EUV MET Printing and Actinic Imaging Analysis of The Effects of Phase Defects on Wafer CDs

Hakseung Han, Stefan Wurm SEMATECH Kenneth A. Goldberg, Eric M. Gullikson, Anton Barty* LBNL, LLNL* Yoshiaki Ikuta, Toshiyuki Uno AGC Obert R. Wood II AMD

Accelerating the next technology revolution.

Advanced Materials Research Center, AMRC, International SEMATECH Manufacturing Initiative, and ISMI are servicemarks of SEMATECH, Inc. SEMATECH, the SEMATECH logo, Advanced Technology Development Facility, ATDF, and the ATDF logo are registered servicemarks of SEMATECH, Inc. All other servicemarks and trademarks are the property of their respective owners.

Outline

- Program defect mask fabrication and structure
- MET exposure condition
- Analysis of substrate pit defect printability
 - Focus & dose effect
 - Comparison with simulation
 - Programmed pit image from actinic imaging tool

2



Printability Study Required for EUVL

- Mask blank defect spec is a critical issue.
- When to introduce 3rd generation blank inspection tool.
- What size defect can be tolerated?
- SEMATECH has the necessary equipments for this study.
 - EUV printing using the EUV microexposure tool (MET)
 - Programmed defect mask fabrication and characterization using IBD, inspection, FIB and AFM at the MBDC
 - EUV imaging and scanning inspection using SEMATECH-Berkeley actinic inspection tool

3



Mask Fabrication and Structure

- Using Facilities at SEMATECH North MBDC
- FIB milled substrate pits \rightarrow ML deposition \rightarrow FIB milled line
- 9 pit sizes : Depth(a): 2,4,6 nm Width(b): 50, 100, 150 nm





Mask Fabrication and Structure

- Substrate pits in proximity to isolated line for CD change study
 - Lateral pit-to-line spacing varies in 50 nm steps
 - 225 nm isolated line 45 nm for 5X exposure



6





7

Substrate Pit Size Change After ML Deposition

- Pit size before/after deposition AFM scanned images
- Deposition by MBDC IBD tool: Wider FWHM and lower depth after depo. But the change is less than 20%.



From synchrotron Scanner module Reticle stage - SEMATECH Berkeley MET - 5X demagnification, 0.3NA MET - Rotated Dipole, R&H resist Wafer stage and - Dose focus split 19 x 11 height sensor • Dose 10.6 / 5% • Focus 4675 / 50 nm Pupil-fill monitor

Accelerating the next technology revolution.

Exposure

•

08/11/2006

Printability of Substrate Pits

Another line With same size pits

- Substrate pits 150 nm wide and 6 nm deep were clearly printed •
- 6 pits printed on one side \rightarrow Pits 200 nm from the line are printable •
- All 150 nm wide pits were printed down to 2 nm deep ٠





Printability of Substrate Pits

- Substrate pits 100 nm wide and 6 nm deep
- Only 3 pits were printed. This means pits up to about 80 nm from the line are printable.







Printability of Substrate Pits

- Substrate pits 100 nm wide and 2 nm deep
- Not printable but printability depends on focus and dose



Focus & Dose effect



Accelerating the next technology revolution.

Through Focus

Defocus makes pits a little more printable •



150 nm W 6 nm D

Through Dose

• Low dose makes pits more printable

150 nm W 6 nm D

-30%



-50%





SEMATEC

Printability According to Dose and Focus

- Defocus images (-100nm)
- 100 nm x 2 nm pits look printable only at -5% dose



Accelerating the next technology revolution.

Printability According to Dose and Focus

- At just focus, some pits are not printable
- Only 2 pits are printable, pits 40nm from the line are printable.
- Printability depend more on depth than width





Defect Printability – Simulation

- Aerial image simulation as a function of defect FWHM, height and focus
- Clearly showing printability change according to focus



Comparison of Simulation and Real Test

- Comparison at 100 nm defocus
- Well matched at large defect sizes, 1-2 nm difference at smaller defects
- Bake diffusion, develop process OR exposure condition difference btw simulation and test



Comparison of Simulation and Real Test

- Comparison at 100 nm defocus
- Well matched at large defect sizes, 1-2 nm difference at smaller defects
- Bake diffusion, develop process OR exposure condition difference btw simulation and test



Comparison with EUV Imaging

- **EUV image from SEMATECH-Berkeley actinic tool** ٠
- **Clearly shows substrate pits** •
- Upgrading to get reliable CD measurement •



(synchrotron source)

Summary

- Printability study using SEMATECH EUV infrastructure
- Below 100nm x 6nm pit size, printable pit-to-line edge spacing is only 40nm
- 50 nm wide substrate pits up to 4 nm deep were not printable
- More optimistic than aerial image simulation
- Planning comparison study of printing image and EUV image with New program defect mask and upgraded actinic inspection tool.
- Ultimately determining exact 32 nm HP printable blank defect size and spec.



Acknowledgement

- SEMATECH MBDC deposition, integration and cleaning team.
- Berkeley EUV MET team.



This work was performed under the auspices of the U. S. Department of Energy by University of California, Lawrence Livermore national Laboratory under Contract W-7405-Eng-48.

