



IPC-WP-019

2017 - August

An Overview on Global Change in Ionic Cleanliness Requirements

A White Paper Report Developed by IPC

Association Connecting Electronics Industries



Copyright Association Connecting Electronics Industries
Provided by IHS Markit under license with IPC
No reproduction or networking permitted without license from IHS

Licensee=Hong Kong Polytechnic University/9976803100, User=TSANG, Tsz Ching
Not for Resale, 05/17/2018 03:28:03 MDT

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

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 847/597-2872.

Thank you for your continued support.

©Copyright 2017. IPC, Bannockburn, IL, USA. All rights reserved under both international and Pan-American copyright conventions. Any copying, scanning or other reproduction of these materials without the prior written consent of the copyright holder is strictly prohibited and constitutes infringement under the Copyright Law of the United States.



IPC-WP-019

An Overview on Global Change in Ionic Cleanliness Requirements

Developed by the J-STD-001 ROSE Working Group 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

Copyright Association Connecting Electronics Industries

An Overview on Global Change in Ionic Cleanliness Requirements

Author: Douglas Pauls, Rockwell Collins
On behalf of the J-STD-001 ROSE Working Group

Overview

For many years, military (e.g., MIL-STD-2000) and commercial (e.g., IPC-J-STD-001) manufacturing standards have required manufactured circuit card assemblies (CCAs) to meet an ionic cleanliness requirement of 1.56 microgram (μg) of sodium chloride (NaCl) equivalence per square centimeter (cm^2) of extracted surface, using Resistivity of Solvent Extract (ROSE) testing per IPC-TM-650, Method 2.3.25.

It is the position of the IPC committees that the value of 1.56 μg NaCl equivalence per square centimeter should be considered as **obsolete** for the following reasons:

- This test methodology was originally developed in the 1970s; it was never intended to be used as a cleanliness test, nor as a test for product acceptability, it was only intended to be used as a process control method
- The use of the ionic contamination value as a measure of product acceptance was the result of a US Department of Defense desire to implement a pass/fail criteria.
- This ionic contamination value, and those derived from them, were originally developed for high solids (35% solids) rosin fluxes and ozone depleting chemical (ODC) cleaning. The flux chemistries and cleaning solutions used today are completely different from those used when the ROSE limits were established.
- Modern assemblies are simply too complex in terms of residues to have a single “one size fits all” cleanliness criterion.
- There is mounting evidence that as CCA component density increases, so does the sensitivity of the circuit to ionic contamination. Modern circuit assemblies have far greater component densities than found in the 1970s. This also means that residues that had minimal impact on 1970s component technologies can now have a significant impact on component reliability.
- For many assemblies, ROSE testing is no longer sufficient test regimen to adequately predict acceptable levels of ionic residues. IPC has compiled a list of technical presentations showing the inadequacy of ROSE to predict ionic residues for high performance electronics (see last page of the document).
- It is recognized that ionic residue testing is critical for reliable circuit function and so the ROSE test has continued in use until a more suitable alternative can be identified and implemented.

IPC Technical Report 583 (IPC-TR-583, 1995) documents an extensive review of the ionic contamination testers on the market at that time. In general, it was found that the automated ROSE testers suffered from a lack of repeatability and reproducibility, even within the same make and model of tester. One of the conclusions was that the established “equivalency factors,” allowing comparison of values generated by different ionic cleanliness testers, were also invalid. The Executive Summary of IPC-TR-583 is included with this document as Appendix A. The full technical report is available from the IPC.

It should be noted that the TR-583 conclusions refer to the ionic testers of that era (1990s). Many of the more modern configurations of the ionic testers have been shown to be repeatable and reproducible. See Reference [36] as an example of testing modern instruments for repeatability and reproducibility. However, many of the instruments from that era are still in service today, so the TR-583 conclusions are still pertinent for older equipment.

Many of the other references in the Bibliography section can assist the reader in understanding the history of the ROSE test, as well as some of the shortcomings of using ROSE as a measure of product acceptance.

