

Multi-Site Efficiency and Throughput

Joe Kelly

*Originally published 2008, Revised 2026

Key Words – Multi-Site Efficiency, Throughput, UPH, Cost of Test, COT, ATE

1. Introduction

In the ATE (Automated Test Equipment) industry there are two key concepts that are used to measure the efficiency of test time. These concepts are multi-site efficiency and throughput. It is crucial that both be considered together so that all corner cases can be explored. These two concepts and their impact will be discussed in this article.

It should be noted that throughout this article, a hypothetical device having a single-site test time of 4 seconds is used. This value is arbitrarily chosen and is not meant to reflect a specific device being tested on any manufacturers' ATE. It has also been chosen to be independent from any "magic number" phenomenon, potentially skewing results. It must also be mentioned that the focus of this study is with the RF/SOC device testing market, involving primarily RF, mixed signal, and digital testing. The multi-site efficiency values for these devices are in the 90-95% range. The concepts also follow for the testing of other domains (such as memory) but such domains often have high parallelism and hence multi-site efficiencies much closer to 100%.

2. Multi-Site Efficiency

The ATE industry accepted definition [1] of the figure of merit multi-site efficiency, *MSE*, expressed in percent is

$$MSE = \left[1 - \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta N(t_1)} \right] \cdot 100\% \quad (1)$$

where Δt is the difference in multi-site and single-site test execution time, ΔN is the difference in number of sites relative to single-site, and t_1 is the single site test time. From both a mathematical as well as a definition point of view, the number of sites, N , is always greater than 1. Since ΔN and Δt are always referenced to the single-site case, this is more simply written as

$$MSE = \left[1 - \frac{(t_{MS} - t_1)}{(N - 1)(t_1)} \right] \cdot 100\% . \quad (2)$$

The definition of multi-site efficiency is highly dependent upon an understanding of the qualitative description of what multi-site efficiency really means. Multi-site efficiency within the realm of ATE measures the deviation from perfect parallel execution of a test program (or individual test) across multiple sites in a test cell. Perfect parallelism is exhibited when one site is tested in a fixed amount of time and adding additional sites does not consume any additional test time. Perfect parallelism corresponds to 100% multi-site efficiency. In contrast to that, if

there is absolutely no parallelism during testing, the overall multi-site test execution time scales with the number of sites,

$$t_{MS} = (N)(t_1). \tag{3}$$

This corresponds to 0% multi-site efficiency and is obviously not desirable.

Often, people use incorrect equations for determining multi-site efficiency, and they do so because they only evaluate the two extreme cases, perfect parallelism and full serial, and see that their calculations yield 100% and 0% respectively. There are many equations that meet these two boundary conditions. It is their behavior in situations between these two extremes that causes discrepancies.

Number of Sites	Execution Time (sec)	Multi-Site Efficiency (%)		Number of Sites	Execution Time (sec)	Multi-Site Efficiency (%)
<i>Case 1</i>				<i>Case 4</i>		
1	4	N/A		1	4	N/A
2	4	100		2	7	25
3	4	100		3	10	25
4	4	100		4	13	25
<i>Case 2</i>				<i>Case 5</i>		
1	4	N/A		1	4	N/A
2	5	75		2	8	0
3	6	75		3	12	0
4	7	75		4	16	0
<i>Case 3</i>				<i>Case 6</i>		
1	4	N/A		1	4	N/A
2	6	50		2	9	-25
3	8	50		3	14	-25
4	10	50		4	19	-25

Table 1 Example scenarios to demonstrate the description of multi-site efficiency

Table 1 is presented to demonstrate the description of multi-site efficiency. The table is based upon a hypothetical single-site test execution time of 4 seconds. Cases 1 and 5 exemplify perfect parallel and serial test program executions respectively. Notice how Case 5 follows Equation (3). In Cases 2, 3, and 4 each added site increases the execution time in an amount equal to 25%, 50%, and 75% respectively. Notice that the multi-site efficiency values are reduced by those respective amounts.

Multi-site efficiency values should not be negative, or greater than 100% for that matter. In either of these cases, as demonstrated in Case 6, something is likely incorrect in the test program or with the ATE and the situation should be evaluated and remedied. As an example of this, in Case 6, adding a second site is taking more than twice the execution time of one site.

