IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

GREENTHREAD, LLC,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
VS.	)	Civil Action No.
	)	1:23-cv-00369-DC
CIRRUS LOGIC, INC.,	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

CONFIDENTIAL - OUSIDE ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
ORAL AND VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF
SCOTT WARRICK
JUNE 7, 2024

Reported by: Donna Wright, CSR

DIGITAL EVIDENCE GROUP
1730 M Street, NW, Suite 812
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 232-0646

1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Here begins the
2 deposition of Scott Warrick taking place at
3 2801 Via Fortuna in Austin, Texas, in the matter of
4 Greenthread, LLC versus Cirrus Logic, Inc., filed in
5 the United States District Court for the Western
6 District of Texas, Austin Division. The cause number
7 is 1:23-CV-00369.
8 Today's date is June 7, 2024, and the
9 time is 8:13 a.m. Will counsel please identify
10 themselves for the record, after which the court
11 reporter will swear in the witness.
12 MR. MATICH: Nick Matich of McKool Smith
13 for the plaintiff, Greenthread.
14 MR. OZARKAR: Neil Ozarkar from McKool
15 Smith for the plaintiff Greenthread as well.
16 MR. LIDDELL: Andrew Liddell for the
17 defendant Cirrus Logic, and I'm joined today by my
18 colleague Bert Greene, also with Duane Morris, and
19 Cirrus Logic's in-house counsel, Michelle Connors.
20 THE REPORTER: Okay. Will you raise your
21 right hand, please?
22 (Witness sworn.)

1 MR. LIDDELL: Nick, before we begin, I
2 would like to designate this entire transcript
3 confidential, outside attorneys' eyes only.
4 And note for the record today that Mr.
5 Warrick is being put up for Topics 24, 25, 28, 29, 31,
6 32, 60, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83 and 84 of Greenthread's
7 30(b)(6) notice.
8 MR. MATICH: Okay. Thank you. We will
9 note your designation. Obviously we will see where the
10 deposition goes to see if the designation is
11 appropriate. And we can get started.
12 MR. LIDDELL: I would also just to like
13 note for the record that Mr. Warrick has also been
14 noticed for his personal deposition, and so any
15 testimony outside the scope of designated topics is in
16 his personal capacity.
17 SCOTT WARRICK,
18 having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:
19 EXAMINATION
20 BY MR. MATICH:
21 Q. Okay. Good morning, Mr. Warrick.
22 A. Good morning.

it.

Q. And, again, if you want to see more of any document that I show you, you can ask the tech and he will scroll -- scroll through it.

What's your understanding of what this document is?

A. This is the -- this is the suit against Cirrus Logic and the underlying claims and questions, as I understand it.

Q. Okay. So would -- do you also understand that this document lays out topics on which you are here to testify?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And is the list of topics that Mr. Liddell read at the beginning the list of topics on which you are here to testify?

A. Can we repeat that list and go through these?

Q. Sure. So can we go to --

A. What page is this?

Q. -- Topic 24.

A. Yes.

Q. Sorry, that's --

A. Sorry. That's Topic 24.
Q. Oh, yes, okay.
So you are here to testify on Topic 24?
A. Correct.
Q. And 25?
A. That's correct.
Q. And 28?
A. That's correct.
Q. 29?
A. That's correct.
Q. 31?
A. That's correct.
Q. 32?
A. That's correct.
Q. 60?
A. That's correct.
Q. 79?
A. That's correct.
Q. 80?
A. That's correct.
Q. 81?
A. That's correct.

Q. 82?
A. That's correct.
Q. 83?
A. That's correct.
Q. And 84?
A. That's correct.
Q. Great.
And is it your understanding that your answers in response to questions for those topics are binding on Cirrus Logic?
A. That is my understanding.
Q. So I'm going to -- I want to ask you if you talked to certain people in preparing for today's deposition, and I'm just going to read their names and if you can tell me whether or not you spoke to them --
A. Okay.
Q. -- to prepare for today's deposition?
A. Okay.
Q. Zhonghai Shi?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Marc Tarabbia?
A. Yes.

1 A. That is Mayank Shah.
2 Q. Can you spell that?
3 A. M-A-Y-A-N-K, S-H-A-H, I'm going to believe.
4 Q. Okay. And did you speak to any of his
5 subordinates?
6 A. I did not.
7 Q. Okay. And what did you -- what did you talk
8 to him about?
9 A. I talked to him specifically about tool -- I'm
10 sorry, the failure analysis tools, equipment,
11 techniques, as well as any outside use of such
12 techniques at various labs.
13 I also discussed with him -- because he
14 is a long-term Cirrus employee, I discussed with him
15 past -- you know, past employees, past -- past working
16 methodologies, these type of things.
17 Q. Okay. Let's go back to Alex Barr for a
18 second.
19 So you -- you said he's part of the
20 silicon technology group?
21 A. Correct.
22 Q. Is he in the silicon technology development

1 group?
2 A. Yes, he is.
3 Q. And what did you talk to him about?
4 A. We discussed a number of topics.
5 Specifically, we reviewed the patents from -- from this
6 case, both the -- both the patents that you -- or that,
7 I guess, are involved in the lawsuit, as well as the
8 list of patents that -- that was in question, one of
9 the questions. I forget which one. So we discussed
10 all of that.
11 We additionally discussed -- discussed a
12 good number of topics about -- regarding, I guess, the
13 patents in general.
14 Q. And what did Mr. Barr tell you about
15 Greenthread's patents?
16 A. So we discussed the -- we discussed the patent
17 claims. We discussed prior art. We discussed physics
18 of -- the physics of what is happening to -- to, you
19 know, carriers. We discussed -- yeah, I guess that
20 would summarize in large tail what we discussed.
21 Q. What did you discuss with regard to the
22 patents in -- that are listed in the 30(b)(6) notice --

1 or, sorry, the Cirrus Logic patent applications that
2 are listed in this 30(b)(6) notice?
3 A. Yeah, can we go to that page?
4 Q. Yeah.
5 MR. MATICH: Can we pull up Tab 1, which
6 is -- yeah, it's already been marked as -- I believe
7 it's Exhibit 3. If we go down to Topic 80. I'm sorry,
8 keep going down.
9 THE WITNESS: I believe it was before
10 that.
11 Q. (BY MR. MATICH) Yeah, can we go to topic --
12 A. I want to say 34 or something in there. I
13 don't have it in front of me, though.
14 Q. Sorry. Topic 83.
15 A. Sorry about that.
16 Q. All right. So just so there is a clear
17 record, you discussed with Mr. Barr the patent
18 applications listed in Topic 83 of the 30(b)(6) notice?
19 A. I did.
20 Q. And what did he tell you about those patent
21 applications?
22 A. We went through the patent applications. I

1 don't -- we just discussed them. I'm not sure he told
2 me any conclusion. We discussed each patent
3 application.
4 Q. And you said you discussed the -- with him the
5 physics of carrier movement in relation to
6 Greenthread's patents; is that correct?
7 A. Correct.
8 Q. And what did -- what did Mr. Barr say?
9 A. You know, we just discussed how the -- how the
10 carriers would be moving versus the claims in the
11 patent. I'm not sure he had a conclusion to it.
12 Q. Okay. All right. So then you also discussed
13 with the -- with Justin Dougherty?
14 A. Correct.
15 Q. And what did you discuss with Mr. Dougherty?
16 A. The overall -- I would say the overall case,
17 the involvement -- you know, the involvement of myself
18 and the patent applications and just the overall kind
19 of review of it.
20 Q. What did he tell you as part of those
21 conversations?
22 A. No -- no conclusions of anything. It was a

1 you're talking about the patents listed in Topic 83 or
2 Greenthread's patents.
3 A. Greenthread's patents, yeah.
4 Q. Okay.
5 A. I did refresh myself with the -- specifically
6 the patent in No. 83, which I am listed on, because I
7 didn't recall -- I recall it was abandoned, but I
8 didn't recall it. I specifically read that one over.
9 But I refreshed my understanding of
10 Greenthread patents.
11 Q. And all told, about how many hours did you
12 spend preparing for this deposition?
13 A. Between -- I would say, in earnest, between
14 January and today, 80-plus hours or something, you
15 know.
16 Q. Okay. So the -- this deposition wasn't
17 noticed until May.
18 A. Correct.
19 Q. So how did you start preparing in January?
20 A. So in January I was in -- I was in Asia, and
21 specifically I was meeting with the foundries, TSMC in
22 this case. I had -- I was -- I had a discussion with

1 TSMC, TD and TSMC counsel about the -- about
2 Greenthread's claims and patents and -- and I continued
3 to just kind of keep my understanding of what was --
4 what was going on.
5 So from that point until, in earnest,
6 discussions with people for the deposition, I mean,
7 that's where I started having, you know, more detailed
8 discussions about -- about you know, the people
9 involved and refreshing myself on all of that.
10 Q. Okay. But focusing on the period since the
11 deposition was noticed --
12 A. Uh-huh.
13 Q. -- about how much time did you spend
14 preparing?
15 A. What day -- so May 27, roughly. I don't know.
16 I mean, call it ten to 12 hours.
17 Q. Okay. Great.
18 MR. MATICH: Could we pull up Tab 2 and
19 mark it as -- are we on Exhibit 4?
20 EXHIBIT TECH: We're on Exhibit 4.
21 (Exhibit 4 marked)
22 Q. (BY MR. MATICH) Mr. Warrick, I'm going to --

1 Exhibit 4 is a series of screenshots of what I
2 understand to be your LinkedIn profile. The -- it's
3 formatted this way because you can't -- it's the
4 easiest way to get the same information on one or two
5 pages. There's actually two pages, so can we scroll to
6 Page 2?
7 So, Mr. Warrick, do you recognize the
8 information that's in Exhibit 4?
9 A. Yes.
10 Q. Okay. Is this information from your LinkedIn
11 profile?
12 A. Yes.
13 Q. Is there anything inaccurate in what's here?
14 A. No.
15 Q. Okay. Do you have other experience or
16 education in the semiconductor field that is not
17 represented in Exhibit 4?
18 A. No.
19 Q. Is there any professional or educational
20 experience relevant to this case that is not
21 represented in Exhibit 4?
22 A. No.

1 Q. What's your understanding of n+ and n- and p+
2 and p-?
3 A. I mean, the normal -- the normal lexicon, for
4 lack of a better word, is -- p+ is a heavily-doped or
5 more heavily-doped p-type region. The n+ would be
6 similarly a more heavily-doped n-type region.
7 N-, keeping with the same, you know, kind
8 of structure, the n- would be a lesser-doped region.
9 Q. Does the temperature of a device affect
10 carrier motion?
11 A. Can you clarify for me, are you talking
12 operating temperature or what -- what are we talking
13 about?
14 Q. Just in general, in a transistor, if it gets
15 hotter, does a carrier -- is there more resistance to
16 carrier motion?
17 A. So for transistor self-heating, yes, it
18 affects carrier mobility.
19 Q. And what is transistor self-heating?
20 A. Essentially the transistor, in operating, is
21 becoming -- you know, becoming more -- becoming hot.
22 Q. Is there anything that affects the ease of

1 carrier movement in a semiconductor device?
2 A. So the ease of carrier movement in a
3 semiconductor device, you know, the size of the device
4 matters, the doping of the device matters, the
5 potential on the device matters, the -- yeah, all of --
6 I would say it's probably a long list of these type of
7 physics attributes, which affect the movement of
8 carriers.
9 Q. Okay. Is silicon a resistor or a conductor,
10 intrinsic silicon?
11 A. It's a semiconductor.
12 Q. The silicon without any doping in it, is
13 that -- is that a conductor or a resistor?
14 A. I mean, it's a semiconductor. Silicon without
15 any doping would be a semiconductor.
16 Q. Okay. What --
17 A. It would have low level of conduction, you
18 know, to -- to basically get it to be conductor, you
19 need to have dopants.
20 Q. But there's an inherent level of resistance in
21 silicon?
22 A. Correct.

A. Melanson.
Q. Melanson?
A. Yeah.
Q. And he reports directly to the CEO?
A. I would have to check that. That's my -- I can check and get back. I don't -- I assume that's who he reports to. I don't know.
Q. Do all of the fellows report to the CEO?
A. No.
Q. Who are the other fellows that you are aware of?
A. Axel Thomsen, Eric King and Paul Lesso.
Q. Are they all in the United States?
A. Three of the four are in the U.S.
Q. Which one is not in the U.S.?
A. Paul Lesso.
Q. Is he based in the UK?
A. Correct.
MR. MATICH: Can we pull up Tab 5 and mark it as Exhibit 8?
(Exhibit 8 marked)
Q. (BY MR. MATICH) Have you seen -- Mr. Warrick,

1 have you seen Exhibit 8 before?
2 A. Not in -- maybe not in its entirety. If you
3 go down, maybe I can see if I have seen portions of it.
4 I don't believe I have seen the entirety of it.
5 Is this the -- is this the work that --
6 that you had TechInsights do?
7 A. It's a report by TechInsights.
8 Q. Okay. I saw some of this.
9 Q. Okay.
10 A. I believe.
11 Q. And you're welcome to scroll through it if you
12 need to, or you can direct Henry to --
13 A. Okay. Because I was -- my scroll is not --
14 Q. Yeah, yours won't work. But if you want to
15 direct Henry to go down.
16 THE WITNESS: If you could maybe just go
17 down and just let me make sure -- go down a little
18 more. Yeah, keep going. Is this a teardown or -- keep
19 going. Okay. Keep going. Next, please. Next,
20 please. Next, please. Keep going. Keep going. Next,
21 please. Next, please. Next, please. Next, please.
22 Next, please. Next, please. Okay. Next, please.

1 Next, please.
2 I don't know how many pages this is. Can
3 you maybe just scroll to the end and go up from the
4 bottom? I was just trying to see if this is the one
5 where I think there was some analysis done by
6 TechInsights of some analytical type things.
7 Is that this report?
8 Q. (BY MR. MATICH) I believe so.
9 Can we go to Page 45?
10 A. That would probably be easier.
11 Q. Yeah. I want to give you the opportunity to
12 familiarize yourself with the document.
13 A. Yeah. So I have not seen the whole document,
14 but I have seen portions of it.
15 Q. Have you seen -- do you recognize Page 45?
16 A. Yeah, probably. I mean, in a list of full
17 things that I have looked at, yes.
18 Q. Okay.
19 MR. MATICH: And the -- could we zoom in
20 on the part that says, "Source wells," in the image
21 that has pink and yellow and purple, I guess.
22 EXHIBIT TECH: Yeah.

1 Q. (BY MR. MATICH) Do you see the parts
2 indicating source wells there?
3 A. I do.
4 Q. And do you see how it kind of grades from pink
5 into purple where the arrows are pointing?
6 A. Vertically?
7 Q. Yes.
8 A. Yes.
9 Q. Okay. And what's your understanding of the
10 significance of that color change?
11 A. I mean, I'm not familiar with this technique.
12 This -- but that is -- I assume that's looking at
13 dopant gradients.
14 Q. Okay. And the -- I also want to give you the
15 chance to look at the legend on the right-hand side, if
16 you want to discuss -- get some information on that.
17 A. Yeah.
18 Q. So it's your understanding that that change
19 from pink to purple is a -- is a dopant gradient?
20 A. That's what this is saying, yes.
21 Q. Okay. Can you tell me if --
22 MR. MATICH: Sorry, Henry. Can we zoom

1 in again on the source wells section there?
2 Q. (BY MR. MATICH) Can you tell me if the
3 gradient there would aid carrier movement downward?
4 MR. LIDDELL: Objection, form.
5 THE WITNESS: I cannot tell you that.
6 Q. (BY MR. MATICH) Why not?
7 A. I don't have an understanding of what the
8 benefit of that gradient would be or the degradation of
9 that gradient.
10 Q. What do you mean by the degradation of the
11 gradient?
12 A. I don't understand the -- what that
13 degradation result would be.
14 Q. By degradation, I don't understand what you
15 mean.
16 A. I mean, it's -- the dopant has diffused.
17 Q. Yeah.
18 A. And so it's diffused for a reason. I don't,
19 you know, know the reason it has diffused. It's
20 naturally diffusing, of course, and there is -- you
21 know, the fabs will diffuse it, but I don't know
22 whether this is as intended or beyond intended.

1 Q. And you can't tell me -- but can you tell me
2 the -- leaving aside intent for a moment, you can't
3 tell me what the effect of that gradient is?
4 A. No.
5 MR. LIDDELL: Objection, form.
6 Q. (BY MR. MATICH) Okay. And why not?
7 A. I don't know -- I don't -- you know, I don't
8 have a knowledge of why that would be -- or the effect
9 of that diffused grading here.
10 Q. Is -- is that because there's other things
11 that might affect carrier movement besides the
12 gradient?
13 A. Yes.
14 MR. MATICH: Thanks. We can take this
15 down.
16 THE WITNESS: Is it potential for a bio
17 break?
18 MR. MATICH: Yes, we can go off the
19 record.
20 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record.
21 The time is 10:53.
22 (Recess from 10:53 a.m. to 11:25 a.m.)

