Forensic Analysis of UPW System Failure: Design Deficiencies vs. Impossible Specifications (SEMI F63)

Frank Naujoks
Decker Verfahrenstechnik GmbH, Germany
Nuremberg Institute of Technology, Germany
https://www.linkedin.com/in/frank-naujoks/
frank.naujoks@decker-vt.de
frank.naujoks@th-nuernberg.de

Abstract — This case study examines the technical evaluation of an ultra-pure water (UPW) system commissioned for semiconductor manufacturing that failed to meet stringent SEMI F63 quality specifications and created significant contractual liabilities and necessitated costly CAPEX retrofits.

The system, designed to produce water with electrical resistivity >18.18 MΩ*cm and sodium concentration <1 ppt, exhibited multiple exceedances including sodium (58.8 ppt), dissolved oxygen (7,400 ppb), and boron (1,220 ppt) levels far beyond acceptable limits. Through reverse engineering and systematic analysis, six fundamental design deficiencies were identified: misplaced membrane degassing, absence of pH adjustment post-softening, suboptimal DI-water tank design, uncontrolled reclaim water recirculation, inadequate component specifications, and incompatible metallic materials. The mixed-bed polisher resin demonstrated an unacceptably short service life of only 4 months (diluate-only) or 12 months (with reclaim) under current configuration, compared to industry-standard 12-24 month intervals. Implementation of recommended optimization measures—including pH elevation to 10-11 with NaOH, repositioning membrane degassing after second-stage reverse osmosis, and reclaim water rerouting—could extend polisher lifetime to 12-24+ months while achieving compliance with sub-ppt contamination targets. This analysis demonstrates how specification ambiguities and deviation from state-of-the-art practices in ppt-level water treatment can compromise system performance despite fundamentally sound process architecture.

Keywords: Ultra-pure water, semiconductor manufacturing, mixed-bed ion exchange, electrodeionization, SEMI F63, reverse osmosis, system optimization, water treatment

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and Industrial Context

Ultra-pure water (UPW) represents the highest grade of purified water, essential for semiconductor manufacturing where even trace contaminants in the parts-per-trillion (ppt) range can compromise device functionality and manufacturing yield. A major public infrastructure authority in the D-A-CH region commissioned a UPW system designed to meet semiconductor industry specifications based on SEMI F63-0918 standard. The facility serves critical high-technology manufacturing operations requiring continuous supply of water with electrical resistivity exceeding 18.18 MΩ*cm at 25°C (equivalent to conductivity <0.055 µS/cm) and ionic contamination below 1 ppt for most species.

The commissioned system employed a multi-stage treatment train: water softening, dual-stage reverse osmosis (RO), membrane degassing (MEG), electrodeionization (EDI), ultraviolet treatment, and final mixed-bed polisher units. Despite this comprehensive configuration, the system failed acceptance testing due to persistent exceedances of critical quality parameters, particularly sodium ions and dissolved gases. This failure precipitated an independent technical assessment to identify root causes and propose remediation strategies.

1.2 Problem Statement and Objectives

The primary challenges identified in initial testing included:

- Sodium concentration 58.5 times specification (58.5 ppt vs. <1 ppt target)
- Dissolved oxygen 740 times specification (7,400 ppb vs. <10 ppb target)
- Boron concentration 24 times specification (1,220 ppt vs. <50 ppt target)
- Silicate exceeding limits (0.2 ppb vs. <0.05 ppb)
- Microbial contamination (190 CFU/L vs. <10 CFU/L)

This case study analyzes the technical deficiencies through systematic reverse engineering, evaluates the deviation from industry best practices, and quantifies optimization potential. The objective is to provide actionable insights for practitioners designing UPW systems for sub-ppt applications while contributing to the broader understanding of critical control points in ultrapure water production.

