

What are the IRPS VIRTUALS?

- See the visuals with the video and audio of the platform presentations
- Click to go back or jump ahead by visual
- The pdfs of the visuals and the text and figures of the manuscripts including posters

IRPS records the video and audio of the Year-In-Review presentations and the Symposium platform presentations to enable the production of files that can be viewed employing the Internet Explorer browser. The files are rendered at local play-back resolution. The visuals with video and the text with figures of the manuscript are combined together to form a "Virtual Symposium." The "Virtual Year-In-Review" has video, audio, and visuals (there is no text just the visuals). The 2011 virtuals are available on USB flash drives while previous years are available on DVDROM.

video

navigate visuals list

Low-Energy Proton Testing Challenges

Linear Energy Transfer (MeV cm²/mg)

Proton Kinetic Energy (keV)

Experimental Data
PSTAR/CIRCU-49
SRAM 2008

Data from H. Paul, <http://www.exphys.jku.at/stopping/>

- Increased (dE/dx)/p variability at the Bragg peak – systematic error
- Problems increase with flip-chip irradiation

Energy/range straggling close the Bragg peak makes (dE/dx)/p a stochastic process

8/15

visual

Fig. 1: Single- and double-bit proton upset (SEU and DSEU) in an IBM 47 nm SOCMOS SRAM after [1]. The cross sections for proton energies below 2 MeV are the points dominated by direct ionization, resulting in a 10% increase for SEU and a 10% increase for DSEU. These irradiations were carried out at the UC Davis Crocker Nuclear Laboratory, which is pictured in Fig. 2.

Fig. 3: Experimental and simulated proton linear energy transfer (mass stopping power) as a function of energy in silicon. The experimental values, shown as open circles, are from Helmut Paul's database [22, 23]. The simulated linear energy transfer curves were calculated using SRIM-2008 [24, 25] and NIST PSTAR [26, 27]. The points on the simulation curves are sparse at low energy. Note that the PSTAR calculations do not go below 1 keV.

Fig. 2: Test setup for experimental low-energy proton testing at the University of California at Davis Crocker Nuclear Laboratory. The electron at the Crocker Lab can provide low-energy proton beams of a few megaelectron volts that can be degraded further by using microstate-thick aluminum and Al-bar foils in air downstream of the beam entrance. The daughter card is attached to the NASA/GSFC Xilinx Spartan-3E-based low-cost digital tester [20].

The issues with accelerated low-energy proton testing can be summarized as limited range, energy straggling, and uncertainty in electronic stopping power. A 2 MeV proton has a range of approximately 50 μm in silicon and 7 μm in air, which means that testing either has to be carried out in a vacuum or tested in air using foil degraders. The inaccuracy of testing in vacuum mode, the difficulty is exacerbated by the fact that at 2 MeV the LET of the proton is too low to generate enough charge to cause a soft error. Facilities can lower the proton energy below the beam tube energy using a combination of aluminum and Mylar degraders from hundreds of nanometers to several micrometers thick along with air columns and the semiconductor die itself. Particle range limitations become severe with flip-chip ball grid arrays where irradiation has to be done through the substrate. In-situ device thinning is often necessary, which is problematic because the ball grid array is under stress and will crack the die without sufficient mechanical support [21].

Fig. 3 shows experimental measurements of proton LET in silicon, compiled from Helmut Paul's database [22, 23], as well as two theoretical calculations of proton LET in silicon using SRIM-2008 [24, 25] and the National Institute of Standards and Technology's PSTAR tool [26]. The latter is based on ICRU Report 49 [27]. As the figure shows, at high energy there is good agreement between experiment and theory. However, below 1 MeV, moving up towards the Bragg peak, the spread in experimental data becomes large. These low-energy transmission measurements require thin foils, making the presence of pin holes and other material variations critical. The critical angle for ion channeling also increases at low energy along with the importance of multiple scattering [27]. These experimental facts translate to uncertainty in