# SIGNIFICANCE OF INCLUDING **SUBSTRATE CAPACITANCE** IN THE FULL CHIP **CIRCUIT** MODEL OF ICs UNDER CDM **STRESS**

 $a^*$  M.S.B.Sowariraj,  $b^*$  Peter C. de Jong,  $a^*$  Cora Salm,  $b^*$ Theo Smedes,  $a^*$  A.J. Ton Mouthaan and  $a^*$  Fred G Kuper **<sup>a</sup>**MESA' Research Institute. University of Twente, **P.0.Box** 217,7500 **AE,** Enschede, The Netherlands. <sup>h</sup> Philips Semiconductors, Gerstweg 2, 6534 AE Nijmegen, The Netherlands, **003 1-53-489** 2729; fax: 003 1-53- 489 1034; e-mail: m.s.b.sowariraj dutwente.nl

In CDM type **of** ESD, the IC is both the source and part of discharge current path. To study the CDM performance of an IC, a full-chip circuit model that includes the various static charge sources and its discharge path through the circuit as it occurs in reality is needed. Static charge sources in **a** CDM event are rhe various package capacitors. The CDM circuit models presented before only include the capacitors formed by the IC circuit design on the package and not that of die attachment plate on which the die is placed. This paper emphasizes the need to include this capacitance and presents a simple method of including this capacitor and its discharge path through the circuit during CDM stress. *[Kejwords: CDM* ]

#### INTRODUCTION

Most of the CDM simulation works has focused on modeling the behavior of individual protection devices [ **11.** But CDM performance of an IC does not only depend on the performance of the protection devices but on its entire circuit design layout and its package parasitics **as** well **12.31. A** charged IC under CDM stress is equivalent to several pre-charged capacitors formed by the various conducting layers in the IC with the package. The influence of these capacitors on the CDM performance of an IC, depends on the amount of charge stored in it and its discharge path through the circuit **[4].** The CDM circuit models presented before, includes only those capacitors formed by the IC circuit design, namely bus lines, metal interconnects, junction capacitors and so on. The voltage overshoot across the gate-oxides always referred to the voltage drop between the gate node and source node of a **MOSt.** The capacitance formed **by** the die attachment plate (or die) with the package, the substrate capacitance is not included. This capacitor **is** generally much larger than any of the capacitors formed by the circuit design and hence can be considered as the major source *of* static charge during CDM stress *[5].* Moreover all circuit elements in a given circuit design are either directly or indirectly connected to the substrate. The general picture is that tribo-electric charge on the package surface mirrors as charge on the die (+attach). For simplicity this charge can be considered present on the back side of the die. During discharge via one pin, this charge finds its way through the substrate and all possible connections of the substrate (substrate contacts -guard rings- to V<sub>SS</sub>, via parasitic n-well junction diodes to  $V_{DD}$ ) ultimately via a protection device to the discharging pin. During this process of discharge, gate-oxide failure can result when the voltage transients across the gate-substrate nodes of a MOSt increases beyond its breakdown threshold. But if a dense mesh *of* substrate contacts or guard rings is present, properly connected to low-Ohmic ground and/or power line system, core circuits can be properly protected. So for a complete study of the CDM performance of a given IC, the voltage transients across both the gate-source and gate-substrate have to be taken into account. This paper is organized as follows: In the first section, an equivalent circuit model for an IC, including its substrate capacitance and its discharge path during **a** Field lnduced CDM (FCDM) test method **is** presented. In the second section, the full chip model is applied to evaluate the CDM performance of an **IC**  with *U0* cells of two different designs in **0.18nun** technology node.

## **EQUIVALENT** CIRCUIT MODEL FOR **COMPLETE** IC

The most commonly used test method to study CDM robustness of an IC is FCDM. **An** equivalent circuit model for an IC under FCDM is shown in Figure **1.** The parasitic parameters **of** both the IC and the test set-up. are taken into account in this circuit model. The package capacitors C<sub>PIN</sub> and C<sub>SUB</sub>, are pre-charged to the initial stress level. CDM discharge is initiated by the sudden switching of V<sub>SWITCH</sub> from the stress level say  $V_{CDM}$  V to 0V. Notice that the discharge current from **Cpm** does not **flow** through the circuit and hence does not have much influence in the **CDM** performance of the IC. but can have a considerable contribution to the total CDM current measured. The discharge path of the substrate capacitance consists of the silicon substrate and the circuit elements which are directly or indirectly connected to it. To model the discharge current path the substrate is subdivided into smaller unit volumes. Each unit volume is modeled into **a 3-D** resistive network as shown in Figure 2. One end of this resistive network in the Z direction is connected to  $C_{SUB}$  and the other end to the circuit elements in that volume. Any circuit in general consists of protection devices, bus lines and internal core circuitry.



