Workmanship Risks: Reworking Printed Circuit Board (PCB) Solder Joints

Understanding and managing risks associated with underfilled through-hole solder joints
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cPCI Solder Joints Routinely Found Underfilled

- cPCI style connector becoming standard for NASA backplanes
- Hypertronics brand is required to provide non-fretting contacts and solder tails. Commercial version is a reliability concern: uses tuning fork pin/socket contacts and press-fit board-side contacts.
- Backplane boards are becoming thicker and have increasingly higher percentages of copper (12 layers and counting)
- Soldering is performed by wave soldering machine or by hand.
- The typical model used has 100+ pins. Stand-off is 0.50 mm.
| Pin # | 25 | 24 | 23 | 22 | 21 | 20 | 19 | 18 | 17 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 9  | 8  | 7  | 6  | 5  | 4  | 3  | 2  | 1  |
|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Signal Name | Pin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Signal Name | PIN Z | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | 3.3V | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | KEY | KEY | KEY | KEY | KEY | KEY | KEY | KEY | KEY | KEY |
| Signal Name | PIN F | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND | GND |
Solder fill requirement for through-hole solder joints is intended for leaded parts whose solder joints are readily viewable:

*NASA-STD-8739.3, para. 11.2.3*
- Heat may be applied to either side
- No bulk solder defects (cracks, blow-holes, excessive graininess)
- Solder quantity shall exhibit:
  - flow through to opposite side
  - bonding of lead to solder pad but not necessarily wetting to entire periphery of pad
  - slight shrink back is acceptable

*NASA-STD-8739.3, para. 4.3.2.d and 8.4.1*

Parts mounting design requirements shall allow full visual or nondestructive inspection of all soldered connections.

Does **not** say: “fully filled” or “100% filled”
Through-Hole Component Lead Soldering. When soldering component leads into PTH connections, the goal of the process is to accomplish 100% fill of the PTH with solder and good wetting to the lands, lead, and barrel top and bottom. The solder connection shall meet the requirements of *Table 6–4 of this addendum*, regardless of the soldering process, e.g. hand soldering, wave soldering, intrusive soldering, etc.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Vertical fill of solder</strong>&lt;sup&gt;2,3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Circumferential wetting of lead and barrel on solder destination side.</strong></td>
<td>360º</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Percentage of original land area covered with wetted solder on solder destination side.</strong>&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Circumferential fillet and wetting of lead and barrel on solder source side.</strong></td>
<td>360º</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Percentage of original land area covered with wetted solder on solder source side.</strong>&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1. Wetted solder refers to solder applied by any solder process including intrusive soldering.

Note 2. Applies to any side to which solder or solder paste was applied. The 25% unfilled height includes a sum of both source and destination side depressions.

Note 3. Provided the solder has flowed onto, and wetted to, the lead and solder land before receding.

---

**The Quality Policy:** (Soon to be NASA) J-STD-001ES

---

IPC does not speak to artifacts that require X-ray inspection to view, such as buried voids or underfill.
What are the failure modes that we are trying to prevent? *Electrical “open” or unacceptable increase in connection resistance.*

What causes this change in electrical connectivity?
- full or nearly full disconnection with the device lead.
- full or nearly full disconnection between solder and barrel wall and solder pad
- lack of solder + 360° barrel crack isolates PCB layers from lower/upper layers.
- barrel crack or trace crack separates trace from the barrel.

---

Trace-to-barrel cracks

bulk solder cracks

Source: R.N. Wild
Missing or disconnected solder doesn’t always result in electrical failure for this solder joint type because the barrel/solder configuration is highly redundant.

The most non-redundant part of the interconnect is between the trace and barrel.

Solder and barrel(trace) failures often go undetected at room temperature and are detected at high temperature during testing.
Will an underfilled through-hole joint have a shorter trip to failure than a fully filled joint?

How will it tend to fail?

If fully filled joints last longer, should we try to fix underfilled joints with rework?


6. Garrison, Ann; Lee, Mike; Park, Hyun; and Todd, Norma Lee. “How Much is too Much?: The Effects of Solder Joint Rework on Plated-Through Holes in Multilayer Printed Wiring Boards”, 1994

Z-axis expansion of the dielectric layers during exposure to soldering heat will deform and stress outer barrel-to-trace connections.

