SINGLE USER LICENSE - NOT FOR USE ON A NETWORK OR ONLINE

# IPC-4552A

## 2017 - August

# Performance Specification for Electroless Nickel/Immersion Gold (ENIG) Plating for Printed Boards

Supersedes IPC-4552 with Amendments 1 & 2
December 2012

*An international standard developed by IPC*

*Association Connecting Electronics Industries*

**The Principles of Standardization**

In May 1995 the IPC's Technical Activities Executive Committee (TAEC) adopted Principles of Standardization as a guiding principle of IPC's standardization efforts.

**Standards Should:**

- Show relationship to Design for Manufacturability (DFM) and Design for the Environment (DFE)
- Minimize time to market
- Contain simple (simplified) language
- Just include spec information
- Focus on end product performance
- Include a feedback system on use and problems for future improvement

**Standards Should Not:**

- Inhibit innovation
- Increase time-to-market
- Keep people out
- Increase cycle time
- Tell you how to make something
- Contain anything that cannot be defended with data

**Notice**

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

Recommended Standards and Publications are adopted by IPC without regard to whether their adoption may involve patents on articles, materials, or processes. By such action, IPC does not assume any liability to any patent owner, nor do they assume any obligation whatever to parties adopting the Recommended Standard or Publication. Users are also wholly responsible for protecting themselves against all claims of liabilities for patent infringement.

**IPC Position Statement on Specification Revision Change**

It is the position of IPC's Technical Activities Executive Committee that the use and implementation of IPC publications is voluntary and is part of a relationship entered into by customer and supplier. When an IPC publication is updated and a new revision is published, it is the opinion of the TAEC that the use of the new revision as part of an existing relationship is not automatic unless required by the contract. The TAEC recommends the use of the latest revision. Adopted October 6, 1998

**Why is there a charge for this document?**

Your purchase of this document contributes to the ongoing development of new and updated industry standards and publications. Standards allow manufacturers, customers, and suppliers to understand one another better. Standards allow manufacturers greater efficiencies when they can set up their processes to meet industry standards, allowing them to offer their customers lower costs.

IPC spends hundreds of thousands of dollars annually to support IPC's volunteers in the standards and publications development process. There are many rounds of drafts sent out for review and the committees spend hundreds of hours in review and development. IPC's staff attends and participates in committee activities, typesets and circulates document drafts, and follows all necessary procedures to qualify for ANSI approval.

IPC's membership dues have been kept low to allow as many companies as possible to participate. Therefore, the standards and publications revenue is necessary to complement dues revenue. The price schedule offers a 50% discount to IPC members. If your company buys IPC standards and publications, why not take advantage of this and the many other benefits of IPC membership as well? For more information on membership in IPC, please visit www.ipc.org or call 847/597-2872.

Thank you for your continued support.

©Copyright 2017. IPC, Bannockburn, Illinois, USA. All rights reserved under both international and Pan-American copyright conventions. *Any copying, scanning or other reproduction of these materials without the prior written consent of the copyright holder is strictly prohibited and constitutes infringement under the Copyright Law of the United States.*

SINGLE USER LICENSE - NOT FOR USE ON A NETWORK OR ONLINE

# IPC-4552A

# Performance Specification for Electroless Nickel/ Immersion Gold (ENIG) Plating for Printed Boards

Developed by the Plating Processes Subcommittee (4-14) of the Fabrication Processes Committee (4-10) of IPC

***Supersedes:***
IPC-4552 with Amendments
1 & 2 – December 2012
IPC-4552 – October 2002

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

Contact:

IPC
3000 Lakeside Drive, Suite 105N
Bannockburn, Illinois
60015-1249
Tel 847 615.7100
Fax 847 615.7105

SINGLE USER LICENSE - NOT FOR USE ON A NETWORK OR ONLINE

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

SINGLE USER LICENSE - NOT FOR USE ON A NETWORK OR ONLINE



# Acknowledgment

Any document involving a complex technology draws material from a vast number of sources across many continents. While the principal members of the Plating Processes Subcommittee (4-14) of the Fabrication Processes Committee (4-10) are shown below, it is not possible to include all of those who assisted in the evolution of this standard. To each of them, the members of the IPC extend their gratitude.

**Fabrication Processes Committee**

Co-Chair
George Milad
Uyemura International Corp.

Co-Chair
Gerard O'Brien
Solderability Testing & Solutions, Inc.

**Plating Processes Subcommittee**

Co-Chair
George Milad
Uyemura International Corp.

Co-Chair
Gerard O'Brien
Solderability Testing & Solutions, Inc.

**Technical Liaison of the IPC Board of Directors**

Bob Neves
Microtek (Changzhou) Laboratories

**Plating Processes Subcommittee**

Wallace Ables, Dell Inc.

Glenn Ames, TTM Technologies

Martin Anselm, Ph.D., Rochester Institute of Technology

Craig Bachman, Molex Copper Flex Products

Donald Banks, Abbott Laboratories

Tina Barcley, TAS Consulting

Bill Barthel, Plexus

John Bauer, Rockwell Collins

Martin Bayes, Ph.D., TE Connectivity

Elizabeth Benedetto, Hewlett-Packard Company

Jon Bengston, Uyemura International Corp.

Beatriz Bennett, Lockheed Martin Missiles & Fire Control

Wendi Boger, TTM Technologies

Jim Bogert, Fischer Technology Inc.

Mumtaz Bora, Peregrine Semiconductor

William Bowerman, OM Group Electronic Chemicals, LLC

Trevor Bowers, Adtran Inc.

Scott Bowles, L-3 Fuzing and Ordnance Systems

Peter Bratin, Ph.D., ECI Technology, Inc.

Jerry Brewer, Atotech USA Inc.

