

Thin Foil Printing in Today's Miniaturized World: Do Printing Rules Change?

Chrys Shea Shea Engineering Services East Greenwich, RI, USA chrys@sheaengineering.com

Greg SmithRay WelchBlueRing StencilsKoh Young AmericaLumberton, NJ, USADuluth, Georgia, USAgsmith@blueringstencils.comray.welch@kohyoung.com



Agenda

- Introduction
- Experimental Design
- Results of Experiments
- Discussion
- Conclusions
- **Q** & A



Introduction: Area Ratio and Paste Transfer

AR = $\frac{Area \, of \, Circuit \, Side \, Opening}{Area \, of \, Aperture \, Walls}$





After the aperture is filled, the solder paste sets up and sticks to both the stencil walls and the pads.



Depending on area ratio, **a portion of the paste will transfer to the PCB, while some will remain in the aperture.** Some paste may also stick to the bottom of the stencil due to stringing, bad gasketing or "pump out."

The smaller the AR, the lower the TE



Introduction: Area Ratio

Rectangles



Images courtesy of Indium Corporation



Introduction: Transfer Efficiency

Relates how much paste we want to print versus how much we actually printed.

 $\% TE = \frac{Volume of Paste Deposited}{Volume of Stencil Aperture} X 100$



- Minimum of 80% TE when possible
- Minimizing Variation is more important than maximizing transfer!



Introduction: Printing Technology Timeline





Experiment: Test Vehicle

SMTA Board, unpopulated side



Print-To-Fail Aperture Shapes

Edit Component ID : 5	MTA V2 PTF Bottom V2 2 mils.mdb[Job File Ver 2.0] [Non Pattern Job]
File Tools	
04 22	🖗 🔺 🕰 1 Pad Search Same Pads 💌 Select Unused Search 10 ALL Not Find Trend _Array
Pad	
ID :1452	
Comp ID P1F2_CIS	
M_3-15-15A_1	
(DEPADET_PART_14	
Panel 1	🚍 🕧
Type Polygon	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
X Pps :76.678	
Y Pos (61.318	
SizeX 0.381	
SizeY :0.381	
Area(%) :98.6207%	
Condition	
Volume :True	
E.W/E :150/160	
LW/E :70/ 60	😤 1
Offset False	0
X W.0.095(25%)	
X 5.0.1143(3076)	
Y E-0.1143/3055	
Bridge True	
30/700	000000000000000000000000000000000000000
Shape :True	
50/180/150	O i
Cop. : False	
Dual :False	
Head R. True	``````````````````````````````````````
50 8/25 4/101 8/12 7	
Head R False	
Ędt	G
Group	\sim 1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.
ADD	
The Let a later	[155] M. S. Market and M. S. Market and Market and M. S. Market and M. S. Market and M. S. Market and M. Market and M. Market and M. S. Mar
4 mi Squirde	(0)
a second s	
Import/Eigon Delete	
Component ID - Set -> 1	
CED Butweet Bal	Ψ
CHO Henesdy of the	
A Modify Edit	
Fed	
a strategie a la seconda de la	
« NOT Match Not Match »	
Cop. Part Pack.	
PTF1_CICU_R-03-0: A	
PTF1_CICU_R-03-02	
PTF1_CICU_R-03-02	
PTF1_CLC0_R-03-04	
PTF1 CICU R-03-04	
IPTEL CTCU P.03.04	



Experiment: PTF Pattern Layout

Print To Fail (PTF) Design



Alternates pad definition, shape, and print order

Experiment: Materials

<u>Solder Paste:</u> Indium 8.9 HF Type 5-MC 15-25µm particle diameter SAC305 alloy

Stencils			
Thickness	Coating	Uncoated	
2 mil (50 µm)	Х	Х	
3 mil (76 µm)	Х	Х	

Experiment: Equipment

<u>Set Up</u> *Knead:* 4-6 strokes *Setup prints:* 2-7 for paste alignment

<u>MPM Momentum BTB</u> Support Tooling: Quik-tool (3) Speed: 30 mm/sec Pressure: 7.0 kg Separation Speed: 5.0 mm/sec Separation Distance: 3.0 mm

