

IPC/JEDEC-9301

2018 - December

Numerical Analysis Guidelines for
Microelectronics Packaging Design
and Reliability

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 also 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 847/597-2809.

Thank you for your continued support.



IPC/JEDEC-9301



Numerical Analysis Guidelines for Microelectronics Packaging Design and Reliability

Developed by the JEDEC Reliability Test Methods for Packaged Devices Committee (JC-14.1) and the SMT Attachment Reliability Test Methods Task Group (6-10d) of the Product Reliability Committee (6-10) of IPC

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

Acknowledgment

Members of the JEDEC Reliability Test Methods for Packaged Devices Committee (JC-14.1) and the SMT Attachment Reliability Test Methods Task Group (6-10d) of the IPC Product Reliability Committee (6-10) have worked together to develop this document. We would like to thank them for their dedication to this effort. Any document involving a complex technology draws material from a vast number of sources. While the principal members of the SMT Attachment Reliability Test Methods Task Group 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 JEDEC and IPC extend their gratitude.

Product Reliability Committee	SMT Attachment Reliability Test Methods Task Group	Technical Liaison of the IPC Board of Directors
Chair James Monarchio TTM Technologies	Chair Reza Ghaffarian Jet Propulsion Laboratory	Bob Neves Microtek Laboratories
Vice Chair Vasu Vasudevan Dell Inc.	Vice Chair Vasu Vasudevan Dell Inc.	

SMT Attachment Reliability Test Methods Task Group

Mudasir Ahmad, Cisco Systems Inc	Reza Ghaffarian, Jet Propulsion Laboratory	Clarence Nichols, Gables Engineering, Inc.
Aileen Allen, Hewlett-Packard Inc.	Cynthia A. Gomez, Continental Temic SA de CV	David Oris, Gables Engineering, Inc
Dudi Amir, Intel Corporation	Allen Green, Acoustic Technology Group	Chandradip Patel, Schlumberger Well Services
Martin K. Anselm, Rochester Institute of Technology	Bill Hargin, Nan Ya Plastics Corporation	Jagadeesh Radhakrishnan, Intel Corporation
Michael Azarian, University of Maryland	Kayleen Helms, Intel Corporation	Gnyaneshwar Ramakrishna, Cisco Systems Inc.
Elizabeth Elias Benedetto, Hewlett-Packard Inc.	Gaston Hinkle, Toyota Motor North America	Edda Rivera, Gables Engineering, Inc.
Nicole Butel, Broadcom Limited	Jeffrey Lee, Intel Corporation	Jose A. Sanchez, Gables Engineering, Inc.
William P. Cardinal, UTC Aerospace Systems	Christopher Hunt, Pireta	Martin Scionti, Raytheon Missile Systems
Beverley Christian, HDP User Group	Jeffrey ChangBing Lee, iST Integrated Service Technology	Jose Ma Servin-Olivares, Continental Temic SA de CV
Jean-Paul Clech, EPSI	Anna Lifton, Alpha Assembly Solutions	Russell S. Shepherd, NTS Anaheim
Gino Cochella, Northrop Grumman Aerospace Systems	Rene R. Martinez, Northrop Grumman Aerospace Systems	Julie Silk, Keysight Technologies
Richard J. Coyle, Nokia	Daniel McCormick, Naval Surface Warfare Center	Bhanu Sood, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center
William C. Dieffenbacher, Boeing Systems	Steve Minich, Amphenol InterCon Systems	Jorge Suarez, Gables Engineering, Inc.
Harold O. Ellisc, Quantum Corporation	Jim Mulvey, Lockheed Martin Corporation	Taylor J. Swanson, Rochester Institute of Technology
Gerd Fischer, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center	David R. Nelson, Raytheon Company	John Paul Thompson, FCI USA, Inc.
Dennis D. Fritz, SAIC	Keith G. Newman, AMD	
Enrico Galbiati, SEM Communication & GESTLABS Srl		
Phil Geng, Intel Corporation		

Kristen K. Troxel, Hewlett-Packard
Inc.
Vasu S. Vasudevan, Dell Inc.