Carl Brooks, Northrop Grumman Corporation

Dock Brown, DfR Solutions

Vanja Bukva, Teledyne Dalsa

Martin Bunce, MacDermid Enthone Electronics Solutions

Lee Burger, OM Group Electronic Chemicals, LLC

Matthew Byrne, BAE Systems

Christopher Carrillo, TTM Technologies

Yudy Cetina, TTM Technologies

Srinivas Chada, Ph.D., Stryker Instruments

Alex Chen, Celestica

Denise Chevalier, Amphenol Printed Circuits, Inc.

Peter Chiang, MSI Micro-Star International Co., Inc.

Joshua Civiello, DLA Land and Maritime

Lenora Clark, MacDermid Enthone Electronics Solutions

Horst Clauberg, Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc.

David Corbett, DLA Land and Maritime

Donald Cullen, MacDermid Enthone Electronics Solutions

Edward Cuneo, EC Consulting

Christopher Daczkowski, Atotech USA Inc.

Richard Davidson, Honeywell Aerospace

Caitlin Devaney, Crane Electronics

Michael DiCicco, Northrop Grumman Corporation

Karl Dietz, Karl Dietz Consulting LLC

Miguel Dominguez, Continental Temic SA de CV

Steven Dunford, Schlumberger Well Services

Don Dupriest, Lockheed Martin Missiles & Fire Control

Richard Edgar, Tec-Line Inc.

Theodore Edwards

Julie Ellis, TTM Technologies

Dave Esler, GE Global Research

Steven Ethridge, Dell Inc.

Robert Farfan, TTM Technologies

John Fendrock, Raytheon Missile Systems

Ellen Finch, Anaren Microwave Inc.

Sandra Fortune, Northrop Grumman Corporation

Dennis Fritz, MacDermid Enthone Electronics Solutions

Hiroyuki Fukuda, Shikoku Chemicals Corporation

Lionel Fullwood, WKK Distribution Ltd.

Gerald Gagnon, Extech Instruments Corporation

Thomas Gahagan, Anaren Microwave Inc.

SINGLE USER LICENSE - NOT FOR USE ON A NETWORK OR ONLINE



Arturo Garcia, MicroConnex Corporation

Cynthia Gomez, Continental Temic SA de CV

Constantino Gonzalez, ACME Training & Consulting

Robert Gordon, Amonix, Inc.

Albin Gruenwald, Uyemura International Corp.

Donald Gudeczauskas, Uyemura International Corp.

Michael Haller, Fischer Technology Inc.

Vicka Hammill, Honeywell Inc. Air Transport Systems

Philip Henault, Raytheon Company

David Hillman, Rockwell Collins

Charles Hirbour, Technic Inc.

Joanne Hohman, Lockheed Martin Missiles & Fire Control

Cory Holda, Northrop Grumman Corp.

Helen Holder, Hewlett-Packard Company

Shunsaku Hoshi, Uyemura International Corp.

Jay Huang, Wistron Corp.

Werner Huegel, Ph.D., Robert Bosch GmbH

Jim Huff, Dell Inc.

Bruce Hughes, AMRDEC MS&T EPPT

Joe Hughes, Hughes Circuits, Inc.

Ingrid Swenson, TTM Technologies, Inc.

Lei Jin, Ph.D., MacDermid Enthone Electronics Solutions

William Johannes, Sandia National Labs Albuquerque

Christopher Kapusta, GE Global Research

Karl Sauter, Oracle America, Inc.

Jordan Kologe, MacDermid Enthone Electronics Solutions

John Konrad, i Electronics

Kelly Kovalovsky, i Electronics

John Kraus, Bourns Inc.

Matthew Kreiner, Oxford Instruments

Rajesh Kumar, TTM Technologies

April Labonte, TTM Technologies

Henry Lajoie, MacDermid Enthone

Kevin Lamelin, TTM Technologies, Inc.

Joseph LaRoche, BAE Systems

Brigitte Lawrence, Brigitflex Inc.

Paul Lomax, Fischer Technology Inc.

Harry Lucas, TTM Technologies

Clifford Maddox, Boeing Company

Brian Madsen, Ph.D., Continental Automotive Systems

Chris Mahanna, Robisan Laboratory Inc.

Guenther Mayr, AT&S Austria Technologie & Systemtechnik AG

Martin McDaniel, NSWC Crane

Joe McGurran, Atotech USA Inc.

Mike McKeown, Hesse Mechatronics, Inc.

Tim McKliget, Holaday Circuits Inc.

Stephen Meeks, ViaSat

Peter Menuez

Renee Michalkiewicz, NTS

William Miller, Panasonic Automotive Systems Company of America

James Monarchio, TTM Technologies, Inc.

Alton Moore, Raytheon Company

Michael Moore, U.S. Army Aviation & Missile Command

Denis Morrissey, MacDermid Enthone

Ted Myers, ECI Technology, Inc.

Dave Nelson, Adtran Inc.

Jeff Nelson, Ph.D., MicroConnex Corporation

Keith Newman, Hewlett-Packard Company

Thi Nguyen, Lockheed Martin Missile & Fire Control

Gary Nicholls, Metalor Technologies USA

Rick Nichols, Atotech Deutschland GmbH

Bob Noland, Daktronics

Sean Oflaherty, Oxford Instruments

Patrick O'Keefe, Holaday Circuits Inc.

Jose Servin Olivares, Continental Temic SA de CV

Wim Ongenae, EC Europe

William Ortloff, Raytheon Company

Michael Paddack, Boeing Company

Michael Pavlov, ECI Technology, Inc.

John Palmer, TTM Technologies

J. Lee Parker, JLP

Dan Parquet, TTM Technologies

Gerry Parta, Summit Interconnect

Anders Pedersen, Harris Corporation

Robert Peterson, Alternate Finishing Inc.

Michael Pietrantonio, Ph.D., GE Aviation

Michah Pledger, Vivint, Inc.

Michael Pomeroy, Continental Automotive Systems

Gnyaneshwar Ramakrishna, Cisco Systems Inc.