3. Efficiency Calculations in Other Industries

At times, engineers borrow or derive equations from other industries to arrive at (erroneous) multi-site efficiency values applied to ATE. Although there is a link to the most general equation for efficiency, work-in/work-out, the constraints on the definition of multi-site efficiency would make the linking of these an exercise in verbiage.

Another common error is when people use the calculation for efficiency describing the concept of parallel efficiency of parallel processors as used in the computer industry. In effect, it is an opposite situation. In the computer industry, the measure is to look at the efficiency of spreading a task across multiple processors, with the efficiency calculation pointing out internal overhead.

In ATE, the measure is to add sites (tasks) to a fixed number of resources. If there are enough tester resources to handle the added sites (tasks) in parallel then the ATE efficiency calculation tends toward 100%. If not (as is often the case with analog and RF) the efficiency is less than 100%.

4. Throughput

So far, this analysis has not mentioned the term Cost of Test (COT). In the end, COT is the ultimate measure that determines the production test conditions and resources. COT analysis can be overwhelming when taken to a low level. Although this article does not get into the concept of COT, the concept of throughput is a key contributor to the COT calculation. For further reading Reference [2] provides an excellent overview of the key contributors to COT.

The ATE industry standard definition of throughput is the measure of the units (devices) tested per hour (UPH). Throughput can be derived from Equations (2) and (3) by rearranging them to solve for the total execution time for multi-site, t_{MS} ,

$$t_{MS} = (1 - MSE)(N - 1)(t_1) + t_1. \tag{4}$$

Then, throughput in UPH is calculated by,

$$Throughput = \frac{3600}{\frac{t_{MS}}{N}}. \tag{5}$$

5. Can Throughput Decrease Even with Increased Multi-Site Efficiency?

Yes. Focusing *only* on improving multi-site efficiency is not always prudent thing to do. Multi-site efficiency and throughput must be considered together. This is because it is possible to have improved multi-site efficiency at the expense of reducing throughput.

Consider the real-world situation where some measurement overhead occurs because of the ATE or test program. This is typically a uniform overhead (delay) and is the same for one site or for N sites. As the number of sites increases, this fixed delay becomes spread across the sites and less pronounced in the overall test time numbers. However, the larger this delay, the more the multi-site efficiency is increased, while decreasing throughput.

Number of Sites	SS Test Time, t_1 (sec)	MS Test Time, t_{MS} (sec)	MSE (%)	Throughput (UPH)
4	4.0	6.0	83.3	2400
4	4.5	6.5	85.2	2215
4	5.0	7.0	86.7	2057
4	5.5	7.5	87.9	1920
4	6.0	8.0	88.9	1800

Table 2 A fixed amount of overhead (delay) is added to the single-site test execution time. This same amount is also added to the overall multi-site test execution time. As the delay increases, so does multi-site efficiency. However, even though multi-site efficiency is improving, overall throughput is decreasing.

Consider the hypothetical scenario depicted in Table 2 and Figure 1. The initial case is that the single-site test time is 4 seconds and the quad-site test time is 6 seconds. From Equation (2), the multi-site efficiency is calculated to be 83% and the throughput is 2400 UPH from (3). If this same setup were performed on a tester that had some fixed internal measurement time overhead (on one or many measurements), both the single-site test time (t_1) and overall multi-site test time (t_{MS}) would increase by the same amount. This would, however, cause an artificially-inflated multi-site efficiency, yielding a reduced overall throughput. Notice how this arises because of the roles of t_1 and t_{MS} in Equations (2) and (3).




Figure 1 Graphical representation of data from Table 2, showing increasing of multi-site efficiency at the expense of decreased throughput.

The scenario shown in Table 2 demonstrates increasing multi-site efficiency with a slight increase in single site test time. Note the resulting reduced throughput in UPH. This table demonstrates that the number of units that can be shipped in an hour (throughput) has a definite link to the individual test time, *as well as* multi site efficiency. The important thing to note from is that one cannot always look at just the multi-site efficiency values to judge the quality of a test program. It is crucial to observe the throughput numbers as well. Of course, the best scenario is when multi-site efficiency approaches 100% *and* throughput is at a maximum value (i.e., low test time).