Terminology

Over the years, the industry has developed various terms surrounding this test and the meaning of the established criteria. In many cases, the various terms used have led to a misunderstanding of the test and associated specification.

Ionic Cleanliness:

The greatest fallacy for the ROSE test is that it is often referred to as a “cleanliness test,” with the natural assumption that if you pass this test with a value of 1.56 or less, then the assembly is “clean” or “acceptable,” and if the test result was more than 1.56, then the assembly was “dirty” and “rejectable.” This is often not the case. Any extraction based test, such as ROSE, is based on variables of solvency, time and temperature.

- If a residue is not soluble in isopropanol and/or water, it cannot be detected with ROSE.
- If a residue is not soluble within the extraction time, it cannot be detected with ROSE.
- If a residue is not soluble at the extraction temperature, it cannot be detected by ROSE.
- If a residue does not impact the electrical conductivity of the extract solution, it cannot be detected by ROSE.

Consequently, passing the ROSE test using the 1.56 value, does not guarantee that an assembly is “clean” or “good” or “acceptable.”

Ionic Testing For No-Clean Processes

ROSE testing was developed and widely implemented during an era when almost everyone cleaned circuit assemblies. As such, a cleaning process has always been an assumed background to the use of ROSE as a measurement tool. As more of the industry transitioned to low-residue (e.g., no-clean) materials and processes, the question of how to apply ionic contamination testing to a no-clean assembly process has been raised repeatedly, but without a good answer.

In general, ROSE testing for the monitoring of a no-clean assembly process should not be used, for the following reasons:

- The isopropanol will leach out materials (e.g., resin) out of the flux residues, yielding high NaCl-equivalent readings, but which do not have an effect in a given humid end-use environment. The “high” values observed are often viewed as indicators of an unacceptably dirty board, and this is often not the case.
- No-clean flux residues often turn white after exposure to the isopropanol/water mixture of the ROSE test, leading to an assembly which may be functionally acceptable, but cosmetically unacceptable. Consequently, ROSE is considered to be destructive test for no-clean assembly processes.
- No-clean assembly lines are often very high in manufacturing volume. If typical ROSE sample rates of once per shift were applied, it would create unacceptably high non-value-added testing, with an associated high scrap rate of product.

J-STD-001 Requirements

After publication of J-STD-001, Revision F, July 2014, the leadership of the J-STD-001 committee formed a working group of subject matter experts (SMEs) (shown below) to determine what the “next-generation” ionic contamination requirements “should” be for future revisions of the standard. The following individuals were involved in this effort:

Name	Company	Category
Doug Pauls, Chair	Rockwell Collins	Aerospace OEM
Dan Foster (J1 Chair)	Missile Defense Agency	Class 3 user
Kathy Johnston (J1 Chair)	Raytheon	Aerospace OEM
David Lober	Kyzen Corporation	Cleaning Chemical Supplier
Eric Camden	Foresite	Test Lab / Ionic SME
Erik Bjerke, Joe Kane	BAE Systems	Aerospace OEM
Graham Naisbitt, Mark Routley, Dr. Chris Hunt	Gen3 Systems Ltd.	Cleanliness Tester Mfr, IEC leader
James Saunders	Raytheon	Aerospace OEM
Jason Keeping	Celestica	Class 2/3 EMS
Rick Kraszewski, Josh Huetner	Plexus	Class 2/3 EMS
Dr. Udo Welzel, Dr. Lothar Henneken	Robert Bosch GmbH	Automotive OEM
Michael Sosnowski	Dell Computers	Consumer Electronics OEM
Joe Rousseau	Precision Analytical Labs	Test Lab / Ionic SME
Dr. Karen Tellefsen, Jason Fullerton	Alpha Metals	Flux Supplier
Teresa Rowe, Linda Stepanich	IPC	IPC Staff Liaison

These individuals and companies were chosen to give a good cross-section of manufacturing materials and process experience, and those with experience determining the impact of residues on the functional performance of electronic hardware in the end use environment.