Gustavo Ramos, Atotech Deutschland GmbH

Robert Reid, Technic Inc.

Randy Reed, R. Reed Consultancy LLC

Henry Rekers, Schneider Electric

Curtis Ricotta, Lockheed Martin Space Systems Company

Jose Rios, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Hugh Roberts, Atotech USA Inc.

Gary Roper, Roper Resources, Inc.

Mario Rosin, Atotech Deutschland GmbH

Brian Rowden, GE Global Research

Stan Sappington, S/G Electronics Inc.

Daryl Sato, Intel Corporation

Tom Saven, Ticer Technologies

Stefan Schmitz, Fraunhofer IZM Branch Lab Microsystem Engineering

Michael Schneer, ECI Technology, Inc.

SINGLE USER LICENSE - NOT FOR USE ON A NETWORK OR ONLINE



Dieter Scholz, Materials Evaluation and Engineering

Randy Schueller, Ph.D., DfR Solutions

Michael Schwaemmlein, Atotech Deutschland GmbH

Martin Scionti, Raytheon Missile Systems

Jeff Seekatz, Raytheon Company

Keith Sellers, NTS

Dave Shaddock, GE Global Research

Gordon Simmons, Superior Processing

Atamjit Singh, Unitech Industries Inc.

Polina Snugovsky, Ph.D., Celestica

Dave Sommervold, The Bergquist Company/Henkel Electronic Materials LLC

Young Song, Teledyne Dalsa

Eric Stafstrom, Technic Inc.

Thomas Stewart, TTM Technologies

Guhan Subbarayan, Ph.D., Juniper Networks

Richard Sullivan, Analog Devices Inc.

Donald Susan, Sandia National Labs Albuquerque

Magnus Svensson, Multi-Teknik Monsterkort AB

John Swanson, MacDermid Enthone Electronics Solutions

Royce Taylor, Raytheon Company

Stephen Tisdale, Tisdale Environmental Consulting LLC

Michael Toben, Dow Electronic Materials

James Trainor, MacDermid Enthone

Kristen Troxel, Hewlett-Packard Company

Patrick Valentine, Uyemura International Corp.

Dave Van Booven, Continental Automotive Systems

Paul Vianco, Ph.D., Sandia National Labs Albuquerque

Joe Vo, Broadcom Corporation

Donald Walsh, Uyemura International Corp.

Andreas Wippel, AT&S Austria Technologie & Systemtechnik AG

Michael Wolverton, Raytheon Systems Company

Glenn Woodhouse, All Flex

Chen Xu, Ph.D., Nokia

Yung-Herng Yau, MacDermid Enthone Electronics Solutions

William Yelton, Sandia National Labs Albuquerque

Joshua Young, Maxwell Technologies Inc.

Joseph Zhu, Oxford Instruments Roentgenanalytik GmbH

Steve Zimmer, Viasystems Toronto, Inc.

SINGLE USER LICENSE - NOT FOR USE ON A NETWORK OR ONLINE



This Page Intentionally Left Blank

SINGLE USER LICENSE - NOT FOR USE ON A NETWORK OR ONLINE



# Table of Contents


**1 SCOPE** ... 1
1.1 Statement of Scope ... 1
1.1.1 Feature Size for Thickness Measurement ... 1
1.2 Description ... 1
1.2.1 Electroless Nickel Reducing Agents – Phosphorus Content ... 1
1.3 Objective ... 1
1.3.1 Order of Precedence ... 2
1.3.1.1 Appendices ... 2

**2 APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS** ... 2
2.1 IPC ... 2
2.2 ASTM International (ASTM) ... 2
2.3 JEDEC ... 2
2.4 Defense Standardization Program ... 2
2.5 Telcordia Technologies, Inc. ... 3
2.6 International Organization for Standardization (ISO) ... 3
2.7 Terms, Definitions and Acronyms ... 3
2.7.1 Metal Turnover (MTO) ... 3
2.7.2 Hyperactive Corrosion Deposit ... 3
2.7.3 Selective Annular Ring Dewetting (SAD) ... 3

**3 REQUIREMENTS OF ENIG DEPOSIT** ... 4
3.1 Printed Board Fabrication Supplier Process Requirements ... 5
3.1.1 General Plating Line Requirements ... 5
3.1.1.1 ENIG Deposit Thickness Measurement ... 5
3.1.1.2 Gauge Capability – Gauge R&R Type 1 Study ... 5
3.1.1.3 Collimator Size and Measurement Times ... 10
3.1.1.4 Guard Bands and Lot Conformance Testing ... 10
3.1.2 ENIG XRF Calibration Standards ... 10
3.1.3 XRF Zero Offset Acceptability ... 10
3.1.4 Process Qualification Measurement Requirements ... 11
3.1.5 Measuring Phosphorus Content in an ENIG Deposit ... 12
3.1.5.1 Measurement of % Phosphorous (P) Content in Electroless Nickel (EN) Layers with Energy Dispersive X-Ray Spectroscopy (EDS) ... 12
3.1.5.2 Measurement of % Phosphorous (P) Content in Electroless Nickel (EN) Layers with Energy Dispersive X-Ray Fluorescence (EDXRF) ... 13
3.1.5.2.1 Instrument Calibration for Phosphorus Content ... 13
3.1.6 Gold Stripping of Plated Deposits for Evaluation of Hyper-Corrosion ... 13
3.1.6.1 Recognized Methods for Gold Stripping ... 14
3.1.6.1.1 Chemical Stripping Solution Dwell Times and Process Steps ... 14
3.1.6.1.2 Evaluation Using SEM ... 14
3.1.6.1.3 Grain Boundary Enhancement vs. Hyper-Corrosion ... 14
3.1.6.1.4 Verification of Hyper-Corrosion ... 14
3.2 Performance Functions ... 16
3.2.1 Shelf Life ... 16
3.2.1.1 Solderability ... 16
3.2.1.2 Gold Embrittlement ... 16
3.2.2 Aluminum and Copper Wire (Wedge) Bonding ... 17
3.2.2.1 Gold Wire Bonding ... 17
3.2.3 Contact Surface ... 17
3.2.3.1 Soft Membrane Switches ... 17
3.2.3.2 Metallic Dome Contacts ... 17
3.2.4 EMI Shielding ... 17
3.2.5 Conductive and/or Anisotropic Adhesive Interface (Replacement for Solder) ... 17
3.2.6 Connectors ... 17
3.2.6.1 Press Fit Connectors ... 17
3.2.6.2 Edge Tab ... 17
3.2.7 Limitations of ENIG ... 17
3.2.7.1 Creep Corrosion/Chemical Resistance ... 17
3.2.7.2 High Frequency Signal Loss ... 18
3.3 Visual ... 18
3.4 Selective Annular Ring Dewetting (SAD) ... 19
3.5 Finish Thickness ... 20
3.5.1 Electroless Nickel Thickness ... 20
3.5.1.1 Electroless Nickel for Rigid Printed Boards ... 20
3.5.1.2 Deposits More Than the Upper Limit ... 20
3.5.1.3 Deposits Less Than the Minimum Thickness Limit ... 20
3.5.1.4 Electroless Nickel for Flexible Circuits ... 20
3.5.1.5 Modifications to the Base Structure of the Electroless Nickel Deposits with Flexible Circuits ... 20
3.5.2 Immersion Gold Thickness ... 21
3.5.2.1 ENIG – Category B Coating Durability per IPC J-STD-003 ... 21