<u>Under-Stencil Wipe</u> Speed: 30 mm/sec Sequence: wet/vac/vac or wet/vac/vac/dry Frequency: 1 (each print)

<u>Koh Young aSPler3</u> *Resolution:* 10 um *Height Threshold:* 20 μm

Data Review: Metrics

Coefficient of Variation - CV

- Calculate average and standard deviation
- Divide the standard deviation by the average
- Look at std dev as a % of the average:
 - <10%: desired</p>
 - > 10 15%: acceptable
 - > Over 15%: unacceptable

Presented at SMTA International 2021

Calcworkshop.com

Data Review: Excess Variation and Missing Pads

Print To Fail (PTF) Design

* Fabricator given waiver for features 5 mil or less to mitigate cost

Results: SPC Run Charts

Results: SPC Run Charts

Results: TE vs AR on 2 mil foil

Notice the divergence between copper defined and mask defined pads

- Mask defined show acceptable TEs
- Copper defined show excessive solder, presumably from less robust gasketing

Results: TE vs AR on 3 mil foil

Similar divergence between mask and metal defined pads

Mask defined pads offer far better process control

Results: Main Effects Plots

Factors in Variability #1: Stencil Coating #2: Pad Size #3: Pad Definition #4: Foil Thickness

<u>Non-Factors</u> Aperture Shape Pad Shape

Discussion: Stencil Coating and Pad Size

No surprises here...

- Benefits of stencil coating have been documented for over 10 years
- Challenges of smaller pad sizes have been documented for over 30 years

Discussion: The Differences in Pad Definition

PCB Pad Definition

Discussion: Features of PCB Pad Definition

Discussion: Rounding Sharp Corners

"Squircle" Aperture

Squares with Radiused Corners

The advantage of squares and squircles appear to wane as features shrink

Discussion: The effect of foil thickness on AR

- ARs increase dramatically as foils become thinner
- AR Formulas:
 - □ W/4t (square)
 - □ D/4t (circle)
- Differences in foil thickness have 4X the effect of aperture sizes on AR

Discussion: Three Ball Rule

Solder Mask Defined pads printed well with coated stencils all the way down to 2 mils!

The three-ball rule does not seem to apply

Discussion: Five Ball Rule

Mask Defined pads printed well with coated stencils all the way down to 5 mil features

If applied, the 5-ball rule would pertain only to mask defined pads and coated stencils

Conclusions: Reducing Variation

In leading edge electronic miniaturization, reducing variation is more important than high average paste transfer rates

Variation can be controlled by:

- Product Design: Mask Defined pads and their sizes had the largest influences on repeatability. PCB Features smaller than 8 mils should be mask defined.
- Product Manufacturing: Nanocoating the stencils was the most dominant main effect in reducing variation. Uncoated stencils could not produce CV values <10% for apertures 8 mils or smaller and were more difficult to autoclean in the printer. They also were far more sensitive to changes in foil thickness.

Conclusions: The Rules

Area Ratio of 0.6 or higher:

For the case of solder mask defined pads and coated stencils, an Area Ratio of 0.6 or higher should be applied. Both saw just under 80% Transfer Efficiency but met Coefficient of Variation targets of less than 10%.

Three Ball Rule:

For the case of solder mask defined pads and coated stencils, the Three Ball Rule predicts a minimum stencil thickness of 2.4 mils. The actual minimum was 2 mils, exceeding the expectation, even based on the average particle diameter.
Eive Ball Pule:

Five Ball Rule:

For the case of solder mask defined pads and coated stencils, the finest feature to print repeatably was 5 mils, agreeing with the theory that the smallest aperture should be at least as wide as 5 of the *largest* particles in the solder paste.

Notice the rules all apply in the context of SMD pads and coated stencils. The data shows poor process capability without these key features.

Thank You.....Questions?

SHEA ENGINEERING SERVICES

Chrys Shea Shea Engineering Services East Greenwich, RI, USA chrys@sheaengineering.com Greg Smith BlueRing Stencils Lumberton, NJ, USA gsmith@blueringstencils.com

Ray Welch Koh Young America Duluth, Georgia, USA ray.welch@kohyoung.com