1 Instruct the witness not to answer.
2 THE WITNESS: I'll follow the advice of
3 counsel.
4 Q. (BY MR. MATICH) How many years have you been
5 working in the semiconductor industry?
6 A. I started with Motorola in '97 and I have been
7 in the industry since.
8 Q. All of those roles have been technical roles?
9 A. They -- yeah, as I moved up I got into less
10 and less technical roles. From '97 through -- through
11 my stint in France, so 2007, and they were all
12 technical roles primarily focused on the fab. I mean,
13 I was in the fab, you know, working on stuff.
14 2007 to 2009, I was in design for
15 manufacturing, so looking at the type of things you're
16 talking about, how many -- how many contacts should be
17 there to keep it from blowing up, these type of things.
18 And then from 2009 to present day, time
19 at Apple exclusive -- or excluded, I have been in, you
20 know, more management roles.
21 Q. But your current role is still sufficiently
22 technical that you're applying for patents with your

1 name on it?
2 A. Yeah, it's still sufficiently technical. I
3 would say as technology continues to speed down the
4 path, I find myself, you know, less and less attuned to
5 exactly what's going on, you know, in semiconductors
6 for sure. But, you know, that's -- I think that's kind
7 of natural.
8 Q. You mentioned working at fabs?
9 A. Correct.
10 Q. Which fabs did you work at?
11 A. So I was at -- I started at Motorola when it
12 had fabs, Motorola fab in California. And they moved
13 me here to fabs in Austin, I was at a couple fabs in
14 Austin.
15 I did an expat in France for four years
16 at a -- at a three-way partnership between Philips
17 Research, Motorola and STMicroelectronics. I was in
18 that fab and then came back.
19 Q. And that was from roughly 1997 to 2007?
20 A. Yes, that's exactly when that was, yeah.
21 Q. And what were you doing in those fabs?
22 A. So initial roles, I started out in lithography

1 and I was running lithography equipment. I mean, I was
2 the -- I started out running photoresist track codes.
3 And then I gradually moved into the
4 optics side of it. So I was running -- I did a lot of
5 work on Nikon and Cannon scanners. I had spent a lot
6 of time at ASML working on emerging lithography. So
7 those were the kind of roles I did.
8 At the -- in the three-way partnership in
9 France, I was the -- I was the lead of the gate module
10 development.
11 THE REPORTER: Gate?
12 THE WITNESS: Gate, G-A-T-E, yeah.
13 Gate module development, which was
14 working on, at that time, 45-nanometer and 32-nanometer
15 processes.
16 Q. (BY MR. MATICH) What about between your role
17 at Apple and your role at -- your current role at
18 Cirrus Logic?
19 MR. LIDDELL: Objection, form.
20 THE WITNESS: Yeah, the role at -- the
21 role at Apple -- first of all, I had no direct reports
22 at Apple. So I was an individual contributor. I was,

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

Warrick Exhibit
3 (6-7-24)
WWW.DIGITALEVIDENCEGROUP.COM

GREENTHREAD, LLC Plaintiff, vs. CIRRUS LOGIC, INC. Defendant.	Civil Action No. 1:23-cv-00369-DC JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

NOTICE OF DEPOSITION OF CIRRUS LOGIC, INC.
PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 30(b)(6)

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(b)(6), Plaintiff Greenthread, LLC ("Greenthread") by and through its counsel, will take the deposition of Defendant Cirrus Logic, Inc. ("Cirrus Logic" or "Defendant"), upon the matters for examination identified in Schedule A below. This deposition will take place on June 21, 2024 at 9:00 AM local time at the offices of McKool Smith, 303 Colorado Street, Suite 2011, Austin, TX 78701, or such other time or location agreed to by the parties, before a Notary Public or other officer duly authorized to administer oaths. The deposition will take place within the time duration provided by Rule 30(d) and with the understanding, as provided in the Advisory Committee Notes to the 2000 Amendment to Rule 30, that "the depositions of each person designated under Rule 30(b)(6) should be considered a separate deposition." Notice is further given that the deposition testimony will be recorded by stenographic means, by videotape, and real time transcription services may be utilized.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE THAT pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6), Cirrus Logic is required to designate one or more appropriate person(s) to testify fully on its behalf with respect to each of the topics listed in Schedule A, and the person(s) so designated shall be required to testify as to each of those matters known or reasonably available to Cirrus Logic. Please provide notice of the identity of the witness(es) you designate to Greenthread's counsel no later than ten (10) days prior to the date of the deposition.

Dated: May 24, 2024

MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.

/s/ Alan L. Whitehurst
Alan L. Whitehurst
D.C. Bar No. 484873
awhitehurst@mckoolsmith.com
Nicholas J. Matich
D.C. Bar No. 1024907
nmatich@mckoolsmith.com
Arvind Jairam
D.C. Bar No. 1017133
ajairam@mckoolsmith.com
MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.
1999 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: 202-370-8300
Telecopier: 202-370-8344

Samuel F. Baxter
Texas Bar No. 01938000
sbaxter@mckoolsmith.com
Jennifer Truelove
Texas Bar No. 24012906
jtruelove@mckoolsmith.com
MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.
104 East Houston Street, Suite 300
Marshall, TX 75670
Telephone: 903-923-9000
Telecopier: 903-923-9099

John B. Campbell
Texas Bar No. 24036314
jcampbell@mckoolsmith.com
MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.

303 Colorado Street, Suite 2100
Austin, Texas 78701
Telephone: 512-692-8700
Telecopier: 512-692-8744

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF GREENTHREAD, LLC

DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of these requests, the following definitions shall apply:

1. The term "Action" refers to the above-captioned action, *Greenthread, LLC v. Cirrus Logic, Inc.*, No. 1:23-cv-00369 (W.D. Tex.).

2. "Accused Products" is defined as the products identified and discussed in Greenthread's Complaint and/or Infringement Contentions, Including any supplements or amendments thereto. Accused Products include products made (in whole or in part), used, sold, offered for sale, or imported into the United States by Cirrus Logic or its customers, that comprise or consist of the same or similar structures, features, or functionalities as the exemplary Cirrus Logic CLI1793B1 power management integrated circuit identified in and discussed in Greenthread's Complaint and/or Infringement Contentions. Accused Products include, but are not limited to, the following product categories/types: amplifiers, decoder and encoder integrated circuits (ICs), digital-to-analog converters, analog-to-digital converters, digital clocks, haptic drivers, voice processor ICs, and other ICs. Accused Products also includes the 17 products specifically identified in Greenthread's Infringement Contentions, products fabricated by Cirrus Logic's 55nm silicon process, and any and all successor products sold, offered for sale or planned for sale before September 2024. For avoidance of doubt, the Definition of "Accused Product" is not limited to products that are sold or shipped to the United States, but includes products made, shipped or sold abroad.

3. "Apple" refers to Apple Inc. and Includes any and all past and present officers, directors, employees, agents, representatives, and any other Persons acting on Apple's behalf and any and all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, assigns, predecessors and successors in interest.

4. "Asserted Claims" is defined as the claims of the Patents-in-Suit that Greenthread identified in its Infringement Contentions. Any additional claims identified by Greenthread in any amended version(s) of its Infringement Contentions are within the meaning of the term as of the date that such amended version is served on Defendant.

5. "Cirrus Logic," "Defendant," "You," and "Your" refers to Defendant Cirrus Logic, Inc. and Includes any and all past and present officers, directors, employees, agents, representatives, and any other Persons acting on Defendant's behalf and any and all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, assigns, predecessors and successors in interest.

6. "Communication" or "Communications" mean any written, verbal, or other transmission of fact, information, ideas or opinion, Including, but not limited to, any utterance, notation, question, command, interjection, expression, gesture, suggestive conduct or statement of any nature whatsoever, any conversation (whether by telephone or otherwise), and any meeting and also Including, but not limited to, correspondence, financial records, corporate records, reports, and Documents.

7. "Complaint" means the Complaint filed in this case on March 31, 2023 (Dkt. No. 1, Case No. 23-cv-00369-DC), Including any supplements or amendments thereto, Including the First Amended Complaint filed in this case on July 16, 2023 (Dkt. No. 22).

8. "Concerning" or "Relating to" means referring to, concerning, mentioning, reflecting, summarizing, evidencing, involving, describing, discussing, showing, pertaining to, responding to, supporting, contradicting, constituting, consisting, containing, comprising, composing, embodying, or commenting on, in whole or in part.

9. "Discovery Requests" means Greenthread's Document Requests and Interrogatories served in this action, including:

a. Greenthread's First Set of Requests for Production (Nos. 1-7);

b. Greenthread's Second Set of Requests for Production (Nos. 8-27);

c. Greenthread's First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-12);

d. Greenthread's Second Set of Interrogatories (No. 13); and,

e. any additional requests for documents or interrogatories served by Greenthread.

10. "Document" or "Documents" are used herein in their broadest sense as set forth in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. These words mean and Include all written, printed, typed, recorded, or graphic matter of every kind and description, both originals and copies, and all attachments and appendices, within Your possession, custody, or control. Without limiting the foregoing, the terms "Document" and "Documents" shall Include all agreements, contracts, communications, correspondence, facsimile, letters, opinion letters, telegrams, telefaxes, messages, memoranda, records, reports, books, summaries, or other records of telephone conversations or interviews, summaries or other records of personal conversations or interviews, minutes, summaries, other records of meetings and conferences, statements obtained from witnesses, summaries or other records of negotiations, other summaries, diaries, diary entries, calendars, appointment books, time records, instructions, work assignments, forecasts, progress reports, statistical data, statistical statements, financial statements, work sheets, work papers, drafts, graphs, charts, tables, accounts, analytical records, consultants' and experts' reports, appraisals, bulletins, notes, notices, marginal notations, notebooks, telephone records, bills, statements, records of obligation and expenditure, invoices, lists, journals, printouts, compilations, tabulations, analyses, studies, surveys, expense reports, microfilm, microfiche, tape or disc recordings, sound recording, video recordings, film, tape, photographs, programs, and electronic data created by word processing programs such as Word or Docs or Pages, slide presentation

programs such as PowerPoint or Slides or Keynote, spreadsheet programs such as Excel or Sheets or Numbers, database programs such as Access, internal wikis, share drives, collaboration programs like Facebook Workplace, and electronic mail ("e-mail") programs such as Outlook or Mail or Gmail, and data compilations from which information can be obtained (Including matter used in data processing), and other printed, written, handwritten, typewritten, recorded, stenographic, computer-generated, computer-stored, or electronically stored matter, however and by whomever produced, prepared, reproduced, disseminated or made. The words "Document" and "Documents" also Include all copies of Documents by whatever means made, except that where a Document is produced, identical copies of it that do not contain any markings, additions, or deletions that are different from the original do not have to be separately produced.

11. "Greenthread" or "Plaintiff" means Greenthread, LLC.

12. "Identification," "Identify," "Identity," or "Identifying" when used in reference to:

    a. a natural Person, means: to state, to the extent known,

        i. the Person's full name or title, last known address, e-mail address, and telephone number;

        ii. the Person's present employer(s) and place(s) of employment; and

        iii. the Person's job title or position held.

    b. an entity, other than a natural Person, means: to state, to the extent known,

        i. the name or title of the entity;

        ii. the type of entity; and

        iii. the present or last known address and telephone number of its business and/or organizational offices.

    c. a Document, means: to Identify the Document by

i. its date, author, and addressee(s);

ii. state the type of Document (e.g., letter, memorandum, etc.)

iii. Identify its present location and Identity of its custodian; and

iv. Identify the Document by its Bates number range.

d. a statement, either written or spoken, means:

i. the substance of each such statement;

ii. the exact words used by each Person participating in the statement;

iii. to Identify each Person engaging in the statement;

iv. the Identity of each Person present at the making or reception of such statement;

v. the time and place of the statement;

vi. the means of such statement (e.g., written, telephone, face-to-face, etc.).

13. "Including" means including, but not limited to.

14. "Infringe" and "Infringement" should be understood to Include direct infringement, inducement of infringement, literal infringement, and infringement by the doctrine of equivalents.

15. "Infringement Contentions" is defined as Plaintiff's Preliminary Infringement Contentions, Supplemental Preliminary Infringements Contentions and Final Infringement Contentions, Including any amended or supplemented version(s) of the Infringement Contentions as of the date that such amended or supplemented version is served upon Defendant.

16. "Named Inventor" is any person that is a named inventor on one or more of the Patents-in-Suit.

17. "Patents-in-Suit" means U.S. Patent Nos. 8,421,195, 9,190,502, 10,510,842, 10,734,481, 11,121,122, and 11,316,014.

18. “Parties” means one or both of “Plaintiff” and “Defendant” as defined herein.

19. “Person” shall mean all natural persons, male or female, and all types and kinds of business or other entities, Including but not limited to, corporations, partnerships, joint ventures, associations, and sole proprietorships and any reference to an individual person, either singularly or as part of a defined group, Including that person’s employees, attorneys, heirs, successors, assigns, and any other person or entity acting on the behalf of such individual person.

20. “Process Information” as used herein shall mean Detailed Process Flows, a Recipe, or Chip-Level Schematics. The term “Detailed Process Flows” shall mean chart, diagram, or other type of document (or set of documents) that describes the manufacture or assembly of a finished integrated circuit, including the order of steps, applicable tooling Recipes, types of materials, thickness of materials, properties of materials, or the manufacturing process for a specific integrated circuit. The term “Recipe” shall mean a document constituting or containing, whether in text, a chart, a diagram, or other manner of presentation of information, a description of the specific formula or recipe for configuring tools used in the manufacture or assembly of a finished integrated circuit, including without limitation the order of steps, types of materials, thickness of materials, properties of materials, and the manufacturing process for a specific integrated circuit. The term “Chip-Level Schematics” shall refer to schematics and layout files for a semiconductor product (such as GDS, GDSII, OASIS, LAFF, or other comparable file types).

21. “Third Party” means any natural person, corporation, partnership, association, joint venture, government body, or other legal entity other than Plaintiff and Defendant.

22. “Third-Party Foundry” means any third-party organization responsible for any aspect of the design or manufacture of the Accused Products.

INSTRUCTIONS

The following instructions apply to the deposition topics found in Schedule A that follow:

1. The definitions set forth herein have the broadest meaning under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of the Western District of Texas, and all other applicable rules related to this lawsuit.

2. Whenever appropriate, the singular form of a word shall be interpreted in the plural or vice versa; verb tenses shall be interpreted to Include past, present, and future tenses; and the terms "and" as well as "or" shall be construed either conjunctively or disjunctively, as necessary, to bring within the scope of these topics any information that might otherwise be considered outside their purview.

SCHEDULE A

Topics upon which examination is requested:

1. The factual bases for Cirrus Logic's Affirmative Defenses, if any.

2. The factual bases for Cirrus Logic's claim that it does not infringe the Patents-in-Suit.

3. The first knowledge of any of the Patents-in-Suit by anyone at Cirrus Logic.

4. The first knowledge of any applications leading to any of the Patents-in-Suit by anyone at Cirrus Logic.

5. Any and all communications between Cirrus Logic and Greenthread and/or any Named Inventor (other than outside counsel) about the Patents-in-Suit, the Accused Products, and/or this litigation.

6. Press releases, promotional materials, presentations, and technical publications or papers concerning the Accused Products.

7. The use, proposed use, and/or intended use of the Accused Products.

8. Information concerning the use, proposed use, and/or intended use of the Accused Products presented to any customer or end user and/or potential customer or end user of the Accused Products.

9. To the extent not encompassed by any other Topic, facts relating to the manner of use of an Accused Product by any customer or end user.

10. Benefits (both projected and actual) associated with any and all Accused Products.

11. Benefits (both projected and actual) associated with Cirrus Logic's past, current, and planned future use of any and all Accused Products.

12. The reactions or assessments of experts in the field to the Accused Products.

13. The reactions or assessment of end users and/or customers to the Accused Products.

14. Cirrus Logic's organizational structure, including without limitation, the relationship between and/or among You and all your direct and indirect parents, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, or associated entities.

15. The identities and duties of persons responsible for the research, design, development, testing, marketing, and sale of the Accused Products.

16. The sales and marketing process for the Accused Products, including the geographical location of sales and marketing for the Accused Products.

17. Testing of the Accused Products, including the geographical location of any testing of the Accused Products.

18. For each Accused Product, the production, fabrication, manufacture, packaging, assembly, testing, and/or certification processes for the Accused Products, including, without limitation, the identity of the entities responsible for the foregoing and the geographical location where each step in the process is performed.

19. The identity of any foundry or Third-Party Foundry where any Accused Product is made.

20. Communications with any foundry or Third-Party Foundry regarding the Accused Products, including any information or documents sent or exchanged regarding the design, production, fabrication, manufacture, packaging, assembly, testing or certification processes for the Accused Products.

21. Design and development of the Accused Products, including the facts surrounding the design and development of the Accused Products, the identity of the persons or entities responsible and the geographical location of the design and development of the Accused Products.

22. Cirrus Logic's public statements that the components it produces are "largely proprietary" and it considers "our end customer to be the entity specifying the use of our component in their design."[1]

23. Design, structure, uses, operation, functionality, and performance of the Accused Products, including the physical, structural, and functional details and manner of use of the Accused Products.

24. For each Accused Product, the operation and structure of the substrate of the Accused Product, such as the type, operation, and structure the transistors, and whether the substrate has epitaxial silicon on top of a nonepitaxial substrate.

25. The movement of carriers in the Accused Products.

26. Documents Cirrus Logic creates during its design process of its products.

27. Any and all software used by Cirrus Logic in the design of its products, including any software developed or sold by Synopsys.