## **Figure 1. IC chip under FCDM test condition along with its equivalent circuit model (C's carry an initial stress V).**

The **CDM** behavior of the protection devices are modeled by its compact circuit model **[l].** The parasitic bus line resistances of the supply lines are also taken into account. The circuit elements have either direct or indirect contact'to the substrate. [Figure 3](#page-1-0) shows the parasitic contacts which a single inverter inside a guard ring makes with the substrate. This circuit representation holds good under the assumption that the IC is not powered up during **CDM** discharge.



**Figure 2. Equivalent** *ID* **resistive network of substrate** 

<span id="page-1-0"></span>

**Figure 3. Equivalent circuit model of an inverter inside a guard ring and its parasitic contacts with the substrate.** 

## **SlMUtATION** AND EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

*1C* test structures with **a** ring of input and output cells were made in 0.18mm technology node with two different protection designs. We will refer to them as design I and design **2.** Basic schematic sketch of the input cell is shown in Figure 4. Each *U0* pin is clamped to the supply lines via large protection devices, PD as shown in figure 4. The internal circuitry consists of two input inverters placed inside a guard ring region. IC with design 2 is identical to design 1 in all aspects such as package type, die size, pin counts and protection devices at the *VO* pads. but has additional clamping devices PD **5**  and PD 6 placed closer to the inverter as shown inside the dotted lines in the schematic sketch. The sources of both nMOSt and pMOSt have only a parasitic diode contact to the substrate. Hence even if the gate-source voltage is well guarded below its breakdown threshold. the gate-substrate voltage can be higher than its gatesource voltage, depending on the voltage drop across the substrate resistance which in turn depends on the distance of the MOSt from its closest source-substrate contact. CDM measurements on the ICs showed that all the *U0* cells with design **1** failed at **-4DOV** stress level, while those of design 2 did not fail even at **-1OOOV CDM**  stress. Failure Analysis on the failed ICs showed gate-oxide failure at the first input inverter and that it was most often at the nMOSt.

The full chip circuit model as explained above was applied to study the CDM performance of the two ICs. In Figure *5.* the potential at the substrate nodes with respect to the **gate of** the first input inverter of the discharged **YO** pin, in the area directly below the inverter during **-300V** CDM stress at **450ps** is shown. From Figure 5, we see that the substrate potential under the nMOSt of the first input inverter is higher than that at the pMOSt. In Figure 6, the potential drop across **both** the gate-source and gate-substrate **nodes** of the nMOSt in the first input inverter in design 1 and design 2 is plotted. Note that the potential drop across the gate-substrate nodes is higher than the potential drop across the gate-source nodes of the nMOSt.



**Figure 4. Schematic sketch of input cell protection structure of design 1 and design 2.** 



**Figure 5. Potential drop distribution across the substrate in the region below the inverter at 450ps during -3OOV CDM stress** 

**Also** the gate-source and gate-substrate voltage transients across the nMOSt gate-oxide of design 1 are higher than that in design 2. Apart from avoiding the additional voltage drop along the bus line to be seen by the gate-source node, the added clamping device also brings the substrate potential closer to its source potential.



**Figure 6. Voltage transient across nMOSt gate-oxide during -3OOV CDM stress.** 

#### **CONCLUSIONS**

Among the various CDM current sources, the substrate capacitance is one of the significant current sources. Hence should not be neglected in the CDM circuit model used to evaluate the CDM performance of an IC. **A** suitable method **by** which one can model the substrate capacitance and its discharge path during CDM **stress** is presented. This model helps us not only to study the effect of bus line resistance but also the possihle gate-oxide damage resulting from gate-substrate voltage overshoot. The circuit model is applied to explain the observed CDM performance of two ICs with different input protection designs. Simulation shows that gate-oxide damage could originate from gate-substrate voltage overshoot as well. Thus for a complete CDM performance analysis of an IC, the substrate capacitance needs to be included.

# **REFERENCES**

- [I **1 M.P.J.Mergens** et al., Journal of Microelectronics Reliability, **Vol. 40,** pp. 99- 1 **15,2000**
- [2] J.Lee et at., IEEE Transactions on CAD of ICs and Systems, Vol. 22, No. I, January 2003, **pp** 66-81.
- **[3]**  M.Etherton et al., **EOS/ESD** Symposium Proceedings, **pp** 107-1 16,2004
- **141**  M.S.3.Sowariraj et al., Journal *of* Microelectronics Reliability, Vol. 43. pp. 1569-1575, 2003
- **[5]**  L.R.Avery, EOS/ESD Symposium Proceedings, pp 88-92, 1987