

Jean-Marie Lauenstein¹, Megan Casey¹, Alyson Topper², Edward Wilcox², Anthony Phan², Stanley Ikpe³, and Ken LaBel¹

Jean-Marie Lauenstein

Introduction

This work presents heavy-ion test data for several SiC power MOSFETs and diodes in order to increase the body of knowledge that will enable single-event effect (SEE) hardening of this technology. Specifically, diode data and MOSFET current signatures under different bias, temperature, and beam conditions are presented for devices from different manufacturers or different generations within a single manufacturer, and the emerging patterns are discussed.

Both the performance benefits of SiC over Si power devices (Fig. 1) and the high tolerance of commercial SiC components to total ionizing dose (TID) [1-3] have enhanced the allure of SiC technology in the aerospace community. To date, however, SiC power devices have not performed well under heavy-ion irradiation, suffering permanent degradation and/or catastrophic SEE (Fig. 2, modified from [6]) [4-6]. The mechanisms of heavy-ion induced degradation and failure are an active area of research [6-9].



Fig. 1. Benefits of SiC power technology as compared to silicon.



Fig. 2. Power diode response to heavy-ion irradiation range from no permanent effect to leakage current degradation to sudden catastrophic single-event burnout (SEB) depending on the reverse bias voltage (V_R) during irradiation [6].

Test Methods and Devices

Device Type	Technology	# of Part Types/ Manufacturers	Voltage Rating (V)					
Power MOSFET	VDMOS*	7/4	1200 – 3300					
Diode	SBD [†]	3/3	650 – 1200					
Diode	PiN	2/1	1200 – 3300					
*VDMOS: Vertical, planar gate double-diffused power MOSFET								
[†] SBD: Schottky barrier diode								

Part Preparation

- Typical sample size of each part type: 15 pieces

Beam Conditions

Diode Single-Event Effect Testing

- Test conditions:

- each run Failure criteria:

Power MOSFET Single-Event Effect Testing

- Test conditions:

- Failure criteria:
- BV_{DSS} pre- vs. post-irradiation;

Facility	lon	Energy <i>(M</i> eV)	LET* (SiC) <i>(MeV-cm²/mg)</i>	Range (SiC) <i>(µm)</i>			
	Ne	267	2.9	177			
TAMU	Ag	1110	49	66			
	Xe	1291	60	64			
	Ar	361	11	77			
	Cu	566	23	61			
LDINL	Kr	750	34	62			
	Xe	996	65	45			
*LET = linear energy transfer							

Silicon Carbide Power Device Performance Under Heavy-Ion Irradiation

1. NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD; 2. AS&D, Inc., Beltsville, MD; 3. NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, VA

Abstract: Heavy-ion induced degradation and catastrophic failure in SiC power MOSFETs and diodes are examined to provide insight into the challenge of single-event effect hardening of SiC power devices.

Table I: Summary of SiC Power Devices Tested

 Decapsulation via acid-etching or manufacturer-supplied unlidded. 1-mil parylene-C deposited to prevent arcing.

 Heavy-ion beam facility and properties given in Table II. - Flux range: under 10 cm⁻² s⁻¹ up to 5×10^3 cm⁻² s⁻¹.

- Reverse bias (V_R) incremented before each run; - DC peak reverse voltage (V_{RRM}) and I-V curves measured after

- Maximum bias yielding no degradation: no measurable change in reverse current (I_R) pre- vs. post-irradiation; - Threshold bias for sudden SEB: catastrophic failure

 $(\Delta I_{R} > 20 \text{ mA}, \text{ shorted device})$ upon beam shutter opening.

- Gate-source voltage (V_{GS}) held at 0 V (off-state); - Drain-source voltage (V_{DS}) incremented before each run; Post-irradiation gate stress (PIGS) test performed and breakdown voltage (BV_{DSS}) measured after each run.

