IEEE
Advancing Technology for Humanity

INTERNATIONAL ROADMAP FOR DEVICES AND SYSTEMS™

INTERNATIONAL ROADMAP FOR DEVICES AND SYSTEMS

2020 EDITION

LITHOGRAPHY

THE IRDS IS DEVISED AND INTENDED FOR TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT ONLY AND IS WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY COMMERCIAL CONSIDERATIONS PERTAINING TO INDIVIDUAL PRODUCTS OR EQUIPMENT.

© 2020 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. Permission from IEEE must be obtained for all other uses, in any current or future media, including reprinting/republishing this material for advertising or promotional purposes, creating new collective works, for resale or redistribution to servers or lists, or reuse of any copyrighted component of this work in other works.

COPYRIGHT © 2020 IEEE. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments iv
1. Introduction 1
   1.1. Lithography Drivers 1
   1.2. Development of Roadmap 1
2. Technology Requirements 1
   2.1. Summary 1
3. Potential Solutions 3
   3.1. Line and Space Potential Solutions 3
   3.2. Contact Hole, Via and Cut type pattern Potential Solutions 3
4. Challenges 4
   4.1. Short-term Challenges (2020 to 2025) 4
   4.2. Long-term Challenges (2028 and Beyond) 6
5. Summary and Key Points 7

List of Figures

Figure LITH-1 Line and Space Potential Solutions 3
Figure LITH-2 Contact Hole, Via and Cut Type Pattern Potential Solutions 4
Figure LITH-3 Projected EUV Photo-Speed as a Function of Printed Contact Hole Size 5

List of Tables

Table LITH-1 Lithography Technology Requirements 2
Table LITH-2 Lithography Difficult Challenges 6

COPYRIGHT © 2020 IEEE. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to thank the 2020 Lithography International Focus Team members:

Hajime Aoyama, Ted Fedynyshyn, Heiko Feldmann, Cesar Garza, Reiner Garreis, Naoya Hayashi, Hidemi Ishiuchi, David Kyser, Michael Lercel, Harry Levinson, Iaso Mita, Tsuyoshi Nakamura, Mark Neisser, Shinji Okazaki, Laurent Pain, Abbas Rastegar, Doug Resnick, Tadatake Sato, Kiwamu Sue, Walt Trybula, Takeo Watanabe, John Wiesner, Jim Wiley, Grant Willson, Stefan Wurm, Akiyoshi Yamazaki

COPYRIGHT © 2020 IEEE. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

LITHOGRAPHY

1. INTRODUCTION

Historically, improvements in lithography have been a key enabler to make improved chip technologies. The International Roadmap for Devices and Systems (IRDS) Lithography roadmap predicts where current patterning capability can support future chip generations and where challenges and improvements are needed. It is intended to be used by semiconductor industry participants, by industry analysts, and by researchers who want or need to know how the industry will evolve in the future and what challenges need to be addressed.

1.1. LITHOGRAPHY DRIVERS

This roadmap projects how the patterning needs of new devices in the More Moore roadmap might be met and where the key challenges are. In the past, both logic and memory devices have driven improvements in patterning technology. Key drivers of patterning technology have been high performance logic chips, DRAM memory and flash memory. Currently high-performance logic devices are driving the introduction of novel patterning technology. DRAM is continuing to introduce new devices with smaller critical dimensions (CDs), but trails logic in smallest resolution. Flash memory is scaling using 3D structures that have relatively large CDs and does not need higher resolution patterning to make progress. Memory chip producers are more sensitive to patterning cost than logic chip producers. The cost of patterning is driving flash memory producers to explore nanoimprint lithography