2. System Description and Specification Analysis

2.1 Process Configuration

The UPW system employed the treatment sequence (Figure 1):

1. Pre-treatment: Water softening (presumably existing infrastructure)
2. First-stage reverse osmosis (RO1): High-rejection membranes
3. Membrane degassing (MEG): CO_2 removal unit
4. Intermediate storage: DI-water collection tank (10 m^3 polypropylene)
5. Second-stage reverse osmosis (RO2): Polishing RO
6. Electrodeionization (EDI): Continuous ion removal with recirculation to VE-tank
7. Ultraviolet treatment: TOC reduction and disinfection
8. Mixed-bed polisher: Final ion exchange polishing
9. Reclaim loop: 24 m^3/h recirculation plus 6 m^3/h diluate feed

The system was designed for 6 m^3/h production capacity with a recirculation loop operating at 24 m^3/h through the mixed-bed polisher to maintain minimum bed velocity requirements.

2.2 Quality Specification Requirements

The tender specification referenced the SEMI F63-0918 key parameters:

Parameter	Specification	Critical Observations
Electrical resistivity (25°C)	>18.18 MΩ*cm	Specification of “ <0.055 µS/cm” is physically impossible (theoretical minimum: 0.05501 µS/cm at 25,00 °C)
Sodium ions	< 1 ppt	Most challenging requirement; drives system design
Other metal ions	< 1 ppt each	Nickel (8 ppt) and molybdenum (13 ppt) detected, indicating material incompatibility
Total silicate	< 0.05 ppb	Requires online monitoring; not visible in conductivity
Boron	< 50 ppt	Requires pH adjustment for effective RO rejection
Total Organic Carbon	< 1 ppb	"TOC-free" resin specification impossible; only "TOC-low" achievable
Dissolved oxygen	< 10 ppb	Primary driver of premature polisher exhaustion
Microbial count (20 °C)	<10 CFU/L	Tank design contributes to contamination
Particles (0.2 µm)	<100/L	Ultrafiltration performance concern
Chloride ions	<50 ppt	Secondary concern
Temperature stability	+/- 1 K	Not specifically addressed in this analysis

2.3 Specification Deficiencies

Critical deficiencies identified in the tender documents include:

a) Reference to Non-Public Standard: SEMI F63-0918 is a proprietary English-language document behind a paywall, inappropriate for public procurement without explicit provision. The document was superseded by SEMI F63-0521 (published January 5, 2021).

b) Absence of Analytical Methods: No reference to SEMI C1 or SEMI C10 standards defining measurement procedures. Without specified methods, limit values become non-justiciable.

c) Impossible Conductivity Specification: The requirement "<0.055 µS/cm" cannot be achieved as the theoretical minimum for pure water at 25,00 °C is 0.05501 µS/cm. Industry standards typically specify "< 0.056 µS/cm".

d) Lack of Calibration Standards: Below 5 µS/cm, conductivity measurements are manufacturer-specific without standardized calibration solutions. The lowest available conductivity standard (0.00007 M KCl) exhibits +/- 2% variance, translating to ~50% measurement uncertainty in the UPW range.

e) Measurement Equipment Not Specified: For valid inline conductivity measurement in this range, specific measurement cells (e.g., Thornton/Mettler Toledo systems with enhanced calibration) should have been mandated.

3. Technical Assessment Methodology

3.1 Reverse Engineering Approach

The analysis employed computational modeling using ion exchange software to project water quality at each treatment stage. Input parameters included:

- Raw water composition: Eastern well field characteristics (anonymized location)
- Membrane specifications: High-rejection (HR) membranes assumed for both RO stages
- Operating parameters: Flow rates, pressures, and recovery ratios

- Ion exchange resin properties: Selectivity series for strong acid cation (SAC) and strong base anion (SBA) Type 1 resins

3.2 Analytical Framework

The evaluation focused on six critical dimensions:

1. Process sequence optimization: Comparison to industry best practices for sub-ppt applications
2. Material compatibility: Assessment of metallic and polymeric component selections
3. Hydraulic design: Evaluation of flow velocities, retention times, and gas entrainment risks
4. Ion loading analysis: Quantification of contaminant burden on polisher resins
5. Recirculation loop impact: Assessment of contamination accumulation in closed-loop operation
6. Operational parameters: Verification of pH, temperature, and flow rate setpoints

4. Results: Identified Design Deficiencies

4.1 Critical Deficiency #1: Misplaced Membrane Degassing

Finding: Membrane degassing was positioned after RO1 and before the DI-water storage tank, rather than after RO2 and before EDI.