28. Creation and use of technical and/or design documents relating to the dopant concentrations in the Accused Products, including scanning electron microscopy (SEM), scanning capacitance microscopy (SCM), scanning microwave impedance microscopy (sMIM), secondary ion mass spectrometry (SIMS), spreading resistance profiling (SRP) testing, Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy (EDS), designs, specifications, drawings, schematics, plans, SPICE models, TCAD files or other tests or files relevant to the dopant concentrations of Cirrus Logic's products.

29. Cirrus Logic's possession of, or access to, design documents relating to the dopant concentrations in the Accused Products, including scanning electron microscopy (SEM), scanning capacitance microscopy (SCM), scanning microwave impedance microscopy (sMIM), secondary

[1] *See* 2023 Cirrus Logic, Inc. Form 10K at 5.

ion mass spectrometry (SIMS), spreading resistance profiling (SRP) testing, Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy (EDS), designs, specifications, drawings, schematics, plans, SPICE models, TCAD files or other tests or files relevant to the dopant concentrations of Cirrus Logic's products.

30. Any SEM, SCM, SIMS, SRP, EDS, design, specification, drawings, schematics, plans, SPICE models, TCAD files or other tests or files relevant to the dopant concentrations of the Accused Products responsive to, or produced or provided for inspection by Cirrus Logic in response to, Plaintiff's Discovery Requests.

31. Process Information related to the Accused Products.

32. Any Process Information responsive to, or produced or provided for inspection by Cirrus Logic in response to, Plaintiff's Discovery Requests.

33. The identity of each Accused Product sold in the six years prior to the Complaint in this Action.

34. The identity of finished goods or products incorporating the Accused Products.

35. Your worldwide revenues, costs, and profits attributable to each and every Accused Product, including without limitation, all revenues from sales of each such product, as well as sales of products including or incorporating an Accused Product.

36. Any financial information responsive to, or produced by Cirrus Logic in response to, Plaintiff's Discovery Requests.

37. For each and every Accused Product used or offered by Cirrus Logic, all sales and offers for sale of each such product, worldwide, for each year from 2017 to present.

38. Prices for the Accused Products and the manner in which Cirrus Logic determines the prices.

39. For the Accused Products, the physical location of the manufacture or development of such products and/or any components thereof, the physical location of transfer of title to such products and/or any components thereof, the importation into the United States of such products and/or any components thereof, and the sale within the United States of any such product and/or any components thereof.

40. All information regarding the worldwide market for the Accused Products including (a) identification of customers, (b) annual dollar volume by customer by product, (c) annual volume by product including amount sold, and (d) market studies and/or market share studies.

41. Cirrus Logic's business plans, projections, or forecasts of Cirrus Logic's sales of Accused Products.

42. Cirrus Logic's projection or forecast of worldwide sales (a) by any entity, worldwide, that Cirrus Logic considers as selling a product that is competitive to an Accused Product, and (b) by any entity, worldwide, that Cirrus Logic considers as a competitor for any Accused Product.

43. All other products and services purchased or licensed by any customer, worldwide, who purchased or licensed an Accused Product.

44. All agreements or other arrangements whereby You agreed to pay any third party a royalty, license fee, and/or settlement for the use, copying, or distribution of its invention or other technology related to transistors.

45. Cirrus Logic's patent licensing policies and practices.

46. Details related to any Cirrus Logic policies or practices related to avoiding infringement of patent rights belonging to other entities or individuals, including any internal

system or process that Cirrus Logic has used for identifying, reviewing, evaluating, or tracking intellectual property rights that could potentially cover the Accused Products.

47. Cirrus Logic's policies and procedures for determining whether any of its products, or their manufacture, offer for sale, sale, or use has infringed, or would or might infringe, the patent rights of another Person.

48. All agreements or other arrangements whereby You agreed to pay any third party a royalty, license fee, and/or settlement for the sale, use, copying, or distribution of its invention or other technology in any Accused Product.

49. Any non-infringing alternative(s) to the Patents-in-Suit which Cirrus Logic claims would be available to it if it were unable to sell or use any or all of the Accused Products, including the identity of such non-infringing alternative(s), the time period during which the non-infringing alternative(s) was/were available, the time and cost to Cirrus Logic to develop, design, manufacture, and sell the non-infringing alternative(s), and any differences between the non-infringing alternative(s) and the Accused Products.

50. The value in the market of the Accused Products, including the desirability of the Accused Products.

51. The commercial success of the Accused Products.

52. All agreements, contracts, and terms and conditions between Cirrus Logic and its customers, potential customers, partners, resellers, intermediaries or other similar parties that use or have permission to use, sell, or offer to sell any Accused Products.

53. All agreements, contracts, and terms and conditions between Cirrus Logic and any of employees, independent contractors, or sub-contractors that impose any restraint or covenant of confidentiality as a result of employment, contracting, or sub-contracting with Cirrus Logic.

54. The first use or sale of the Accused Products.

55. Identification of all versions or designs of the Accused Products made, used, sold, offered for sale, imported, put into service, developed, planned, or otherwise deployed by Cirrus Logic since March 2017.

56. Persons most knowledgeable concerning the development and operation of the Accused Products.

57. Changes made to the design of each version of the Accused Products and the reasons for the changes.

58. Improvements in speed and performance in the Accused Products as compared to prior versions or prior designs.

59. The cost savings or other economic or technical benefits realized or expected by sale or use of the Accused Products as compared to prior versions or prior designs.

60. Changes made to the Accused Products in response to Greenthread's claims of infringement.

61. All disclosures about this litigation, including any disclosures in Cirrus Logic's SEC documents.

62. The factual basis, if any, for Your responses to Plaintiff's Discovery Responses and an identification of the Person(s) most knowledgeable still employed at Cirrus Logic with respect to Plaintiff's Discovery Responses and any claims and defenses in this litigation.

63. The identity of each of Your customers of an Accused Product, including any and all known end customers or end users.

64. Supplier or design proposals for an Accused Product.

65. Supplier competitions or design win competitions for the Accused Products.

66. Importation into the United States of the Accused Products, including importation by Third-Parties of products that contain Accused Products.

67. For each Accused Product, the facts surrounding any and all design wins, including the identification and location of the end customer, communications and information exchanged with the end customer, the end product, expected sales or market value of the design win, and all purchase orders or sales agreements.

68. Cirrus Logic's strategic plans, business plans, marketing plans, sales forecasts, and related documents and/or studies for Accused Products, including estimates, forecasts, or projections of the volume (whether measured in units, dollars, or percentages) of Accused Products overseas that are imported into the United States, whether by You or a Third-Party.

69. Cirrus Logic's efforts, either by Cirrus Logic or through a Third-Party, to track or estimate where Accused Products end up geographically.

70. Cirrus Logic's relationship with Apple.

71. All products sold, offered for sale, or marketed to Apple since March 2017.

72. The percentage of Cirrus Logic's yearly sales since March 2017 made to Apple.

73. Any market studies, forecasts, business plans, financial analysis, or presentations related to Cirrus Logic's expected or actual sales since March 2017 to Apple, including expected sales of Apple products incorporating the Accused Products in the United States.

74. Identification of the person(s) most knowledgeable about Cirrus Logic's relationship with Apple.

75. The function, operation and purpose of Cirrus Logic's Cupertino office, including identification of the employees at this office and their roles.

76. The identification of, and facts surrounding, any and all design wins with Apple since March 2017 for the Accused Products.

77. Design, development, engineering and/or sales support provided by Cirrus Logic in the United States to any customer of an Accused Product, including for Accused Products incorporated into a Third-Party product.

78. The function, operation and purpose of Cirrus Logic's Austin office, including identification of the employees at this office and their roles.

79. Any and all software used by Cirrus Logic for the purposes of "transistor-level design, and simulation" as discussed in Cirrus Logic online job postings.[2]

80. Any and all software used by Cirrus Logic for the purposes of "semiconductor device physics" and "compact modeling of different types of devices" as discussed in Cirrus Logic online job postings.[3]

81. The background, nature, and purpose of Cirrus Logic employee positions and online job postings referring to "transistor-level design, and simulation," including the nature of any work performed by any employee hired into such role.

82. The background, nature, reasoning, and purpose of Cirrus Logic employee positions and online job postings referring to "semiconductor device physics" and "compact modeling of different types of devices," including the nature of any work performed by any employee hired into such role.

[2] *See* https://jobs.eu.lever.co/cirrus/10ae0a08-1382-46d3-a27c-903b3b418c23 (Ex. A).

[3] *See* https://jobs.eu.lever.co/cirrus/9bebfb30-cb63-408a-b8d3-7e4e995c7719 (Ex. B).

83. The job duties of any inventors named on any of the following Cirrus Logic patent applications, including the manner in which the technology described in the patent applications relates to the inventors' job duties.

a. 16/451,733

b. 62/082,324

c. 15/093,574

d. 15/910,843

e. 15/675,242

f. 15/144,657

g. 14/297,008

84. Information regarding why Cirrus Logic seeks employees with knowledge of "Transistor level implementation of" semiconductor designs;"[4] "experience designing for different CMOS processes;"[5] "fundamental knowledge of semiconductor device physics related to compact modeling of different types of devices;"[6] and "transistor-level design, and simulation."[7]

85. Cirrus Logic's use of the 55nm silicon process and the facts surrounding the decision to use this process, including the identification of the Cirrus Logic 55nm design and project teams, how Cirrus Logic designs products for use with this process and the documents generated by the design process, why Cirrus Logic uses this process, what Cirrus Logic

[4] *See, e.g.*, Ex. A; https://jobs.eu.lever.co/cirrus/f357285d-5b87-4ee9-acc0-d2421c389b2f (Ex. C); https://cirrus.com/careers/job-detail/?p=ca3421d9-12dc-4da5-9625-2e99a5d5091a (Ex. D).

[5] *See, e.g.*, Ex. D.

[6] *See, e.g.*, Ex. B.

[7] *See, e.g.*, Ex. A; Ex. C.

manufacturers use the process, and identification of the Cirrus Logic products are made by this process.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document has been served on all counsel of record via email on May 24, 2024.

/s/ *Alan L. Whitehurst*
Alan L. Whitehurst

EXHIBIT A

Sr. Staff Analog Design Engineer (RP-342)

Chandler, AZ

Hardware & Software – Hardware / Full Time / Hybrid

As an Analog Design Engineer working on power conversion technologies, you will be part of a collaborative team developing high-performance mixed-signal integrated circuits, including innovative power converters and other circuitry in advanced CMOS processes. You will play a meaningful role in developing next-generation devices and ensuring that leading consumer electronics manufacturers can easily integrate our devices into their products.

Responsibilities

- Development of advanced power conversion solutions and respective circuitry
- Development through concept, architecture, design, and design integration into high-performance mixed-signal ICs
- Modeling of solutions using tools such as Matlab, Simulink, and Spectre AMS Designer
- Transistor level implementation of the design
- Leading all aspects of layout implementation and performing post-layout simulations and optimization
- Hands-on lab checkout, silicon learning, and debug
- Supporting post-silicon activities including product validation, characterization, and production test

Required Skills and Qualifications

- Master's degree in Electrical Engineering and 8+ years of proven professional experience in integrated circuit design engineering; or Bachelor's degree in Electrical Engineering and 10+ years of proven expertise in integrated circuit design engineering
- Deep understanding of the analog design flow steps, including architecture, design, and design integration
- Experience mentoring other less experienced designers
- Proven understanding of high-level modeling tools such as Matlab, Simulink, or similar
- Expertise in power conversion architectures, transistor-level design, and simulation
- Understanding of control theory for power conversion solutions
- Experience designing inductive and/or capacitive power converters
- Hands-on lab test/debug experience with scopes, logic analyzers, and other lab equipment
- Possess an understanding of device physics and basic ESD/Latchup concepts
- Strong oral and written communication skills

#LI-DB1
#LI-Hybrid

Cirrus Logic Home Page

Jobs powered by LEVER

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 48 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

EXHIBIT B

Spice Modeling Engineer (SB-352)

Austin, Texas

Hardware & Software – Hardware / Full Time / Hybrid

We're seeking an experienced engineer with device characterization, test chip design, SPICE and device reliability modeling background. In this position, you will be responsible for maintaining device lab equipment functions, performing a wide range of device characterization, and extracting SPICE and device aging models for semiconductor devices.

Required Skills and Qualifications

- Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering or Physics or related engineering discipline, or Master's in Electrical Engineering or Physics or related engineering discipline with 3+ years of work experience in Spice Modeling
- Fundamental knowledge of semiconductor device physics related to compact modeling of different types of devices
- Proven experience in deep submicron CMOS and BCD device measurement and characterization with parametric analyzer, LCR meter, etc.
- Detailed knowledge in using manual, semi-automatic, and automatic probers
- Familiar with active and passive devices in CMOS and BCD process technologies
- Understanding of semiconductor device noise and matching behaviors
- Familiar with physics of semiconductor device aging
- Experience in test structure layout of individual devices and arrays

- Experience in SPICE model generation and QA flow
- Excellent verbal communication skills and technical writing skills

Preferred Skills and Qualifications

- Ability to stress test devices to understand post-stress behavior and SOA
- Prior experience with digital and analog design flow and methodology is a plus
- Experience running simulations using Cadence ADE
- Knowledge and experience in test structure layouts for various technology nodes, including advanced CMOS and BCD/HV for Analog/Mixed-Signal products
- Coding skills in Python, Perl or other computing languages

#LI-Hybrid
#LI-DB1

Cirrus Logic Home Page

Jobs powered by LEVER

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 50 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

EXHIBIT C

Analog Design Engineer - Power (PC-65)

Edinburgh, Scotland / Newbury, England

Hardware & Software – Hardware / Full Time / Hybrid

At Cirrus Logic, mixed-signal engineering drives our company. We develop high-performance, low-power signal processing solutions in audio, voice, and haptics, delivering innovative end-user experiences and solving difficult challenges for new generations of mobile and consumer devices. While breaking the innovation barrier, we’ve also built an award-winning company culture thanks to our extraordinary workforce, ongoing efforts to champion and promote diversity, and our workplace principles of equality and fairness. Do you enjoy working alongside the industry's top engineers and solving sophisticated challenges for the world's leading consumer brands? Join our team and help us continue making this an exceptional workplace!

Cirrus Logic are looking for talented Staff Analog Design Engineer working on power conversion technologies, you will be part of a collaborative team developing high-performance mixed-signal integrated circuits, including innovative power converters and other circuitry in advanced CMOS processes. You will play a meaningful role in developing next-generation devices and ensuring that leading consumer electronics manufacturers can easily integrate our devices into their products.

Responsibilities

- Modelling and development of advanced power conversion solutions and respective circuitry from specification through concept, architecture, design, and design integration into high-performance mixed-signal IC's.
- Transistor level implementation of the design.
- Leading all aspects of layout implementation and performing post-layout simulations and optimization.
- Hands-on lab evaluation of silicon and debug.
- Supporting post-silicon activities including product validation, characterization, and production test.

Required Skills and Qualifications

- BSc or MSc in electronic/electrical engineering or equivalent degree, and a number of years of experience in the industry.
- Deep understanding of the analog design flow steps including architecture, design, and design integration.
- Confirmed understanding of high-level modelling tools such as Matlab, Simulink, Simplis, LTSpice or similar.
- Expertise in power conversion architectures, transistor-level design, and simulation.
- Understanding of control theory for power conversion solutions.
- Proven hands-on experience in design of inductive and/or capacitive power converters.
- Hands-on lab test/debug experience with scopes, logic analyzers, and other lab equipment.
- Possess an understanding of device physics, device parasitics and basic ESD/Latchup protection.
- Experience in products for the AUTOMOTIVE market and understanding of the safety requirements will be considered as a plus.
- Strong oral and written communication skills.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 52 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

This role is based in either our Edinburgh office or Newbury office in the United Kingdom.

This is a hybrid position and will follow a 2+ day in-office work schedule, with in-office days based on business needs and team preference. You must be based within commutable distance of the work location listed on the job posting, or willing to relocate prior to beginning employment with Cirrus Logic

#LI-PD1
#LI-Hybrid

At Cirrus Logic, we believe that diversity drives innovation and we are committed to encouraging an open and collaborative culture where different approaches, ideas and points of view are respected and valued. Our aim is to promote a workplace where everyone can contribute irrespective of race, colour, national origin, religion or belief, gender or gender identity, sexual orientation, age, marital status, pregnancy status or disability.

Cirrus Logic Home Page

Jobs powered by LEVER

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 53 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

EXHIBIT D

Analog IC Design Engineer (PC-60)

Edinburgh, Scotland / Newbury, England

Hardware & Software – Hardware / Full Time / Hybrid

For nearly four decades, Cirrus Logic has been propelled by the top engineers in mixed-signal processing. Our rockstar team thrives on solving complex challenges with innovative end-user solutions for the world's top consumer brands. Cirrus Logic is also known for its award-winning culture, built on a foundation of inclusion and fairness, meaningful community engagement, and delivering enjoyable employee experiences at every turn. But we couldn't do it without our extraordinary workforce – and that's where you come in. Join our team and help us continue to make Cirrus Logic an exceptional place to grow your career!

Cirrus Logic are looking for talented Senior/Staff Analog IC Design Engineers to help drive the next generation of technologies and products, to serve new and exciting opportunities in Mixed Signal IC design for consumer electronics. We have roles for those with a passion for detailed transistor level design and also roles for those more interested in project and sub-system leadership. As part of a highly collaborative team, you will be responsible for the development of low-power, high-performance IC's in advanced CMOS processes, specified to drive transformational change in new applications and markets.