1.2. DEVELOPMENT OF ROADMAP

This roadmap was developed through consultation with an international team of patterning experts and review of publicly available literature and other available documents. The current contributing membership is shown in the Acknowledgments. Contributing members come from Asia, Europe, and the United States and represent semiconductor, equipment and material manufacturers, as well as research institutes. The IRDS More Moore focus team provides the device roadmap from which lithography requirements are derived. Through polls of the lithography team members the key options, their timing and their key challenges are developed. These are codified in a set of Excel tables and those tables were used to write this document. The table and this document undergo internal review by the team and by the overall IRDS before publication. In this year, the tables follow the convention of the More Moore tables and have only columns for each year a new product node is expected to be introduced. Intervening years are omitted. However, in the potential solutions' charts the horizontal axis is time, so the intervening years are included so the reader can readily see the time frames required for innovation. There are two possible options charts, one for lines and spaces and one for hole type patterns such as contacts, vias, cuts and vertical gate all around devices, because these two types of patterning have very different requirements and the timing of innovation is different for each of them.

2. TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

2.1. SUMMARY

The More Moore requirements related to lithography are shown in the Table LITH-1 below, along with the Lithography team's color coding for feasibility. The color coding has changed substantially since our last roadmap in 2017. EUV is finally being used in high-volume chip production after being on industry roadmaps since 2001. Feature sizes that can be done with extreme ultraviolet (EUV) single patterning are coded in white. Features that can be done with EUV double patterning are coded in yellow, meaning "manufacturing solutions are known," because both double patterning and EUV are established in volume manufacturing. Combining them is a question of cost, not feasibility. This means that all lines and space CDs in the roadmap are coded yellow, except for the 8nm and 7nm generation DRAM projected for manufacturing in 2031 and 2034, respectively and the minimum metal half-pitch for logic nodes expected in 2028, 2031 and 2034. The logic contacted poly half pitch and the physical gate length for high performance logic are coded white to the end of the table. This is because these two dimensions are set by thin film deposition processes and not set lithographically. The projected sizes of hole patterns, such as contacts, vias and cuts are more challenging. Cells are coded red where we judge EUV double patterning insufficient to reach the dimension. Red cells for such CDs start appearing in 2025. Note that in 2017, we judged the projected vertical gate all around (VGAA) structures to be a particular challenge. But these structures are no longer in the More Moore roadmap.

COPYRIGHT © 2020 IEEE. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Line edge roughness (LER) and critical dimension uniformity (CDU) are the main challenges in the requirements other than reaching the desired critical dimension. Red coded cells start to appear in 2025.

High numerical aperture (NA) EUV exposure tools with a reduced field size are projected to be available in the early 2020s, in time for the 2025 column shown in Table LITH-1. However, there are challenges associated with such lithography tools. Besides the normal challenges for new tool generations of overlay, resolution, aberrations and such, stochastic effects will be worse with smaller features. Also, EUV multiple patterning could compete with high NA EUV as an option for 8 to 12 nm half-pitch lines and spaces. The choice of patterning option could be based on cost considerations rather than technical capabilities.

Overall, the successful implementation of EUV has meant that the roadmap's major challenges are no longer resolution. Instead, the major challenges are related to overlay, CDU, LER, and cost.

