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## Objectives \& Recommendations

## Provide analysis \& recommendations for

- Reference receiver (\# taps, \# banks, span)
$\Rightarrow$ Group recommendation: 12 fixed taps, 3 banks of 3 or 4 floating taps with 40UI span
- Termination model
$\Rightarrow$ Group recommendation: Adopt the termination model described in http://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/adhoc/jun12_19/healey_3ck_adhoc_01_061219.pdf.
- Rx noise figure ( $\eta_{0}$ )
$\Rightarrow$ Group recommendation: Adopt the baseline value $\left(8.2 \times 10^{-9}\right.$ $\mathrm{V}^{2} / \mathrm{GHz}$ ) that we have been using.
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## COM Worksheet - Proposed Termination

| Table 93A-1 parameters |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parameter | Setting | Units | Information |
| f_b | 53.125 | GBd |  |
| f_min | 0.05 | GHz |  |
| Delta_f | 0.01 | GHz |  |
| C_d | [1.2e-4, 1.2e-4] | nF | [ $7 \times \mathrm{RX}$ ] |
| L_s | [0.12, 0.12] | nH | [TXRX] |
| c_b | [0.3e-40.3e-4] | nF | [TX RX] |
| 2_p select | [2] |  | [test cases to run] |
| 2_p (TX) | [1231; 1.81.8] | mm | [test cases] |
| 2_p(NEXT) | [12 30; 1.81.8] | mm | [test cases] |
| 2_p (FEXT) | [1230; 1.81.8] | mm | [test cases] |
| $\underline{2}$ ¢ $(\mathrm{RX})$ | [1229; 1.81.8] | mm | [test cases] |
| c_p | [0.87e-40.87e-4] | nF | [TXRX] |
| R_0 | 50 | Ohm |  |
| R_d | [ 50,50$]$ | Ohm | [ TXRX] |
| A_V | 0.412 | $v$ | vp/vf=. 694 |
| A_fe | 0.412 | v | vp/vf=. 694 |
| A_ne | 0.608 | v |  |
| L | 4 |  |  |
| M | 32 |  |  |
| filter and Eq |  |  |  |
| f_r | 0.75 | *fb |  |
| c(0) | 0.54 |  | min |
| c(-1) | [-0.344:0.02:0] |  | [min:step:max] |
| c(-2) | [0:0:02:0.12] |  | [min:step:max] |
| c(-3) | [-0.06:0.02:0] |  | [min:step:max] |
| c(1) | [-0.1:0:005:0] |  | [min:step:max] |
| N_b | 20 | UI |  |
| b_max(1) | 0.85 |  |  |
| b_max(2.N_ ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ) | 0.3 |  |  |
| g_DC | [-20:1:0] | dB | [min:step:max] |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\text {_ }}$ | 21.25 | 6 Hz |  |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{p} 1}$ | 21.25 | GHz |  |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{p} 2$ | 53.125 | 6 Hz |  |
| g_DC_HP | [-6:6:0] |  | [min:step:max] |
| f_HP_PZ | 0.6640625 | GHz |  |
| ffe pre tap len | 0 | UI |  |
| ffe post tap len | 0 | UI |  |
| ffe tap step size | 0.02 |  |  |
| ffe main cursor min | 0.7 |  |  |
| ffe pre tap 1 max | 0.3 |  |  |
| ffe post tap1 max | 0.3 |  |  |
| ffe tapn max | 0.125 |  |  |
| ffe backoff | 0 |  |  |
| Floating Tap Control |  |  |  |
| N_bg | 1 |  | 012 or 3 groups |
| N_bf |  |  | taps per group |
| N_f | 40 |  | UI span for floating taps |
| bmaxg | 0.3 |  | max DFE value for floating taps |



