	89	Figure A12-1 Results from Gold Thickness Survey	103
Figure A9-C-4 SEM Micrograph (BEI) of ENIG Surface After 15 Minutes of Ion Milling. No Residual Gold is Evident, but the Enhanced Grain Structure and Some Ditching Indicate the Sample is Over-Milled.	89	Figure A12-2 Results from Nickel Thickness Survey	104
Figure A9-C-5 SEM Micrograph (BEI) of ENIG Surface After 15 Minutes of Ion Milling. Hyper-Corrosion is Still Evident, but not Significantly Exaggerated.	89	Figure A12-3 Comparison of Gold Thickness Values by XRF Machine Type	106
Figure A10-1 XRF Instrument Layout	91	Figure A12-4 Comparison of Gold Plating Thickness Variation by Vendor for Similar Bath Life Conditions	108
Figure A10-2 Sample Placement with Respect to Detector	93	Figure A12-5 Comparison of Nickel Plating Thickness Variation by Vendor for Similar Bath Life Conditions	109
Figure A10-3 Positioning of a 1 mm ϕ Collimator on a 1.5 mm x 1.5 mm [0.060 in x 0.060 in] Pad	93	Figure A12-6 Wetting Times as a Function of Plating Dwell Times for Vendor D, 90 Days Old	110
Figure A10-4 Scheme of Interaction	94	Figure A12-7 Wetting Times as a Function of Plating Dwell Times for Vendor D, 90 Days Old	111
Figure A10-5 Spectrum of an EN layer on Cu (PCB), Showing I_{P-K} and I_{Ni-K}	95	Figure A12-8 Test Board for Wetting Balance Measurements	112
Figure A10-6 Spectra of Samples NiP12/Cu/PCB (blue) and 50 nm Au/96 nm Pd/3.2 μ m NiP9.3/Cu/PCB (yellow), Showing Peak Overlap of P-K and Au-M Energy Lines	96	Figure A12-9 Wetting Balance Data for Vendor D Post 18 Hours 85/85 Conditioning	113
Figure A11-1 Reported Phosphorus Content From Seven Test Sites for Sample A. The range in reported content is from a low of 3.85 wt.% to a high of 48.09 wt.%. Generally the higher reported values were from the lower kV values which is typically recommended by the EDS suppliers for evaluating Phosphorus. ...	98	Figure A12-10 Comparison of One Microinch Gold Deposit Tested at 8 Months Shelf Life vs as Received and 85/85	114
Figure A11-2 Reported Phosphorus Content From Eight Test Sites for Sample B. The range in reported content is from a low of 3.36 wt.% to a high of 58.09 wt.%. It is noted that the same test site did not produce these extreme values or was the same location for the data reported for Sample A.	99	Figure A12-11 Comparison of One Microinch Gold Deposit after Various Storage Times/Conditions	115
Figure A11-3 Reported Phosphorus Content From Eight Test Sites for Sample C. The range in reported content is from a low of 3.92 wt.% to a high of 61.24 wt.%. The same two locations that produced the extreme values for Sample B also produced them for Sample C. It is further noted that the low wt.% was produced at the highest accelerating voltage for test site # 2 and the lowest accelerating voltage for test site 8	99	Figure A12-12 Contact Resistance Data for Vendor D for Interlocking Square Contacts	117
Figure A11-4 The Most Consistent Wt.% Reported Regardless of Accelerating Voltage Being Used for Sample A Foil Group	100	Figure A12-13 Contact Resistance Data for Vendor C for Interlocking Square Contacts	118
Figure A11-5 The Most Consistent Wt.% Reported Regardless of Accelerating Voltage Being Used for Sample B Foil Group	100	Figure A12-14 Comparison of Gold Thickness by Vendor for the Interlocking Square Contact Test	119
		Figure A12-15 Interlocking Square Contact Test Coupon ..	120
		Figure A13-1a Part Misclassifications	121
		Figure A13-1b Part Misclassifications	121
		Figure A13-2 Guard Bands	122
		Figure A13-3 Type 1 Gauge Study Results	123
Tables			
	Table 3-1	Requirements of Electroless Nickel/Immersion Gold Plating	4
	Table 3-2	Twelve (12) Repeat Au Measurements and the Mean Value	11
	Table 3-3	Three Examples of XRF Data Sets [= μ in]	22
	Table 3-4	One More Example of XRF Data [= μ in]	22
	Table 3-5	Three Levels of Hyper-Corrosion Observed Using Optical Microscopy	26
	Table 4-1	Suggested Fabricator Qualification Plan	31
	Table 4-2	C=0 Sampling Plan (Sample Size for Specific Index Value ¹)	32
	Table A3-1	XRF Detectors and Their Limitations at Typical Count Rates	35
	Table A4-1	1.0 μ in Minimum at -4 σ From the Mean Sample (all suppliers are below the target) ..	38

