

IPC-9850

# Surface Mount Placement Equipment Characterization

Developed by the SMT Component Placement Equipment Subcommittee (5-41) of the Assembly Equipment Committee (5-40) of IPC



Users of this standard are encouraged to participate in the development of future revisions.

Contact:

IPC 2215 Sanders Road Northbrook, Illinois 60062-6135 Tel 847 509.9700 Fax 847 509.9798

## **Table of Contents**

1 INT	<b>RODUCTION</b>
1.1	Scope 1
1.2	Purpose 1
1.3	Background 1
1.3.1	Future Considerations 2
1.4	Implementation 2
1.4.1	Characterization Limitations 2
1.4.2	Binding Requirements 2
1.4.3	Test Components 2
1.4.4	Test Panels 3
1.4.5	Measurement
1.5	Forms
1.6	Data Methods 4
1.7	Terms and Definitions 4
1.8	Units of Measurement 5
2 RE	FERENCED DOCUMENTS 5
3 PL	ACEMENT PERFORMANCE METRIC 5
3.1	Machine Performance Form IPC-9850-F1 5
3.1.1	General Performance 5
3.1.2	Performance Validation 5
3.2	Characterization Methodology 6
3.2.1	Background
3.3	Machine Performance Parameters 7
3.3.1	Test Conditions 7
3.3.2	Time-Based Parameters 7
3.3.3	CMM Measured Parameters 9
	TRIBUTE DEFECT RATE AND RELIABILITY RFORMANCE METRIC—FORM IPC-9850-F2 . 12
4.1	Attribute Defect Rate 13
4.2	Reliability Parameters 14
4.2.1	Mean Placements Between Assists (MPBA) 15
4.2.2	Mean Time To Recover from Assists (MTTRa)
4.2.3	Mean Placements Between Failures (MPBF) 15
4.2.4	Mean Time To Repair Failures (MTTR <sub>f</sub> ) 15
4.2.5	Total Time
4.2.6	Non-Scheduled Time 15
4.2.7	Operations Time
4.2.8	Equipment Dependent Uptime 16
4.2.9	Preventative Maintenance (PM) Time 16
4.2.10	Mispick Rate (in PPM) 16
4.3	Reporting Sites

4.3.1	Number of Machines 1'	7
4.3.2	Total Number of Placements 17	7
4.3.3	Total Pickup Attempts 17	7
5 M FC	EASUREMENT CAPABILITY VERIFICATION— DRM IPC-9850-F31	7
5.1	Gauge Repeatability and Reproducibility Capability	7
5.2	Accuracy Capability 1'	7
6 T	EST VEHICLES	9
6.1	Placement Verification Panel Specifications 19	9
6.2	Placement Verification Panel Carrier Specifications	0
6.3	Glass Slug Specifications	
6.4	Sticky Media Application	
6.5	Placement Program	
6.5.1	1608C Component	6
6.5.2	SOIC-16 Component 20	6
6.5.3	QFP-100 and BGA-228 Slugs 20	6
6.5.4	QFP-208 Slug	6
7 F0	ORMS AND DIAGRAMS	1
APPEN	<b>IDIX A</b>	5
APPEN	<b>IDIX B</b>	6
APPEN	NDIX C	7
APPEN	<b>IDIX D</b>	9
APPEN	<b>IDIX E</b>	4
APPEN	IDIX F	8
APPEN	IDIX G	9
APPEN	<b>IDIX H</b>	0
APPEN	<b>IDIX I</b>	1
APPEN	NDIX J	2

#### Figures

Figure 3-1	Performance Parameter Description for a Single Panel	8
Figure 3-2	Performance Parameter Description for a Four-Panel Build	8
Figure 3-3	Maximum Lead Tip Error Due to Placement Machine (Combined Xdev, Ydev and θdev 1	1
Figure 5-1	Accuracy Verification Panel 18	8
Figure 6-1	Placement Verification Panel 24	0

Figure 6-2	QFP 100 Slug for White Background for
rigure 0-2	Leads on Chrome Background (Negative) 21
Figure 6-3	QFP 100 Slug for Chrome Leads With No Background (Positive) 22
Figure 6-4	QFP 208 Slug for White Background for Leads on Chrome Background (Negative) 23
Figure 6-5	QFP 208 Slug for Chrome Leads With No Background (Positive) 24
Figure 6-6	BGA-228 Slug for White Background for Leads on Chrome Background (Negative) 25
Figure 6-7	BGA-228 Slug with No Background (Positive)
Figure 6-8	Component Location Layout for 1608C Components
Figure 6-9	Component Location Layout for SOIC 16 Components
Figure 6-10	Component Location Layout for QFP-100 and BGA 228 Slug Components
Figure 6-11	Component Location Layout for QFP-208 Slug Components