6. Multi-Site Efficiency Impact on Number of Sites

Multi-site efficiency can also be used to demonstrate that unless testing is perfectly parallel (100% multi-site efficiency) there is a limit to the benefit of adding sites to a test cell.

Plotting throughput for various values of multi-site efficiency, as in Figure 2, one can observe that aside from the linear case of perfect parallelism, there is an asymptotic value of throughput that is attained with increasing number of sites. This asymptote is independent of any of the additional factors (socket/load board uptime, etc.) that are considered in COT analyses. Taking those into consideration would produce a downward trend in the curve with increased numbers of sites.




Figure 2 Throughput as a function of number of sites in the test cell. Notice that for decreasing values of multi-site efficiency, the asymptotic throughput level of no return on investment is reached earlier.

Figure 3 provides a close-up look at the 90% MSE curve of Figure 2. There are two main sections to this curve; the linear section, A, and the asymptotic section, B. Most current RF/SOC applications use 8 to 16 sites are still slightly in that range of a benefit from adding sites. As site count for these types of devices moves toward 32 and greater, the return on investment must be considered.




Figure 3 Throughput as a function of number of sites in the test cell showing the two regions of behavior; A: linearly-increasing throughput with increased number of sites and B: asymptotic region at which little or no gain in throughput is realized.

7. Why Can't I Keep Adding Sites to My Test Cell?

For an integrated device consisting of RF, analog- and digital-mixed signal, and digital testing needs, it is not practical to add sites endlessly. From a purely digital point of view, if the tester has enough digital channels (which are often relatively low-cost) the site count can be increased significantly. However, to maintain a high degree of parallelism, i.e. multi-site efficiency, for RF and mixed-signal testing additional measurement receivers have to be added to the tester. This can be more costly than adding digital channels.

It is here that the trade-offs need to be considered. Often with RF and mixed-signal testing with higher site count, it can be advantageous to use semi-parallel testing where each pass through the sites perform only portions of the sites testing in parallel. This can be used to offset the cost of the tester hardware. Keeping in mind the true multi-site efficiency and throughput numbers, the proper tradeoffs can be made resulting in an optimized throughput and reduced COT.

In addition to tester limitations, there are also often handler, prober, and load board limitations. The index time of a handler places a cap on the throughput. Additionally, the handler rarely operates at the maximum performance that it is specified at because of potential jamming, resulting in downtime of the test cell. Index and sort time limitations can really be critical as test times become close to the index and sort times.

8. Real-World Results

A study using the Advantest V93000 resulted in multi-site efficiencies greater than 95% on an RF SOC transceiver in a quad-site application [3]. High levels of both multi-site efficiency *and* throughput were achieved because of the parallel RF receiver architecture and by masking the data transfer between ATE hardware and workstation by the calculations. The multithreading

allowed a "close-to-parallel" performance that would not otherwise be achieved without the multi-threading.

9. Conclusion

Multi-site efficiency and throughput are two key concepts that work together to provide an input to the common Cost of Test calculations that are used throughout industry. Multi-site efficiency is an often-misunderstood calculation and as such, it was the goal of this article to address these misconceptions and provide a solid explanation of the proper formula used to calculate multi-site efficiency. It was also shown that even though multi-site efficiency is high, or can be further improved, it is necessary to also evaluate throughput to ensure that throughput is not being traded off for multi-site efficiency, thereby inadvertently increasing overall COT.

10. References

[1] Semiconductor Industry Association (SIA), "International Technology Roadmap for Semiconductors, 2007 Edition" (2007)

[2] J. Rivoir, "Parallel Test Reduces Cost if Test More Effectively than Just a Cheap Tester," Proceedings of Semicon Europe 2005 (2005).

[3] L. Sassoon, J. Smith, M. Engelhardt, and J. Kelly, "Multithreading on V93000 Reduces Multi-Site Test Time on Intel Front-End Transceiver," Proceedings of 2008 VOICE, Verigy Users' Group (2008).