SINGLE USER LICENSE - NOT FOR USE ON A NETWORK OR ONLINE



3.5.3 Exceptions to the Required Thickness Ranges ... 23
3.5.3.1 Immersion Gold Thicker Than Specification by Design ... 23
3.5.3.2 Production Conformance Testing ... 23
3.5.3.3 Production Measurement Exceptions ... 23
3.5.3.4 Statistical Process Control ... 23
3.5.3.5 Lot Sizes of Ten Printed Boards or Less ... 23
3.5.3.6 Production Overruns and/or Inventory Items ... 24
3.5.3.7 Reworking/Repair of ENIG ... 24
3.6 Nickel Hyper-Corrosion ... 24
3.6.1 Evaluation of the ENIG Deposit by Cross Section ... 24
3.6.1.1 ... 25
3.6.1.1.1 Normal ENIG Free of Hyper-Corrosion Defects ... 25
3.6.1.1.2 Acceptable Conditions with Some Evidence of Hyper-Corrosion ... 25
3.6.1.1.3 Acceptable Conditions with End User Sign-Off/Acceptance ... 25
3.6.1.1.4 Rejectable Conditions ... 26
3.6.1.2 Hyper-Corrosion Rating Level Table ... 26
3.6.2 Additional Non-Failure Analysis Testing to Determine Acceptance or Rejection for Level 2 Hyper-Corrosion ... 27
3.7 Porosity ... 28
3.8 Adhesion ... 28
3.9 Solderability ... 29
3.9.1 Stressing of the Deposit Prior to Solderability Testing ... 29
3.9.2 Force Measurement Testing (Wetting Balance Testing) ... 29
3.10 Cleanliness ... 29
3.11 Electrolytic Corrosion ... 29
3.12 Chemical Resistance ... 29

**4 QUALITY ASSURANCE PROVISIONS** ... 30
4.1 General Quality Assurance Provisions ... 30
4.1.1 Qualification Recommendations ... 30
4.1.2 Sample Test Coupons ... 30
4.2 Quality Conformance Testing ... 30
4.2.1 Frequency of Thickness Measurements ... 30
4.2.2 Established Qualified Process ... 30

**APPENDIX 1 Terms and Definitions Not Currently in IPC-T-50** ... 33

**APPENDIX 2 ENIG Process Sequence** ... 34

**APPENDIX 3 XRF Thickness Measurements of Thin Au (ENIG): Recommendations for Instrumentation (Detectors) and Their Limitations** ... 35

**APPENDIX 4 ENIG PWB Surface Finish Wetting Balance Testing** ... 37

**APPENDIX 5 IPC 4-14 SC ENIG Round Robin Solder Spread Testing** ... 55

**APPENDIX 6 Wire Bonding to ENIG** ... 61

**APPENDIX 7 Through Hole Solderability Testing** ... 62

**APPENDIX 8 Evaluation of Electroless Nickel Corrosion Due to Immersion Gold Plating, Using 3000X Magnification After Gold Stripping** ... 77

**APPENDIX 9-A Cyanide Gold Stripping for ENIG** ... 82

**APPENDIX 9-B Test Method for Potassium Iodide/ Iodine (Non-Cyanide) ENIG Gold Stripping Procedure** ... 83

**APPENDIX 9-C Method for Stripping Gold Plating from ENIG Finished PCBs by Broad Beam Argon Ion Milling** ... 85

**APPENDIX 10 Determination of Thickness and Phosphorus Content In Electroless Nickel (EN) Layers X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF) Spectrometry [IPC-TM-650, Method 2.3.44]** ... 90

**APPENDIX 11 Phosphorus Content Measurement in ENIG Using Electron Dispersive Spectroscopy EDS – Initial Testing** ... 97

**APPENDIX 12 Standard Developments Efforts of Electroless Nickel Immersion Gold** ... 102

**APPENDIX 13 Using Guard Bands or a Gauge Correction Factor to Accommodate Type 1 Gauge Study Measurement Uncertainty** ... 102