Impact: This placement creates multiple contamination pathways:

- Recirculation streams from EDI concentrate re-introduce dissolved CO_2 when returning to the VE-tank via gravity feed, creating turbulence and air entrainment
- Free-fall inlet configuration (specified "top entry") maximizes atmospheric CO_2 absorption
- Reclaim water introduction adds additional dissolved gas burden
- CO_2 absorbed post-degassing requires removal at EDI and mixed-bed polisher, drastically reducing capacity

Quantitative Impact: Projected CO_2 concentration after RO2 reached 3,800 ppb, decreasing to only 17.7 ppb after EDI. This CO_2 burden consumes disproportionate ion exchange capacity as it must be converted to carbonate/bicarbonate for removal.

Industry Best Practice: Membrane degassing should be positioned immediately after RO2 and before EDI to minimize gas reintroduction. The VE-tank should be downstream of degassing or employ protective gas blanketing.

4.2 Critical Deficiency #2: Absence of pH Adjustment

Finding: No pH adjustment with sodium hydroxide (NaOH) was implemented after water softening and before RO1, despite sub-ppt requirements for boron and silicate.

Impact:

- Boron rejection: At neutral pH, boric acid $B(OH)_3$ predominates with RO rejection of only 50-70%. pH elevation to 9.2-10 converts boron to borate $B(OH)_4^-$, increasing rejection to >98% with standard HR membranes and >99% with high-boron-rejection membranes.
- Silicate rejection: Silicic acid $Si(OH)_4$ converts to silicate $SiO(OH)_3^-$ at pH > 9.0, increasing RO rejection from ~90% to 99%.
- Carbonate conversion: pH elevation to 8.8 – 9.0 converts CO_2 to HCO_3^-, enabling removal at RO1 and reducing burden on downstream MEG.

Quantitative Analysis: Modeling indicates boron concentration of 24 ppb after RO1 and 16 ppb after RO2 under current neutral-pH operation. With pH 10-11 adjustment, projections suggest < 1 ppb achievable after RO2, reducing polisher burden by < 15-fold.

Implementation Barriers: The specification likely avoided pH adjustment due to:

1. Occupational safety concerns with NaOH handling
2. Component compatibility at pH 10-11
3. Wastewater discharge permit modification requirements (pH > 9.5 typically requires neutralization or variance)
4. Local regulations: (anonymized, as a further example:) Erlangen Municipal Wastewater Ordinance (§15 Abs. 2 Nr. 11c EWS) permits discharge up to pH 11, but state-level Annex 31 regulations may still mandate neutralization

4.3 Critical Deficiency #3: DI-Water Tank Design

Finding: The 10 m³ polypropylene (PP) DI-water collection tank incorporated several suboptimal features:

- Open inlet from reclaim water ("top entry")
- Transparent PVC sight tube for level indication, creating light penetration and dead volume
- PP material selection vulnerable to UV degradation
- No UV disinfection or protective gas blanketing
- Structural support rated for only 150 kg/m², while tank exerts minimum 2,323 kg/m²

Impact:

- Microbial contamination: Combination of light penetration, open inlet, and absence of inline UV creates ideal conditions for biofilm formation.

Measured microbial count: 190 CFU/L vs. < 10 CFU/L specification.

- Gas entrainment: Turbulent inlet promotes CO_2 absorption and oxygen dissolution
- Structural inadequacy: Support frame specification off by order of magnitude, though minimum requirement (min. 150 kg/m²) technically satisfied

Industry Best Practice:

- PE (polyethylene) black material to prevent light transmission
- Submerged inlet to minimize turbulence and gas entrainment
- Non-contact level sensing to eliminate dead volumes
- Inline UV treatment before and after tank
- Protective nitrogen blanketing for long-term storage

4.4 Critical Deficiency #4: Uncontrolled Reclaim Water Circulation

Finding: Reclaim water of undefined quality was recirculated at 24 m³/h directly into the DI-water tank post-RO1, bypassing complete treatment.