Table LITH-1 Lithography Technology Requirements

YEAR OF PRODUCTION	2018	2020	2022	2025	2028	2031	2034
DRAM							
DRAM minimum ½ pitch (nm)	18	17.5	17	14	11	8.4	7.7
Key DRAM Patterning Challenges	Resolution improvements at reasonable cost						
CD control (3 sigma) (nm) [B]	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.4	1.1	0.84	0.8
Mininum contact/via after etch (nm) [H]	18	17.5	17	14.0	11	8.4	7.7
Minimum contact/via pitch(nm)[H]	54	53	51	42	33	25.2	23
Overlay (3 sigma) (nm) [A]	3.6	3.5	3.4	2.8	2.2	1.68	1.5
MPU / Logic							
Logic industry "Node Range" Labeling (nm)	"7"	"5"	"3"	"2.1"	"1.5"	"1.0 eq"	"0.7 eq"
Key MPU/Logic Patterning Challenges	EPE, Single Exposure for <36nm pitch, Cost of EUV patterning						
MPU/ASIC Minimum Metal ½ pitch (nm)	18	15	12	10	8	8	8
Metal LWR (nm) [C]	2.7	2.3	1.8	1.5	1.2	1.2	1.2
Metal CD control (3 sigma) (nm) [B]	2.7	2.3	1.8	1.5	1.2	1.2	1.2
Contacted poly half pitch (nm)	27.0	24.0	22.5	21.0	20.0	19.0	19.0
Physical Gate Length for HP Logic (nm)	20	18	16	14	12	12	12
Gate LER (nm) [C]	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4
Gate CD control (3 sigma) (nm) [B]	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6
Overlay (3 sigma) (nm) [A}	3.6	3.0	2.4	2.0	1.6	1.6	1.6
MPU/ASIC finFET fin minimum 1/2 pitch (nm)	16.0	14.0	12.0				
FinFET Fin width (nm)	8.0	7.0	6.0				
Fin CD control (3 sigma) (nm) [B]	0.80	0.70	0.60				
FIN LER (nm) [C]	0.80	0.49	0.42				
Lateral Gate All Around (LGAA) 1/2 pitch				11	10	10	10
LGAA minimum width				7	6	6	6
LGAA CD control (3 sigma) (nm) [B]				0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6
GAA LER (nm) [C]				0.49	0.42	0.42	0.42
MPU/ASIC minimum contact hole or via pitch (nm)	51	42	34	28	23	23	23
Via CD after etch (nm) [H]	18	15	12	10.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
Contact CD (nm)after etch - finFET, LGAA	18	16	17	18	20	18	18
Chip size (mm^2)							
Maximum exposure field width (mm) [E]	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
Maximum exposure field length, i.e. scanning direction (mm) [E]	33	33	33	16.5	16.5	16.5	16.5
Maximum field area printed by exposure tool (mm^2) [E]	858	858	858	429	429	429	429
Calculated values for figures							
minimum half pitch (DRAM, MPU metal) (nm)	18	15	12	10	8	8	8
minimum half pitch (Flash, MPU fin, LGAA) (nm)	15	14	12	11	10	10	10
minimum hole pitch (DRAM, MPU, VGAA) (nm)	51	42	34	28	23	23	23
minimum contact CD after etch (DRAM, MPU, Flash) (nm)	18	15	12	10	8	8	8
minimum CD control(DRAM, MPU, Flash) (3 sigma) (nm)	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6
minimum required OL (DRAM, Flash, MPU) 3 sigma (nm)	3.6	3.0	2.4	2.0	1.6	1.6	1.5
Estimated Cut pitch (1.4 x minimum metal pitch)	51	42	34	28	23	23	22
minimum LER (nm)	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4
Gate Pitch	54	48	45	42	40	40	40
One half gate pitch	27	24	23	21	20	20	20
Gate lentgh (nm)	20	18	16	14	12	12	12

COPYRIGHT © 2020 IEEE. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

3. Potential Solutions

3.1. Line and Space Potential Solutions

Lines and spaces are the flagship pattern of lithography. In practice, the minimum imageable half pitch for lines and spaces is smaller than the minimum imageable half pitch for contact hole patterns, so when leading edge resolution is discussed it usually refers to dense line and space capability. The roadmap predicts that logic metal levels will drive improvements in line and space resolution. Figure LITH-1 shows different product nodes and their projected time frames for implementation along with possible patterning options for each node. Note that the logic node names are the commonly used names for each node but are not the same as the minimum half pitches of those nodes. Resolution improves to 12 nm half pitch over the next two years. Then there is a further decrease in line and space resolution of 2nm per node until 2028, when minimum line and space resolution is expected to reach 8 nm half pitch. After that, no further improvement in required resolution is projected.