**Figures**

Figure A Example of Repeat Measurement Data from Three Different XRF Tools ... 6
Figure B Graphical and Statistical Evaluation of Data from XRF Tool # 1 ... 7
Figure C Graphical and Statistical Evaluation of Data from XRF Tool # 2 ... 8
Figure D Graphical and Statistical Evaluation of Data from XRF Tool # 3 ... 9
Figure 3-1 Potassium Iodide/Iodine ($KI$ / $I_2$) at 15 sec. dwell (left) vs. 60 sec. dwell (right) ... 14

SINGLE USER LICENSE - NOT FOR USE ON A NETWORK OR ONLINE



Figure 3-2 Cyanide-Based Stripping at 15 sec. dwell (left) vs. 60 sec. dwell (right) ........................ 15
Figure 3-3 Cyanide Stripping (left) vs. KI/$I_2$ Stripping (right) Using Focused Ion Beam (FIB) .......... 15
Figure 3-4 25,000X FIB Images – Cyanide (left) vs. KI / $I_2$ (right) – Same Dwell Time ................. 15
Figure 3-5 Ion Mill Stripping of Defect-Free Nickel (left) vs. Hyper-Corroded Nickel (right) ................ 16
Figure 3-6 Uniform Plating ............................................. 18
Figure 3-7 Extraneous Plating or Nickel Foot ................ 18
Figure 3-8 Skip Plating (No Ni plating) .......................... 18
Figure 3-9 Edge Pull Back ............................................. 19
Figure 3-10 Example of SAD (Selective Annular ring Dewetting) .................................................... 20
Figure 3-11 Another Example of the SAD Defect ............ 20
Figure 3-12 Selective Annular Ring Dewetting Defect ..... 20
Figure 3-13 Grain Structure of Conventional Nickel Deposit ......................................................... 21
Figure 3-14 Grain Structure of Nickel Deposit Modified for Dynamic Flex Applications ....................... 21
Figure 3-15 Example of Fracture in Conventional Nickel Deposit ......................................................... 21
Figure 3-16 Modified Nickel Deposit of Cycles Showing No Fracture with Same Number .................. 21
Figure 3-17 Defect Free ENIG Deposit – Knee of Hole ... 25
Figure 3-18 Defect Free ENIG Deposit – SMT Feature ... 25
Figure 3-19 Level 1 Hyper-Corrosion – SMT Feature ...... 25
Figure 3-20 Level 1 Hyper-Corrosion – Knee of Hole ...... 25
Figure 3-21 Level 2 Hyper-Corrosion – Knee of Hole ...... 25
Figure 3-22 Level 2 Hyper-Corrosion – SMT Feature ...... 25
Figure 3-23 Level 3 Hyper-Corrosion – Knee of Hole ...... 26
Figure 3-24 Level 3 Hyper-Corrosion – SMT Feature ...... 26
Figure 3-25 Example of a Crack in the Nickel Deposit .... 26
Figure 3-26 Decision Tree to Assist in Setting Rating Level of Hyper-Corrosion ............................. 27
Figure 3-27 Example of an Acceptable Contiguous IMC Layer 1000X ......................................... 28
Figure 3-28 Example of a Rejectable Non-Contiguous IMC Layer 1000X ......................................... 28
Figure 3-29 Example – Rejectable with Little-to-No IMC Formation 1000X .......................................... 28
Figure 3-30 Example – Rejectable with Little-to-No IMC Formation 1000X .......................................... 28
Figure 3-31 Standard IPC Force Measurement Coupon . 29
Figure A4-1 Example of the Wetting Balance Coupon Used for the Testing of ENIG ....................... 38
Figure A4-2 Box Plot of the 1 µin Samples From All Suppliers ....................................................... 39
Figure A4-3 Box Plot of the 1.5 µin Samples From All Suppliers ....................................................... 39
Figure A4-4 Box Plot of the 2.0 µin Samples From All Suppliers ....................................................... 40
Figure A4-5 The Metronelec ST88 Wetting Balance Used for the Testing ..................................... 40
Figure A4-6 Example of Excellent and Consistent Wetting From Sample Group # 4 Tested as Received with SAC305 and Test Flux # 2 (this is a 1.6 µin at - 4σ IAu thickness sample) ........... 41
Figure A4-7 Wetting Curves From Sample # 8 Tested as Received Showing Again Excellent Wetting Consistency Intra Group (this is one of the control thickness samples) ........................... 41
Figure A4-8 Example of Some Very Inconsistent Wetting Seen with Sample Group 11, Again Tested As Received with No Stressing (this group was later identified to have had a plating issue and was withdrawn from further consideration for this specification revision effort) ............................................... 42
Figure A4-9 Post 2X Reflows Using a SnPb Profile and SnPb Solder for Testing (good robustness) .. 42
Figure A4-10 Post 2X Reflows Using a Hotter Pb-Free Profile but Testing with SnPb Solder (FAIL) ............................................................ 43
Figure A4-11 Post 8 Hours Exposure to 72 °C/85% R.H. (excellent robustness) ................................. 43
Figure A4-12 Post 2X Exposures to a SnPb Profile Then Tested With SnPb (excellent robustness) ..... 44
Figure A4-13 Post 2X Exposures to a Pb-Free Profile and Tested with SnPb (shows some increased spread in the data but overall, very good robustness compared to the failures seen in Figure A4-7) .............................................. 44
Figure A4-14 Post 8 hours @ 72 °C/85% R.H. (excellent robustness) ................................................... 45
Figure A4-15 Another Sample Group Post 2X Exposures to a SnPb Profile Then Tested with SnPb (slower rate of rise indicating some reducible oxide layers present with good robustness) .................................. 45
Figure A4-16 Post 2X Pb-Free Reflow Profile Exposure (good robustness) ....................................... 46
Figure A4-17 Post 8 hours @ 72 °C/85% R.H. (excellent robustness) ................................................... 46
Figure A4-18 Post 2X SnPb Profile Exposure (good wetting times, increased spread in the data) ............................................................ 47
Figure A4-19 Post 2X Pb-Free Profile Exposure (increasing spread in the data and some failures) ............................................... 47
Figure A4-20 Post 8 Hours @ 72 °C/85% R.H. (excellent robustness) ................................................... 48
Figure A4-21 Post 2X SnPb Reflow Exposures (excellent robustness) ................................................... 48
Figure A4-22 Post 2X Pb-Free Reflow Exposures (one outlier but overall, excellent robustness) ...... 49
Figure A4-23 Post 8 Hours @ 72 °C/85% R.H. (excellent robustness) ................................................... 49
Figure A4-24 Post 2X SnPb Reflow Exposures From Another Supplier (excellent robustness) ....... 50
Figure A4-25 Post 2X Pb-Free Reflow Exposures From Another Supplier (excellent robustness) ....... 50