- Maximum bias yielding no degradation: no change in PIGS or

- Onset bias for current degradation: lowest bias yielding measurable change in gate (I_G) or drain (I_D) current during run; – Threshold bias for sudden SEE: catastrophic failure $(\Delta I_D > 20 \text{ mA and } BV_{DSS} < 1 \text{ V (shorted), or } \Delta I_G > 1 \text{ mA})$ immediately upon beam exposure.

Table II: Heavy Ion Facilities and Ions Used Values are Surface-Incident to the Die

Tables III and IV summarize results of the discrete power diode and MOSFET responses to heavy-ion irradiation. Device hardness was evaluated principally under Ag and Xe irradiation to reveal performance at typical robotic mission SEE hardness requirement conditions (LET > 40 MeV-cm²/mg in silicon, range to Bragg peak > overlayer + epilayer thickness). Diode ("D") and MOSFET ("M") manufacturers are distinguished by numerical identification; different parts from the same manufacturer are further distinguished by sequential lettering ("A", "B", etc.). See Test Methods section for definitions and criteria for the tabulated device responses. Importantly, the threshold bias condition necessary for catastrophic SEB or single-event gate rupture (SEGR) cannot be identified due to the rapid degradation and damage to the device when irradiated at biases just below that resulting in immediate catastrophic failure upon beam exposure [6]. In Table IV, V_{DS} levels falling between the maximum bias at which no damage was measured (column 4) and the onset bias for current degradation (column 5), resulted in latent degradation identified only after beam exposure during PIGS or BV_{DSS} testing. The degradation revealed by these tests was in part a function of ion fluence as opposed to a true single-event effect.

Table III: Summary of Discrete Power Diode Test Results

							-		C				
lon	Device	Туре	Rated	Max V _R	Min V _R Sudden SEB		lon	Device	Rated	Max V _{DS}	Onset V _{DS} : I _D , I _G Degradation		Min V _{DS}
			Voltage	No Degradation	V	%			Voltage	No Damage	$I_G = I_D$	$I_D > I_G$	Sudden SEE
1110 MeV Ag	D1A	PiN	1200	350 ≤ V _R < 375	$425 < V_{R} \le 500$	35% - 42%	1110 MeV Ag	M1	1200	50 < V _{DS} < 75	$200 \le V_{DS} < 225$	$350 < V_{DS} < 400$	500 < SEB ≤ 600
	*D1B	PiN	3300	400 ≤ V _R < 450	$800 < V_R \le 1000$	24% - 30%		M6	1200	25 < V _{DS} < 50	50 < V _{DS} < 100	not found	SEE ≤600 (see Xe)
	D2	SBD	1200	100 ≤ V _R < 200	$500 \le V_R \le 550$	42% - 46%	996 MeV	M1	1200	50 < V _{DS} < 75	$200 < V_{DS} < 300$	400 < V _{DS} < 425	450 < SEB ≤ 500
	D3	SBD	1200	not found (< 350)	$475 < V_R \le 500$	40% - 42%		M2A	1200	$40 < V_{DS} < 50$	< 182	*400 < V _{DS} < 500	600 < SEB ≤ 700
	D4	SBD	650	150 ≤ V _R < 175	250 < V _R ≤ 300	38% - 46%		M2B	1200	50 < V _{DS} < 60	< 182	300 < V _{DS} < 400	not found (> 500)
1291	D2	SBD	1200	150 ≤ V _R < 175	not found ((see Ag)	Хе	M2C	3300	50 < V _{DS} < 75	n/a [†]	$325 < V_{DS} < 350$	600 < SEB ≤ 800
MeV Xe	D4	SBD	650	150 ≤ V _R < 175	not found ((see Ag)		M5	1200	$40 < V_{DS} < 50$	< 182	200 < V _{DS} < 400	400 ≤ SEE ≤ 600
996 MeV		iN 1200 325 < V ~	325 < V₂ < 350	450 - V < 475	38% - 40%		M6	1200	not found	not found	not found (≤ 500)	SEE >500 (see Ag)	
Хе			1200	$\frac{1}{200} \frac{323}{2} \frac{1}{2} $	+00 < V _R = +10		566 MeV						
278 MeV	D3	SBD	1200	$550 \le V_{\rm p} \le 600$	600	50%	Cu	M5	1200	70 < V _{DS} < 80	$200 < V_{DS} \le 400$	not found (> 400)	400 < SEB ≤ 600
Ne			1200				*Onset > 400 V based on 4 samples irradiated to low, 1x10 ³ cm ^{-2,} fluence						