Figure LITH-1 Line and Space Potential Solutions

The 7 nm logic node has versions made both with EUV patterning and with ArF immersion patterning for critical levels. The 5 nm and 3 nm logic nodes after that will use EUV and may use EUV double patterning for their smallest pitches but could still use ArF immersion quadruple patterning for some levels. It is also possible that improvements in EUV single patterning will occur enabling smaller half pitches with EUV single patterning. For DRAMs, either quadruple patterning with ArF immersion, EUV or nanoimprint lithography (NIL) will be used for nodes down to 10 nm half pitch.

3.2. Contact Hole, Via and Cut Type Pattern Potential Solutions

In the past, contact holes and other hole type patterns usually have had a larger minimum pitch than the lines and spaces in a memory or logic device. Double patterning of hole structures gives a 30% shrink of CD unlike pattern doubling of lines and spaces that gives a 50% shrink. More exposures are needed for multiple patterning of hole patterns than of line and space patterns. Hole patterns are therefore one of the first implementations of EUV. Potential solutions for hole type patterns are shown in Figure LITH-2. EUV double patterning will have adequate resolution through the "3nm" logic node in 2021. After that either high NA EUV or some other technique will be needed. Whatever technique that is used for the node after that, it will suffice for the rest of the projected roadmap.

Copyright © 2020 IEEE. All rights reserved.



Figure LITH-2 Contact Hole, Via and Cut Type Pattern Potential Solutions

4. CHALLENGES

4.1. SHORT-TERM CHALLENGES (2020 TO 2025)

With the successful implementation of EUV in manufacturing, patterning challenges for logic and DRAM have shifted from resolution to noise, defects, overlay and edge placement. For flash memory the challenges are cost and demonstrating nanoimprint lithography with sufficiently low defects and cost.

Some of the defect challenges relate to keeping masks clean. Although pellicles are available, their transmission is low, thereby reducing exposure tools throughput significantly. Actinic patterned mask inspection tools have recently been introduced, addressing a problem that has long been without a satisfactory solution. Other defects are due to what are called stochastics, which are random variations in light exposure and in resist chemistry.

Stochastic defects come from random variations in the number of photons in a discrete exposure of a small area and come from the random placement, reaction and dissolution of the various molecular components that make up photoresist. These defects can take the form of bridging between lines, missing contact holes, line opens or merged contact holes. Recent work has shown that they are actually more common than simple extrapolation of CD variation assuming a normal distribution would predict. These sorts of defects currently limit the usable resolution of EUV tools. There are fewer such defects with slower resist, so EUV users typically use slower resists than they would like. A slower resist is one that requires a higher exposure dose to define the desired pattern. This results in decreased exposure tool throughput and more expensive exposures. Long term, the need for slower resists is expected to drive the development higher power light sources and/or a more efficient optical train in exposure tools.

Stochastic defects do not scale well. Even if stochastic variations were the same magnitude for smaller features, they would be a larger fraction of that features size. But in fact, as printed feature sizes get smaller, the variations get bigger rather than smaller, so this is a twofold challenge. One way to compensate for this is to use slower photoresists. Photo-speed of the resist is the limiting factor for EUV tool throughput and is a critical parameter for the cost and feasibility of an EUV process. The IRDS lithography team decided to prepare an EUV photo-speed roadmap.

To do the roadmap we took the 7nm logic node as a baseline. Since this node is in production that noise must be at an acceptable level for the 7nm critical features and the photoresist used is as fast as it can be while still giving acceptable noise. We used a CDU specification of 15% of CD as an acceptable noise level. The expected three sigma variation of 7nm node contact hole critical dimensions is then 3.82nm. The actual stochastic variation comes from both chemical noise and