SINGLE USER LICENSE - NOT FOR USE ON A NETWORK OR ONLINE




Figure A4-26 Post 8 Hours @ 72 °C/85% R.H. (some increased wetting times but overall excellent robustness) ........ 51

Figure A4-27 Post 2X SnPb Reflow Exposures From Another Supplier (excellent robustness) ....... 51

Figure A4-28 Post 2X Pb-Free Reflow Exposures From Another Supplier (excellent robustness) ....... 52

Figure A4-29 Post 8 Hours @ 72 °C/85% R.H. (excellent robustness) ........ 52

Figure A4-30 Post 2X SnPb Reflow Exposures From Another Supplier (increase in rate of rise time but overall excellent robustness) .......... 53

Figure A4-31 Post 2X Pb-Free Reflow Exposures From Another Supplier (increase in rate of rise time but again overall excellent robustness) ........ 53

Figure A4-32 Post 8 Hours @ 72 °C/85% R.H. (increased spread in the data but overall excellent robustness) ........ 54

Figure A5-F-1 Flowchart for Process ........ 56

Figure A5-1 Image of the Solder Spread Test Vehicle Used by IPC for This Testing ........ 56

Figure A5-2 Description of the Solder Spread Measurement Using the IPC Solder Spread Coupon ........ 56

Figure A5-3 PCB Solder Spread Versus Au Thickness for 4 ENIG Suppliers Using Pb-Free SAC Solder Paste ........ 57

Figure A5-4 Interaction Plot and Regression Analysis for Parameters Influencing Solder Spread on ENIG-Finished Pcbs in This Study .......... 58

Figure A5-5 Back-Scattered SEM Image of a Solder Spread Dot From an OSP Board With a Solder Spread Value of 21%. ........ 58

Figure A5-6 Solder Spread Coupons Soldered With Pb-Free SAC Solder After 8 Hours Exposure to 72 °C, 85% R.H. Left - thinnest gold sample from supplier #2 with 34% average spread, Right - thinnest gold sample from supplier #3 with 21% average spread. ........ 59

Figure A5-7 Maximum Solder Deposit Line Count (1-18) for all Boards [4 ENIG Suppliers] in the DOE Soldered With Pb-Free SAC Solder (left) and SnPb Eutectic Solder (right) Pastes. Data in the red region indicate areas with almost no spread and would likely show dewetting under inspection. Dewetting is a concern in the yellow region. ........ 59

Figure A7-1 An Example of a Test Vehicle and an Individual 20 – Hole Coupon That Is Showing Various Degrees of Hole Fill .......... 63

Figure A7-2 Example of the Coupon Internal Construction, Copper Weight and Interconnect Method to Inner Layers as Applicable – This is for the J1 Coupon ........ 63

Figure A7-3 XRF Measurements From the Fiducials of the 30 Test Vehicles and the Stressing Methods for Each Sample ........ 64

Figure A7-4 The Wave Soldering Parameters Used at Adtran for Processing of the Test Vehicles ... 65

Figure A7-5 Hole Fill Evaluation of the Non-Stressed Samples Tested Using Eutectic SnPb Solder ........ 65

Figure A7-6 The Impact of 2X Reflows on Samples Tested Subsequently with Eutectic SnPb Solder ........ 66

Figure A7-7 Impact on Hole Fill Defects When Samples Experience 2X Reflows + 8 Hours of 72 °C 85% R.H. ........ 67

Figure A7-8 Example of Complete Hole Fill and the Level of Inner Layer Interconnects from One Row of a Single Test Coupon from a Sample Tested with No Stressing with SnPb Solder ........ 68

Figure A7-9 Example of the Impact of Stressing on the Hole Fill Using 2X SnPb Reflows and Tested With SnPb Solder, the I Au Thickness was 1.71 µm″ ........ 69

Figure A7-10 Example of the Impact of Stressing on the Hole Fill Using 2X SnPb Reflows + 8 Hours of 72 °C/85% R.H. and Tested with SnPb Solder, the I Au Thickness was 2.96 µm″ ..... 70

Figure A7-11 The Hole Fill Defects Seen with SAC305 Solder on Non-Stressed Samples ........ 71

Figure A7-12 The Impact of 2X Reflow Stressing on Samples Subsequently Soldered with SAC305 Solder ........ 72

Figure A7-13 The Impact on Hole Fill Defects When the Samples Experience 2X Reflows + 8 Hours of 72 °C 85% R.H. ........ 73

Figure A7-14 Example of the Impact of Stressing on the Hole Fill Using 2X Pb-Free Reflows and Tested with SAC305 Solder; the I Au Thickness was 1.77 µm″ ........ 74

Figure A7-15 Example of the Impact of Stressing on the Hole Fill Using 2X Pb-Free Reflows + 8 Hours of 72 °C / 85% R.H. and Tested with SAC305 Solder; the I Au Thickness was 2.37 µm″ ........ 75

Figure A7-16 Summary Graph on Hole Fill Defects as a Function of Stressing Pre-Testing ........ 76