Milena Vujosevic, Intel Corporation
Michael Wolverton, Raytheon
Systems Company

Fonda B. Wu, Raytheon Company
Andy Zhang, Texas Instruments

SPECIAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT

JC-14.1 JEDEC Reliability Test Methods for Packaged Devices Committee

Ife Hsu, Intel Corporation

Mudasir Ahmad, Cisco Systems Inc

Currently in preview, click buy full version

Table of Contents

1 SCOPE	1	11.2.2 Stresses	14
1.1 Introduction	1	11.3 Volume Averaging	14
1.2 Purpose	1	11.4 Temperature Dependent Results	14
2 APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS	4	11.5 Correlation with Experimental Data	14
2.1 IPC	4	11.5.1 Nomenclature	14
2.2 ASTM	4	11.5.2 Experimental Statistical Analysis	15
3 TERMS AND DEFINITIONS	4	11.5.3 Comparison of Results	15
4 RESULTS REPORTING	5	12 REFERENCES	16
5 BASIC ANALYSIS INFORMATION	6	13 APPENDICES	17
5.1 Analysis Type	6	APPENDIX A Material Property Modeling	18
5.2 Physics Type	6	APPENDIX B DMA/TMA Testing Algorithms	33
5.3 Software	7	APPENDIX C Experimental Benchmarking Model Case Study (Thermomechanical Lead Level Joint Reliability)	38
5.3.1 Software Version	7	APPENDIX D Warpage	50
5.4 Analysis Files and Scripts	7	APPENDIX E Experimental Benchmarking Model Case Study (Transient Bend Testing)	52
6 BASIC MODEL INFORMATION	8		
6.1 Boundary Conditions	8		
6.2 Model Stackup Schematics	8		
6.3 Boundary Condition Schematics	8		
7 MATERIAL PROPERTY INFORMATION	10		
7.1 Material Properties	10		
7.2 Reference Temperature	10		
7.3 Temperature Dependent Properties	10		
8 MESH INFORMATION	10		
8.1 Mesh Selection and Information	10		
8.2 Mapped or Tetrahedral Mesh	10		
8.3 Dissimilar Meshes	11		
8.4 Mesh Sensitivity Analysis	11		
9 LOADING INFORMATION	11		
9.1 Ramped vs. Stepped Loading	11		
10 SOLUTION INFORMATION	12		
10.1 Operating System	12		
10.2 High Performance Computing (HPC)	12		
10.3 Hardware	12		
10.4 Solution Algorithms and Settings	13		
10.4.1 Time Steps	13		
10.4.2 Solution Time	13		
11 POST PROCESSING	13		
11.1 Post Processing	13		
11.2 Results Parameters	13		
11.2.1 Fatigue	13		
		Figures	
		Figure 1-1 Building Blocks of a Typical Finite Element Analysis Problem	2
		Figure 1-2 Expected Modular Structure of Numerical Analysis Reliability Guideline Documents	3
		Figure 6-1a Examples of Model Schematics	8
		Figure 6-1b Examples of Model Schematics	8
		Figure 6-1c Examples of Model Schematics	8
		Figure 6-2 Quarter Symmetric Model	8
		Figure 6-3 Symmetry Boundary Conditions Added	9
		Figure 6-4 Zoom in View of Symmetry Boundary Conditions	9
		Figure 6-5 Displacement Boundary Conditions to Constrain All Rigid Body Displacement	9
		Figure 8-1 Example of Multi-Point Constraint to "Tie" Dissimilar Mesh Regions	11
		Figure 8-2 Example of Mesh Sensitivity Analysis	11
		Figure 10-1 Computational Time vs. Number of Cores Used (PBGA 680 Solder Joint Model)	12
		Figure 10-2 Octant PBGA680 Solder Joint Reliability Model	12
		Figure 10-3 Example of Time Step Too Big to Capture Fluctuation in Loading History	13
		Figure A2-1a Isotropic and Kinematic Hardening Rules ..	21
		Figure A2-1b Isotropic and Kinematic Hardening Rules ..	21
		Figure A2-1c Isotropic and Kinematic Hardening Rules ..	21