Responsibilities

By continuing to use our site you are agreeing to our use of cookies. To find out more please review our Cookie Policy.

- Ownership and development of advanced solutions for complex mixed-signal products and respective circuitry from concept, architecture, design, design integration through to production with an awareness of competing solutions and commercial

production with an awareness of competing solutions and commercial pressures.

- Modeling of solutions using tools such as Matlab, Simulink, Spectre, AMS Designer etc.
- Transistor level implementation of the design
- Overseeing layout implementation and performing post layout simulations and optimization
- Hands on lab checkout, silicon learning, and debug
- Supporting post-silicon activities including product validation, characterization, and production test

Required Skills and Qualifications

- BSc, MSc, Meng or PhD in Electrical Engineering (or related fields) with proven and relevant professional experience in mixed signal CMOS circuit design
- Deep understanding of analog design flows including architecture, design, and design integration
- Strong skills in CMOS analog design and layout of high precision, low power circuits

By continuing to use our site you are agreeing to our use of cookies. To find out more please review our Cookie Policy.

Equal Opportunity Employer/Veterans/Disabled

Benefits & Perks

Culture of Innovation

Locations

Women's Leadership Team

clean

CIRRUS LOGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION NETWORK

By continuing to use our site you are agreeing to our use of cookies. To find out more please review our Cookie Policy.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 56 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

CLEAN

Award Winning Culture of Innovation

More

We solve the big challenges in audio, and we do it in a culture that fosters engineering excellence.

Cirrus Logic is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. We strive to select the best qualified applicant for any opening and to reward employees based on their skills, experience and performance. We do not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, pregnancy status, marital status, gender, age, religion, physical or mental disability, medical condition, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, genetic information or any other characteristic protected by law. Please see our EEO Policy and ADA Compliance Policy; EEO is the law.

This link, www.ticmrf.com/77-0024818, leads to the machine-readable files that are made available in response to the federal Transparency in Coverage Rule and includes negotiated service rates and out-of-network allowed- amounts between health plans and healthcare providers. The machine-readable files are formatted to allow researchers, regulators, and application developers to more easily access and analyze data.

By continuing to use our site you are agreeing to our use of cookies. To find out more please review our Cookie Policy.

© 2024 Cirrus Logic, Inc.

By continuing to use our site you are agreeing to our use of cookies. To find out more please review our Cookie Policy.

Scott Warrick · 3rd

Cirrus Logic

Vice President Of Technology at Cirrus Logic

Austin, Texas, United States · Contact info

1,322 followers · 500+ connections

Message | Connect | More

Highlights

You both worked at US Navy

Scott worked at US Navy before you started

Message

About

Self driven and results oriented leadership developed through experience and education.

Activity

1,322 followers

Scott Warrick commented on a post • 5mo

Congratulations Olov! On to the next adventure.

Show all comments →

Experience

Vice President Of Technology
Cirrus Logic · Full-time
Jun 2021 - Present · 3 yrs 1 mo
Austin, Texas, United States

Silicon Engineering Group
Apple
Jul 2019 - Jun 2021 · 2 yrs

Director - Corporate Technology
Cirrus Logic
Nov 2013 - Jul 2019 · 5 yrs 9 mos
Austin, Texas Area

Freescale Semiconductor
10 yrs 2 mos

- **Operations Manager - External Manufacturing**
  Jul 2008 - Nov 2013 · 5 yrs 5 mos
  Austin, Texas Area
- **Development Manager - Design for Manufacturing**
  Apr 2007 - Jul 2008 · 1 yr 4 mos
  Austin, Texas Area
- **Principal Staff Engineer - Technology Development (International Assignment)**
  Oct 2003 - Apr 2007 · 3 yrs 7 mos
  Crolles, France

  Responsible for advanced photolithography development and gate module integration as a team member of the Crolles2 Alliance – a tripartite 300mm joint operation between Freescale Semiconductor, Philips Semiconductors, and STMicroelectronics.

Process Engineer - Photolithography
Motorola - Semiconductor Products Sector
Jun 1997 - Oct 2003 · 6 yrs 5 mos
Austin, Texas Area

Operations
United States Navy
Jul 1987 - May 1992 · 4 yrs 11 mos

Warrick Exhibit 4 (6-7-24)

WWW.DIGITALEVIDENCEGROUP.COM

Education

California State University, Fullerton
Bachelor of Science (BS), Chemistry
1995 - 1997

Columbia Engineering
Graduate Studies, Materials Engineering
2000 - 2002

Walden University
Master of Business Administration (M.B.A.), Technology Management
2007 - 2009

Patents

Dual gate metal-oxide-semiconductor field-effect transistor
US 10,586,865 · Issued Mar 10, 2020

Integrated circuit device with reduced leakage and method therefore
US 8,898,614 · Issued Nov 25, 2014

Other inventors

Method of forming openings in a semiconductor device and a semiconductor device fabricated by the method.
US 8,435,874 · Issued May 7, 2013

Other inventors

Method of forming openings in a semiconductor device and semiconductor device.
US 8,187,978 · Issued May 29, 2012

Other inventors

Immersion lithography apparatus and method of performing immersion lithography.
US 7,948,607 · Issued May 24, 2011

Other inventors

Method of distancing a bubble and bubble displacement apparatus.
US 7,837,762 · Issued Nov 23, 2010

Other inventors

Warrick Exhibit
5 (6-7-24)
WWW.DIGITALEVIDENCEGROUP.COM

CIRRUS LOGIC®

Quality Handbook



Experts in Low Power, Mixed-Signal Processing

Cirrus Logic Quality Handbook

First Choice in Quality



CIRRUS LOGIC®

Quality Policy 3
Quality Management System 4
Environmental and Social Responsibilities 5
Global Quality Network 6
Product Development Process 8
Software Quality 18
Supplier Quality Management 21
Customer Quality Management 24
Product Analysis 26
Appendix A: *Product Reliability Operations* 32
Appendix B: *ESD Latch-Up Testing* 35
Appendix C: *Moisture Sensitivity Levels* 37
Appendix D: *White Papers* 38

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 63 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

At Cirrus Logic, Quality is Built In

Cirrus Logic is a world leader in low power, high precision, mixed-signal processing solutions that create innovative user experiences for the world's top mobile and consumer applications. The best known electronics OEMs rely on Cirrus Logic's superior engineering innovation and execution of highly specialized, cutting-edge design, software and manufacturing technology to meet their rapid, ultra high volume product introductions.

Cirrus Logic has become a valued, strategic partner by weaving quality into the processes and systems used at every level of the organization. Cirrus Logic's Quality Management System (QMS) provides an all encompassing focus on quality that flows throughout the company's Product Development Process (PDP). From the initial stages of product concept, all the way through high volume production, the Cirrus Logic team stands behind our track record of exceeding the expectations of our customers by delivering proven results every day.

Corporate Vision

First choice in signal processing products.
For our customers • For our shareholders • For our employees

Corporate Mission

Cirrus Logic provides innovative, high performance analog and digital signal processing products that "rock" (advances our customers, benefits our shareholders and rewards our employees).

- To exceed our customers' expectations
- Deliver solid value to our shareholders
- Build confidence and pride in our company

Corporate Values

- Continuous Improvement
- Innovation
- Integrity
- Communication
- Job Satisfaction

Cirrus Logic's flagship quality product development, reliability and analysis operations in Austin, Texas

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 64 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Quality Policy

Cirrus Logic is committed to deliver innovative signal processing solutions, exceed our customers' expectations, drive continual improvement and comply with regulatory requirements.

In support of our Quality Policy we strive to achieve the following objectives:

- Understand the needs of our customers and strive to constantly meet or exceed their expectations
- Continually improve the effectiveness of our Quality Management System and integrate into critical processes, projects and systems
- Partner with customers and suppliers to establish quality guidelines and to ensure they are met

Quality Management System

The Cirrus Logic Quality Management System (QMS) defines how quality is built into every facet of the company's design and development processes, as well as the systems that govern the manufacturing supply chain through fabrication, test and delivery. It is through our QMS that Cirrus Logic delivers innovative solutions that are built with quality to exceed our customers' expectations.

Cirrus Logic is compliant to the requirements set forth by ISO 9001:2015. It is through our QMS that we not only maintain this compliance, but we also actually drive quality beyond expectation. Cirrus Logic measures and continually improves the degree to which customer requirements and the quality policy are satisfied. Senior management establishes goals for product conformity and business process effectiveness. Effectiveness is measured by comparing actual results to expected results.

The efficiency and effectiveness of the QMS is reviewed on a regular basis. The Quality department participates in each Quarterly Data Review (QDR) where metrics are reviewed by senior management to assess the relevance and progress of the quality system. Actions pertaining to the quality system are assigned and documented at this review. An annual summary of internal audits is published by the Quality department and distributed to senior management. Findings are reviewed with each department manager for necessary corrective actions.

Change Management

Cirrus Logic follows JEDEC standards (JESD46) for customer notification of product/process changes. Prior to customer notification, changes to datasheet, wafer fabrication, assembly, or test undergo a rigorous internal change management process. Evaluation and implementation plans are developed by a cross-functional team of technical content experts and then reviewed and approved by a board of management representatives from several different areas within the company.

Quality Certifications

Cirrus Logic requires all suppliers to be ISO 9001:2015, ISO/TS16949, and ISO 14001 certified. Cirrus Logic also maintains a Sony Green Partner certification for environmental standards.

CIRRUS LOGIC
ISO 9001
QMS
CERTIFIED



Visual inspections support the product quality evaluation process

Environmental and Social Responsibilities

Cirrus Logic is actively committed to protecting the environment by reducing the amount of hazardous substances in our products. Cirrus Logic is working with customers and suppliers to exemplify industry standards of environmental and social responsibility.

RoHS (Restricted Use of Hazardous Substances)

The Restriction of Hazardous Substances Directive 2002/95/EC (RoHS 1) was adopted in February 2003, effective July 2006 by the European Union (EU). This regulation restricted the use of Lead (Pb), Mercury (Hg), Cadmium (Cd), Hexavalent chromium (Cr6+), Polybrominated biphenyls (PBB), and Polybrominated diphenyl ether (PBDE). A RoHS recast 2011/65/EU (RoHS 2) took effect in January 2013 clarifying scope and implementation of the RoHS regulation. Directive 2015/863 amending Annex II to Directive 2011/65/EU added four additional substances Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), Butyl benzyl phthalate (BBP), Dibutyl phthalate (DBP), Diisobutyl phthalate (DIBP) with enforcement by July 2019.

All integrated circuits (ICs) produced after 2021 are compliant with the provisions of the RoHS agreement. Before 2021, Cirrus Logic products use a “CS” prefix in their part numbers and are designated with a “Z” suffix if they are also RoHS compliant. Products acquired through the 2014 acquisition of Wolfson Microelectronics use a “WM” prefix and are all RoHS compliant if manufactured after 2007.

REACH (Registration, Evaluation, Authorization and Restriction of Chemical Substances)

REACH is the European Union (EU) regulation on chemicals and their safe use (EC 1907/2006). It covers the Registration, Evaluation, Authorization and Restriction of Chemical Substances. The law went into force in the EU on July 1, 2007. The REACH regulation identifies substances of very high concern (SVHC).

Substances of very high concern are not intentionally added to Cirrus Logic products. For this reason, Cirrus Logic has determined that its IC products are non-emitting articles as defined by the REACH regulation. This means that SVHC are not intended to be released under normal or reasonably foreseeable conditions of use. Consequently, Cirrus Logic products do not emit any SVHC in concentrations greater than 0.1% by weight. Because the SVHC list is updated several times per year, Cirrus Logic does take the necessary steps to monitor REACH regulations. If there are any material changes, this disclosure will be updated as warranted.

Conflict Materials

Cirrus Logic takes very seriously the worldwide concerns that the use of certain minerals that originated in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) or an adjoining country may be directly or indirectly financing human rights violations or benefiting armed groups within those countries. In addition, Cirrus Logic is committed to complying with all reporting requirements relating to these “conflict minerals (3TG)” as adopted by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) on August 22, 2012.

Section 1502 of the 2010 Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act (US HR-4173) requires SEC reporting companies to make an annual disclosure of any gold, tin, tantalum, and tungsten that originates from conflict mines in the region of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Annual disclosure is necessary for the ongoing production or sale of manufactured products.

As a member of the RMI organization, Cirrus Logic expects its suppliers to obtain materials through environmentally and socially responsible supply chains. In support of that effort, we are utilizing the Responsible Minerals Initiative (RMI) (previously CFSI), Responsible Business Alliance (RBA) (previously EICC) and the Global e-Sustainability Initiative (GeSI) Conflict-Free Smelter Program (CFSP), and Conflict Minerals Reporting Template (CMRT).

Each year, all Cirrus Logic suppliers must use the industry standard Conflict Minerals Reporting Template to report the origin of the metals they use. In addition, they are required to report:

- Evidence of a Corporate Policy on the use of metals from the DRC
- Acknowledgement of Cirrus Logic’s Conflict Minerals Policy Statement
- Verification of the procedures in place to demonstrate compliance with this policy

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 67 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Global Quality Network

Cirrus Logic maintains an extensive network of facilities strategically located to support our global design centers, supply chain partners and customer base. It is within this network where new products come to life. Reliability labs are utilized to test the robust nature of product designs, and product analysis labs are tasked with identifying the root causes of performance limitations once a product is deployed. In addition, Cirrus Logic has strategically placed software development centers that support the development, testing and implementation of our SoundClear® software.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 68 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

The Jason P. Rhode Center for Semiconductor Research in Austin, Texas

The Jason P. Rhode Center for Semiconductor Research encompasses more than 13,000 square feet and houses the industry's most advanced, state-of-the-art analytical equipment to support our quality management initiatives. Located near the Cirrus Logic headquarters in downtown Austin, Texas, this lab facilitates collaboration between our design engineering and support teams in the development and debugging of new product designs, product qualification and product analysis. In addition, the state-of-the-art equipment is utilized to accelerate environmental and product life cycle testing.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 69 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

The Product Development Process

Cirrus Logic's Product Development Process (PDP) defines the company's process for IC product development. The PDP is the systematic execution of product development from concept through production release. The PDP is tailored to fit each new project so there is flexibility to support the needs of multiple product lines. It is through the PDP that Cirrus Logic integrates all the essential phases of product realization to achieve a rapid and error-free ramp to production.

Quality is built in from the beginning. It cannot be added in later.

The PDP is the process of building in quality.

Phase gates are management checkpoints within the PDP. These checkpoints define the required deliverables that must be evaluated at each phase. The decision is then made whether or not to proceed to the next phase. PDP reviews are held at phase exits and within phases to help management make informed decisions for product success. Continuous improvement is facilitated and corrective actions are driven as needed. All elements of product development are coordinated to enable successful release to production. Corporate quality specifications apply to all products and are woven into the PDP. Any custom products or sustained engineering activities designed to enhance products already in the marketplace also follow the PDP.

PHASE 0

Marketing Concept and Product Requirements

Prior to Phase 0 is business review. This step, along with Phase 0, serves as the "think tank" for identifying potential new product concepts. It is during this phase that a business case is developed and the strategic fit of the project is determined, taking into consideration its alignment with the company's current technology, markets and customers. Phase 0 provides the details on what is going to be built and feasibility for readiness to ramp a team.

The key objectives of Business Review and Phase 0:

Product marketing identifies key customers and works to build the business case. First pass requirements for technical and financial milestones are defined.

Product features and performance requirements are identified and evaluated, as well as any software requirements.

Preliminary intellectual property (IP) blocks are summarized for both analog and digital design elements.

Quality and support requirements are specified with respect to temperature grade, characterization and all necessary qualification requirements.

Product support materials are defined by the applications group. The product development schedule and a preliminary product launch plan are drafted.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 71 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

PHASE 1

Architecture and Detailed Planning

Phase 1 takes the product concepts approved at Phase 0 and defines the key feature sets and the circuit architecture for the new IC.

The key objectives of Phase 1:

Feasibility Assessment

An engineering pre-architectural analysis is used to determine if the requested requirements are achievable. Architectural scoping is used to identify any potential limitations and the necessary corrective actions.

Target IC Data Sheet

A draft product data sheet is generated that outlines the preliminary product specifications and describes the function of the IC in relation to the system level requirements. A block diagram is used to capture the main functionality of the IC. It shows all major components of the design, and an effort is made to make each block open to future developments and extensions. For a mixed-signal IC, the chip is divided into analog and digital domains. The test strategy is elaborated and the preliminary characterization and validation plan is defined, while the means to debug each block independently on the bench is identified. Test time reductions and methods to eliminate multiple test insertions are given consideration.

Systems Architecture Specification (SAS)

The SAS outlines the preliminary specifications covering components, software and required evaluation boards. The final SAS deliverable is a comprehensive description of the environment in which the IC will operate, as well as how the proposed solution meets market requirements.

Software Systems Architecture

The development of software architecture is used to define the necessary requirements to make the system operational. The proposed environment in which the software will operate is described with respect to the overall platform, operating system or RTOS, volatile memory, permanent storage, and primary input and output. The input and output of the software are described, including layouts and formats where applicable. Any significant impact that the software will have on the overall environment also is identified.

Platform Hardware Systems Architecture

This is a description of the printed circuit boards and other electrical circuits that require development in order to make the system operational. Typically, these boards are designed to meet system specifications for operating conditions and absolute maximum ratings for parameter, supply voltage and supply current, and any design constraints on the board are described and documented. Relevant electrical specifications for the board also are provided.