Impact:

- Accumulation of contaminants in closed-loop operation, particularly if reclaim contains process residues
- EDI concentrate recirculation (projected composition: 7,700 ppb Na, 13,240 ppb HCO_3, 76,000 ppb CO_2) re-contaminates DI-water
- No verification of reclaim water quality before reintroduction
- Progressive concentration increase overwhelms EDI operating range, shifting performance and accelerating polisher exhaustion

Quantitative Impact: EDI concentrate contained 7,700 ppb sodium and 76,000 ppb CO_2. Continuous recirculation without purge creates accumulation, particularly of weakly-rejected species.

Industry Best Practice: Reclaim water should be:

1. Quality-verified before return
2. Routed to system inlet (before RO1) for complete treatment
3. Subject to continuous bleed/purge to prevent accumulation
4. Isolated if contamination risk exists

4.5 Critical Deficiency #5: Material Selection Issues

Finding: Specification did not mandate specific stainless steel grades for high-pressure pumps and wetted metallic components. Test results showed nickel (8 ppt vs. < 1 ppt), molybdenum (13 ppt vs < 1 ppt), and elevated boron (1,220 ppt), suggesting incompatible alloys.

Analysis: The contamination signature indicates:

- Probable use of 1.4571 (X6CrNiMoTi17-12-2) or even 300-series stainless steel
- Potential boronizing ("BOROCOAT") treatment on pump impellers for cavitation resistance
- Continuous leaching in recirculation mode concentrates contamination

Industry Best Practice: UPW systems require:

- Electropolished 1.4404 (316L, X2CrNiMo17-12-2) as minimum standard
- Prohibition of boronized components
- PVDF (polyvinylidene fluoride) or ultra-high-purity polymer alternatives where feasible

4.6 Critical Deficiency #6: Inadequate Sampling and Monitoring

Finding:

- No sampling ports after each treatment stage (only at ultrafiltration)
- No online silicate monitoring (silicate invisible in conductivity measurement)
- Inconsistent sampling methodology between test dates
- No provision for flamed sampling ports required for sub-ppb work

Impact: Inability to systematically troubleshoot or localize contamination sources. Silicate breakthrough from polisher would remain undetected until catastrophic failure.

Industry Best Practice:

- Flamed sampling ports after each major stage
- Online silicate monitoring (e.g., Swan analyzers)
- Continuous TOC monitoring
- Particle counting at multiple points

5. Quantitative Impact Analysis: Mixed-Bed Polisher Performance

5.1 Ion Exchange Selectivity and Breakthrough Prediction

Mixed-bed polishers combine strong acid cation (SAC) and strong base anion (SBA) Type 1 resins to remove trace ionic contamination. The selectivity series determines which ions break through first:

SAC Selectivity (H^+ form):

$Al^{3+} > Cr^{3+} > Fe^{3+} > Ba^{2+} > Pb^{2+} > Ca^{2+} > Ni^{2+} > Mg^{2+} > K^+ > NH_4^+ > Na^+ > H^+$

SBA Type 1 Selectivity (OH^- form):

$SO_4^{2-} > HSO_4^- > I^- > NO_3^- > Br^- > Cl^- > HCO_3^- > HSiO_3^- > F^- > OH^-$

Species on the right (weak selectivity) are easily displaced and break through first. Sodium and silicate represent the expected breakthrough species.

5.2 Projected Water Quality Through Treatment Train

Computational modeling projected compositions:

Ion	Softened Water (ppb)	RO1 Permeate (ppb)	RO2 Permeate (ppb)	EDI Diluate (ppb)
Na^+	133,000	2,676	385	1.8
K^+	1,800	41	23	1.0
HCO_3^-	279,000	5,588	662	3.1
SO_4^{2-}	16,000	46	1	1.0
Cl^-	24,000	276	18	1.0
NO_3^-	13,000	1,056	377	1.8
SiO_2	6,360	70	4	0.0
Boron	40	24	16	NA
CO_2	14,780	14,780	3,800	17.7

Key Observations:

- EDI diluate still contains 1.8 ppb sodium (1,800 ppt) – 1,800× specification
- CO_2 at 17.7 ppb (17,700 ppt) represents massive ion exchange burden
- All parameters require mixed-bed polisher for final reduction to ppt levels
- System operates at extreme end of treatment capacity with minimal safety margin