Figure A2-2a	Examples of One-Dimensional Stress Strain Relationships	21	Figure A4-9b	Measurement and the Simulation of the Deflection Over Temperature of a Bi-material Beam Consisting of Molding Compound and Silicon. The Linear-elastic (LE) Model Clearly Overestimates the Deflection Whereas the LVE Model can Reproduce the Deflection Correctly	28
Figure A2-2b	Examples of One-Dimensional Stress Strain Relationships	21	Figure A4-10a	Schematic Representation of the Tests Until Failure: a) Tensile Test Until Failure, b) Tensile Test Until Failure with Relaxation Segments	29
Figure A2-2c	Examples of One-Dimensional Stress Strain Relationships	21	Figure 4-10b	Schematic Representation of the Tests Until Failure: a) Tensile Test Until Failure, b) Tensile Test Until Failure with Relaxation Segments	29
Figure A2-2d	Examples of One-Dimensional Stress Strain Relationships	21	Figure A4-11a	Results of the Tensile Tests Until Failure at Different Temperatures	30
Figure A3-1a	Characteristic Measurements of the Storage Modulus and the Thermal Expansion of a Thermosetting Polymer Over Temperature.	22	Figure A4-11b	Stress Relaxation of the Investigated Molding Compound	30
Figure A3-1b	Characteristic Measurements of the Storage Modulus and the Thermal Expansion of a Thermosetting Polymer Over Temperature.	22	Figure A4-12	Representation of the Bristow-Boyce Model	30
Figure A3-2a	Extraction of T_g by Tangents from TMA Measurement.	23	Figure A4-13	Results of Experiment and Simulation of the Tensile Test Until Failure at 125 °C and the Load Rate of 1.0 mm/min	30
Figure A3-2b	Extraction of T_g by Tangents from TMA Measurement.	23	Figure A4-14	Scheme of Cooling Shrinkage During Polymerization Process of Molding Compound [7]	31
Figure A4-1a	Tri-linear (left) and Bi-linear (right) Interpolating Functions for Fitting of DMA/TMA Data Respectively	25	Figure A4-15	Constitutive Law for an Orthotropic Material	32
Figure A4-1b	Tri-linear (left) and Bi-linear (right) Interpolating Functions for Fitting of DMA/TMA Data Respectively	25	Figure C1-1a	Four Packages Selected for Case Study	38
Figure A4-2a	Example of Best Fit for DMA (left) and TMA (right) Data	25	Figure C1-1b	Four Packages Selected for Case Study	38
Figure A4-2b	Example of Best Fit for DMA (left) and TMA (right) Data	25	Figure C1-1c	Four Packages Selected for Case Study	38
Figure A4-3	Thermal Expansion Measurement of a Thermosetting Polymer and the Extraction of Instantaneous CTEs from Measured Thermal Strain Data	26	Figure C1-1d	Four Packages Selected for Case Study	38
Figure A4-4	Extracted Instantaneous CTE $\alpha_{th,inst}$ Over Temperature. The instantaneous CTE $\alpha_{th,inst}$ Changes at the Glass Temperature T_G	26	Figure C1-2	Thermal Cycling Test Profiles	39
Figure A4-5	Extraction of the Secant CTE $\alpha_{th,secant}$ from Measured Thermal Strain Data for the Reference Temperature of 25 °C	26	Figure C1-3a	Different Model Type Schematics	40
Figure A4-6	Extracted Secant CTE $\alpha_{th,secant}$ Over Temperature for a Reference Temperature of 25 °C	27	Figure C1-3b	Different Model Type Schematics	40
Figure A4-7	Overview Viscoelastic Modeling	27	Figure C1-4a	Strip Model	41
Figure A4-8	Illustration of the Linear-Viscoelastic Material Modeling Approach Using the Generalized Maxwell Model Consisting of Several Spring-Damper Elements	28	Figure C1-4b	Strip Model	41
Figure A4-9	Measurement and the Simulation of the Deflection Over Temperature of a Bi-material Beam Consisting of Molding Compound and Silicon. The Linear-elastic (LE) Model Clearly Overestimates the Deflection Whereas the LVE Model can Reproduce the Deflection Correctly	28	Figure C1-5	Example of Full Model Boundary Conditions for Component Level Temperature Cycling	41
			Figure C1-6a	Example of Boundary Conditions for Multichip Modules	42
			Figure C1-6b	Example of Boundary Conditions for Multichip Modules	42
			Figure C1-6c	Example of Boundary Conditions for Multichip Modules	42
			Figure C1-7a	Strip Model Boundary Conditions	43
			Figure C1-7b	Strip Model Boundary Conditions	43
			Figure C1-8	Critical Solder Joint Dimensions for Analysis	44
			Figure C1-9	CBGA400 Octant Model and Joint Mesh	45
			Figure D1-1a	Experiment vs. FEA Warpage Measurements Across Different Reference Planes	50