Attachment of the board to a metal frame transfers all Z-axis expansion to one size of the PCB increasing stresses there.

Solder cracking starts near intermetallic layers which are strong but less ductile. Bulk solder near intermetallic layer will not have the same Sn-Pb microstructure as the rest of the joint.
All soldering reduced PTH barrel life.

Not all "fully filled" joints are equal. Reworked joints (3 heats) have less than half the life expectancy of an first-time fully filled solder joint. Wild’s cycles-to-1st failure is in the infant mortal range.


Three board thicknesses tested: 0.140”, 0.118”, 0.200”
Connector types: 50 – 225 pins, 1” – 7.5” long; barrels masked with oxide to control solder wetting depth
Fill levels: 0% (capped), 15%, 25%, 50%, 75%, 100%
Wave and hand soldered.

-55°C to 105°C, 1 hr dwell, 3 hr cycle

Results:

0.140” board: capped joints failed between 200 and 260 cycles, No Other Failures
0.118” board: one 15% joint failed between 240 and 400 cycles, No Other Failures (even 0%)
0.200” board: capped joints failed at 50 cycles, No Other Failures

Cracking at top pad was common and related to additional stress on the joint from the “moving” connector
No difference between cycles-to-failure for hand-soldered vs wave soldered connectors.

*Jeannette paraphrases:*

Often you cannot inspect PTH solder fill on the component side: recognizes IPC requirement which cannot be achieved with many connectors.

If you have accepted the PCB lot, why not rely on a single end of a through-hole solder joint which is electrically the same node as the second side as well as the internal barrel surface?

---


Tested the theory that “the relationship between the [solder] joint appearance or its physical characteristics and its service reliability is known”

Used pits and voids as a test case because they were often reworked and their origins are so well understood that they could be made on-demand. Samples were 25% to 100% full volume (not “underfilled” because loss of solder was by voiding).

Tested the theory that “the relationship between the [solder] joint appearance or its physical characteristics and its service reliability is known”

Used pits and voids as a test case because they were often reworked and their origins are so well understood that they could be made on-demand. Samples were 25% to 100% full volume (not “underfilled” because loss of solder was by voiding).

None of the solder failed in tensile testing. Only the wire or the solder pad broke.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solder Volume (mm³)</th>
<th>Type of “defect”</th>
<th>Visual appearance</th>
<th>Thermal shock performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 (full)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>BEST</td>
<td>WORST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0.9</td>
<td>Blowholes &amp; voids</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7 – 0.9</td>
<td>Blowholes &amp; voids</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 0.7</td>
<td>Blowholes &amp; voids</td>
<td>WORST</td>
<td>BEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 0.6</td>
<td>Blowout (underfill)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Researched a manufacturer’s product that was replaced and returned by users to manufacturer when there was a failure. Touched-up joints were marked before original shipment. Failures in returned units correlated to touched up joints.

Hand soldering can produce higher levels of intermetallic compound than wave soldering.

Reworking tends to add more solder to the fillet which is less compliant than a “slim” fillet.

Soldering time during rework correlated to lower thermal cycle life.

**Would like to have data for:**
- Reliability of original (*Not Reworked*) fully filled joint vs underfilled original joint
- Reliability of reworked joint vs underfilled original joint
- Solder using representative methods: hand soldering and wave soldering

If X-ray inspection is needed, what must we look for as a defect?
Evaluation to Learn Best Response
When we Find Underfilled cPCI Joints

Determine:

– Minimum amount of solder fill required for a reliable joint (from lead to PCB trace)
– Operating conditions which enable under-filled joints to pass generic “space grade” reliability requirements
– Impact of location of voids and solder
– Solder fill and voiding content impact on PWB reliability
– How reheating cycles from soldering (touch-ups or intentional rework) reduce the reliability of joints
  • with or without voiding
  • with or without 100% fill
Four Separate Tests

• Wire Pull Testing
  – How much force is required to pull out an entire connector? How would this compare to forces normally experienced by these connectors?

• Thermal Cycling
  – How reliable are under-filled solder joints compared to fully filled solder joints?

