

PROBLEM A (DEFECT CLASSIFICATION)

IE3100M SYSTEMS DESIGN PROJECT AY19/20 **DEFECT CLASSIFICATION THROUGH MACHINE LEARNING FROM AUTOMATED OPTICAL INSPECTION DATA**

Department of Industrial Systems Engineering and Management Chan Fan Mao | Koh Kai Lun | Loh Jun Hao, Benjamin | Ngiam Qian Qi Department Supervisors: Professor Andrew Lim | Professor Li Chong Shou Industrial Supervisors: Dr Xu Xiao Yan | Mr Vincent Cheng

METHODOLOGY

- Current quality control machines are only able to detect presence of defects but are unable to classify defects according to various defect types.
- Accuracy of KLA machine in detecting actual defects is very low (~20%)
- Requires operators to carry out manual classification which is highly inefficient and inaccurate as there is a lack of proper classification system to ensure consistent quality of checks.
- Lack of Data Visualization tool to effectively analyze data for root cause analysis

OBJECTIVES

1. Transform defect detection process to be more data-driven

- 2. To improve accuracy rates of defect classifications through convolutional neural network (CNN) model
- 3. To enable the machine to do automatic classification of defect on wafer chip
- 4. Perform data analysis on the performance of CNN model

1.DATA PRE-PROCESSING

- Raw image data collected must first be converted into a clean, usable data set using data preparation techniques
- Upon analyzing the collected image with defect types, several problems are identified

DUPLICATE AND NOISY IMAGE DATA







problem









Understand process flow in current defect

classification and effectively define the



Testing and evaluating the performance of convolutional neural network model through key performance indicators

2. DATA TRANSFORMATION

- Annotation of defect types for training image data
- Annotated defect images highlights features specific to defect types which facilitates training CNN model
- Helps to effectively predict images of defect types with high accuracy during testing phase

Collected **Defect Images**



PROJECT **IMPLEMENTATION**



4.RESULTS DISCUSSION

Short Burr

~90%

Dirt on Tool

90%

Burr

~95%

Yield Trend: Tracks defect rates over time

Location: Helps identify common defect locations

Pareto: Determines overall spread of defects

Lead Bent

~ 90%

Defect

Туре

Accuracy

Im age

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

		Actual			
	Model	Pass	Fail		
		199	8		
Predicted	Pass	(True Positive)	(False Positive)		
		11	202		
	Fail	(False Negative)	(True Negative)		

Accuracy Rate = (True Positive + True Negative) / All **Observations**)

Specificity = True Negative / (True Negative + False Positive) Sensitivity (Recall) = True Positive / (True Positive + False Negative)

Precision = True Positive / (True Positive + False Positive)

F1 score = 2 x Recall x Precision / (Precision + Recall)

Accuracy	Specificity	Sensitivity	Precision	F1 score
95.50%	96.19%	94.67%	96.13%	95.44%

Escapee Rate Overall Reject Rate

1.90% 2.60%

Solder Flake

90%

Escapee Rate: Risk of customer receiving defective wafer chip Reject Rate: Proportion of wastage in percentage

5. FUTURE DISCUSSIONS

To roll out to different machines with different defect types classifications

Potential Benefits:

- Wider scale cost savings throughout company
- Higher quality of manufactured wafer chips





3. CNN MODEL FORMULATION



- Utilized back propagation, an algorithm used to train CNN model in supervised learning,
- Objective of minimizing loss function through updating model's weights





 Improved productivity as employees can contribute to activities that are more value-adding

6. ISE CONCEPTS APPLIED:

- Modelling and Analytics
- System Thinking
- Project Management
- Quality Engineering
- Statistics

7.OTHER SKILLS ACQUIRED:

- Classification
- Data Pre-Processing
- Image labelling
- Data Cleaning
- Testing and Evaluation
- Data Visualization
- Data Analysis
- Data Selection
- Basic Modelling

PROBLEM B (IFAME)

- Quality engineers utilize iFame, an internal defect database search engine to retrieve past defect reports based on similar defect images uploaded for analysis.
- iFame faces inaccuracies in results as the defect reports returned to engineers are inconsistent with image defect type uploaded.



METHODOLOGY

Understand process flow taken by engineers in iFame to retrieve defect reports and effectively define the problem

IMPLEMENTATION

- system
- Long, Laborious and Complicated to complete
- Charts are not reflective of the most updated data 3. Automate the updating of the from the system
- **OBJECTIVES**
- 1. Design a simple and easy to read dashboard for data visualization
- 2. Real-time update of dashboard
- consisting of charts and figures dashboard for convenience
- 4. Easy use and maintanence of

dashboard



Identify and conceptualize proper procedures required to test the performance of iFame

PROJECT

Testing



Results

Results

Evaluation

Feedback

PROBLEM C (DATA VISULIZATION)

• Engineers are required to record and upload performance and measurement data into the

- Figures and charts are messy, complicated and hard to understand

• Delays engineer progress to reference to correct report for investigation to remedy related defect type.

OBJECTIVES

- 1. To investigate iFame's current performance through various key performance indicators
- 2. Gather feedback and observations during iFame testing and share them with developers to improve iFame's performance
- 3. Gain exposure to procedures involved in detailed testing and data analysis of key performance indicators

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

EIPD (Test Ru	in 1)						
		Abi_FM	CK_FM	Average	Abi_layout	CK_layout	Average
Case tested	13						
Hit Rate_accuracy		42%	35%	39%	10%	13%	12%
Hit Rate_Coverage		69%	62%	66%	31%	46%	39%
EIPD (Test Ru	n 2)						
		Abi_FM	CK_FM	Average	Abi_layout	CK_layout	Average
Case tested	3	37					
Hit Rate_accuracy		729	6 53%	63%	33%	42%	38%
Hit Rate_Coverage		869	6 81%	84%	65%	78%	72%

Coverage Value = 0 (Reports returned have no similarity in defect type or layout)

OR = 1 (At least one report returned have similarity in defect type or

layout)

Failure Mode Hit Rate = Sum of Similar Defect Type Reports / Total Reports Returned

Layout Hit Rate = Sum of Similar Layout in Reports Returned / Total Reports Returned



Testing and evaluating the performance of iFame through key performance indicators



performance

1.TESTING

1) Create a test plan and test script to conduct testing on iFame 2) Upload image of defect chip onto iFame

3) Returns 20 defect reports based on similarities with defect image

2. OBTAINING RESULTS

1) Record number of failure mode hit, layout hit and coverage 2) Repeat for different defect type (30 images for each defect) 3) Calculate average hit rates (Failure mode and Layout)

3. EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK

1) Identify defects with low hit rate and coverage 2) Repeat the testing and obtaining results phase over many runs 3) Track accuracy and performance of model over time

4. ISE CONCEPTS AND SKILLS ACQUIRED:

Statistical analysis / Creating Test Plan and Script / Obtaining Insights from Data

SOLUTION

• Implementation of Tableau, a data visualization tool that allows realtime updates

- Microsoft Query to automatically download the data from SharePoint and update the dashboard accordingly
- An operating manual to ensure use and maintenance of the dashboard
- **SKILLS ACQUIRED:** • Choosing the right data to visualise
- Design of
- Dashboard • Microsoft Query



FY 2019 Chair Measurements (Ohms)

