

EIA ENGINEERING BULLETIN

Comments on Test Methods & Criteria for Tin Whiskers in Surface Mount Passive Devices

A Statement issued by members of EIA/ECA Steering Committee S-1

EIA/ECA-CB22

November 2005



Electronic Components, Assemblies & Materials Association

**ELECTRONIC COMPONENTS, ASSEMBLIES & MATERIALS
ASSOCIATION**

THE ELECTRONIC COMPONENTS SECTOR OF THE ELECTRONIC INDUSTRIES ALLIANCE

NOTICE

EIA Engineering 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 EIA from manufacturing or selling products not conforming to such Standards and Publications, nor shall the existence of such Standards and Publications preclude their voluntary use by those other than EIA members, whether the standard is to be used either domestically or internationally.

Standards and Publications are adopted by EIA in accordance with the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) patent policy. By such action, EIA does not assume any liability to any patent owner, nor does it assume any obligation whatever to parties adopting the Standard or Publication.

Technical Bulletins are distinguished from EIA Standards or Interim Standards, in that they contain a compilation of engineering data or information useful to the technical community and represent approaches to good engineering practices that are suggested by the formulating committee.

This Bulletin is not intended to preclude or discourage other approaches that similarly represent good engineering practice, or that may be acceptable to, or have been accepted by, appropriate bodies. Parties who wish to bring other approaches to the attention of the formulating committee to be considered for inclusion in future revisions of this Bulletin are encouraged to do so. It is the intention of the formulating committee to revise and update this Bulletin from time to time as may be occasioned by changes in technology, industry practice, or government regulations, or for other appropriate reasons.

(From Project Number 5118, formulated under the cognizance of the ECA S-1 Steering Committee.)

Published by

©ELECTRONIC INDUSTRIES ALLIANCE 2005
Technology Strategy & Standards Department
2500 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22201

**PRICE: Please refer to the current
Catalog of EIA Electronic Industries Alliance Standards and Engineering Publications
or call Global Engineering Documents, USA and Canada (1-800-854-7179)
International (303-397-7956)**

All rights reserved
Printed in U.S.A.

PLEASE!

DON'T VIOLATE
THE
LAW!

This document is copyrighted by the EIA and may not be reproduced without permission.

Organizations may obtain permission to reproduce a limited number of copies through entering into a license agreement. For information, contact:

Global Engineering Documents
15 Inverness Way East
Englewood, CO 80112-5704 or call
U.S.A. and Canada 1-800-854-7179, International (303) 397-7956

Comments on Test Methods & Criteria for Tin Whiskers in Surface Mount Passive Devices

A Statement Issued by members of ECA/EIA Passive Components Group

The ECA passives component group had issued a white paper on tin whiskers last year (an updated version is available on the web site). It introduced facts which showed that the problem of tin whiskers was limited to some very specific applications (there have been anecdotal reports of weapon and satellite systems failing because of tin whiskers, but no scientific data exists in public domain to support that claim) and to the best of our knowledge, as of today the entire commercial electronics industry has never reported a failure due to tin whiskers. Nevertheless, to allay the fears of the electronic industry, JEDEC and iNEMI have come up with a set of test conditions for all components, surface mounted or leaded (including lead frames).

When one considers that the actual physics of whisker growth is not yet clear and mitigation techniques still debatable (more of an art than science), the test guidelines put forth by JEDEC and iNEMI are a good start. However, some of the tests and the judgment criteria need to be reviewed in light of the nature of majority of applications, industrial trends and the properties of whiskers itself. More importantly, the test conditions and judgment criteria being proposed are different for North America and other global electronic alliances, like JEITA (Japan) or IEC (Europe). This is bound to cause confusion in the industry, especially when one considers the integrated nature of the global economy and electronics manufacturing. However, the scope of this paper will be limited to North America. Also, we propose criteria, which we believe to be more practical without sacrificing reliability of components or the end product. We are attempting to highlight and understand the risks involved before making a judgment (or over react).

At this point it is important to note that it is possible to grow whiskers on surface finishes which include lead (a few publications have provided evidence), and although the risks of whisker growth may be higher in pure tin finishes, it is not a new phenomenon. For a good synopsis on possible causes of tin whiskers please refer to the summary presented by Galyon, Smetna and Vo ("Cause of Tin Whiskers Remain Elusive", available at <http://smt.pennnet.com/Articles>).

It is not the intent of this paper to delve into the details of test conditions or methods as proposed by each industry alliance, but we wish to point out that there are marked differences amongst the different groups. This is not to say that one or the other industry alliance group is being lax or strict, but it does show that the approach to risk management is different. However trivial the differences, this would be confusing and cumbersome to a global company with manufacturing sites all over the world. It is therefore recommended that the differences be ironed out and a unified set of test methods and criteria be adopted globally.