## COM Worksheet - Simple Termination

| Table 93A-1 parameters |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parameter | Setting | Units | Information |
| f_b | 53.125 | GBd |  |
| f_min | 0.05 | GHz |  |
| Delta_f | 0.01 | GHz |  |
| c_d | [0.9e-4, 0.9e-4] | nF | [ $7 \times \mathrm{RX}$ ] |
| L_s | $[0,0]$ | nH | [TXRX] |
| c_b | [00] | nF | [ TX RX] |
| 2_p select | [2] |  | [test cases to run] |
| $2 \_p$ (TX) | [1231; 1.81.8] | mm | [test cases] |
| 2_p ${ }^{\text {( }}$ (EXT) | [1230; 1.81 .8 ] | mm | [test cases] |
| 2_p (FEXT) | [1230; 1.81.8] | mm | [test cases] |
| $2 \_p(\mathrm{RX})$ | [1229; 1.81.8] | mm | [test cases] |
| c_p | [0.87e-40.87e-4] | nF | [ $\mathrm{T} \times \mathrm{RX]}$ |
| R_0 | 50 | Ohm |  |
| R_d | [ 50,50$]$ | Ohm | [ $\mathrm{T} \times \mathrm{RX}$ ] |
| A_v | 0.412 | v | vp/vf= 694 |
| A_fe | 0.412 | v | vp/vf= 694 |
| A_ne | 0.608 | v |  |
| L | 4 |  |  |
| M | 32 |  |  |
| filter and Eq |  |  |  |
| f_r | 0.75 | *fb |  |
| c(0) | 0.54 |  | min |
| c(-1) | [-0.34:0.002:0] |  | [min:step:max] |
| c-2) | [0:0:02:0.012] |  | [min:step:max] |
| c(-3) | [-0.066:002:0] |  | [min:step:max] |
| c(1) | [-0.1:0:005:0] |  | [min:step:max] |
| N_b | 20 | UI |  |
| b_max(1) | 0.85 |  |  |
| b_max(2.N_b) | 0.3 |  |  |
| g_DC | [-20:1:0] | dB | [min:step:max] |
| f_工 | 21.25 | 6Hz |  |
| $f_{\text {f_p }}$ | 21.25 | GHz |  |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{p} 2$ | 53.125 | GHz |  |
| g_DC_HP | [-6:1:0] |  | [min:step:max] |
| f_HP_PZ | 0.6640625 | GHz |  |
| ffe pre tap len | 0 | UI |  |
| ffe post tap len | 0 | UI |  |
| ffe tap step size | 0.02 |  |  |
| ffe main cursor min | 0.7 |  |  |
| ffe pre tapl max | 0.3 |  |  |
| ffe post tap1 max | 0.3 |  |  |
| ffe tapn max | 0.125 |  |  |
| ffe backoff | - |  |  |
| Floating Tap Control |  |  |  |
| N_bg | 1 |  | 012 or 3 groups |
| N_bf |  |  | taps per group |
| N_f | 40 |  | UI span for floating taps |
| bmaxg | 0.3 |  | max DFE value for floating taps |



## Channels - Full Set

|  | Main file | Folder | files | Documentation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Cable_SKP_16dB_Op575m.2ip |  |  |
| 2 |  | Cable_EKP_ 16d_ _ops 575 m_more_ Sisizip |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | cable_Cxp_2oderaip | Cable_EkP_20d_ Oop 57 m .zip |  |  |
| 6 |  | Cable_gkp_2odi_Op575m_more_Lsizip |  | hed_3ck_02_0119.pdf |
|  |  | Cable_BP_ 20dB_Op995m_uddateditip | Cable_SkP_20dB_Op995__updated_ .s4p |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | cable_CX_2ads.zip | Cable_gkP_2dd__op57m.zip |  |  |
| 10 |  | Cable_gkP_2ddB_Op575m_more_sisizip |  |  |
| 11 |  | Cable_BKP_2dib_Op9995m_udatededip |  |  |
|  |  |  | Cable_ExP_2did_opopo9sm_more_ is_ updated_*s. |  |
|  | cable_CX_2888.2ip | Cable_gkP_28d__op57m.zip |  |  |
| ${ }_{5}^{14}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Cable_BxP_28dB_09995m_udatadedip | Cable_SkP_28di_Op995m_updated_.s4p |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Dpoollur | Dpoosin Meg7 - 5 Sp | trac_3ck_01b_011.pdf |
| 18 |  | Dpooll2adi |  |  |
|  |  | - | DPo |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |
|  | zambel_3ck_0__1118_Inincoltoos.ip | Lunk_1 | See the folder | zambel_3ck_01_1118.pdf |
|  |  | Lunk.2 |  |  |
|  |  | Lunk 3 |  |  |
| 26 |  | Lunks 5 |  |  |
| ${ }^{27}$ |  | Lunk. 6 |  |  |
| 288 |  | Link. ${ }_{\text {Link }}$ |  |  |
| 30 |  | Lnk. 9 |  |  |
| - | zambel_Sck_01_1118_Inins100018.2ip | Lnk_10 |  |  |
| , |  | Link_11 |  |  |
| 34 |  | Lun 13 |  |  |
|  |  | Lnk. 14 |  |  |
| 6 |  | Link. 15 |  |  |
| - ${ }_{\text {37 }}^{38}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Link_16 } \\ \hline \text { Link_17 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
|  |  | Link_18 |  |  |
| 40 |  | Link. 19 |  |  |
| $4{ }_{4}^{4}$ |  | Link_20 |  |  |
| 43 |  | Lunk 22 |  |  |
| 44 |  | Lnkk 23 |  |  |
| 46 |  | Link 25 |  |  |
|  |  | Lunk26 |  |  |
| 48 |  | Lnk_27 |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 50 |  |  |  |  |
| 51 |  |  |  |  |
| 53 |  |  |  |  |
| 54 |  |  |  |  |