Figure A8-1 SEM/EDS/FIB Equipment Photo ........ 77

Figure A8-2 Sample VI (3000X) ........ 78

Figure A8-3 Potassium Iodide/iodine Gold Stripped EDAX Spectrum ........ 78

Figure A8-4 FIB-SEM Cross Section 10,000X ........ 79

Figure 8A-5 Sample VI, 3000X ........ 79

Figure A8-6 Cyanide Gold Stripped EDAX Spectrum ...... 79

Figure A8-7 Cyanide Gold Stripped EDAX Spectrum ...... 80

Figure A8-8 FIB-SEM Cross Section (10,000X) ........ 80

Figure A8-9 Sample VI, 10,000X ........ 80

Figure A8-10 Sample VI, 10,000X ........ 81

Figure A9-C-A Broad Beam Argon Ion Mill ........ 85

Figure A9-C-1 SEM Micrograph (BEI) of As-Finished ENIG Surface Prior to Broad Beam Ion Milling. ........ 89

SINGLE USER LICENSE - NOT FOR USE ON A NETWORK OR ONLINE



Figure A9-C-2 SEM Micrograph (BEI) of ENIG Surface After 30 Seconds of Ion Milling. Some Residual Gold Still Evident Indicating the Sample is Under-Milled. .......... 89
Figure A9-C-3 SEM Micrograph (BEI) of ENIG Surface After 1 Minute of Ion Milling. The Nodular Morphology is Intact and No Residual Gold is Evident Indicating That the Sample is Properly Milled. .......... 89
Figure A9-C-4 SEM Micrograph (BEI) of ENIG Surface After 15 Minutes of Ion Milling. No Residual Gold is Evident, but the Enhanced Grain Structure and Some Ditching Indicate the Sample is Over-Milled. .......... 89
Figure A9-C-5 SEM Micrograph (BEI) of ENIG Surface After 15 Minutes of Ion Milling. Hyper-Corrosion is Still Evident, but not Significantly Exaggerated. .......... 89
Figure A10-1 XRF Instrument Layout .......... 91
Figure A10-2 Sample Placement with Respect to Detector .......... 93
Figure A10-3 Positioning of a 1 mm ϕ Collimator on a 1.5 mm x 1.5 mm [0.060 in x 0.060 in] Pad .......... 93
Figure A10-4 Scheme of Interaction .......... 94
Figure A10-5 Spectrum of an EN layer on Cu (PCB), Showing $I_{P-K}$ and $I_{Ni-K}$. .......... 95
Figure A10-6 Spectra of Samples NiP12/Cu/PCB (blue) and 50 nm Au/96 nm Pd/3.2 µm NiP9.3/Cu/PCB (yellow), Showing Peak Overlap of P-K and Au-M Energy Lines .......... 96
Figure A11-1 Reported Phosphorus Content From Seven Test Sites for Sample A. The range in reported content is from a low of 3.85 wt.% to a high of 48.09 wt.%. Generally the higher reported values were from the lower kV values which is typically recommended by the EDS suppliers for evaluating Phosphorus. .......... 98
Figure A11-2 Reported Phosphorus Content From Eight Test Sites for Sample B. The range in reported content is from a low of 3.36 wt.% to a high of 58.09 wt.%. It is noted that the same test site did not produce these extreme values or was the same location for the data reported for Sample A. .......... 99
Figure A11-3 Reported Phosphorus Content From Eight Test Sites for Sample C. The range in reported content is from a low of 3.92 wt.% to a high of 61.24 wt.%. The same two locations that produced the extreme values for Sample B also produced them for Sample C. It is further noted that the low wt.% was produced at the highest accelerating voltage for test site # 2 and the lowest accelerating voltage for test site 8 .......... 99
Figure A11-4 The Most Consistent Wt.% Reported Regardless of Accelerating Voltage Being Used for Sample A Foil Group .......... 100
Figure A11-5 The Most Consistent Wt.% Reported Regardless of Accelerating Voltage Being Used for Sample B Foil Group .......... 100
Figure A11-6 The Most Consistent Wt.% Reported Regardless of Accelerating Voltage Being Used for Sample C Foil Group. The Same Two Test Sites Produced the Most Consistent Results for Sample B as Well. .......... 101
Figure A12-1 Results from Gold Thickness Survey .......... 103
Figure A12-2 Results from Nickel Thickness Survey .......... 104
Figure A12-3 Comparison of Gold Thickness Values by XRF Machine Type .......... 106
Figure A12-4 Comparison of Gold Plating Thickness Variation by Vendor for Similar Bath Life Conditions .......... 108
Figure A12-5 Comparison of Nickel Plating Thickness Variation by Vendor for Similar Bath Life Conditions .......... 109
Figure A12-6 Wetting Times as a Function of Plating Dwell Times for Vendor D, 90 Days Old .......... 110
Figure A12-7 Wetting Times as a Function of Plating Dwell Times for Vendor D, 90 Days Old .......... 111
Figure A12-8 Test Board for Wetting Balance Measurements .......... 112
Figure A12-9 Wetting Balance Data for Vendor D Post 18 Hours 85/85 Conditioning .......... 113
Figure A12-10 Comparison of One Microinch Gold Deposit Tested at 8 Months Shelf Life vs as Received and 85/85 .......... 114
Figure A12-11 Comparison of One Microinch Gold Deposit after Various Storage Times/Conditions .......... 115
Figure A12-12 Contact Resistance Data for Vendor D for Interlocking Square Contacts .......... 117
Figure A12-13 Contact Resistance Data for Vendor C for Interlocking Square Contacts .......... 118
Figure A12-14 Comparison of Gold Thickness by Vendor for the Interlocking Square Contact Test .......... 119
Figure A12-15 Interlocking Square Contact Test Coupon .......... 120
Figure A13-1a Part Misclassifications .......... 121
Figure A13-1b Part Misclassifications .......... 121
Figure A13-2 Guard Bands .......... 122
Figure A13-3 Type 1 Gauge Study Results .......... 123