Figure D1-1b	Experiment vs. FEA Warpage Measurements Across Different Reference Planes	50	Figure E3-4a	Examples of the DIC Results Showing: (a) In-Plane, U_x ; and (b) Out-of-Plane, U_z , Displacement Components During the TB Testing of Bare-Aluminum Boards	62
Figure E-1	Typical System Manufacturing Process Flow	52	Figure E3-4b	Examples of the DIC Results Showing: (a) In-Plane, U_x ; and (b) Out-of-Plane, U_z , Displacement Components During the TB Testing of Bare-Aluminum Boards	62
Figure E1-2a	Typical Spherical Bend Test Set-Up	53	Figure E3-5	Finite Element TB Model of the Bare-Aluminum Board	63
Figure E1-2b	Typical Spherical Bend Test Set-Up	53	Figure E3-6	Comparison of the Force vs. Displacement Response from the Model and Experiment for a 32mil Thick Bare-Aluminum Board	64
Figure E2-1	A Typical Quarter Symmetric TB Analysis Model Created in Abaqus® CAE	54	Figure E3-7	Computational Model vs. Experimental Board Strains Comparison for the Strains on the Primary Board Side in a 32mil Thick Bare-Aluminum Board	64
Figure E2-2	Example of Solder Joint Mesh	55	Figure E3-8	Computational Model vs. Experimental Board Strains Comparison for the Strains on the Secondary Board Side in a 32mil Thick Bare-Aluminum Board	64
Figure E2-3	An Example of the Boundary Conditions in a Typical Quarter Symmetric TB Model ...	55	Figure E3-9	A Comparison of the Computational Model vs. DIC Experimental Results for the Board Displacements for a 32mil Thick Bare-Aluminum Board	65
Figure E2-4	A Schematic of the Post-Processed SJ Forces for a Given SJ Set in the Local Coordinate System	57	Figure E3-10	Comparison of the Force vs. Displacement Response from the Model and Experiment for a 62mil Thick Bare-Aluminum Board	65
Figure E2-5	Effect of Computational Model Element Type on the Board Strains and SJ Force	57	Figure E3-11a	Computational Model vs. Experimental Board Strains Comparison for the Strains on: (a) Primary Board Side; and (b) Secondary Board Side in a 62mil Thick Bare-Aluminum Board	66
Figure E2-6a	ETB Mesh Size Effect on Board Strains and SJ Force due to Variation in Mesh Size/Seed in the: (a) ETB Thickness Direction; and (b) ETB In-Plane Direction	58	Figure E3-11b	Computational Model vs. Experimental Board Strains Comparison for the Strains on: (a) Primary Board Side; and (b) Secondary Board Side in a 62mil Thick Bare-Aluminum Board	66
Figure E2-6b	ETB Mesh Size Effect on Board Strains and SJ Force due to Variation in Mesh Size/Seed in the: (a) ETB Thickness Direction; and (b) ETB In-Plane Direction	58	Figure E3-12	Comparison of the Force vs. Displacement Response from the Model and Experiment for a 62mil Thick Bare FR4 Board	66
Figure E2-7a	The Three Types of SJ Mesh Sizes/Seeds: (a) Coarse Mesh; (b) Medium Mesh; and (c) Fine Mesh	59	Figure E3-13	Comparison of the TB Model vs. Experimental Results for the Strains on the Primary Board Side for a 62mil Thick Bare FR4 Board	67
Figure E2-7b	The Three Types of SJ Mesh Sizes/Seeds: (a) Coarse Mesh; (b) Medium Mesh; and (c) Fine Mesh	59	Figure E3-14	BGA TV with the Board Strain Gauges Attached	67
Figure E2-7c	The Three Types of SJ Mesh Sizes/Seeds: (a) Coarse Mesh; (b) Medium Mesh; and (c) Fine Mesh	59	Figure E3-15	Comparison of the Force vs. Displacement Response from the Model and Experiment for BGA TV on a 40mil Thick ETB	68
Figure E2-8a	Package Mesh Size/Seed Effect on Board Strains and SJ Force Due to Change in Mesh Size/Seed in the: (a) Package Thickness Direction; and (b) Critical SJs	59	Figure E3-16a	Package Corner-to-Corner (SW, NW, NE and SE) Board Strain Comparison Between the Computational Model and Test Results: (a) e_2 Strain Component; and (b) e_4 Strain Component	69
Figure E2-8b	Package Mesh Size/Seed Effect on Board Strains and SJ Force Due to Change in Mesh Size/Seed in the: (a) Package Thickness Direction; and (b) Critical SJs	59	Figure E3-16b	Package Corner-to-Corner (SW, NW, NE and SE) Board Strain Comparison Between the Computational Model and Test Results: (a) e_2 Strain Component; and (b) e_4 Strain Component	69
Figure E2-9	Effect of Friction Coefficient on the Board Strains and SJ Forces	60	Figure E4-1	Board Level Test to Fail Data	70
Figure E3-1	A Typical TB Test Setup (Transient Bend Application of Quasi-Static DIC BKM, 2010) used for the Model Validation Process	61			
Figure E3-2a	Examples of (a) Schematic of the TB Test Set-up with STB (Shock Test Board); and (b) Position of the Strain-Gauges on the Primary Side of the Board	61			
Figure E3-2b	Examples of (a) Schematic of the TB Test Set-up with STB (Shock Test Board); and (b) Position of the Strain-Gauges on the Primary Side of the Board	61			
Figure E3-3	An Example of the Board-Strain Components (e_2 , e_4) at Three of the Strain Gauges from the TB Testing of Bare-Aluminum Boards ...	62			