| * | Main file | Folder | files | kretel_3k_01a__1118.pdt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55 | etil_ck_01_1118_baskplane.zip |  | Bch12 305 |  |
| 56 |  |  | Bch2.7 |  |
| 57 |  |  | Bch2 2007 |  |
|  |  |  | Bch2_a10-7 |  |
|  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {Bch2 } 215} 7$ |  |
| 61 |  |  | Bccle 22 P 5 5 7 |  |
| 62 |  |  | Bchz_a57 7 |  |
| ${ }_{6}^{63}$ 64 |  |  | Bch2.97p 5 |  |
| 5 |  |  | Bch2 2015 |  |
| 66 |  |  | Bccre 222 P 57 |  |
| 67 |  |  | Bch2 262.7 |  |
| 68 |  |  | Bch2_64, 7 |  |
| 69 |  |  | Bch2_66.7 |  |
| 70 |  |  | Bch2 -67p5-7 |  |
| 71 72 |  |  | Bch2_b8_7 <br> Bch3 1 |  |
| 73 |  |  | Bch4 30 |  |
| 74 |  |  | Cach1_b2 |  |
| 75 |  |  | Cach1 |  |
| 76 |  |  | CAch2.a |  |
| 78 <br> 78 <br> 8 |  |  | ${ }_{\text {Cachl } 210}{ }_{\text {Cach } 20205}$ |  |
| 79 |  |  | CAAch2as |  |
| 80 |  |  | CAchzap7p |  |
| 81 |  |  | CACA2_b10 |  |
| ${ }^{82}$ |  |  |  |  |
| - 83 | kreeti_3k_01_1118_cablede8._2p |  | CAch2_b2 |  |
| ${ }^{85}$ |  |  | CAch2.b6 |  |
| ${ }^{86}$ |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{87}$ |  |  | CAch2.b8 |  |
| ${ }^{88}$ |  |  | ${ }^{\text {Cach }}$ |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAch3_b2 } \\ & \hline \text { CAch3 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 91 |  |  | Cach4_b2 |  |
| 92 |  |  | Cach4 |  |
| ${ }^{93}$ |  | . | OAch1 |  |
| 94 |  |  | OACh2 |  |
| 958 |  |  | OACh3 |  |
| 97 |  |  | Oach |  |
| 98 |  |  | OAch6 |  |
| 99 |  |  | OAch7 |  |
| ${ }^{201}$ |  |  | Ooch |  |
| 102 |  |  | Och 3 |  |
| ${ }^{103}$ |  |  | Och4 |  |
| ${ }^{205}$ |  |  | Och5 |  |
| 106 |  |  | Och7 |  |
| 107 |  |  | Och8 |  |

107 channels pulled from the p802.3ck repository.