IC/Firmware Verification Plan

This plan outlines the firmware/software requirement specification which details the project's required hardware and software characteristics and functionality. Data types that must be available to the customer are identified, either by the use of application development tools, or by the use of forms, displays, reports, and printouts. The actual application development environment is created so that control structures can be made available to the customer.

Qualification Plan

The "Qual Plan" is used for demonstrating field reliability. All required stresses, number of lots, units per lot, and pre-conditioning requirements are specified. All necessary process and device qualification data (including reliability results) is documented.

Initial Risk Assessment

This assessment evaluates the technical, schedule and market risks that could impact the project. Impact analysis and mitigation plans are made.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 72 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

PRODUCT LAUNCH
FULL FAB RAMP →
100K units
Q1
Q4

PHASE 2

Development Implementation and Verification

During Phase 2, the design architecture of the product is completed and its readiness for fab release is validated. Hardware manufacturing also is supported in this phase, along with identifying and resolving environmental compliance issues.

The key objectives of Phase 2:

IC Sub-System Specifications

The IC sub-system specifications identify the initial top level schematics and system verilog (SV) behavioral models. All known block IOs are created and the expected block area for the IC is determined. The layout team works to create a block abstract view and the process is completed with an architectural review and the closure of all action items. Analog blocks go through five phases: (1) verify, (2) planning, (3) layout, (4) design, and (5) architecture. This results in complete block specifications, determination of how specifications will be tested and enumeration of all required block interfaces. Digital blocks go through three phases: (1) architect, (2) design, and (3) planning. This results in the completions of the IP block design, including block specifications, determination of how specifications will be tested at block and chip level, and enumeration of all required block interfaces.

IC Verification

The verification review provides an audit of design results to assure compliance to the design methodology standards and is held prior to the layout review. The layout review validates the physical design of the IC and addresses any design issues, such as cross talk and digital noise management. Manufacturing issues in need of validation include metal migration, ESD and latch-up.

Hardware schematic and layout reviews for the engineering evaluation board (EEB) and the customer demo board (CDB) are then completed. A quality readiness review organizes all the supporting documentation needed to proceed with the qualification.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 74 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Product Qualification

BATHTUB CURVE

Failure Rates During the Lifetime of a Product



The emphasis on quality at this phase of product development is accomplished through a series of design and peer reviews that are performed throughout this phase to verify and validate. Verification is performed versus the design rules. Validation is performed versus the customer's expectations.

In support of our quality initiative, qualification and reliability testing is used to ensure all products are below targets set for "early failure rates" in PPM and "wear out failures" in FITs. The bathtub curve shown here is a standard way to picture the types of failures during a device's lifetime.

There are two basic types of failures, "early failures" and "wear out failures." During the normal operation of the device, that is the section of time between early failures and wear out, the failure rate is normally constant and at an extremely low rate.

The reliability tests conducted by Cirrus Logic can be divided into two categories: qualification and monitoring. Qualification evaluates new products for their manufacturability. Monitoring assures that manufacturability remains at a high standard of reliability and quality.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 75 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

PHASE 3

Silicon Bring-Up and Initial Customer Samples

Phase 3 sets the stage for a successful product launch. All applicable hardware is finalized and has been tested for stable performance. The product data sheet is released to production.

The key objectives of Phase 3:

- The product launch plan is presented to the product development and management teams.
- The design phase lessons learned is completed based on the knowledge gained in Phases 1 and 2, with key actions taken.
- The Qualified Parts List (QPL) level 2 checklist is completed. Any issues are identified and resolved.
- The preliminary validation and characterization reports are completed. Any issues are identified and resolved.
- First customer samples are delivered (up to 10K parts) and the stage is set for a successful product launch.

At the Phase 3 Exit meeting, the decision whether to advance to Phase 4 is made. But regardless of the "go or no go" decision, an *Engineering Postmortem* is conducted as part of the Cirrus Logic continuous improvement philosophy. This postmortem is conducted by a cross-functional team that evaluates the PDP process for each individual product and assesses the project in terms of what went well and what could be improved. Any identified improvements can then be implemented and fanned out to subsequent projects.

PHASE 4

Validation and Qualification

Phase 4 involves the limited release of product that has been qualified and evaluated. All validation, qualification, and characterization plans are completed in preparation for the full ramp to high volume production. Customer parts can be shipped according to corporate quality specifications.

The key objectives of Phase 4:

- The Customer Reference Design (CRD) datasheet is released to production.
- The preliminary data sheet for the IC is frozen. New content updates in this phase are limited to changes in specification values to reflect new characterization data or production test limits, as well as the addition of new information to the applications section that addresses new issues or routine customer questions. Other revisions also may involve corrections to any inaccurate information from the previous release of the data sheet and updates to the part ordering information. Incorporation of any known errata that the team decides will not be fixed at the time of sign-off can be added at this time.
- The final results of IC validation, characterization and matrix lot reviews are examined. Detailed analyses of sightings and resulting actions are performed, documented and presented.
- The final production test methodology, characterization and hardware investigations are reviewed. The status of the production test program is compared to the original test plan. Test coverage and yield to date are reviewed for all program releases.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 76 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread



Product qualification is important for determining field reliability



Product qualification is performed in-house as part of the design validation process

PHASE 5

Production Readiness and Ramp

Phase 5 is full production readiness and ramp. All package and silicon qualification, validation and characterization is completed.

The key objectives of Phase 5:

- The post-silicon phase lessons are completed based on the knowledge gained during phases 3, 4 and 5, with key actions taken.
- Upon completion of all activities, a Phase 5 Exit meeting is held and the decision is made whether to release to full production.

A *Business Postmortem* is conducted as part of Cirrus Logic's continuous improvement philosophy. A postmortem allows the team to evaluate the PDP process for each individual product and assess the project in terms of what went well and what could be improved. Any identified improvements can then be implemented and fanned out to subsequent projects.

The key business process issues to review are:

- What went well?
- What ideas/practices do we want to port to other projects (keep doing)?
- What ideas/practices did we do that we did not see adding value (stop doing)?
- What new ideas/practices should we add to improve the next project (try doing)?
- What needs improvement?
- What mistakes occurred that impacted quality or schedule that we could avoid on the next project?

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 79 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Audio testing labs are used throughout the software development process

Software Quality

Development Process

As part of the PDP process, quality metrics are integrated into the development of software and firmware associated with specific Cirrus Logic IC products. This approach ensures the technology involved is of the highest standards.

A number of defined processes and methodologies are included in all firmware releases. Software for the company's wide range of "smart codecs" follows the multi-phase AGILE development process that encompasses a group of methods in which requirements and solutions evolve through collaboration between self-organizing, cross-functional teams. This approach uses adaptive planning, evolutionary development, early delivery and continuous improvement to promote rapid and flexible response to change.

The proprietary tools and drivers that support the software modules follow a slightly different development flow. Each phase of development has associated reviews, usually at the end of each phase, to evaluate deliverables and determine what actions are required to progress.

A phase may contain a number of stages with an associated review meeting. In the early phases of the project, taking time to review ensures that the scope of the project, the commitment of resources, the budgetary considerations, and the scheduling for the proposed deliverables are all thoroughly outlined in the business case. An outline of the possible risks associated with the project versus the level of confidence regarding successful completion is also included. This activity leads to a viable development plan and a final agreement on the deployment schedule. Later in the project, having review stages within each phase allows incremental implementation, testing and release of the agreed upon feature set.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 80 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Test Integration

Testing is carried out at all phases of code development. A number of levels of testing are utilized. Audio algorithms are initially developed and tested within MATLAB®, an interactive environment for algorithm development. Once the algorithm has been completed it is coded and simulated for the DSP embedded in the smart codec. Once hardware is available the firmware containing the algorithm is downloaded and tested on an evaluation board before being loaded into a form factor demonstration platform, or a customer's device for final testing and tuning.

Tests may be derived from the initial test specification or may be added as a result of a defect that's been identified. Defects are submitted by developers, testers and early-adoption customers. All defects are subsequently tracked to resolution. As part of the development process, software solutions may be submitted to external agencies for independent testing and verification to ensure industry compliance.



Customer devices are tested in application specific lab settings to ensure delivery of a quality product

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 81 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Tool development typically follows an AGILE development process using an iterative life cycle of prioritize/plan/do/release/review.

Deployment Tools and Support

SoundClear® Studio, CirrusLink,™ CLIDE™ and WISCE™ are the main tool sets developed and supported by Cirrus Logic for deployment of firmware into a customer's device. Work items are broken down into features, stories and tasks that are agreed upon. Once development work commences, any resulting defects are monitored by regular stakeholder meetings.

All new and updated code and associated documentation is peer-reviewed using code collaboration tools. Manual and automated tests are carried out by Continuous Integration (CI). A test failure is considered a build failure, and a "stop-the-line" approach is taken to CI build breaks. No code is accepted except for fixes or back-out until the build is working again.

OS Drivers

OS drivers allow the customer's operating system to manage Cirrus Logic software on Cirrus Logic enabled hardware. The most common drivers are those for the Linux and Windows® operating systems. Windows drivers are written to support a specific combination of host OS, host hardware platforms and Cirrus Logic devices. Testing is conducted on host hardware Reference Verification Platforms. Released drivers are required to pass Windows Hardware Certification Kit tests for 32-bit and 64-bit builds. Volume customization is done at the time of production to allow compliance with European Union (EU) regulations limiting headphone volume.

Linux drivers also are written to support a wide range of Cirrus Logic products and are submitted back into the Linux kernel in order to reduce the integration and maintenance costs for the user. The drivers use the standard Linux subsystems for the functionality provided by the Cirrus Logic device. Since standard APIs are used, the drivers will work with any processor using Linux support.

General Quality Initiatives

Cirrus Logic's coding standards are intended to sustain the readability, consistency and maintainability of all source code. These standards are tailored for C family (C/C++/C#) coding as these are the primary languages used by Cirrus Logic. Our software development initiatives employ techniques across all modes of code development to maintain a consistently high quality both when developing code and when releasing code to customers.

Our build, integration and testing system (BITS) provides an infrastructure for automating builds and tests for all active software projects. BITS ensures the quality control and the quality assurance of our products by using a Continuous Integration (CI) server and a platform for managing and scheduling all builds. Whenever there is a code submission to a project, the CI system triggers an automatic build and runs a battery of tests to ensure that no faults have been introduced. Any build or test errors are reported to the development team immediately for quick resolution.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 82 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Building Quality Through Supplier Relationships

Supplier Quality Management

A key component to the Cirrus Logic commitment to quality is an underlying foundation of integrity in our supplier relationships. To achieve this high standard, supplier performance is rated according to quality, delivery, provision of required certificates, and test reports.

Cirrus Logic follows a Supplier Code of Conduct for selecting and managing our network of suppliers. Within our organization, suppliers are managed in partnership with the supplier quality and supply chain operations. Suppliers are selected based on a number of criteria which include financial viability, ISO9001/TS16949 certifications and a manufacturing capability assessment audit. Various methods are then used to manage, measure and drive continuous improvement within these relationships, including quarterly reviews, scorecards, annual audits, supplier development goals, process yields, and overall quality performance.

Cirrus Logic conducts regular audits that are more rigorous than ISO9001 requirements. These audits not only assess system compliance but also effectiveness and continuous improvement. Scorecards are reviewed with each supplier quarterly. These include a quality component based on effectiveness of corrective actions, frequency of customer returns, inline deviations, and yield. If a supplier fails to meet Cirrus Logic's requirements, resolution may involve corrective action or disqualification, depending on the nature and severity of the problem.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 83 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

A Systematic Approach

Based on a commitment to continuously improve our supplier base, Cirrus Logic provides engineering and statistical support to each supplier to help them effectively utilize traditional improvement tools such as statistical process control and design of experiments. Additionally, innovative techniques like ISTAB, smart sampling and statistical bin limits are created and shared. Cirrus Logic utilizes this systematic approach to achieve higher quality and better performance at each point of the supply chain. This approach consists of three sub-processes that are mutually supportive: audit, feedback and development.

The audit process consists of self-audits in advance preparation for on-site audits. Annual (or biennial) on-site audits provide the supplier with Cirrus Logic's perspective on the efficiency and effectiveness of the supplier's operations. These audits cover the supplier's quality management system, corrective action follow–up and targeting of specific areas of the operation to improve quality through best practices.

The feedback portion of this process is the quarterly business reviews (QBR) which are held at each supplier's site. In the QBR, the quality and operational performance of the supplier are examined and goals are set. Finally, the development process consists of setting and tracking annual development goals. Performance to goal is reviewed monthly with the expectation of continued supplier improvement.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 84 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Manufacturing Continuous Improvement

The Continuous Improvement Process (CIP) is an ongoing effort applied to the products, processes, services, and systems at Cirrus Logic's supply chain partners. These efforts drive improvement over time or breakthrough improvement all at once. Among the most widely used tools for continuous improvement: PDCA (plan-do-check-act) cycle, Six Sigma and TQM (Total Quality Management). These tools emphasize employee involvement and teamwork, measuring and systematizing processes, and reducing variation, defects and cycle times.

Supplier Code of Conduct

As part of Cirrus Logic's commitment to the highest standards of product quality, the company's Supplier Code of Conduct guides the business integrity in all third party supplier relationships. This code is comprised of five sections covering labor, health and safety, environment, business ethics and managing conformity to the code. Based on this code, Cirrus Logic commits to ensuring that working conditions across our supply chain are safe; that workers are treated with respect and dignity; and that manufacturing processes are environmentally and socially responsible.

To ensure our relationships with suppliers meet and support these expectations, the Cirrus Logic Supplier Code of Conduct exceeds the RBA Code of Conduct. As a condition of doing business with Cirrus Logic, suppliers are expected to conform to these requirements and communicate the basics of the code to their suppliers. Cirrus Logic representatives may visit supplier facilities with or without notice to assess compliance to these requirements and will consider a supplier's conformance when making sourcing and procurement decisions. Failure to comply with the standards and provisions set forth in the Cirrus Logic Supplier Code of Conduct may result in a supplier's disqualification.

The code also requires suppliers to commit to operate in full compliance with the laws, rules and regulations of the countries in which they operate. This encourages, and in some cases requires, suppliers to go even further, drawing upon internationally recognized standards in order to advance social and environmental responsibility and business ethics.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 85 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Our Commitment To Quality

Customer Quality Management, Keeping Customers First

Cirrus Logic's commitment to quality extends beyond product quality to the integrity across all of our business relationships. Cirrus Logic's Customer Quality Management Program focuses on providing world-class support to our customers. Customer Quality Engineering teams are located strategically around the globe to ensure the delivery of immediate support to our customers through a coordinated effort between our business units and technical teams.

Customer Change Management

Within our Customer Quality Management Program, activities involving product change notifications (PCNs) and product discontinuations (End of Life, EOLs) represent one of the most compelling drivers of customer communications. Cirrus Logic acknowledges the importance and priority of helping our customers navigate these changes. Cirrus Logic follows generally accepted industry standards for notifying customers of any changes that are classified as "Major" and provide a 90-day review period. Major changes are classified as any change that affects product form, fit, function or reliability.

Customers are notified of product EOLs through our PCN system. Customers have a minimum of 180 days from the date of notification to place final orders and 360 days from the date of notice to accept final shipments. In the rare situation Cirrus Logic is not able to meet these notification timelines for an EOL situation, every effort is made to provide customers with as much advanced notice as possible.

Product Return Process

Reports of product non-compliance are treated seriously by Cirrus Logic. Our global customer quality and field sales teams can be contacted directly to begin determining the best path for solving an issue. If it is determined that the best course of action is to return the effected parts to Cirrus Logic, then the company's standard customer return process flow will be followed. The customer return process flow is adapted as needed in order to address the specific product issue and to provide the most efficient resolution for our customer.

Throughout this process, customers receive ongoing communications to keep them current on investigation efforts and the resultant findings. This can include verification of the specific problem, recommendations on containment, root cause, and the final corrective and preventative actions that are applicable.

Customer returns are tracked in a corporate-wide system that gathers metrics regarding incidents, processing cycle times and failure mechanisms. These metrics are reviewed monthly and quarterly with our business and operations teams to drive continuous improvement throughout the product design, manufacturing fabrication, assembly, test, and shipping processes.

Product Traceability

The customer return process flow is brought full circle through the use of unique package markings which enables material traceability for all Cirrus Logic products. This information is retained within a central storage database and can be used as a part of material containment in case of an issue.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 86 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Customer Return Process Flow



Product Analysis

Once a part is entered into the Cirrus Logic customer return process flow, a product analysis is initiated to determine the exact cause of the failure. Often times this work is conducted at one of Cirrus Logic's product development, reliability and analysis facilities dedicated to electrical and physical product analysis. As noted in the customer return process flow diagram, communications with the customer regarding any findings is paramount at each stage of this product analysis process.

Nano-probing is a critical step in fault isolation analysis

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 88 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Replicating the Failure

The first step in the product analysis process is to reproduce and verify the exact nature of the failure to determine if it matches the reported symptom. The laboratory utilizes ATE testers for verifying functional failures, engineering evaluation boards (EEB's) for verifying analog failures, and a switchboard matrix board for verifying DC parametric failures.

Package Level Analysis

Optical 2D and 3D microscopes with various imaging modes are used for incoming inspections. Non-destructive board level solder ball or lead joints and plastic package bond wire integrity checks are performed on the X-ray tool. Acoustic microscopy is also performed to inspect the package for delamination and other package level failure mechanisms.