• Capacitance Testing
  – How much stress does the board accumulate from under-filled solder joints compared to 100%-filled solder joints and reworked solder joints?

• Interconnect Stress Testing
  – How much stress does the board experience from thermal cycling due to under-filled and reworked solder joints?
Panels
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Boards (4) for Thermal Cycling and Wire Pull Tests

Coupons for IST

Cross-Section Coupons for Code 300

Coupons for IST
Assembly

• Bake out boards for 24 hours to remove moisture
• Reflow boards to simulate surface mount component assembly (cPCI connectors are installed last)
• Developed method of hand soldering for consistent fill amounts
  – Small gauge tin-lead solder wire
  – Larger sized solder tip
  – 300°C soldering iron
  – Vary time of solder application
    • 100% fill: 5 seconds
    • 30-50% fill: 2-3 seconds
    • Less than 30% fill: 1 second
  – Visits to BAE Systems in Manassas, VA to learn sample prep techniques
  – Practice
• Wave soldering performed at GSFC subcontractor
  – Preheat boards
  – Time solder wave

11/2/2011
Solder Settings versus Solder Fill

Wave Solder Settings
- 10 Feet Per Minute, 0.35 inches from Wave
- 12 Feet Per Minute, 0.35 inches from Wave
- 12.5 Feet Per Minute, 0.38 inches from Wave
- 12 Feet Per Minute, 0.40 inches from Wave

Hand Solder Application Timing (s)

Percent Fill

Hand Soldering

Wave Solder
Fill Calculation

- Record quantity of solder in grams
- Examine using X-Ray
  - Calculate fill using photos – pixel count

Fill Level Tally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fill Amount</th>
<th>Quantity of Pins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;75%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51%-75%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%-50%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wire Pull Test Setup

- Chatillon TCD225 Force Tester with 200lb load cell
- Custom fixture designed by Chatillon supplier
cPCI Wire Pull Testing

• Pull on pins soldered to board
• Axial stress on wire, shear stress on solder-to-wire connection
• Pull until:
  – Pin breaks
  – Solder connection breaks
• Record force when failure occurs
• How does breaking force relate to:
  – Shock event?
  – High-cycle fatigue event?
  – Mating/De-mating event?
Wire Pull Forces Related to Solder Fill Amounts - Per Pin

- Force of Failure (lbf)
- % Fill

- Wire Failure
- Solder Failure
- Mating Force for one pin
- Unmating Force for one pin

No solder fillet present

Connector mating force reported by supplier: 16.38 lbf
Results to Normalized to Connector

No solder fillet

Connector mating force reported by supplier: 16.38 lbf
De-mating force: 13.2 lbf
Wire Pull Failure Location
Cross Sections

Solder

Pin
Wire Pull Failure Locations

Note: These failures only seen when wires soldered in from the top of the board. – not relatable to cPCI connector solder joints as the connectors are soldered from the bottom.
Wire Pull Conclusions

• Fully and partially filled through-hole solder joints are very strong.
• The number of joints in cPCI connectors provide high levels of tensile strength redundancy. If just two joints are filled 20% or higher, they will support mechanical overstresses.
Test Vehicle #2: Thermal Cycling

- **Compressor Oven**
  - Cycle: -40°C to +90°C, 106 minutes
- **Analysis Tech 105 Series Event Detector**
- **Event Detector Connections for all 110 channels**
- **Mated Connector Pair**
- Supported by Standoffs
Thermal Cycling Summary

- Failures detected in all ranges of fill, scattered
- Recommend at least 800 cycles to collect more data
- Recommend a second test that includes coating, staking, and random vibration tests as preconditioning, and compare results
- Run same test at different temperatures for a larger database of failures

Weibull Plot of cPCI Solder Joint Failures

Notes:
Failures to be checked for continuity after thermal cycling is complete. Failure determined by criteria defined in IPC-785. 100 Cycles as of 10/11/11.
Future Work

• Finish and resolve thermal cycling testing and results.
• Study Reworked vs Original joint
• Round robin evaluation of X-ray inspection results
• Can Interconnect Stress Testing (IST) demonstrate through-hole joint reliability?
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