As in the past, we analyzed two subsets:

- <29dB
- $<28 \mathrm{~dB}$


## Updated P802.3ck Critical Channels

| Contribution | Channel | \# | Name | IL (dB) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| heck 3ck 011118 | 20docabled_Eaekplane/Cable_ovn_20do_0p575m_more_isi | 14 Heck 20.0 |  |  |
|  | 16 dB Cabled Backplane/Cable_BKP_16dB_0p575m_more_isi | 2 | Heck2 | 15.2 |
| mellitz 3ck adhoc 02081518 |  | 53 | Mellitz1 | 26.3 |
| tracy 3ck 010119 | Traditional Backplane Channels/Std_BP_12inch_Meg7 | 21 | Tracy1 | 15.7 |
|  | Orthogonal Backplane Channels/DPO_IL_12dB |  | Tracy2 | 12.2 |
| (Modified to fix non-physical response) | Measured Orthogonal Backplane Channels/OAch4 |  | Kareti1 | 27.7 |
| kareti 3ck 01a 1118 |  | 103 Kareti2 28.1 |  |  |
|  | Measured Cabled Backplane Channels/CAch3_b2 | 89 | Kareti3 | 28.5 |
|  |  | 63 Kareti4 28.4 |  |  |
| (Replacement for Heck1) | Measured_Traditional Backplane_Channels/Bch2_b7p5_7 | 70 | Kareti5 | 28.9 |
|  | 28dB_Cabled_Backplane/Cable_BKP_28dB_Op575 | 13 | Heck3 | 29.0 |

Notes:

- Kareti1 channel model was modified to remove non-physical artifacts from the pulse response.
- Heck3 replaced Heck1 in final analysis.

Reference Receiver

## Analysis Cases - Round 1

| Case | Total \# Taps | \# <br> Fixed <br> Taps | Banks | \# Taps per <br> Bank | Span |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 24 | 24 | - | - | - |
| 2 | 28 | 28 | - | - | - |
| 3 | 40 | 40 | - | - | - |
| 4 | 20 | 12 | 2 | 4 | 40UI |
| 5 | 24 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 40UI |
| 6 | 24 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 80UI |
| 7 | 21 | 12 | 3 | 3 | 40UI |
| 8 | 23 | 12 | 4 | 3 | 40UI |
| 9 | 20 | 16 | 1 | 4 | 40UI |
| 10 | 24 | 16 | 2 | 4 | 40UI |
| 11 | 24 | 16 | 2 | 4 | 80UI |
| 12 | 28 | 24 | 1 | 4 | 40UI |
| 13 | 30 | 24 | 2 | 3 | 40UI |
| 14 | 32 | 24 | 2 | 4 | 80UI |

## Conditions:

- $\eta_{0}=0.82 \times 10^{-8} \mathrm{~V}^{2} / \mathrm{GHz}$
- $z_{p}=31 \mathrm{~mm}(\mathrm{Tx}), 29 \mathrm{~mm}(\mathrm{Rx})$
- COM version $=2.70^{*}$ w/ new termination model:
- $R_{d}=50$ ohms
- $C_{d}=120 \mathrm{fF}$
- $L_{s}=120 \mathrm{pH}$
- $C_{b}=30 \mathrm{fF}$
- $C_{p}=87 \mathrm{fF}$
- Channels with <29dB IL (93), <28dB IL (77)