5.3 Polisher Capacity and Service Life Analysis

5.3.1 Diluate-Only Operation (6 m^3/h)

Configuration: 2×400 L mixed-bed polisher (Lewatit 1296 MD Plus or Purolite UCW9966)
Flow rate: 6 m^3/h = 15 bed volumes per hour (BV/h)

Theoretical capacity (based on conductivity alone): ~7 years at 0.058 µS/cm EDI diluate

Actual projected service life: 4 months (conservative 1% capacity utilization)

Limiting factors:

1. CO_2/HCO_3^- burden: Weak selectivity requires disproportionate capacity
2. Sodium breakthrough: Weakly bound on SAC resin, easily displaced
3. Silicate creep: Loss of SBA functional groups over time leads to premature silicate breakthrough
4. Sub-ppt requirements: Every ppb in feed represents 1,000 ppt requiring removal; even 1.8 ppb sodium requires > 99.9 % removal to achieve <1 ppt target

5.3.2 Reclaim Loop Operation (6 m^3/h + 24 m^3/h)

Configuration: 2×1,000 L mixed-bed polisher
Total flow: 30 m^3/h = 30 BV/h (optimal for mixed-bed operation)

Projected service life: 10-12 months (assuming reclaim remains uncontaminated)

Critical assumption: This projection assumes reclaim water quality remains pristine. Given uncontrolled recirculation and accumulation documented above, actual service life likely shorter.

Recommended replacement interval: 12-24 months regardless of capacity, due to:

- Biological fouling risk
- Loss of functional groups from SBA resin (manifested as TOC increase)
- Silicate slip risk as quaternary ammonium groups degrade

5.4 Optimization Potential

With implementation of recommended measures (pH adjustment, MEG repositioning, reclaim routing, material upgrades), projected service life extends to:

- Diluate-only: 12-24 months (3-6× improvement)
- With reclaim: 24-72 months (2-6× improvement)

Basis: Reduction of CO_2 burden by ~90%, boron by ~15×, silicate by ~4×, and elimination of metallic ion accumulation reduces polisher loading to protective/polishing function rather than working filter duty.

5.5 Comparative Industry Performance

Reference semiconductor facilities (150 m^3/h total capacity) using optimized systems achieve:

- Resin type: DuPont Amberjet UP6040
- Configuration: 400 L per line, 6-20 m^3/h (15-50 BV/h)
- Service life: 6-12 months in 24/7/365 operation

- Pretreatment: Softening → pH adjustment → RO → RO → MEG → EDI → Polisher (1% capacity utilization)

This validates that the 12-24 month target is achievable with proper system design.

6. Root Cause Analysis

6.1 Specification-Level Failures

The tender specification exhibited multiple deficiencies that enabled design shortcomings:

1. Ambiguous quality requirements without analytical method specification
2. Absence of prescriptive design requirements for ppt-level applications
3. No economic or operational lifetime targets for consumables
4. Reference to superseded, proprietary standards without providing access
5. Contradictory or impossible specifications (e.g., conductivity < 0.055 µS/cm)
6. No requirement for design validation against state-of-the-art practices

These specification gaps allowed technically compliant but suboptimal solutions that fail to meet the spirit of ultra-high-purity requirements.

6.2 Design-Level Failures

The system integrator failed to apply established best practices for sub-ppt water treatment:

1. Process sequence: Membrane degassing placement contradicts fundamental UPW design principles
2. pH optimization: Omission of pH adjustment is inexplicable for boron/silicate targets
3. Material selection: Use of non-UPW-grade alloys indicates inadequate attention to leaching
4. Tank design: Multiple simultaneous deficiencies suggest insufficient UPW design experience
5. Monitoring strategy: Absence of silicate monitoring is critical oversight for anion-limited system
6. Documentation: Lack of sampling ports prevents effective troubleshooting

6.3 Operational Considerations

The system operates in recirculation mode rather than once-through, concentrating any design deficiencies:

- Accumulation effects amplify small contamination sources
- Steady-state contamination levels exceed those predicted by modeling
- Current performance non-representative of production operation
- Each recirculation pass through EDI concentrate return adds contamination burden

7. Recommended Remediation Strategy

7.1 Priority 1: Immediate Actions (Low Cost, High Impact)

Action 1.1: Eliminate recirculation and operate in once-through mode during diagnostic period