COPYRIGHT © 2020 IEEE. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

shot noise. It is instructive to consider the limiting cases. If all of the noise were due to random variation in the dose per hole due to shot noise effects, then effective resist doses at the wafer plane would have to double each node to come close to meeting projected CDU specifications for future nodes. If all of the contact hole CDU came from resist randomness, then the resist randomness would have to improve by about 20% each logic node to keep meeting CDU targets. If half the noise came from each factor, then neither 20% resist improvement per node by itself nor 100% effective wafer plane dose improvement per node by itself would enable new nodes to meet specifications. An improvement in both factors would be needed. How much noise is from photons and from resist chemistry separately is not agreed on in the literature. Estimates vary of how much of the variation is due to photons and how much is due to resist noise, but in all cases the photon noise is a significant part of the observed CD variation. One cannot meet future specifications without slowing down the resist and using a higher exposure dose.

To estimate how much resist dose will need to increase, we used k_4 methodology[1] that has been recently described. The k_4 value is a measurement of the noise in a resist feature relative to the contrast in the aerial image, the exposure dose and the actinic wavelength. Our baseline numbers for the 7nm logic node were a NILS of 2.5, an exposure dose of 36mJ/cm^2 and a k_4 of 6. We project that NILS will stay constant from node to node at around 2.5 as improvements in EUV masks and exposure tools compensate for decreases in NILS due to decreasing feature size. The k_4 value is a measure of resist performance and we project an improvement of 6% per node. This number comes from studies of historical improvement in k_1, which is a dimensionless expression of imaging resolution performance adjusted for wavelength, exposure tool numerical aperture and feature size. It should be noted that this historical data comes from historical I line and KrF resist improvements and occurred when resist developers had ready on-site access to exposure tools and the chemistries in use were newly under development. The first is not the case for EUV and the second is only partially the case, so this assumption of 6% improvement may be an optimistic assumption. Based on these assumptions, we get the following projection for future EUV resist exposure doses. Effective exposure dose is projected to increase roughly 33% each logic node, until logic switches to 3D device scaling in 2031.

Table LITH-2 EUV Dose to Print Roadmap

YEAR OF PRODUCTION	2018	2020	2022	2025	2028	2031	2034
	G54M36	G48M30	G45M24	G42M21	G40M16	G40M16T2	G40M16T4
Logic industry "Node Range" Labeling (nm)	"7"	"5"	"3"	"2.1"	"1.5"	"1.5"	"1.5"
IDM-Foundry node labeling	i10-f7	i7-f5	i5-f3	i3-f2.1	i2.1-f1.5	i2.1-f1.5	i2.1-f1.5
Calculated Resist Dose to meet target LCDU (mJ/cm2)	36	46	64	81	112	99	95
Node to node percent change in dose		27%	38%	27%	38%	-12%	-5%

The increase in printing dose is driven mostly by the decrease in minimum CD and somewhat by improvements in photoresist. The changes in predicted exposure dose from node are not always the same because the percent change in minimum CD is not always the same from node to node. After 2028, CDs stop shrinking but further improvements in resist are projected so doses decline a little. A graph of predicted lithographic printing dose versus contact hole CD is shown below.



Figure LITH-3 Projected EUV Photo-Speed as a Function of Printed Contact Hole Size

COPYRIGHT © 2020 IEEE. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Nanoimprint lithography has also made significant progress in the last two years. Since the templates are 1× (that is, the feature sizes on the template are the same size as the printed features, unlike conventional lithography), the templates are difficult to make for logic and DRAM leading edge feature sizes. But 3D flash memory has much larger feature sizes than 2D flash, so it is a natural type of product to first use nanoimprint on. Manufacturing grade tools are in use for pilot production for 3D flash memory. If pilot production is successful, we project high-volume manufacturing in 2020 or 2021.

The direct write e-beam lithography program at CEA Leti was canceled, and we know of no work going on to make direct write e-beam tools suitable for mass production of chips. However, there is work underway at Multibeam Corporation to develop a multi-beam tool with the goal of personalizing chips with unique ID numbers including private key encryption and communication addresses specific to each chip. This work is funded by the US government. The tool is projected as a complementary tool to conventional lithography that adds a chip specific pattern to some layers of a device, not a tool that replaces conventional lithography.