## \% Passing Channels



## Critical Channels

|  | 18 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 27 | 30 | 30 | 40 | Total Taps |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 12 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 20 | 24 | 16 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 40 | \#Fixed Taps |
|  | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | \# Banks |
|  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 80 | 40 | - | 40 | 40 | 80 | 40 | 40 | Float Span (UI) |
| Heck2 | 5.747 | 5.8486 | 5.7807 | 5.7302 | 5.7302 | 5.7977 | 5.8827 | 5.8998 | 6.2494 | 5.9808 | 6.0119 | HH_CABP16 |
| Heck1 | 2.5802 | 2.6389 | 2.6389 | 2.6271 | 2.6271 | 2.6389 | 2.6743 | 2.6743 | 2.9871 | 2.6861 | 2.7454 | HH_CABP28 |
| Tracy2 | 4.1681 | 4.2273 | 4.2273 | 4.3349 | 4.2035 | 4.2035 | 4.2511 | 4.263 | 4.8299 | 4.263 | 4.2749 | NT_BP_12in_16 |
| Tracy1 | 4.0685 | 4.1102 | 4.0824 | 4.0408 | 4.0408 | 4.1242 | 4.1242 | 4.1382 | 4.2084 | 4.1522 | 4.1943 | NT_OR_12in_28 |
| Mellitz1 | 4.8825 | 4.8978 | 4.8978 | 4.913 | 4.913 | 4.913 | 4.913 | 4.9283 | 4.959 | 4.9437 | 5.0673 | RM_CABP28 |
| Kareti5 | 2.9504 | 3.0733 | 3.0733 | 3.1979 | 3.0733 | 3.0239 | 3.1229 | 3.1229 | 3.4526 | 3.1603 | 3.1853 | UK_28BCh2_b7p5_7 |
| Kareti3 | 4.0132 | 4.1242 | 4.1522 | 4.1522 | 4.1522 | 4.1662 | 4.1943 | 4.2084 | 4.6125 | 4.2225 | 4.265 | UK_28CAch3_b2 |
| Kareti1 | 3.0609 | 3.1353 | 3.1105 | 3.0485 | 2.9017 | 2.9017 | 3.1979 | 3.1229 | 3.5175 | 3.2104 | 3.3116 | UK_280Ach4 |
|  | * | ? | * | * | * | * | $\checkmark$ | $\times$ | $\checkmark \checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |


| Taps/Bank |  | 3 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Termination | $C_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 120 fF |
|  | $L_{\mathrm{s}}$ | 120 pH |
|  | $C_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 30 fF |
| Package <br> trace | Tx | 31 mm |
|  | Rx | 29 mm |
| $\eta_{0}$ | $0.82 \times 10^{-8} \mathrm{~V}^{2} / \mathrm{GHz}$ |  |



## Analysis Cases - Final Experiment

Objective: Finalize the reference DFE details (see the blue table)

- Want to minimize complexity (min \# of banks, min span)


## Metrics:

- \% passing channels \& mean COM for sub-29dB, sub-28dB
- COM results for critical channels


## Analysis Features:

- 24 taps total in each case

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { M } \\ & \text { ® } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{n}{c} \\ & \tilde{\omega} \\ & \# \\ & \# \end{aligned}$ |  | ¢ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 24 | 0 | - | - |
| 15 | 20 | 1 | 4 | 40 |
| 10 | 16 | 2 | 4 | 40 |
| 5 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 40 |
| 11 | 16 | 2 | 4 | 80 |

- $\eta_{0}=0.82 \times 10^{-8} \mathrm{~V}^{2} / \mathrm{GHz}$
- Termination model: $C_{\mathrm{d}}=120 \mathrm{ff}, L_{\mathrm{s}}=120 \mathrm{pH}, C_{\mathrm{b}}=30 \mathrm{fF}$


## Sub-29/28dB Channel Analysis



## Reference Rx Trends for Critical Channels

2 or 3 banks of 4 were needed to get all critical channels to meet 3dB COM.

$\rightarrow-\mathrm{H} 2$
$\rightarrow-\mathrm{H} 3$
$\rightarrow$ T2
$\rightarrow$ T1
$\rightarrow$ M1
$\rightarrow$ K5
$\rightarrow-K 3$
$\rightarrow-K 1$

Group recommendation:
12 fixed taps, 3 banks of 3 or 4 floating taps with 40UI span.

## Termination Analysis

## Proposed vs. Simple Termination Analysis

- Objective: Determine whether the proposed termination model gives different COM performance than a simple model with $C_{d}=90 f \mathrm{fF}$.
- Analysis:
- All sub-29dB channels \& sub-28dB channels
$-\eta_{0}=0.82 \times 10^{-8} \mathrm{~V}^{2} / \mathrm{GHz}$
- Reference Rx cases per the table

| $\begin{aligned} & \ddot{y} \\ & \text { ®i } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\ddot{y}}{\bar{N}} \\ & \text { \# } \\ & \# \end{aligned}$ |  | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 24 | 0 | - | - |
| 15 | 20 | 1 | 4 | 40 |
| 10 | 16 | 2 | 4 | 40 |
| 5 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 40 |
| 11 | 16 | 2 | 4 | 80 |