- Discontinue EDI concentrate return to VE-tank
- Route all reclaim water to system inlet (pre-RO1)
- Purge entire system and refill with fresh diluate
- Operate for minimum 48 hours before further assessment

Action 1.2: Replace mixed-bed polisher resin with TOC-optimized grade

- Specify Lewatit 1296 MD Plus or Purolite UCW9966
- Ensure minimum 80-100 bed volumes (BV) rinse to achieve < 1 ppb TOC
- Size for minimum 10 BV/h, ideally 15-30 BV/h flow
- Operate at minimum 400 L per vessel for 6 m^3/h diluate flow

Action 1.3: Verify UV system specification

- Confirm 185 nm wavelength for TOC reduction (not solely 254 nm disinfection)
- Check lamp output and replacement history
- Consider upgrading to combined 185/254 nm system

7.2 Priority 2: Short-Term Modifications (Medium Cost, High Impact)

Action 2.1: Implement pH adjustment system

- Install NaOH dosing after softening, target pH 10-11
- Provide acid neutralization for concentrate discharge if required by regulations
- Expected improvement: Boron reduction by ~15×, silicate by ~4×, CO_2 by ~10×

Action 2.2: Relocate or supplement membrane degassing

- Option A: Reposition MEG to post-RO2, pre-EDI (requires piping modifications)

- Option B: Install second MEG at optimal location, retain existing unit
- Modify VE-tank inlet to submerged configuration
- Expected improvement: CO_2 reduction by ~90%, eliminating primary polisher burden

Action 2.3: Upgrade DI-water tank

- Replace PP tank with PE black material
- Eliminate sight tube; install non-contact ultrasonic level sensing
- Install inline UV treatment in recirculation loop
- Consider nitrogen blanketing for long-term storage

7.3 Priority 3: Long-Term Optimization (Higher Cost, Comprehensive Solution)

Action 3.1: Material audit and replacement

- Identify all wetted metallic components, verify 1.4404 electropolished specification
- Replace any boronized pump impellers
- Consider PVDF alternatives for highest-purity sections

Action 3.2: Enhanced monitoring implementation

- Install online silicate analyzer (e.g., Swan) post-polisher
- Add TOC monitoring at multiple points
- Install flamed sampling ports after each major treatment stage
- Implement comprehensive data trending for predictive maintenance

Action 3.3: Consider dual-EDI configuration

- Install second EDI stage in series for additional polishing
- Reduces polisher burden, extends service life to 2-6 years
- Positions polisher as true protective filter rather than working unit

8. Discussion

8.1 Achievability of Specification

The fundamental system architecture (softening → dual RO → EDI → polisher) is sound and capable of achieving SEMI F63 requirements with proper implementation. The current system will likely achieve specification with fresh resin for a limited time, but demonstrates multiple characteristics indicating operation at the extreme margin of capability:

1. Mixed-bed polisher as working filter: The polisher removes bulk contamination rather than final traces, indicating insufficient upstream treatment
2. Extremely short service life: 4-month resin replacement cycle is economically and operationally unsustainable
3. Multiple simultaneous exceedances: Suggest systemic issues rather than isolated component failures
4. Recirculation accumulation: Current performance non-representative of steady-state production operation

8.2 Comparison to Industry Best Practices

Modern semiconductor UPW systems for sub-ppt applications typically incorporate:

Feature	Industry Standard	Evaluated System	Gap Assessment
pH adjustment pre-RO	pH 10-11 with NaOH	None	Critical deficiency
MEG positioning	Post-RO2, pre-EDI	Post-RO1, pre-tank	Fundamental error
Reclaim routing	Pre-RO1 complete treatment	Post-RO1 partial treatment	Design flaw
VE-tank material	PE black, sealed	PP, transparent tube	Promotes contamination
Polisher service life	12-24 months typical	4 months projected	3-6× below standard
Online silicate monitoring	Standard for sub-ppb	Not specified	Critical oversight
Sampling infrastructure	Flamed ports, each stage	Minimal	Troubleshooting impossible
Material specification	1.4404 electropolished mandatory	Not specified	Allows incompatible materials

The evaluated system deviates from best practices in nearly every dimension critical to ppt-level performance.