On the home front, let us review the industry/application classification of both JEDEC (JESD201) and iNEMI. Although both have different number classification (exactly opposite of each other), they agree that:

- For mission/life critical applications such as military, aerospace and medical, pure tin and high tin content alloys are not acceptable.
- For Business applications such as Telecom Infrastructure equipment, high-end servers, etc, the whisker length should be less than 45 or 40 um. HOWEVER, as both JEDEC and iNEMI mention, the key point to note here is that, ***the concern in such applications is breakage of whiskers*** (not short circuit of the actual component with whisker growth).
- For industrial and commercial products ***whisker breakage is not a major concern***, although JEDEC further breaks down ***commercial products as "no major concern with whiskers"***. However, the maximum whisker growth is limited to 67 um or 50 um (for RF applications above 6 GHz).

The following argument must be viewed in light of the above. ***It seems that for high reliability applications the major concern is not just the shorting of components with whiskers, but shorting or other problems caused by whiskers falling off.*** Therefore, ***before settling down on whisker length by application, a clear relationship between whisker length and breakage strength (mode and mechanism) needs to be established.*** In our opinion, the debate should focus on not just the growth of whiskers, but their robustness too.

Robustness

We propose that after further studies are conducted, at some point in the near future, the robustness of whiskers should be linked to the criticality of the application (the robustness itself could be linked to size). Some of our

member companies have performed various shock, vibration and other tests of varying severity (as high as required by space launching agencies) on parts with grown whiskers, ***and have found no evidence of whiskers breaking***. If at all, ***such tests should be standardized and used, as criteria to define whether the parts may be used in critical applications are not***. If we just go by the current size guidelines, one may end up having a misconception that whiskers less than 40 or 45 μm would not break off and on the contrary whiskers of length 67 μm are more prone to breakage. At this stage it is more important to know whether the whiskers that have grown would break off or not. Each manufacturer could provide such data. Thus before we settle down on specifications, in the interim we propose the following size based criteria.

Size

We propose that whisker length be linked to case size, instead of application (for now it may be OK to exclude space and specialized military applications). For example, in case of SMD MLCCs, the 0402 package size (the pre-dominant case size along with 0603) has a minimum gap requirement between terminations of 300 μm . This means that whisker on one end must exceed 150 μm (in a straight line) for the part to short. Therefore allowing for enough and reasonable safety margin, we propose the following:

- Case size 0402 and larger, maximum allowable whisker length = 100 μm
- Case size 0201, maximum allowable whisker length = 67 μm
- Case size 01005, maximum allowable whisker length = 40 μm

Of course, deviations to these specifications should be allowed when there is problem with spacing of adjacent parts (although the above specifications should cover almost all cases very well).

Then there are other issues like the significance of 4000 hr storage tests. It is true that whisker growth on shelf is unacceptable, but we need more studies on what happens to these whiskers during soldering. On the other hand, if a part's been soldered (thereby annealing tin), the risk of whisker growth is significantly mitigated (in non soldered areas) and the test may not be representative.

In no way is it our intention to downplay the whisker problem and its elimination or mitigation should be the ultimate goal of the industry. Also, in no way does it downplay the importance of a few manufacturers who have chosen to continue supplying tin-lead finish for special applications. The intent of this paper is to present all the facts (or lack of those) and provide a forum for an objective dialogue, which will allow the vast majority of the industry to go ahead and make well informed judgment. In the end this will benefit the consumers.

We would strongly recommend our readers to review our earlier bulletins (CB19) where we have listed guidelines on how to avoid whisker problems. Once again, for all the excitement it has created, for almost all commercial applications, tin whiskers is not a problem that will affect you and your products. It is more important at this point to eliminate harmful products like lead from the environment.

EIA Document Improvement Proposal

If in the review or use of this document, a potential change is made evident for safety, health or technical reasons, please fill in the appropriate information below and mail or FAX to:

Electronic Industries Alliance
Technology Strategy & Standards Department – Publications Office
2500 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22201
FAX: (703) 907-7501

Document No.	Document Title:
Submitter's Name:	Telephone No.: FAX No.: e-mail:
Address:	
Urgency of Change: Immediate: ☐ At next revision: ☐	
Problem Area: a. Clause Number and/or Drawing: b. Recommended Changes: c. Reason/Rationale for Recommendation:	
Additional Remarks:	
Signature:	Date:
FOR EIA USE ONLY Responsible Committee: Chairman: Date comments forwarded to Committee Chairman:	