Proposed Termination \& Flex Package


## Proposed Termination v Simple 90fF Termination




- Bivariate Normal Ellipse $\mathrm{P}=0.950$
$\Delta$ Linear Fit


-Linear Fit
- Bivariate Normal Ellipse $\mathrm{P}=0.950$
$\triangle$ Linear Fit
COM $(\mathrm{p})=0.028082+0.9952797 *$ COM(s)

$\begin{array}{lrrrrr}\text { Variable } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Mean }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Std Dev Correlation }\end{array} & \text { Signif. Prob } & \text { Number } \\ \text { COM(s) } & 4.621344 & 1.288808 & 0.996083 & <.0001^{*} & 186\end{array}$

-Linear Fit
- Bivariate Normal Ellipse $\mathrm{P}=0.950$
$\Delta$ Linear Fit
$\operatorname{COM}(\mathrm{p})=0.0664946+0.9869931^{*}$ COM $(\mathrm{s})$

| $\Delta$ Summary of Fit |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| RSquare | 0.99144 |
| RSquare Adj | 0.991393 |
| Root Mean Square Error | 0.11836 |
| Mean of Response | 4.658029 |
| Observations (or Sum Wgts) | 186 | Lack Of Fit



COM results are strongly correlated between the two termination types.

## Proposed Termination v Simple 90fF Termination



## Termination Recommendation

Group recommendation: Adopt the proposed termination.

- The more complex reference Rx (e.g. DFE w/ floating taps) washes out the differences between the two termination models.
- With simpler equalizers (e.g. chip-to-module) the difference appears to be larger.
- For example, refer to http://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/adhoc/jun26 19/sun 3ck adhoc 0106 2619.pdf.

Rx Noise

## Rx Noise Sensitivity

Objective: Determine the impact of increasing $\eta_{0}$ on channel performance.

## Metrics:

- \% passing channels \& mean COM for sub-29dB,

| Case | $\eta_{0}\left(\mathrm{~V}^{2} / \mathrm{GHz}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| i | $0.82 \times 10^{-8}$ |
| ii | $0.92 \times 10^{-8}$ |
| iii | $1.02 \times 10^{-8}$ |
| iv | $1.12 \times 10^{-8}$ |
| v | $1.23 \times 10^{-8}$ | sub-28dB

- COM results for critical channels


## Analysis Features:

- 24 taps total in each case
- Termination model: $C_{\mathrm{d}}=120 \mathrm{fF}, L_{\mathrm{s}}=120 \mathrm{pH}, C_{\mathrm{b}}=30 \mathrm{fF}$

| ¢ |  |  |  | ¢ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 24 | 0 | - | - |
| 15 | 20 | 1 | 4 | 40 |
| 10 | 16 | 2 | 4 | 40 |
| 5 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 40 |
| 11 | 16 | 2 | 4 | 80 |

## Rx Noise Impactw/ sub-29/28dB Channels



Increasing $\eta_{0}$ by $50 \%$ reduces the \% passing channels by 6\%-8\%.


## Noise Sensitivity w/ sub-29/28dB Channels

COM impact is roughly 0.1 dB per $10^{-9}$ $\mathrm{V}^{2} / \mathrm{GHz}$ beyond the baseline value ( $8.2 \times 10^{-9} \mathrm{~V}^{2} / \mathrm{GHz}$ ).


Recommendation: Adopt the baseline value $\left(8.2 \times 10^{-9} \mathrm{~V}^{2} / \mathrm{GHz}\right)$ that we have been using.

## Rx Noise Impact on Critical Channels

- All sims used:
- Fixed: 12 taps
- Floating: 3 banks, 4 taps/bank
- Proposed termination model
- Flex package with 31mm Tx, 29mm Rx
- Results show that increasing $\eta_{0}$ beyond $0.82 \mathrm{e}-8 \mathrm{~V}^{2} / \mathrm{GHz}$ causes three of the channels to fail.


Group Recommendation:
Adopt the baseline value $\left(8.2 \times 10^{-9} \mathrm{~V}^{2} / \mathrm{GHz}\right)$ that we have been using.