## Tables

Table 3-1 Requirements of Electroless Nickel/Immersion Gold Plating .......... 4
Table 3-2 Twelve (12) Repeat Au Measurements and the Mean Value .......... 11
Table 3-3 Three Examples of XRF Data Sets [=µin] .......... 22
Table 3-4 One More Example of XRF Data [=µin] .......... 22
Table 3-5 Three Levels of Hyper-Corrosion Observed Using Optical Microscopy .......... 26
Table 4-1 Suggested Fabricator Qualification Plan .......... 31
Table 4-2 C=0 Sampling Plan (Sample Size for Specific Index Value[1]) .......... 32
Table A3-1 XRF Detectors and Their Limitations at Typical Count Rates .......... 35
Table A4-1 1.0 µin Minimum at -4 σ From the Mean Sample (all suppliers are below the target) .......... 38

SINGLE USER LICENSE - NOT FOR USE ON A NETWORK OR ONLINE



Table A4-2 1.5 μin Minimum at -4 σ From the Mean Sample (only one supplier met the goal) ...... 38

Table A4-3 2.0 μin Minimum at -4 σ From the Mean (Control Sample) (only one supplier met goal) ...... 38

Table A5-1 Au Thicknesses Measured by XRF for the PCBs Used for Solder Spread Testing From Appendix G3 ...... 55

Table A5-2 Description of Test Matrix for Solder Spread Evaluation ...... 55

Table A5-3 Average Solder Spread Result for Each Combination of Solder Paste, Au Thickness and PCB Conditioning ...... 57

Table A6-1 Average Thicknesses of Immersion Gold ...... 61

Table A6-2 Pull Values for 1 mil Aluminum Wire Bonds ...... 61

Table A6-3 Pull Values for 10 mil Aluminum Wire Bonds ...... 61

Table A6-4 Pull Values for 1 mil Copper Wire Bonds ...... 61

Table A10-1 Typical Achievable Results for NiP/Cu/PCB Samples (1mm Collimator; Measuring Time 120 s) ...... 92

Table A10-2 Evaluation of 5 Readings (Repeatability Conditions) of the Sample in Figure A10-6 ... 93

Table A13-1 Guard Band Sigma Recommendation ...... 121

Table A13-2 Guard Band Sigma Recommendation ...... 124

SINGLE USER LICENSE - NOT FOR USE ON A NETWORK OR ONLINE



# Performance Specification for Electroless Nickel/ Immersion Gold (ENIG) Plating for Printed Boards

## 1 SCOPE

**1.1 Statement of Scope** This performance specification sets requirements for Electroless Nickel/Immersion Gold (ENIG) deposit thicknesses for applications including soldering, wire bonding and as a contact finish. It is intended for use by chemical suppliers, printed board manufacturers, electronics manufacturing services (EMS) and original equipment manufacturers (OEM). This standard may be used to specify acceptance criteria to meet performance requirements in addition to those found in the IPC-6010-FAM: Printed Board Performance Specifications. The ENIG deposit specified by using this document will meet the highest coating durability rating as specified in the J-STD-003 printed board solderability specification.

This specification is based on three critical factors:

1. The ENIG plating process is in control producing a normal distribution for nickel and gold deposit thickness.
2. That the tool used to measure the deposit and therefore control the process is accurate and reproducible for the thickness range specified.
3. That the ENIG plating process results in uniform deposit characteristics.

If any of these three critical factors are not met, then the deposit produced will not meet the performance criteria defined herein.

**1.1.1 Feature Size for Thickness Measurement** This performance specification has been generated based on a deposit thickness measured ONLY on feature sizes of 1.5 mm x 1.5 mm [0.060 in x 0.060 in] or equivalent area (± 10%). Measurement of non-standard feature sizes and/or a combination of different feature sizes will prevent compliance to the statistical requirements of this specification. Requirements to measure non-standard sized features is AABUS and the supplier of the printed board is not responsible for the performance of the deposit as specified in this document.

**1.2 Description** ENIG is an electroless nickel layer capped with a thin layer of immersion gold. It is a multifunctional surface finish, applicable to soldering, aluminum and copper wedge wire bonding, press fit connections, and as a contact surface. The immersion gold layer protects the underlying nickel from oxidation/passivation over its intended life. However, this layer is not impervious and it will not pass the requirements of a “classic” porosity test as defined in ASTM B 735 & IPC-TM-650, Methods 2.3.24, 2.3.24.1 and 2.3.24.2).

**1.2.1 Electroless Nickel Reducing Agents – Phosphorus Content** Phosphorus-containing, reducing agents are used for the reduction of the electroless nickel during the deposition process and phosphorus is incorporated in the nickel deposit. Currently there are two levels of phosphorus found in electroless nickel deposits used for ENIG:

1. A mid-phosphorus nickel with phosphorus levels ranging from 5 wt. % to 10 wt. %
2. A high phosphorus nickel with phosphorus levels greater than 10.0 wt. %.

The level of this co-deposited element should be controlled within the supplier’s specified process limits. Variation of phosphorus levels outside the specified process limits may have adverse effects on the performance of the finish and/or potentially increase the occurrence and/or severity of hyper-corrosion.

The phosphorus content within the interfacial region between the electroless nickel and immersion gold layers is higher than that found in the bulk deposit. After soldering, the phosphorus levels at the interface between solder and the electroless nickel will always be higher than that found on a non-soldered pad, as the tin in the solder preferentially reacts with the nickel, leaving a phosphorus-rich layer behind. This is a NORMAL and expected occurrence.

**1.3 Objective** This specification sets the requirements specific to ENIG as a surface finish (see Table 3-1 for a summary of these requirements). As other finishes require specifications, they will be addressed by the IPC Plating Processes Subcommittee as part of the IPC-455X specification family. As this and other applicable specifications are under continuous review, the subcommittee will add appropriate amendments and make necessary revisions to these documents. The 4-14