A word on “Objective Evidence”: This term is used often in J-STD-001, but many do not understand what the term means. Consequently, Appendix C of J-STD-001F was written by IPC leaders to give guidance on this important topic. A general concept in J-STD-001, and similar IPC standards, that you must manufacture according to the standard. If you wish to manufacture differently than the standard, then you need to have documented evidence that the alternative methods produce acceptable product.

A Walk Through J-STD-001G Section 8

IPC has found it beneficial in the past to generate explanatory text surrounding a standard or specification, especially if it marks a dramatic change, to give the reader the context by which manufacturing requirements should be viewed. Throughout the following section, the proposed text for J-STD-001, Section 8, is shown in indented *red italics*.

General Things to Keep In Mind

- IPC classifies requirements according to the Class 1/2/3 nomenclatures. In the experience of the working team, class 1 products seldom, if ever, have ionic contamination requirements or require J-STD-001 compliance, so Class 1 requirements are generally listed as N1 through the following sections.

8.1 Qualified Manufacturing Process *Unless otherwise specified by the User, the Manufacturer shall [N1D2D3] qualify soldering and/or cleaning processes that result in acceptable levels of flux and other residues. Objective evidence shall [N1D2D3] be available for review. See J-STD-001 Appendix C for examples of objective evidence.*

The use of the historical 1.56 µg/NaCl equivalence/ cm² value for ROSE, with no other supporting objective evidence, is not considered an acceptable basis for qualifying a manufacturing process (see IPC-WP-019).

The core concept for materials compatibility and residue acceptability is that of the qualified manufacturing process (QMP). In a QMP, a manufacturing materials and processes used to product electronic hardware have been benchmarked and validated against electrical performance in hot/humid conditions in some manner. The art of characterizing what chemical residues exist on a manufactured assembly, and how to assess the impact of those residues on electrical performance, is neither a trivial nor easy exercise. Residues that may have no impact on one assembly may have significant impacts on other assemblies. That is why it is difficult, if not impossible to direct a user to a single test or a single requirement for acceptability from a residue/cleanliness standpoint. This paper, IPC-WP-019, was written as an overall guide to assist the reader in this area.

The second paragraph directs the user on how to view historical ROSE data for product. There have been many published accounts or case studies where reliance on the 1.56 value as a measure of “acceptable” cleanliness resulted in products failing in the field. That class of failure, and the increasing frequencies of such failures, initiated this improvement of the residue requirements. On the other hand, there are many manufacturers who have used the historical 1.56 value and have acceptable field performance, or who have done their own studies to determine what ROSE values should be used. The latter class of manufacturer should not have the burden of additional testing levied upon them. Therefore, the task group desired to keep a “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it” option. Note that the second paragraph does not have a SHALL requirement associated with it. It is a cautionary statement that ROSE data *alone*, without other supporting data, is not viewed as acceptable. If ROSE data is all a manufacturer has, then that manufacturer really does not have a good idea of the residue condition of the assembly is.

The following three scenarios should help illustrate how this requirement should be viewed.

1. Company A, is a small contract manufacturer which has been manufacturing a product with the same manufacturing materials and processes for their customers for 10 years, always meeting the required 1.56 metric. None of their customers have reported any problems of an electrochemical nature on products. In this case, the manufacturer can point to the history of the product as acceptable objective evidence and no additional testing is required or warranted.
2. Company B, is a medium contract manufacturer which is generating a new product line with new materials and processes. Judging the acceptability of the newly manufactured product using nothing more than ROSE data (we meet the 1.56 value, we must be good), would not be considered as acceptable objective evidence. There are too many unknowns from a chemical perspective. However, if the new product was based on an existing manufacturing line with existing materials, which had accepted objective evidence, then the ROSE testing would be supported by that other objective evidence.
3. Company C, a large defense contractor has new products that go through a battery of qualification testing, incorporating function in anticipated end use environments at elevated levels of temperature and humidity. ROSE data on the new