A package x-ray is performed to verify the condition of the package integrity

Package Conditioning

For WLCSP packages, Cirrus Logic uses defined processes to remove the part from the customer board and to remove the underfill and re-ball the device. For plastic packages, a toolset consisting of hot and cold acid de-capsulators and laser assisted de-capsulators are used to expose the die for further analysis. A backside sample polishing tool is utilized to expose or thin down samples for subsequent electrical fault isolation analysis.

Electrical Fault Isolation

Cirrus Logic's in-house developed FA hardware designs support a multitude of package types and pin counts ranging from QFN and TSSOP, to WLCSP and BGA. The setups are geared towards topside and backside electrical fault isolation techniques. A locking thermography system for dynamic infrared (IR) thermal emission analysis is utilized to accurately and efficiently narrow down the location of the failure, often emitting power levels as low as microwatts. A near IR optimized light emissions analysis (LEM) tool coupled with an IR laser overlay is used to detect and isolate IC defect categories including junction leakage, gate defects, latch up, ESD, and floating nodes. Laser-based techniques such as TIVA, OBIRCH, OBIC, LIVA, and LADA are most frequently used for through silicon point emission analysis. FIB assisted partitioning, passive voltage contrast and access point creation are used to further isolate the failing node.



Hotspot observed on the device

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 89 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Typical Product Analysis Flow



Atomic Force Microscopy

Atomic Force Microscopy (AFM) uses a scanning probe microscope (SPM) to measure local properties of the element under examination, such as height, friction, and magnetism. To acquire an image, the SPM raster scans a probe over a small area of the sample, measuring the local property simultaneously. In the field of semiconductor physics, for example, (a) an identification of atoms at a surface, (b) an evaluation of an interaction between a specific atom and its neighboring atoms, and (c) a change in physical properties arisen from a change in an atomic arrangement through the atomic manipulation have been studied.

Advanced Electrical Analysis

Isolating the failing node based on emission data, and sometimes lack of abnormal emissions, requires exhaustive and time intensive functional microprobing. This step requires developing a CAD layout and schematic review; creating probe points to die level metalization; and probing identified nodes to pinpoint the failure. Scanning electron microscope (SEM) based nanoprobing is utilized to handle small feature process geometries in addition to fault isolation methods such as EBAC. Atomic Force Microscopy (AFM) is used for nano scale electrical characterization including conductive and tunneling imaging to produce a map of P, N and resistive characteristics of the sample area. Focused ion beam (FIB) tools that support gas chemistries to selective etch or deposit metals, polymers and insulators are used to perform circuit edits for design debugs.



Nanoprober



Nanoprober

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 90 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Use of Focus Ion Beam (FIB) Tools to Debug Circuit Designs











Physical Analysis

The optical inspection toolset consists of various microscopes that support 3D, dark field, confocal, and bright field imaging. A combination of plasma dry etching and chemical assisted wet etching is used to deprocess the sample, layer by layer. Mechanical cross sections of packages, qualification vehicles and layer removal in the area of interest are conducted on industry standard polishing tools. Precision cross sectioning and high resolution images of the defects is achieved on the dual beam FIB tools. This toolset also supports SEM based TEM imaging required for nanoscale defects. SEM/EDS X-ray elemental analysis is used to identify the defects for subsequent corrective actions at the foundry or assembly.



FIB Cross Section



STEM Image

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 91 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 92 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Appendix A: *Product Reliability Operations* 32
Appendix B: *ESD Latch-Up Testing* 35
Appendix C: *Moisture Sensitivity Levels* 37
Appendix D: *White Papers* 38

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 93 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Appendix A

Product Reliability Operations

Reliability test conditions follow Cirrus Logic Integrated Circuit Qualification Specifications, applicable JEDEC standards, or AEC Q100. When conflicts arise, JEDEC standards are followed for commercial products and AEC standards are followed for automotive products.

Devices which undergo stress tests are required to pass the same electrical and functional tests from start to finish. Analysis of non-conforming units is required; root causes are identified and corrective actions are taken as necessary.

High Temperature Operating Life (HTOL)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-A108

HTOL is an intense stress test performed to thermally and electrically accelerate failure mechanisms through the application of extreme temperature and dynamic biasing conditions. Typically, it is performed at +125°C with bias levels at the maximum data sheet specifications or greater. HTOL performance is considered to be a measure of the intrinsic reliability of the design and manufacturing process taken together. HTOL results are quoted in failures per billion device hours, aka "failures in time" (FIT).

Early Life Failure Rate (ELFR)

ELFR is considered a reliability measure of the manufacturing process used for the product. This is because the failure rate can depend on age due to latent defects introduced by the process. Early life testing is performed to estimate this failure rate, usually quoted in defects per million opportunities (DPM) in the first three months to one year of life. If unacceptable early failure rates are encountered, they can be mitigated by production burn-in or wafer level stress screens until the manufacturing process is made more robust.

Device specific conditions of maximum VSSs (or greater), I/O loading and clock rate are applied to exercise the maximum amount of digital circuitry while full scale ranges are applied to exercise the analog circuitry. The failure rate is calculated for +125°C conditions and the failure rate is de-rated to use conditions. The need for production stress screening is determined based on the predicted failure rate under use conditions.

Low Temperature Operating Life (LTOL)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-A108

LTOL is stress test performed to activate failure mechanisms that are accelerated by lower temperature (e.g. Hot carrier degradation). Typically, it is performed at ambient temperatures of -40°C with bias levels at the maximum data sheet specifications or greater. LTOL performance is considered to be a measure of the intrinsic reliability of the design and manufacturing process taken together. LTOL results are quoted in failures per billion device hours, aka "failures in time" (FIT).

High Temperature Storage Life (HTSL)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-A103

HTSL determines the effect of time and temperature under controlled storage conditions for thermally activated failure mechanisms. Devices are stressed in a chamber at extreme levels of temperature for various periods of time.

Stress conditions are:

Temperature = +150°C
Time = 1000 hours

Low Temperature Storage Life (LTSL)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-A119

LTSL, like HTSL determines the effect of time and temperature under controlled storage conditions for thermally activated failure mechanisms. Devices are stressed in a chamber at extreme levels of temperature for various periods of time.

Stress conditions are:

Temperature = +40°C
Time = 1000 hours

Preconditioning (PC)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-A113, J-STD-020

Pre-conditioning consists of a bake, soak and reflow, and is used to simulate the PC board assembly process. This assures that the units going into an accelerated test would have survived the assembly process.

Temperature Humidity Bias (THB)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-A101

THB assesses device and package resistance to prolonged temperature, humidity and electrical stresses. Devices are stressed under extreme temperature and humidity conditions. The devices are subjected to maximum differential bias on alternating pins while under stress conditions.

Stress conditions are:

Temperature = +85°C
Humidity = 85% RH
Time = 1000 hours with interim read points at 100 and 500 hours

Voltage bias levels are product dependent.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 94 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Biased Highly Accelerated Stress Test (HAST)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-A110

Like THB, HAST simulates extreme operating conditions and assesses the moisture resistance of the product's external protective layers (encapsulant or seal ring). Devices are stressed in a chamber at an extreme level of temperature and humidity for various periods of time. The devices are biased while under stress.

Stress conditions are:

Temperature = +110°C
Humidity = 85% RH
Time = 264 hours

Voltage bias levels are product dependent.

Unbiased Highly Accelerated Stress Test (UHAST)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-A118

Like HAST, UHAST simulates extreme operating conditions. Devices are stressed in a chamber at an extreme level of temperature and humidity for various periods of time. The devices are not biased while under stress.

Stress conditions are:

Temperature = +110°C
Humidity = 85% RH
Time = 264 hours

Temperature Cycle (TC)

Applicable JEDEC standard: JESD22-104

TMCL accelerates the effects of thermal expansion mismatch among different components of the package and circuit. It is used to determine package tolerance to temperature variation extremes during transportation and use.

Devices are placed in a chamber and subjected to the specified temperature cycling stress condition for the specified number of minimum and maximum temperature cycles. Failed devices are checked for stress cracks and delamination of the product interfaces (passivation, dielectric layers and/or a "popcorn effect" on epoxy packaged devices). There are other conditions that are or can be used.

Stress conditions are:

Temperature = +125°C (top chamber) and -40° C (bottom chamber)
Time = 10 minutes per chamber for 1000 cycles between chambers



Solderability

Applicable JEDEC standard: J-STD-002

Solderability is a characterization test that determines the solderability of terminals after transportation and storage. Two types of tests are performed: Solder bath dip/look and surface mount process simulation. For the dip/look test, devices are dipped in a solder bath for a pre-determined time. Units are pre-conditioned with steam or hot aging, or both.

Stress conditions are:

Solder bath
Temperature = +245°C/-5°C
Dip Time = +5/-0.5 seconds

Solder composition: Pb:Sn = 4:6, used with rosin flux. Lead-free alloys are used with lead-free packages.

At least 95% of the immersed area must be coated with solder in order to pass the test. For the Surface Mount process simulation test, a stencil with appropriate pad geometry is used to simulate actual surface mount component performance in a reflow process. All terminations shall exhibit a continuous solder coating free from defects for a minimum of 95% of the critical surface area.

MEMS (Micro ElectroMechanical Systems) must meet the reliability requirements of ICs as described above and in addition the following stresses specific to MEMS microphone technology and package integrity.

Vibration (VIB)

Applicable standards: JESD22-B103 / MIL 883, Method 2007

VIB accelerates the effects of forces on the product through repetitive pulse amplitude and durations simulating shipping or field conditions.

Devices are mounted to boards and placed on a vibration table that can stress the parts with random vibration pulses or harmonic pulses for given force conditions. The force may be on different orientations of the parts (X/Y/Z). There are other conditions that are or can be used.

Stress conditions are:

Sine vibration: 20g peak acceleration, 20-2000Hz
Random vibration: 5G, low frequency levels

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 95 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Mechanical Shock (Mech Shock)
Applicable standards: JESD22-B104, JESD22-B110B / MIL 883, Method 2002 / IEC60068-2-27
Mech Shock accelerates the effects of forces on the product through severe or suddenly applied mechanical impacts simulating shipping or field conditions.

Devices are mounted to boards and placed on a table that can stress the parts with controlled impact pulses for given force conditions. The force may be on different orientations of the parts (X/Y/Z). There are other conditions that are or can be used.

Stress conditions are:

Force: 1500G peak, 0.5ms duration, half sine pulse wave

Tumble Test (Tumble)
Applicable standards: IEC60068-2-31
Tumble Test accelerates the effects of rough handling forces on the product through severe or suddenly applied mechanical impacts simulating handling, shipping or field conditions.

Devices are mounted to boards and placed in a chamber that can apply a drop to a steel base with the product striking the surface with a random orientation. There are other conditions that are or can be used.

Stress conditions are:

Force: 1M drop
Cycles: ~10 cycles / minute

Drop Test (Drop)
This test is performed to customer specific requirements and is to evaluate the robustness of the microphone when dropped directly onto a hard surface from a specified height, typically 1 metre. The microphone is mounted on a weighted buck which simulates the weight and size of the end product. The expectation is that a microphone will survive multiple drops.

Qualification Stress Flow example



Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 96 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Appendix B

Electro Static Discharge Latch-Up Testing

Electrical Static Discharge (ESD) testing is used to determine a semiconductor's level of ESD sensitivity. Cirrus Logic's ESD laboratory performs in-house, JEDEC compliant ESD and latch-up testing. This allows for rapid design feedback and complete debug capability.

Human Body Model (HBM)

Applicable JEDEC standards:
ANSI/ESDA/JEDEC JS-001 models the discharge of electricity into a pin on a device through contact with a human body that has been charged with static electricity. Equivalent capacitance of the discharge circuit is 100pF and resistance is 1.5K ohm.

The typical flow for HBM testing is as follows (the device is not powered up during ESD stress):

- Parametric and functional testing
- Pre-stress I/V
- HBM stress
- Post stress I/V
- Parametric and functional testing

Three devices per voltage step specified by JEDEC are used. Intermediate voltage steps can be added.

Charged Device Model (CDM)

Applicable JEDEC standard:
ANSI/ESDA/JEDEC JS-002 models the discharge of electricity that occurs when part of the device package or lead frame becomes charged due to handling and a pin on the device then contacts a metal apparatus or fixture. This model shows good correlation to the typical breakdown mode of an automatic assembly line.

The typical flow for CDM testing is as follows (the device is not powered up during ESD stress:

- Parametric and functional testing
- CDM stress
- Parametric and functional testing

Three devices per voltage step specified by JEDEC are used. Intermediate voltage steps can be added.



Example waveform, 1kV HBM through short

HBM tester

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 97 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread



Example waveform, 1kV HBM through short



CDM tester

Latch-Up

Applicable JEDEC standard: JEDEC 78

Latch-up testing is performed to ascertain whether a device can sustain SCR latch-up due to DC current injected into the input, output and I/O pins. Cirrus Logic requires testing of both current injection and power supply overvoltage conditions.

Stress conditions are:

Current injection	=	±100 mA on all non-supply pins
Overvoltage	=	1.5xVDDmax on all supply pins
Temperature	=	Maximum operating temperature on data sheet or room temperature ambient

The typical flow for latch-up testing is as follows (the device is powered up during Latch-up stress):

- Parametric and functional testing
- Pre-stress I/V
- Positive I-Test Input pins high
- Positive I-Test Input pins low
- Negative I-Test Input pins high
- Negative I-Test Input pins low
- Overvoltage Test Input pins high
- Overvoltage Test Input pins low
- Parametric and functional testing

Three devices per voltage step are used. Separate devices can be used for I-Test and Overvoltage or room temp and max temp.



Latch-up tester

Appendix C

Moisture Sensitivity Levels

JEDEC levels are the industry standard for pre-conditioning flows used to simulate a customer's PCB attachment process. Pre-conditioning flows are performed on all surface mount devices before specific qualification testing. This establishes the moisture sensitivity level (MSL) under which the device will be released to production and determines whether dry pack is required or not. This testing determines the level of moisture absorption by the product for a set period of time. Defects that can result are delamination of the product interfaces (passivation, dielectric layers and/or a "popcorn effect" on epoxy packaged devices) during the customer assembly process. This popcorn effect on epoxy molded product was noticed several years ago as the industry began migrating from primarily pin-through-hole packages and dual-in-line power packages, to surface mount devices. A popping sound was heard on assembly lines as packages were mounted on PCB boards. The cause of this phenomenon was isolated to moisture ingress into the device package which in turn generated a rapid expansion during reflow, causing packages to crack. This cracking happened so rapidly that an audible "pop" was observed and thus the nickname "popcorn" effect was coined. Generally, WLCSP products are MSL 1, epoxy package devices below 22-pins are qualified to MSL < 2 and epoxy package devices of 24-pins and greater are usually qualified to a less stringent level 3 and dry packed to prevent a popcorn effect issue during PCB attachment (e.g. IR reflow).

Solder Reflow Profiles for Cirrus Logic Products

Cirrus Logic Quality and Assembly Engineering Departments receive frequent customer inquiries asking for recommended reflow soldering profiles for our IC devices. Providing such recommendations pose quite a considerable challenge given the wide variety of available reflow equipment models and the unique factors related to each piece of equipment, such as PCB board size and mass and the specific solder chemistry used by the customer. Given all of these variables, customers are best served to create custom, optimized reflow solder profiles for each assembly scenario.

For non-hermetic plastic and wafer level chip scale packages (WLCSP), Cirrus Logic devices are qualified and rated using the joint industry specification J-STD-020. Using this specification to both rate the susceptibility of ICs to moisture and to guide customers towards proper reflow exposure parameters helps ensure compatibility between the Cirrus Logic device and the customer's soldering application.

This specification also is useful in understanding the limits and preferred practices for reflow soldering for both eutectic and lead-free chemistries. The standard defines a target reflow profile and explains the acceptable limits for time and temperature during reflow soldering. Proper interpretation of this document will assist customers in developing solder reflow profiles for their manufacturing process which provide repeatable high-quality solder joints in a reliable and efficient manner.

Solder paste manufacturers should also be consulted for any additional requirements to facilitate a successful application of their products. The standard may be downloaded free of charge by JEDEC registered individuals using this link: https://www.jedec.org/standards-documents/docs/j-std-020e. There is no cost or obligation associated with registering for access to this information.

Moisture Sensitivity Levels per IPC / JEDEC J-STD-020

	Floor Life		Soak Requirements				
			Standard		Accelerated Equivalent		
					eV 0.40-0.48	eV 0.30-0.39	
Level	Time	Condition	Time (hours)	Condition	Time (hours)	Time (hours)	Condition
1	Unlimited	≤ 30°C/85% RH	168 + 5/-0	85°C/85% RH	NA	NA	NA
2	1 year	≤ 30°C/60% RH	168 + 5/-0	85°C/60% RH	NA	NA	NA
2a	4 weeks	≤ 30°C/60% RH	696[2] + 5/-0	30°C/60% RH	120 + 1/-0	168 + 1/-0	60°C/60% RH
3	168 hours	≤ 30°C/60% RH	192[2] + 5/-0	30°C/60% RH	40 + 1/-0	52 + 1/-0	60°C/60% RH
4	72 hours	≤ 30°C/60% RH	96[2] + 5/-0	30°C/60% RH	20 + 0.5/-0	24 + 0.5/-0	60°C/60% RH
5	48 hours	≤ 30°C/60% RH	72[2] + 5/-0	30°C/60% RH	15 + 0.5/-0	20 + 0.5/-0	60°C/60% RH
5a	24 hours	≤ 30°C/60% RH	48[2] + 5/-0	30°C/60% RH	10 + 0.5/-0	13 + 0.5/-0	60°C/60% RH
6	Time on Label (TOL)	≤ 30°C/60% RH	TOL	30°C/60% RH	NA	NA	NA

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 99 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Classification Profile per IPC / JEDEC J-STD-020 (not to scale)



© 2019 Cirrus Logic, Inc. All rights reserved. Cirrus Logic, Cirrus Logic and the Cirrus Logic logo designs are trademarks of Cirrus Logic, Inc.