Figure E4-2 Model Calibration Board Level Test Data for 40mil Thick Board 70

Figure E5-1 Model Prediction Results for TV (pitch=0.4mm and board thickness=28mil) 71

Figure E9-1 SJ Loading Angle 77

Tables

Table 4-1 Sample Final FEA Report Questionnaire 5

Table 5-1 Example of Physics, Loads and Degrees of Freedom 7

Table 11-1 Examples of Warpage and Fatigue Life Results Comparison Data 15

Table A1-1 Typical Material Properties of Silicon 18

Table A1-2 Typical CTE Properties of Silicon 19

Table A3-1 Recommended TMA Parameters 23

Table A3-2 Recommended DMA Parameters 24

Table C1-1 Test Package Detail Information 38

Table C1-2 Experimental Thermal Cycling Data 39

Table C1-3 Material Properties 39

Table C1-4 3D Model Types and Tradeoffs 40

Table C1-5 Modeling Constants for Three Different Methodologies 43

Table C1-6 Strip Model Results and Comparison with Experimental Data 44

Table C1-7 Octant Model 1 Results and Comparison with Experimental Data 45

Table C1-8 Octant Model 2 Results and Comparison with Experimental Data 45

Table C1-9 Effect of “crplm” Command 47

Table D1-1 Example of Warpage Results Comparison Data Across Different Reference Planes 51