8.3 Economic Implications

Current configuration costs (annualized, diluate-only operation):

- Mixed-bed resin replacement: 3× per year @ estimated €5,000-10,000 per exchange = €15,000-30,000
- Additional labor for frequent changeouts

- Production downtime during resin replacement
- Risk of extended specification exceedance

Optimized configuration costs:

- One-time pH system installation: ~€20,000-40,000
- MEG relocation or supplementation: ~€30,000-60,000
- Tank upgrade: ~€15,000-30,000
- Mixed-bed resin replacement: 1× per 12-24 months = €5,000-10,000/year

Payback period: Less than 2 years based solely on resin savings, with substantial additional value from improved reliability and reduced production risk.

8.4 Regulatory and Procurement Considerations

This case highlights critical issues in technical procurement:

Procurement deficiencies:

1. Specification of non-public standards without provision
2. Use of superseded standards (SEMI F63-0918 vs. F63-0521)
3. Absence of analytical method specifications
4. No service life or economic performance requirements
5. Insufficient mandatory design elements for stated purity targets

Contractor obligations:

German construction law (VOB/B §13 Abs. 3 in conjunction with VOB/B § 4 Abs. 3 and § 242 BGB) requires contractors to identify obvious specification deficiencies ("Bedenkenanmeldung"). The magnitude and number of deviations from state-of-the-art suggest this obligation was not fulfilled.

8.5 Limitations of This Analysis

Several factors limit the precision of this assessment:

1. Modeling uncertainty: Ion exchange software provides limited accuracy in ppt range; manufacturers acknowledge projections are "looking into a glass/crystal ball" at these concentrations
2. Incomplete information: Specific membrane types, EDI manufacturer/model, exact metallic alloys not disclosed
3. Sampling methodology: Inconsistent sampling between test dates may contribute to variability
4. Steady-state uncertainty: System not operated in representative production mode; accumulation effects not fully characterized
5. No on-site verification: Assessment based solely on documentation review; physical inspection would provide additional insights

Recommendations are therefore based on best engineering judgment and industry experience rather than site-specific validated data.

9. Conclusions

This case shows that compliance cannot be engineered into a system post-commissioning if the initial tender ignores physical constraints. Legal contracts must align with chemical reality to protect CAPEX investments.

In detail this case study demonstrates that achieving ultra-pure water quality in the parts-per-trillion range requires rigorous adherence to established best practices throughout specification, design, and implementation. The evaluated system exhibits a fundamentally sound process architecture that fails to achieve performance targets due to multiple preventable design deficiencies:

Critical findings:

1. Misplaced membrane degassing creates massive dissolved gas burden (primary failure mode)
2. Absence of pH adjustment prevents effective boron and silicate removal at RO stages
3. Uncontrolled reclaim recirculation and suboptimal tank design promote contamination accumulation
4. Mixed-bed polisher operated as working filter rather than protective polisher, resulting in 4-month service life vs. 12-24 month industry standard
5. Material selection and monitoring infrastructure inadequate for ppt-level requirements

Remediation potential:

Implementation of recommended optimizations can extend polisher service life 3-6× (to 12-24+ months) while achieving specification compliance. The most critical interventions—pH adjustment and MEG repositioning—address the root causes of premature capacity exhaustion by reducing ionic and dissolved gas burden by order of magnitude.

Broader implications:

This case underscores the necessity of:

- Explicit specification of design requirements, not solely performance targets, for extreme-purity applications
- Reference to public, current standards with defined analytical methods
- Mandatory adherence to industry best practices for sub-ppt water treatment

- Comprehensive sampling and monitoring infrastructure for systematic troubleshooting
- Contractor disclosure obligations regarding specification deficiencies

Ultra-pure water systems represent mature technology; the challenges documented here reflect specification and implementation gaps rather than fundamental technical limitations. Future practitioners should ensure specifications mandate state-of-the-art practices appropriate to target purity levels, particularly pH adjustment, MEG positioning, material selection, and monitoring strategies that have been validated across numerous semiconductor manufacturing installations globally.