Figure A-1	Cpk Graphic Representation 35
Figure H-1	Gauge R&R Spreadsheet Example 50
Figure I-1	Placement Verification Panel Carrier 51
Figure J-1	Termination-to-Land Calculation Example 52

#### Tables

Table 3-1	Cpk for Termination-to-Land Coverag 11
Table 4-1	Component Types and Quantities for 'Typical Kit'
Table 4-2	Calculation Example 15
Table 4-3	Terms Definition 16
Table 6-1	Tool Kit Materials List for Performance Evaluation
Table D-1	Mean and stdev using 2 fiducials 40
Table D-2	Mean and stdev per method using 4 fiducials 40
Table D-3	Mean and stdev vs. number of measured leads 42

### Surface Mount Placement Equipment Characterization

#### **1 INTRODUCTION**

**1.1 Scope** This standard establishes the procedures to characterize the capability of surface mount assembly equipment in specification documents, as well as in documentation used to verify a specific machine's placement capability conformance to the specification, while maintaining a placement accuracy to placement speed relationship.

**1.2 Purpose** IPC-9850 has been developed to standardize the parameters, measurement procedures, and the methodologies used for the specification, evaluation, and continuing verification of assembly equipment characterization parameters. These standardized tools **shall** be used to develop and report the information called out in this standard.

**1.3 Background** With the proliferation of Surface Mount Technology (SMT), placement equipment users have struggled with the question of which machine will perform best in a given manufacturing environment. The advantage of the SMT assembly process to rapidly place components in precise alignment to the land patterns on the printed wiring board (PWB) was the initial yardstick by which machines were selected. Machines that could place components the quickest and with the least amount of scrap were considered the best.

Initially, the most common evaluation method was placement yield. For this evaluation, a machine is made to populate a large number of the user product where visible placement errors are counted as defects. Machines with the least defects and the most robust operation were considered best. The high yield and reliability of modern SMT placement systems require that very large amounts of data be collected to meaningfully assess yield and reliability. This standard provides new tools for gauging the yield and reliability of placement equipment yet presents performance results in the traditional metrics.

In addition to the high yield and reliability expected of modern placement equipment, the SMT assembly process has become significantly more demanding. Components have decreased in size, component terminations are smaller, and placement locations have moved closer together. All this while the number of components on the PWB and product volumes have increased significantly. Placement equipment must now place components more rapidly and with extreme precision to be financially viable. This has made requirements on placement machines more demanding. Historically, placement equipment vendors have selected their own parameters and methodologies to present the specification of their machines' throughput and placement capabilities. The many representations of this information have made the comparison between similar types of placement machines very difficult. To obtain comparable data, users have been forced to conduct on-location evaluations of various machines under the same conditions. This type of methodology is very time consuming for users and very capital intensive for suppliers.

This standard simplifies the evaluation process by standardizing the performance parameters that describe the placement machines' capabilities. It also couples placement throughput and placement quality so speed and accuracy parameters are dependent on each other. This standard also specifies the methodologies by which the capability parameters are measured. This reduces potential user-vendor friction created when the user believes the equipment is not functioning properly. The methodologies specified herein are consistent and verifiable, thus providing commonground-methodologies between users and vendors.

These methodologies were achieved by separating machine performance from the rest of the SMT process variables, which include paste printing, component quality, packaging type and PWB quality. The speed and quality evaluation methods of this standard specify that measurements will be made by placement of standardized components into sticky media on clear glass panels. Experience shows that surface mount equipment must perform well on sticky media before it can perform well in production. Furthermore, improved process capability on sticky tape usually translates into enhanced process capability in production. Although this method does not provide information that can be utilized to perfectly predict production quality, this methodology was selected in order to remove as much of the variation as possible between facilities, products, process, and operators.

While the ultimate goal is to evaluate a machine's capability to place components in paste on actual PWBs, it is not currently possible to make such measurements at the required precision and speed. It is anticipated that future in-line inspection systems will improve in their ability to measure component location and orientation. In the future it may become possible to use in-line post-placement (prereflow) automatic optical inspection (AOI) systems to measure the placement machine capabilities.

Due to the convergence of high-speed and fine pitch machines, this standard makes no attempt to separate the two types of machines. The user is empowered to decide if