Predictive Maintenance

Abstract

An overview of predictive maintenance (PdM) is presented and contrasted with preventive maintenance (PM). Examples of PdM methods used in wafer fab are given.

I. Introduction

Cirrus Logic quality management believes that predictive maintenance is a key factor in preventing quality disasters. The essential difference between traditional *preventive* maintenance (PM) and *predictive* maintenance (PdM) is that PM activity depends on the *history* of the tool and PdM activity depends on the *current condition* of the tool. This is why PdM is sometimes called "condition-based" maintenance.

PdM not only prevents disasters, it also improves equipment uptime. Tools go down for maintenance when warranted by their current condition, not because they are simply "due." To the degree that maintenance events are predictable they can be planned. Planned maintenance takes less time, has less variability and can be performed when the tool is not in demand.

The central concept of PM is the *bathtub curve*. The bathtub curve is the failure rate as a function of age. We take a tool down because we think that enough time since the last renewal of the tool has accumulated for the bathtub curve to rise to an intolerable level. This strategy is consistent with the belief that failure mechanisms are time-dependent.

The central concept of PdM is *anomaly detection*. An anomaly detector is an annunciator that is a function of measured variables. We take a tool down because we think that the current condition of the tool inferred from measured variables is anomalous. This strategy is consistent with the belief that failure mechanisms have precursors that are observable.

PdM and PM are not antagonistic in any way. In fact, PM is a special case of PdM wherein *cycles of time* are an observable precursor to wear-out failure mechanisms.

II. Examples

Preventive maintenance: Change oil every 3,000 miles. Oil is changed every 3,000 miles, no matter what–summer or winter, hard miles or easy miles, dirt roads or asphalt, etc.

Predictive maintenance: Change oil because the current spectrographic analysis says that the oil is degraded to the point that its lubrication properties are barely sufficient. Better still, use a sequence of recent spectrographic data to predict when lubrication properties will become insufficient, if ever.

In this example, the spectrometer plays the role of *sensor suite* and *processor*. The user specifies a *detection threshold* in terms of spectrometer output that when breached, triggers an *annunciation* that maintenance is required.

III. Infrastructure Requirements

Preventive maintenance requires little more than a clock. Various ways of reckoning time may be relevant depending on the nature of the wearout mechanism to be intercepted. The PM clock may account for calendar

time, operational time, duty cycles, number of units of production, or raw material use. In any case, PM activity is triggered by the accumulation of cycles of time.

Predictive maintenance requires more elaborate infrastructure. An anomaly detector must be devised and implemented. The detector consists of a sensor suite, processor, detection threshold and annunciator.

The sensor suite is the means by which relevant characteristics of the tool are measured and transmitted to the processor. In wafer fab applications the term SVID (system variable identification) is used to refer to a generic sensor and FDC (Fault Detection and Classification) is used to refer to the suite. In other contexts, the term SCADA (Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition) is used to refer to monitoring as well as control infrastructure. The term condition monitor (CM) is sufficiently general to refer to a sensor suite that is compatible with PdM.

Considered individually, the output of each sensor is a univariate random variable. Taken together, the output of a sensor suite is a multivariate random variable. Early-stage PdM implementations treat each sensor in isolation, much like traditional SPC. This mode is called univariate analysis (UVA). More mature PdM implementations consider the joint behaviour of the sensors in the suite as a vector. This mode is called multivariate analysis (MVA). MVA of the sensor suite will always out-perform UVA because MVA exploits the correlation structure between sensors. This makes it possible to achieve a higher degree of sensitivity to anomalies than is possible by responding to sensors individually through UVA.

For a depiction of the UVA for two variables, X1 and X2, see Figure 1.

Figure 1



The process is deemed to be "in control" as long as both variables remain inside their respective limits. When we treat X1 and X2 as elements of a 2 x 1 vector, the correlation structure becomes apparent: see Figure 2.

Figure 2



The MVA limit reclaims a substantial portion of the factor space *simply by virtue of its shape* thereby improving the sensitivity of the detector. The more correlated the variables are, the larger the reclaimed region and the more sensitive the detector will be relative to the corresponding UVA.

The processor is the means by which raw sensor output is transformed so that it is compatible with a detection threshold. For example, CM data may be output as a multi-channel, time-varying signal that is on from the start to finish of a production run. In wafer fab applications this is called trace data. Depending on how the detection threshold is defined, various operations may need to be performed on the trace data. These may be simple, like limit checking or computation of summary statistics. More complex operations like

feature extraction or discrete Fourier transforms may be required from the processor. In any case, processor output must be directly comparable to the detection threshold.

The detection threshold is the decision rule that governs the annunciator. If the threshold is exceeded, the annunciator is turned on, indicating the detection of an anomaly. Various procedures for setting the detection threshold may be used depending on the specifics of the particular PdM implementation.

The annunciator is the means by which the detector communicates the inferred presence or absence of an anomaly to the outside world. A flashing red light, automated text message and tool logging event are examples of common annunciators.

IV. Optimal Detector Design

Optimal detector design strongly depends on the context of the PdM implementation. There are two generic paradigms to consider: *supervised* and *unsupervised*.

In supervised design, we have the benefit of knowing which CM data is associated with "good" and "bad" tools. A good tool is defined to be one which we would like to use because we trust it to make quality product. A bad tool is one that we would like to put down for maintenance and restore to good status.

CM data is noisy in the sense that it sometimes misclassifies tools as good or bad. Optimal supervised design adjusts the detection threshold to achieve the best trade off between putting a good tool down and letting a bad tool run.

In unsupervised design, we do not know which CM data is associated with good and bad tools. All we have to go on is the possibility that the CM data organizes itself into "clouds." A statistical procedure for discerning the presence of data clouds is called *cluster analysis*. There are many algorithms for cluster analysis and the most common in PdM applications is called "k-means clustering." In this concept, clusters are defined such that there is more variation between clusters than within.

Optimal unsupervised design adjusts the cluster definitions to achieve the sharpest distinction between clusters. In this paradigm, the threshold function is the distance from a new CM vector to the center of each cluster. The new CM vector is assigned to the closest cluster. Instead of declaring the presence or absence of an anomaly, the annunciator communicates the cluster membership of the new CM vector.

For a depiction of a 2-means cluster analysis of three variables, Prin1, Prin2 and Prin3, see Figure 3.

Unsupervised detectors are sometimes called tool health metrics. The good cluster is often taken to be the one with the most members; especially when all others have much smaller membership. CM vectors are like multiple heart rate and pulse measurements from the same patient. Measurements that are not assigned to the large cluster of typical values are taken to be anomalous.

Supervised design is always preferred to unsupervised whenever it is possible. This is because the annunciator has an unambiguous interpretation: act or do not act. Unsupervised design requires the additional effort of discerning the nature of each cluster. Often there is very little to go on to make this determination.

If it is possible to relabel clusters from their generic labels {C1, C2…Ck} to actionable labels {Bad1, Good2… Badk} (say), then we can advance our PdM application to the next level of maturity.

In supervised design we are given both the true condition of the tool and the CM vector that is associated with that condition. In unsupervised design we are only given CM vectors and must discern the nature of the CM data. In all cases, we seek the PdM solution that has the most unambiguous and accurate annunciator.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 103 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

V. PdM in the Wafer Fab: Supervised Learning

Special wafers with an array of embedded thermocouples (TC wafers) are used to measure chuck temperature uniformity in plasma processes. These TC wafers are very expensive and their use interrupts normal production. We would like to eliminate the TC wafer without giving up the information it provides. To do this, we establish a reliable connection between TC wafer behaviour (assumed to portray the true condition of the tool) and CM data.

The solution is to run calibration experiments where we simultaneously measure a TC wafer and record the corresponding CM data. We use the experimental data to build a model to predict what the TC would have been based on the CM data that we actually have. This is called virtual metrology and it works amazingly well using the PLS procedure in JMP. Through the model, the CM data has virtually become a TC wafer, eliminating the need for its routine use. The calibration experiment is repeated periodically, based on a recall interval that is not unlike traditional metrology. For example, see Figure 4.

TC Wafer uniformity = 4.9922316 + 1.5403795*SVID

The calibration equation can be solved for the limits of SVID that keep TC wafer uniformity in control. The PLS procedure can comprehend multiple SVID and multiple channels of output.

Figure 3



Figure 4



VI. PdM in the Wafer Fab: Unsupervised Learning

Suppose that we have the results of a cluster analysis that assigns membership to one of five clusters based on CM data. We would like to discern the true nature of each cluster so that we can advance beyond tool health metrics and obtain an accurate annunciator for PdM.

Tool logging events reflect our best understanding of the true condition of the tool at the time. A model that predicts logging event as a function of the corresponding CM data could be used to relabel generic cluster labels to more actionable labels. For example, if the probability of the PROD event being logged is maximized when C4 is observed, then we relabel C4 as “Good4” and so on. The Multinomial Logistic Regression procedure in JMP can be used to obtain the model that relates logging event (dependent variable) to cluster label (independent

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 104 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

variable). We can account for the imperfect nature of logging events by processing them with a Hidden Markov Model (HMM). In this concept, the true state of the tool {Fit, Broken, Degraded} is hidden and logging events provide noisy information about the true state. For example, see Figure 5.

The HMM model yields a prediction of the true state of the tool at each point in time as a function of the logging events leading up to that time. The Multinomial Logistic Regression is used as previously to obtain a model that relates predicted true state (dependent variable) to cluster label (independent variable).

The HMM model provides additional insights as well. Objective evaluation of the consistency of event logging is obtained through analysis of the emission matrix. A new way to evaluate tool matching is available by comparing the steady-state distributions of tools running the same processes. The existence of an undocumented degraded state for which there is no logging event is evidenced by the transition matrix.

VII. Conclusions

Figure 5



Predictive Maintenance is a generalization of traditional Preventive Maintenance. Observable precursors to failure mechanisms may be measured by a sensor suite deployed for a tool. These condition monitors can be used to predict the present and future states of the tool. Depending on the context of the PdM implementation, we may or may not know the true condition of a tool. In either case, a detector can be devised to make an inference about the true state of the tool. The maturity of a PdM implementation depends on how accurately the annunciator communicates the true state of the tool.

Contributing Authors:
Chris Alanis, *Supplier Quality Engineer, Cirrus Logic, Inc.*
Max Hsieh, *Supplier Quality Engineer, Cirrus Logic, Inc.*
Yi-Rong Meng, *Supplier Quality Engineer, Cirrus Logic, Inc.*
Rodel Reyes, *Supplier Quality Engineering Manager, Cirrus Logic, Inc.*
Hung-Chi Su, *Supplier Quality Engineer, Cirrus Logic, Inc.*
Jeff Weintraub, *Corporate Statistician, Cirrus Logic, Inc.*

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 105 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

© 2019 Cirrus Logic, Inc. All rights reserved. Cirrus Logic, Cirrus Logic and the Cirrus Logic logo designs are trademarks of Cirrus Logic, Inc.

A New Metric for SPC Performance

Abstract

An index of process instability (ISTAB) is presented that compares the observed average run length to the expected run length (ARL) of a statistical process control (SPC) scheme. Excessively long run lengths relative to expectation are associated with one kind of defect in a particular implementation of a scheme and inordinately short run lengths are associated with another kind of defect. The probability distribution of run length is given as the basis for establishing ARL. A sampling distribution is introduced as a way to quantify excessively long and inordinately short observed run lengths. An SPC management system based on ISTAB is presented as an alternative to more conventional approaches.

I. Introduction

Statistical process control (SPC) has attained nearly universal acceptance as a tool to achieve stability and control. It is not unusual for a microelectronics factory to employ tens of thousands of SPC charts (30,000 is not an unusually high number). These charts encompass the entire spectrum of criticality. Some are for customer-critical product characteristics. Others are simply for data collection in anticipation of a future need. Still others are for supplier-critical process characteristics.

We define an SPC *scheme* to be the set of charts, statistics and rules that are used to achieve stability and control. An instance is a particular implementation of a scheme. Multiple instances of the same scheme may or may not have the same numerical values of control limits.

From the point of view of the producer, *run length* is a basic measure of performance. It is natural to think in terms of run length in various manufacturing contexts. For example, it may be the number of product units moved from one operation to the next in the course of a shift. It may be the number of repetitions of an operation between maintenance events. In the context of an SPC instance, it is the number of points plotted (subgroups) until an out-of-control (OOC) condition is indicated. In each of these examples, the interpretation of observed run length is the same.

It is meaningful to speak of *observed average run length* ($\overline{RL}$) as a measure of typical performance. The reciprocal of observed average run length is the observed percentage of trials in which a particular event occurred.

McTurk (2001) proposed a Stability Index[1] (Index of STABility) as a way to manage SPC in an extensive (many process) and intensive (many variable) control environment.

McTurk defines the ISTAB index for an SPC instance as:

$$ISTAB = \frac{(\text{count of } \overline{X} \text{ limit violations in reporting period})}{(\text{count of subgroups in reporting period}} = 1/\overline{RL}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\overline{RL} + 1}$$

Where $\overline{RL}$ is the observed average run length until an OOC event, not counting the OOC event itself.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 106 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

In our concept, $ISTAB = \overline{RL} - ARL$. This modification is made in order to make use of the considerable body of knowledge concerning the random nature of run length.

ISTAB has three generic behaviours that are indicative of defects in an SPC instance.

Case 1: The observed average run length is excessively long relative to expectation. ISTAB > 0 is indicating the possibility that the limits are too wide due to errors in estimating the in-control values of the process parameters. An appropriate action is to re-estimate the process parameters and compare them to the estimates in use.

Case 2: The observed average run length is consistent with expectation. ISTAB near zero is indicating that the process is stable. The SPC rules are violated at the expected rate and no defects in the instance are evident.

Case 3: The observed average run length is inordinately short relative to expectation. ISTAB < 0 is indicating that the limits are too tight or the process is unstable or both. An appropriate action is to investigate the nature of the apparent instability and re-examine the assumptions of the scheme.

In our experience, fundamental process instability is by far the most plausible explanation for short run lengths rather than any defect in the instance. However, we have found examples where new sources of *stable* process variation have been introduced subsequent to the initialization of an instance. For example, early in the product lifecycle, low production volumes are processed on a few machines. As volumes increase, more machines are brought on line. Depending on the characteristics of the expanded fleet of machines, this change in the nature of *previous* processing is manifested as increased variation at a given step. In other cases, short runs are caused by gross errors in estimating the in-control values of the process parameters.

We now turn to the problems of determining the distribution of an individual run length and the sampling distribution of observed run lengths for an SPC scheme. The first is needed to compute the ISTAB statistic, the second for establishing decision rules for distinguishing between the three cases.

II. Probability Distribution of Run Length

If the probability that an *individual* subgroup triggers a false OOC is α, subgroups are independent and have the *same* value of α, then the random number of subgroups (X) until the first false alarm is a geometric random variable:

$X = run\ length$

$f_x(x|\alpha) = (1-\alpha)^x\alpha$

$x = 0,1,\ldots$

$0 < a \leq 1$

For example, if an SPC scheme consists of an $\overline{X}$ & S chart with an OOC indicated by a breach of limits by $\overline{X}$ *or* S *or* both, the false alarm probability for the scheme is:

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &= P(LCL > \overline{X} \text{ or } UCL < \overline{X} \text{ or } UCLs < S \mid \text{stable process})\\ &= P(LCL > \overline{X}) + P(UCL < \overline{X}) + P(UCLs < S)\\ &\quad - P(LCL > \overline{X})P(UCLs < S)\\ &\quad - P(UCL < \overline{X})P(UCLs < S)\end{aligned}$$

by the independence of ($\overline{X}$, S) when sampling from a Gaussian distribution.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 107 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

If $p = P(LCL > \overline{X}) = P(UCL < \overline{X}) = P(UCLs < S)$

= 0.00135 by design, then $\alpha = 0.004$ and the expected run length of the scheme when the process is stable is ARL = $(1-\alpha)/\alpha$ = 249 subgroups (not counting the one that triggers the OOC).

The ISTAB index for this scheme is equal to $\overline{RL}$–249. (See Figure 1.)

If a randomly selected stable run length is a geometric random variable with parameter α, then the random sum of run lengths (T) until the nth false alarm is a negative binomial random variable with parameters (α,n)[2].

$T = sum\ of\ n\ run\ lengths$

$T = n \cdot (\overline{RL})$

$$g_T(t\,|a,n) = \binom{n+t-1}{t} \alpha^n (1-\alpha\ a)^t$$

$t = 0,1,\ldots$

$0 < a \leq 1$

$n > 0$

$$P(T \leq t) = \sum_{i=0}^{t} \binom{n+i-1}{i} \alpha^n (1-\alpha)^i$$

$$= P(n \cdot \overline{RL} \leq t) = P(\overline{RL} \leq t/n)$$

We interpret this negative binomial distribution as the sampling distribution of the statistic T. It can be used to define a rule for deciding if an observed value of $(\overline{RL})$ is consistent with Case 1, 2 or 3.