Directed self-assembly (DSA) defines edges through a different mechanism than photoresist and thus has the potential to reduce noise in imaging. Defects from failed pattern formation are the issue with DSA, not stochastic defect. It can be used either to improve the quality of patterns, such as hole patterns or to multiply pitches. It still has some work being reported, but this is mostly based in academic institutions. Using DSA requires printing guide patterns. These patterns can be printed by various methods, including ArF immersion and EUV lithography.

Near term challenges, together with target applications and potential earliest timing for each of the options discussed above are shown in Table LITH-2 as a function of the patterning approach.

Table LITH-3 Lithography Difficult Challenges

Next Generation Technology	First Use in HVM	Feature Type	Device Type	Key Challenges	Required Date for Decision making
EUV Single Patterning	2019	22 to 24 nm hp CH/Cut Levels back end metals at 18nm hp LS	"7nm" Logic Node	-Pellicles -Resist speed combined with LER and Stochastics -shot noise	Product Evaluation Completed
EUV Multiple Patterning	2022	12nm hp LS	"3nm" Logic Node	-Tolerance, EPE, and Overlay	2021
EUV high NA	2025	10.5nm hp LS	"2.1nm" Logic Node	-Stitching of two mask patterns -Shot noise	2024
EUV new wavelength	2028 ?	8nm hp LS ?	"1.5nm" Logic Node	-EUV source power -Resist material -Actinic blank and patterned mask inspection	2030
NanoImprint	2019	20 nm lines and spaces 20 to 30nm contact holes	3D Flash Memory	-Defectivity -Overlay -Master Template fabrication and inspection <20nm -Defect repair -Mass-production capacity	Product Evaluation Completed
DSA (for pitch multiplication)	2022	Contact hokes/cut levels for logic. Possibly nanowire patterning	"3nm" Logic Node	-Pattern Placement -Defectivity and defect inspection -Design -3D Metrology	2021

4.2. LONG-TERM CHALLENGES (2028 AND BEYOND)

After the "1.5nm" logic node goes into production in 2028, logic dimensions will stop shrinking and improved densities will be achieved by increasing the number of devices vertically. DRAM will continue to shrink CDs after that, but the minimum lines and spaces will only shrink modestly and should be reachable by improved EUV and EUV double patterning. The large number of masking levels and the many steps for 3D stacking of devices will make yield and cost high priorities. So, potential patterning challenges will probably be related to cost, yield and defectivity, imaging over topography, and alignment and overlay over complicated 3D stacks. Etch and deposition of sub 10 nm structures are also major challenges.

COPYRIGHT © 2020 IEEE. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

5. SUMMARY AND KEY POINTS

DRAMs and logic are both driving higher resolution patterning, with logic devices slightly ahead of DRAMs in their critical dimension roadmap. EUV has been implemented for leading edge logic devices and will likely be used for DRAM production in the near future. The biggest challenges for EUV will be related to stochastics, defects and overlay. Stochastics and defects will force manufacturers to adopt slower resists as critical dimensions get smaller. Flash memory innovation has switched to 3D structures and is looking for lower cost patterning rather than higher resolution patterning. The leading candidate for novel 3D flash patterning is nanoimprint. EUV is now successfully implemented in logic device production. The roadmap shows continued resolution improvements through 2028. But after that, logic devices will switch to 3D architectures and DRAM minimum dimensions will shrink slowly. So long term patterning challenges will be related to etch, deposition yield and topography rather than minimum resolution.

---

[1] Bernd Geh, "*EUVL: The natural evolution of optical microlithography*," Proc. SPIE Vol. **10957**, p. 1095705 (2019) https://doi.org/10.1117/12.2515791

COPYRIGHT © 2020 IEEE. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.