*Small sample size; older-quality wafer



Fig. 3. D4 response to Ag radiation. Left: I_{R} degradation is proportional to fluence (ϕ) rate increases (non-linearly) with V_{R} [6]. Middle: SEB susceptibility is reduced b damage [6] and functionality is gradually lost. $dI_R/d\phi$ decreases possibly due to reduced mobility (thus impact ionization) from heat and/or collapsed drift fields from the distributed excessive I_R. Right: Immediate SEB upon a pristine D4 sample exposure to Ag ions.



Fig. 4. Low-Z ion exposure. Left: SEB in absence of I_R degradation. Right: Despite minimal degradation at lower V_{R} , sudden SEB occurs at a higher V_{R} (750 V vs. 600 V) than sample on left, possibly due to inhibition by prior damage [6]. Note $dI_R/d\phi$ increases slightly with total fluence.

Results









Discussion

Several conclusions emerge from Tables III & IV:

- PiN diodes exhibit higher onset V_R for heavy-ion induced degradation of I_{R} than do SBDs, but similar susceptibility to sudden SEB.
- Different mechanisms may be responsible for the two responses.
- Not surprisingly, PiN diode performance is more comparable to power MOSFET I_{DS} and sudden SEB performance than is SBD performance.
- Gate leakage current effects (latent and prompt) show the most variability between part types and manufacturers.
- Process and geometry play an important role in I_Grelated effects.
- Known defect-dense SiC material results in sudden SEB at a lower fraction of rated V_{R} .









2.0x10⁻²-

Discussion Cont'd

In silicon power MOSFETs, SEB susceptibility during radiation testing is often reduced by elevated temperature and/or by the addition of a drain resistor to dampen the drain voltage and suppress second breakdown. In two of the SiC power MOSFETs studied here, elevated temperature tests did not impact current degradation or sudden SEB onset, suggesting different fundamental mechanisms are involved in SiC power devices.

Small sample sizes limit the conclusions that can be drawn from the studies conducted here. It is hoped that this work will contribute meaningfully to the growing collaboration of SiC power device researchers seeking to understand the failure mechanisms in order to harden these devices against heavy ions and neutrons.

Conclusions

From the work presented here and performed by others, it is clear that serendipitously SEE-hard commercial SiC power devices are rare or non-existent. Most space applications will require SiC power devices that have been hardened to SEE.

All commercial SiC power devices evaluated here exhibit immediate catastrophic SEE at biases below 60 % of their rated breakdown voltage and experience permanent degradation down to much lower biases (< 10 % for MOSFETs). The catastrophic SEE safe operating area falls within the range of biases at which cumulative degradation occurs and at this time cannot be established for space applications. This limitation is compounded by the unknown impact of the non-catastrophic, cumulative heavyion damage on device life time. Much work remains to be done to reliably introduce SiC technology into space applications.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported in part by the NASA Electronic Parts and Packaging (NEPP) Program, NASA Solar Electric Propulsion Program, the NASA High-Temperature Boost Power Processing Unit Project, other NASA flight projects, and the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA). We thank the different manufacturers who contributed to this work.

In addition, we thank Ray Ladbury, Yusif Nurizade, Stephen Cox, Jim Forney, Martha O'Bryan, and Donna Cochran of NASA-GSFC, for technical assistance.