Figure 1 Run length distribution for the Xbar and S scheme



Figure 2 Negative binomial sampling distribution of $(\overline{RL})$ for n = 10 OOC events



For example, consider a *hypothetical* history of an instance of the *X & S* scheme presented earlier in which n = 10 OOC events were observed. The inherent randomness in run length under Case 2 (stability) would cause ~95% of such hypothetical histories to have observed average run lengths between 119 and 426. If we were to *actually* observe a value of $(\overline{RL})$ = 445 with n = 10, we would be inclined to believe that the instance was defective because the observed average run length is excessively long relative to expectation.

III. ISTAB as an Approach to SPC Management

The foundation of ISTAB is the control plan (CP). The minimum elements of a CP are specified by ISO/TS16949:2009E[3]. Control plans drive ISTAB reporting by establishing the level of criticality that merits review.

To the CP foundation we join the actual performance of the controls. These elements make the ISTAB report a quick and easy way to see how critical controls are implemented (like a control plan) and how they are performing (out-of-specification conditions, out-of-control conditions and individual rule violations).

[2]*Proof is given in the annex.*

To create an ISTAB report for an SPC instance, use the CP to get:

- Process Name (STI, FG, Wire bonding, Molding, etc.)
- Characteristic (Tox, CD, ball shear, wire pull, etc.)
- Variable (Pre-polish Tox, strength, etc.)
- Recipe name
- Control statistics (Xbar, R, S, Uniformity, etc.)
- Specification limits (LSL, USL) for the variable
- Sample size (wafers per lot, bonds per tool, etc.)
- Sample frequency (every lot, every shift, etc.)
- Control limits (LCL, UCL) for statistics in the instance
- Control targets (CT) for statistics in the instance
- ARL derived from the stable run length distribution

Join the CP to the performance of the instances in the reporting period:

- Count of subgroups plotted
- Count of out-of-specification measurements
- Count of SPC rule #1 violations
- Count of SPC rule #2 violations
- Count of SPC rule #n violations
- Count of subgroups with one or more rule violations

Create a column for observed average run length:

$$\overline{RL} = \frac{S-g}{g}$$

Where S is the count of subgroups in reporting period for a given instance and g is the count of subgroups with one or more rule violations.

Create a column for $ISTAB = \overline{RL} - ARL$.

Where ARL is obtained from the run length distribution of the SPC scheme. The following considerations enhance the accuracy and usefulness of the ISTAB report.

Each instance of a requirement from the CP is a line item in the ISTAB report. This feature makes ISTAB a guide to SPC as implemented in the factory.

For example, there may be multiple instances of a process – variable combination because multiple machines are in use. In that case there will be multiple line items for the same scheme, one for each instance. This is sometimes necessary due to the heterogeneity of machines, the reason for separate instances in the first place. Conversely, if a process – variable combination is run on many machines and tracked in one instance (all data to one chart set) then there will be one line item on the ISTAB report to reflect that implementation.

If a rule is not used in a particular instance, the violation count for that rule is empty, not zero.

The ISTAB workbook contains a section that gives the definition of each supplemental SPC rule as implemented in the factory.

The ISTAB index for an instance of a scheme is re-initialized when the control limits, runs rules or reporting window are changed.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 109 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

IV. Conclusions

The ISTAB index is presented as a way to maintain an efficient and effective window on the manufacturing process. The characteristic behavior of ISTAB points to specific defects in an SPC instance. The sampling distribution of the observed run length facilitates a way to decide the health status of an SPC instance. ISTAB is a new way to efficiently and effectively manage large scale SPC implementations.

V. References

1. L. McTurk, L. (2001) "Use of Control Rules and Stability Index to maintain an effective SPC system in a high volume fab" in *Process and Equipment Control in Microelectronic Manufacturing II,* Martin Fallon, Editor, Proceedings of SPIE Vol. 4405
2. A. M. Mood, F. W. Graybill, D. C. Boes (1974) *Introduction to the Theory of Statistics,* New York: McGraw-Hill
3. The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) (2000) *Quality management systems — Requirements ISO/TS16949:2009E,* Geneva: ISO

VI. Annex

The moment generating function of the sum of n independently distributed random variables is equal to the product of the individual moment generating functions of the variables in the sum:

$$m_s(t) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} m_{x_i}(t)$$

The moment generating function of the geometric random variable is:

$$m_{x_i}(t) = \frac{p}{1-(1-p)e^t}$$

The moment generating function of the negative binomial random variable is:

$$m_s(t) = \left(\frac{p}{1-(1-p)e^t}\right)^n$$

This is exactly equal to the product of n identical geometric moment generating functions. Thus, we have proven that the sum of n independent and identically distributed geometric random variables with parameter p is a negative binomial random variable with parameters (p, n).

Contributing Authors:
Jeff Weintraub, *Corporate Statistician, Cirrus Logic, Inc.*
Scott Warrick, *Director, Quality and Control Management, Cirrus Logic, Inc.*

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 110 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

© 2019 Cirrus Logic, Inc. All rights reserved. Cirrus Logic, Cirrus Logic and the Cirrus Logic logo designs are trademarks of Cirrus Logic, Inc.

Test Escape Consequences of Low Yield

Abstract

Although it is intuitive that variation in yield is linked to variation in test escapes, the assertion has not been rigorously proven. We use basic axioms to express the probability of test escape as a function of the operating characteristics of the test process, the incoming quality level and in turn, yield. Examples that demonstrate the practical application of the method are given. These feature sensitivity analyses that inform defect reduction efforts, improvements to the test process, and statistical control schemes.

I. Introduction

It is widely believed that when test yield is decreasing, test escapes are increasing. Logically, low yield is indicative of the reduced quality of the input to the test process. Because the test process is not perfect, some of the reduced quality material survives the process. These units are called test escapes. What is not obvious is size of the effect.

Define the following random variables and their possible outcomes:

True State of a unit of product: S = {*good, bad*}

Test Result for a unit of product: R = {*pass, fail*}

The quality of the (untested) material input to the process is:

P(S = *bad*) = p

P(S = *good*) = 1 – p

The test result for a unit is not perfectly consistent with the true state of that unit for most test processes that we will encounter. The imperfect relationship between the test result (R) and the true state (S) of a tested unit gives rise to the *operating characteristics* of the process:

P(R = *fail* | S = *good*) = α, also called “false positive”

P(R = *pass* | S = *bad*) = β, also called “false negative”

Sentences like these are read “the probability of A given B is p”. Taken together, (p,α,β) are the *fundamental quantities* of the test process. As we will see in the next section, these fundamental quantities are used to derive the quality characteristics of the tested product:

P(S = *good* | R = *fail*) = overkill probability

P(S = *bad* | R = *pass*) = escape probability

Note that, in general,

P(S = *good* | R = *fail*) $\neq$ P(R = *fail* | S = *good*)

The former is the overkill probability, the latter is α. Likewise for escape probability and β. An operating characteristic is the probability of a test result given the true state. As such, operating characteristics are properties of the test process. A quality characteristic is the probability of a state given the test result. As such, quality characteristics are properties of the tested product.

II. Derivation of Product Quality Characteristics

In this section we use three probability axioms to obtain the relationship between product quality characteristics and the fundamental quantities of the test process. We will exploit our knowledge of these relationships to explore the sensitivity to variation in the fundamental quantities. This will illuminate the effect that we are seeking: the change in escape probability with respect to yield.

The random variable Yield is derived from the fundamental quantities of the test process using the "total probability" axiom:

$Y = P(R = \mathit{pass}) = P(R = \mathit{pass}, S = \mathit{good} \text{ or } R = \mathit{pass}, S = \mathit{bad})$

$= P(R = \mathit{pass}, S = \mathit{good}) + P(R = \mathit{pass}, S = \mathit{bad})$

By the "joint probability" axiom we can write this as

$$= P(S = \mathit{good}) \cdot P(R = \mathit{pass} \mid S = \mathit{good}) + P(S = \mathit{bad}) \cdot P(R = \mathit{pass} \mid S = \mathit{bad})$$

$= (1 - p) \cdot (1 - \alpha) + p \cdot \beta$

From this expression we see that there are two varieties of units that will yield: good and bad.

Fraction of units that will yield and be good:

$P(R = \mathit{pass}, S = \mathit{good}) = (1 - p) \cdot (1 - \alpha)$.

Fraction of units that will yield and be bad:

$P(R = \mathit{pass}, S = \mathit{bad}) = p \cdot \beta$

This is our first indication that yield and test escapes are related.

However, $Y = P(R = \mathit{pass})$ is predictive of the population of untested units. We are interested in the quality characteristics of units that have been dispositioned by the test process. From the axiomatic definition of conditional probability, we can obtain the quality characteristics of the tested product.

For escape probability:

$P(S = \mathit{bad} \mid R = \mathit{pass}) = P(R = \mathit{pass}, S = \mathit{bad})/P(R = \mathit{pass})$

$= p \cdot \beta/[(1 - p) \cdot (1 - \alpha) + p \cdot \beta]$

For overkill probability:

$P(S = \mathit{good} \mid R = \mathit{fail}) = P(R = \mathit{fail}, S = \mathit{good})/[1 - P(R = \mathit{pass})]$

$= (1 - p) \cdot \alpha/[1 - (1 - p) \cdot (1 - \alpha) + p \cdot \beta]$

The improvement in quality attributable to the test process:

$P(S = \mathit{bad}) - P(S = \mathit{bad} \mid R = \mathit{pass})$

We have expressed the quality characteristics of the tested product in terms of the fundamental quantities of the test process. We can obtain sensitivities to the fundamental quantities by differentiation or by differencing.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 112 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

CIRRUS LOGIC®

III. Practical Applications

Consider the following baseline test process:

		Fraction	PPM
units to be tested	N	–	1,000,000
bad units in untested population	p	0.0500	50,000
"false positive" probability	α	0.0100	–
"false negative" probability	β	0.0500	–
good units that will yield	$(1-p)(1-\alpha)$	0.9405	940,500
bad units that will yield	$p\beta$	0.0025	2,500
units (good and bad) that will yield	$(1-p)(1-\alpha) + p\beta$	0.9430	943,000
test escapes = P (bad | pass)	$p\beta/Y$	0.0027	2,651
test escapes = P (good | fail)	$(1-p)\alpha/(1-Y)$	0.1667	166,667
improvement in quality due to test	P(bad) - P(bad | pass)	0.0473	47,349

The poor quality characteristics produced by this process are being masked by the relatively low level of bad units in the untested population. That is, until an excursion causes an increase in P(S = *bad*) from p = 0.05 to p = 0.15.

		Fraction	PPM
units to be tested	N	–	1,000,000
bad units in untested population	p	0.1500	150,000
"false positive" probability	α	0.0100	–
"false negative" probability	β	0.0500	–
good units that will yield	$(1-p)(1-\alpha)$	0.8415	841,500
bad units that will yield	$p\beta$	0.0075	7,500
units (good and bad) that will yield	$(1-p)(1-\alpha) + p\beta$	0.8490	849,000
test escapes = P (bad | pass)	$p\beta/Y$	0.0088	8,834
test escapes = P (good | fail)	$(1-p)\alpha/(1-Y)$	0.0563	56,291
improvement in quality due to test	P(bad) - P(bad | pass)	0.1412	141,166

We see that this excursion causes yield to decrease from 94.3% to 84.9% and causes an increase in test escapes from 2651 to 8834 ppm. These results are a strong justification for a statistical yield limit of 85%.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 113 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Suppose that test program improvements reduce the α –risk to 0.005 and the β –risk to 0.025:

		Fraction	PPM
units to be tested	N	–	1,000,000
bad units in untested population	p	0.0500	50,000
"false positive" probability	α	0.0050	–
"false negative" probability	β	0.0250	–
good units that will yield	$(1-p)(1-\alpha)$	0.9453	945,250
bad units that will yield	$p\beta$	0.0013	1,250
units (good and bad) that will yield	$(1-p)(1-\alpha) + p\beta$	0.9465	946,500
test escapes = P (bad | pass)	$p\beta/Y$	0.0013	1,321
test escapes = P (good | fail)	$(1-p)\alpha/(1-Y)$	0.0888	88,785
improvement in quality due to test	P(bad) - P(bad | pass)	0.0487	48,679

We see that these improvements cause yield to increase from 94.3% to 94.7%, test escapes to decrease from 2651 to 1250 ppm and overkill to decrease from 166667 to 88785 ppm.

IV. Conclusions and Call to Action

We have derived the dependence of product quality characteristics on the fundamental quantities that characterize the test process (p, α, β).

We can eliminate the need for hard data on p = P(S = *bad*) if we treat it as a scenario parameter, varying p systematically so that we may evaluate the test process independently of the manufacturing process. This leaves us with the problem of determining the operating characteristics (α, β) of the test process. The most direct way to obtain estimates of (α, β) is to bench test samples of passed and failed units:

α' = failed units bench tested as good/number of failed units

β' = passed units bench tested as bad/number of passed units

Some would advocate the use of FACR/RMA data to establish the value of β. RMA data is vulnerable to bias due to the fact that not all returned units are bad in the application. FACR data is vulnerable to bias due to the fact that not all application failures are returned on an FACR.

The guard-band yield loss may be a good indicator of the value of α where guard bands are implemented. This may be biased when false fails are caused by factors like settling time that are not directly related to the accuracy or precision of the measurement.

Lastly, there are factors in the test process that drive (α, β) in addition to measurement itself. For example, discrepancies between the data log file and wafer map can cause pick errors.

These results are a strong justification for including the measurement and improvement of (α, β) in the development, deployment and control of test processes.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 114 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

V. References

1. A. M. Mood, F. W. Graybill, D. C. Boes (1974) *Introduction to the Theory of Statistics,* New York: McGraw-Hill

VI. Mathematical Details

A and B are discrete random variables that happen together

$A = \{A_1, A_2, \ldots A_n\}$

$B = \{B_1, B_2, B_m\}$

Generic outcomes of A and B are (A_i, B_j)

The "total" probability of the outcome Ai is obtained by summing over all possible values of B:

$P(A_i) = P(A_i, B_1) + P(A_i, B_2) + \ldots + P(A_i, B_m)$

Likewise for the probability of outcome B_j:

$P(B_j) = P(A_1, B_j) + P(A_2, B_j) + \ldots + P(A_n, B_j)$

The "joint" probability of (A_i, B_j) is the probability of a randomly selected unit manifesting outcomes Ai and Bj:

$P(A_i, B_j) = P(A_i) \cdot P(B_j \mid A_i)$

This sentence is read "probability of A and B."

Alternatively,

$P(A_i, B_j) = P(B_j) \cdot P(A_i \mid B_j)$

The choice between these depends on the information available in a given context.

The "conditional" probability of outcome B_j given that outcome A_i has already been observed is:

$$P(B_j \mid A_i) = \frac{P(A_i, B_j)}{P(A_i)}$$

$$= \frac{P(A_i, B_j)}{P(A_i, B_1) + P(A_i, B_2) + \ldots + P(A_i, B_m)}$$

When this is equivalently written as

$$= \frac{P(B_j) \cdot P(A_i, B_j)}{P(A_i, B_1) + P(A_i, B_2) + \ldots + P(A_i, B_m)}$$

The result is known as "Bayes' Theorem".

Contributing Author:
Jeff Weintraub, *Corporate Statistician, Cirrus Logic, Inc.*

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 115 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 116 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

Copyright © 2021 Cirrus Logic, Inc.
All rights reserved. Printed in the USA.

The information contained in this document is provided for informational purposes only and represents the current view of Cirrus Logic, Inc. on quality, as of the date of publication. In specific circumstances, or with specific customers, procedures may differ from those outlined herein. Cirrus Logic makes no commitment to update the information contained in this document, and Cirrus Logic reserves the right to make changes at any time, without notice.

This document is provided "as is." Cirrus Logic does not warrant that this document is free from errors, or that any products or other technology developed in conformance with this document will perform in the intended manner, or will be free from infringement of third party proprietary rights, and Cirrus Logic disclaims all liability therefor.

Limited License Grant: Cirrus Logic hereby grants you a limited copyright license to copy this document for your use and internal distribution only. You may not distribute this document externally, in whole or in part, to any other person or entity.

Limited Liability: in no event shall Cirrus Logic have any liability to you or to any other third party, for any lost profits, lost data, loss of use or costs of procurement of substitute goods or services, or for any direct, indirect, special or consequential damages arising out of your use of this document or reliance upon the information contained herein, under any cause of action or theory of liability, and irrespective of whether Cirrus Logic, or any contributor has advance notice of the possibility of such damages. These limitations shall apply notwithstanding the failure of the essential purpose of any limited remedy.

Cirrus Logic, Cirrus, CLIDE (Cirrus Logic Integrated Development Environment), SoundClear, CirrusLink, WISCE, and the Cirrus Logic logo designs are among the trademarks of Cirrus Logic, Inc. and/or its subsidiaries. Other brand and product names in this document may be trademarks or service marks of their respective owners.

Greenthread Ex. 2022, p. 117 of 118
Texas Instruments v. Greenthread

CIRRUS LOGIC®

CORPORATE HEADQUARTERS
800 West Sixth Street
Austin, Texas 78701
United States

T +1 512-851-4000
Toll Free +1 800-888-5016

cirrus.com