10. Recommendations for Future Projects

Based on this analysis, the following recommendations are offered to project owners, specifiers, and system designers:

10.1 For Project Owners and Specifiers

1. Engage specialist consultants for systems targeting sub-10 ppb (preferably sub-1 ppb) purity
2. Reference current, public standards with explicit analytical method specifications (SEMI C1, C10)
3. Specify operational performance requirements: polisher service life, economic targets, reliability metrics
4. Mandate compliance with industry best practices for target purity level, not solely performance testing
5. Require comprehensive O&M documentation including detailed sampling protocols and troubleshooting procedures
6. Include independent commissioning oversight with expertise in ultra-high-purity applications

10.2 For System Designers

1. Apply holistic optimization: Every ppb removed upstream saves exponentially more capacity downstream
2. pH adjustment is non-negotiable for boron/silicate targets below 1 ppb
3. Position membrane degassing immediately before EDI to minimize gas reintroduction
4. Design recirculation systems to prevent accumulation; treat reclaim water completely
5. Specify UPW-grade materials throughout: 1.4404 minimum for metallics, PVDF preferred for piping
6. Implement comprehensive monitoring: silicate, TOC, particle counting at multiple points
7. Size mixed-bed polishers for protective duty (1-2% capacity utilization) with minimum 10 BV/h flow
8. Document design basis explicitly, including deviations from best practices with justification

10.3 For Operators

1. Establish baseline performance immediately after commissioning with comprehensive sampling
2. Monitor trend data for early indication of capacity exhaustion or contamination
3. Implement predictive maintenance based on actual performance rather than arbitrary schedules
4. Maintain detailed operational logs to correlate process changes with quality excursions
5. Budget appropriately for resin replacement; 12-24 month cycles are standard for optimized systems

Acknowledgments

The author acknowledges the cooperation of facility management in providing technical documentation and test data for this analysis. All identifying information has been anonymized to protect confidentiality while preserving technical content for the benefit of the broader water treatment community.

References

1. Technical Assessment Report, Ultra-Pure Water System Design Evaluation, Project 202510XXX, July 2025 [Decker Verfahrenstechnik GmbH Internal documentation, anonymized]
2. SEMI F63:2021, Guide for Ultrapure Water Used in Semiconductor Processing, Semiconductor Equipment and Materials International, 2021
3. SEMI C1, Guide for the Analysis of Liquid Chemicals, Semiconductor Equipment and Materials International (current edition)
4. SEMI C10, Guide for Determination of Method Detection Limits, Semiconductor Equipment and Materials International (current edition)
5. SEMI F61, Guide for Design and Operation of a Semiconductor Ultrapure Water System, Semiconductor Equipment and Materials International (current edition)
6. ASTM D5127, Standard Guide for Ultra-Pure Water Used in the Electronics and Semiconductor Industries, ASTM International
7. Kulakov, L.A., et al., "Analysis of Bacteria Contaminating Ultrapure Water in Industrial Systems," Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 68(4):1548-1555, 2002

8. Zhang, X., et al., "A Critical Review on Challenges and Trends of Ultrapure Water Production for Semiconductor Industry," Science of the Total Environment, 785:147254, 2021
9. International Roadmap for Devices and Systems (IRDS), Ultrapure Water Technology Requirements, latest edition
10. Various manufacturer specifications: Lewatit, Purolite, DuPont (ion exchange resins); membrane manufacturers (DuPont Filmtech, Toray, Hydranautics)

Author Note:

This case study is published to contribute to the professional knowledge base regarding ultra-pure water system design for semiconductor and related high-technology applications. All parties, technical details and specific locations which may identify the individuals or the location have been anonymized. Practitioners facing similar challenges are encouraged to engage qualified specialists familiar with SEMI standards and semiconductor-grade water treatment.

Frank Naujoks acts as a Strategic Risk Architect for industrial water infrastructure. Uniquely combining the qualifications of a fully qualified lawyer (RA) and a certified technical planner (AwSV), he serves as CEO of Decker Verfahrenstechnik GmbH in Germany. He specializes in mitigating technical and contractual liabilities in complex plant engineering. Frank lectures at the Nuremberg Institute of Technology and shapes industry standards as Spokesperson for the DWA Working Group 2.36 and member of the DWA Steering Committee IG-2.

Document Status:

Prepared for publication on ResearchGate and other academic/professional platforms, January 2026.