## Objectives \& Recommendations

## Provide analysis \& recommendations for

- Reference receiver (\# taps, \# banks, span)
$\Rightarrow$ Group recommendation: 12 fixed taps, 3 banks of 3 or 4 floating taps with 40UI span
- Termination model
$\Rightarrow$ Group recommendation: Adopt the termination model described in http://www.ieee802.org/3/ck/public/adhoc/jun12_19/healey_3ck_adhoc_01_061219.pdf.
- Rx noise figure ( $\eta_{0}$ )
$\Rightarrow$ Group recommendation: Adopt the baseline value $\left(8.2 \times 10^{-9}\right.$ $\mathrm{V}^{2} / \mathrm{GHz}$ ) that we have been using.

Additional Data

## Channel Insertion Loss Statistics



| IL (dB) | \# Channels | Cum \% |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28.0 | 68 | $63.6 \%$ |
| 28.1 | 74 | $69.2 \%$ |
| 28.2 | 77 | $72.0 \%$ |
| 28.3 | 80 | $74.8 \%$ |
| 28.5 | 82 | $76.6 \%$ |
| 29.0 | 86 | $80.4 \%$ |
| 30.0 | 93 | $86.9 \%$ |
| 31.0 | 97 | $90.7 \%$ |
| 32.0 | 99 | $92.5 \%$ |
| 33.0 | 103 | $96.3 \%$ |
| 34.0 | 105 | $98.1 \%$ |
| 35.0 | 105 | $98.1 \%$ |
| 36.0 | 106 | $99.1 \%$ |
| 37.0 | 106 | $99.1 \%$ |
| 38.0 | 107 | $100.0 \%$ |

All of the .ck 'highlighted' channels fit within 29dB.

## Analysis: \% Passing Channels



## Proposed Termination v Simple 90fF Termination

## $\triangle$ Linear Fit

$\operatorname{COM}(\mathrm{p})=0.0553345+0.9898595^{*} \mathrm{COM}(\mathrm{s})$
$\triangle$ Summary of Fit

## RSquare

RSquare Adj
Root Mean Square Error Mean of Response
0.990546
0.990536
0.124593
4.67717

930
Observations (or Sum Wgts)

## $\triangleright$ Lack Of Fit

$\triangle$ Analysis of Variance

| Source | DF | Sum of <br> Squares | Mean Square | F Ratio |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Model | 1 | 1509.3561 | 1509.36 | 97231.65 |
| Error | 928 | 14.4056 | 0.015523 | Prob $>$ F |
| C. Total | 929 | 1523.7617 |  | $<.0001^{*}$ |

## $\triangle$ Parameter Estimates

Term Estimate Std Error t Ratio Prob> $|\mathbf{t}|$
Intercept $0.05533450 .0153753 .600 .0003^{*}$ COM(s) 0.98985950 .003174 311.82<.0001*

## $\Delta$ Bivariate Normal Ellipse $\mathbf{P}=\mathbf{0 . 9 5 0}$

Variable Mean Std Dev Correlation Signif. Prob Number COM(s) $4.6691831 .2876990 .995262<.0001^{*} 930$ COM(p) $4.67717 \quad 1.28071$

- Bivariate Fit of COM(p) By COM(s)

$\eta_{0}=0.82 \mathrm{e}-8$
Rx Cases:

| $\begin{aligned} & \ddot{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{n}{c} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\omega} \\ & \# \\ & \# \end{aligned}$ |  | ¢ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 24 | 0 | - | - |
| 15 | 20 | 1 | 4 | 40 |
| 10 | 16 | 2 | 4 | 40 |
| 5 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 40 |
| 11 | 16 | 2 | 4 | 80 |

$\operatorname{COM}(\mathrm{p})=$ proposed term with $C_{\mathrm{d}}=120 \mathrm{fF}, C_{b}=30 \mathrm{fF}, L_{\mathrm{s}}=120 \mathrm{pH}$ $\operatorname{COM}(\mathrm{s})=$ simple term with $C_{\mathrm{d}}=90 \mathrm{fF}$

COM results are strongly correlated between the two termination types.