Table A4-2	1.5 μin Minimum at -4σ From the Mean Sample (only one supplier met the goal)	38
Table A4-3	2.0 μin Minimum at -4σ From the Mean (Control Sample) (only one supplier met goal)	38
Table A5-1	Au Thicknesses Measured by XRF for the PCBs Used for Solder Spread Testing From Appendix G3	55
Table A5-2	Description of Test Matrix for Solder Spread Evaluation	55
Table A5-3	Average Solder Spread Result for Each Combination of Solder Paste, Au Thickness and PCB Conditioning	57
Table A6-1	Average Thicknesses of Immersion Gold	61
Table A6-2	Pull Values for 1 mil Aluminum Wire Bonds	61
Table A6-3	Pull Values for 10 mil Aluminum Wire Bonds	61
Table A6-4	Pull Values for 1 mil Copper Wire Bonds	61
Table A10-1	Typical Achievable Results for NiP/Cu/PCB Samples (1mm Collimator; Measuring Time 120 s)	92
Table A10-2	Evaluation of 5 Readings (Repeatability Conditions) of the Sample in Figure A10-6 ...	93
Table A13-1	Guard Band Sigma Recommendation	121
Table A13-2	Guard Band Sigma Recommendation	124

Performance Specification for Electroless Nickel/ Immersion Gold (ENIG) Plating for Printed Boards

1 SCOPE

1.1 Statement of Scope This performance specification sets requirements for Electroless Nickel/Immersion Gold (ENIG) deposit thicknesses for applications including soldering, wire bonding and as a contact finish. It is intended for use by chemical suppliers, printed board manufacturers, electronics manufacturing services (EMS) and original equipment manufacturers (OEM). This standard may be used to specify acceptance criteria to meet performance requirements in addition to those found in the IPC-6010-FAM: Printed Board Performance Specifications. The ENIG deposit specified by using this document will meet the highest coating durability rating as specified in the J-STD-003 printed board solderability specification.

This specification is based on three critical factors:

1. The ENIG plating process is in control producing a normal distribution for nickel and gold deposit thickness.
2. That the tool used to measure the deposit and therefore control the process is accurate and reproducible for the thickness range specified.
3. That the ENIG plating process results in uniform deposit characteristics.

If any of these three critical factors are not met, then the deposit produced will not meet the performance criteria defined herein.

1.1.1 Feature Size for Thickness Measurement This performance specification has been generated based on a deposit thickness measured ONLY on feature sizes of 1.5 mm x 1.5 mm [0.060 in x 0.060 in] or equivalent area ($\pm 10\%$). Measurement of non-standard feature sizes and/or a combination of different feature sizes will prevent compliance to the statistical requirements of this specification. Requirements to measure non-standard sized features is AABUS and the supplier of the printed board is not responsible for the performance of the deposit as specified in this document.

1.2 Description ENIG is an electroless nickel layer capped with a thin layer of immersion gold. It is a multifunctional surface finish, applicable to soldering, aluminum and copper wedge wire bonding, press fit connections, and as a contact surface. The immersion gold layer protects the underlying nickel from oxidation/passivation over its intended life. However, this layer is not impervious and it will not pass the requirements of a "classic" porosity test as defined in ASTM B 735 & IPC-TM-650, Methods 2.3.24, 2.3.24.1 and 2.3.24.2).

1.2.1 Electroless Nickel Reducing Agents – Phosphorus Content Phosphorus-containing, reducing agents are used for the reduction of the electroless nickel during the deposition process and phosphorus is incorporated in the nickel deposit. Currently there are two levels of phosphorus found in electroless nickel deposits used for ENIG:

1. A mid-phosphorus nickel with phosphorus levels ranging from 5 wt. % to 10 wt. %
2. A high phosphorus nickel with phosphorus levels greater than 10.0 wt. %.

The level of this co-deposited element should be controlled within the supplier's specified process limits. Variation of phosphorus levels outside the specified process limits may have adverse effects on the performance of the finish and/or potentially increase the occurrence and/or severity of hyper-corrosion.

The phosphorus content within the interfacial region between the electroless nickel and immersion gold layers is higher than that found in the bulk deposit. After soldering, the phosphorus levels at the interface between solder and the electroless nickel will always be higher than that found on a non-soldered pad, as the tin in the solder preferentially reacts with the nickel, leaving a phosphorus-rich layer behind. This is a NORMAL and expected occurrence.

1.3 Objective This specification sets the requirements specific to ENIG as a surface finish (see Table 3-1 for a summary of these requirements). As other finishes require specifications, they will be addressed by the IPC Plating Processes Subcommittee as part of the IPC-455X specification family. As this and other applicable specifications are under continuous review, the subcommittee will add appropriate amendments and make necessary revisions to these documents. The 4-14