SAS-2 Interconnect Signal-to-Noise Ratio Study (07-484r2)

Barry Olawsky

Hewlett Packard

(1/15/2008)

Issue

- While SAS-I and SAS-II specify crosstalk limits on some connector interfaces no guidance is provided for other components or to those involved in system integration
- Crosstalk limit lines are also problematic. Short cables tend to have higher levels of crosstalk but can deliver most of the signal to the load. Long cables deliver only a small portion of the signal to the load but may have low crosstalk levels.
- Is an “insertion loss to crosstalk ratio” specification a more appropriate way to control crosstalk?

Measurements

- A sampling of cables lengths from 0.5 to 10 meters is first characterized for crosstalk and insertion loss.
- The data is then processed to estimate the insertion loss to crosstalk ratio from 100MHz to 6GHz

Typical Insertion Loss



Cable NEXT (Smoothed by using peak value in sliding window)



Estimated Insertion Loss to NEXT ratio



The crosstalk curves used to derive this estimate may include a resonance response. Frequencies where the resonances cancel out will still be problematic for digital signaling

Conclusions

- Using this type of approach for noise will not penalize short interconnect.
- Also, an SNR type of specification will encourage those developing lossy interconnects (10m cable or more) to focus on minimizing crosstalk.

Further Investigation

- Feedback from the rev 0 presentation indicated that further investigation into system noise levels would yield valuable information

Noise Sources

- Additional product surveys indicate that the dominant noise sources continue to be crosstalk in the connector interfaces, component footprints and in some cases integrated circuit layout
- Poor printed circuit board layout in other regions can also induce crosstalk but layout modifications can eliminate the problem. This problem is frequently observed as a common mode signal present on the differential signaling.

Signal to Noise Ratio

- After further analysis it is apparent that an SNR based specification is inadvisable at this time for the following reasons
  1) Such an approach would greatly complicate receiver margin testing. It is likely that tolerable SNR varies with receiver signal strength.
  2) Quantitative data to support such a proposal does not exist.
- Future consideration should not be ruled out given the motivation to solve the above to problems exists.

Form of Specification

- Limit line specifications appear to be a reasonable approximation for multi-aggressor crosstalk. The exception is at low frequencies (below ~500MHz).



Crosstalk Level

- Data supports a -26dB (5% through 3GHz) total crosstalk estimate.

Crosstalk Level

- Value to be used in stressed eye testing needs to be carefully selected. Calibration of crosstalk test setup needs to replicate real levels. Selection of RMS limit must consider broadband crosstalk specification.

Crosstalk Level

- Assuming a flat crosstalk transfer profile of -26dB what is the RMS signal level of a PRBS7 at the victim?
- A simulation with edge rates (20/80) ranging from slow (0.4UI) to fast (0.2UI) yields a range of 26.5mV to 28.4mV

Recommendations

- Recommend using existing -26dB NEXT value for the crosstalk budget. Additional margin may be desirable.
- Slide 16 in r1 illustrating table 56 markup was deleted in r2.

Recommended Changes

- Crosstalk specification applies at compliance points only. Edit 07-471r3 table 51 note b to add the following comment.
  - This also applies to any combination of internal cables and backplanes that are used to form a TxRx connection


invent