Table E1-1 Parameters Defining Scope of Modeling Approach Applicability 53

Table E2-1 Summary of the Finite-Element Mesh in the TB Model 54

Table E2-2 Summary of the Contact Interactions in the TB Model 56

Table E2-3 Summary of the TB Analysis Model Outputs 56

Table E2-4 Typical TB Analysis Model Run Times 56

Table E2-5 Details of the ETB Mesh Size/Seed Study 58

Table E2-6 Details of the Substrate Mesh Size/Seed Study 59

Table E3-1 Summary of the TB Testing Used for Model Validation Purpose 60

Table E5-1 Summary of Temperature Bend Test Data for TV Used for Validation 70

Table E5-2 Comparison Between Model and Experiment 71

Table E5-3 General Reasons for Difference Between Model and Test Data 71

Numerical Analysis Guidelines for Microelectronics Packaging Design and Reliability

1 SCOPE

1.1 Introduction This document is an effort to standardize and document some of the basic tenets of a typical Finite Element Analysis (FEA) model. The intent of this document is to help educate new designers (and in some cases even experienced designers) on the basic information and best practices that should be captured and provided to technical reviewers of the results of FEA data.

FEA has been used in the microelectronics industry for several decades. Numerical models offer several advantages in the design of microelectronics devices. If used correctly, they can provide guidance on:

1. Potential tradeoffs to be made in achieving the optimal design of microelectronic devices.
2. Performance and reliability of microelectronics devices will be evaluated by including the impact of multiple design, material, geometry, and process parameters.

With the exponential reduction in the cost of computing, numerical models can save significant time and expense because they can be used to reduce the number of iterations of experimental tests that may be needed to finalize and optimize a design. With ever increasing cost pressure, shrinking design margins and faster time to market, there is a need to rely more on numerical models rather than running multiple time consuming and expensive experiments.

However, to achieve all these benefits, numerical models must be used correctly. This involves setting up the problem correctly, obtaining the input parameters accurately, running the analysis properly and outputting and interpreting the results correctly.

There is considerable “tribal” knowledge across the industry where individual designers have their own best practices on how they run their models. However, there is a wide spectrum of knowledge proficiency. At one end, there are engineers who design and develop their own models, refined over decades of experience. At the other end of the spectrum, there are engineers who have very little experience, and use ad-hoc information to develop models that are incomplete and could result in even more expense and time-consuming losses if implemented incorrectly.

Across the industry, there is a need to standardize the basic information, terminology and methodologies used to develop these numerical models. While individual models can be quite complex and customized, some best practices could help make model comparison across different players in the microelectronics supply chain much easier and scalable. The basic structure of this document is outlined in the schematic in Figure 1-1.

1.2 Purpose FEA is versatile and is used to solve several complex problems in microelectronics. It is impossible to standardize all applications and flavors in which FEA is performed. This document is not intended to create device release requirements or to imply that simulation or design information is to be provided to customers as evidence for or as a condition of device suitability for any given application. It is expected that this document will be the first of a series of numerical analysis guideline documents. This will serve as a foundational document for other domain specific guidelines that delve deeper into best practices and guidelines for specific applications of FEA. The expected modular structure of the numerical analysis reliability guidelines documents is shown in Figure 1-2.

The objective of this document is to provide some guidelines for the basic information that should be provided when FEA is performed in most cases. Examples are provided for some select cases (illustrated as pattern filled topics in Figure 1-2) to help users understand why certain information should be captured and reported. In addition, some examples of best practices are provided, to help guide users on best practices that could be implemented to avoid loss of information or accuracy. The examples provided in this document are not meant to be exhaustive or all encompassing. They are meant to highlight examples of key aspects that need to be taken into account when an FEA analysis is set up and the results reported.

Several commercial FEA software are widely used across the industry. Due to the nature of the analysis, some recommendations may be specific to certain software and may be articulated in the context of a specific FEA software code. However, these recommendations are not exhaustive and do not imply endorsement of any one software over another.