

Attendance:

Mr. Paul von Stamwitz	AMCC
Mr. Mickey Felton	EMC
Mr. Douglas Wagner	FCI
Mr. Rob Elliott	Hewlett Packard Co.
Mr. James Rockrohr	IBM Corp.
Mr. Harvey Newman	Infineon Technologies
Mr. Michael Jenkins	LSI Corp.
Mr. Andy Chen	Marvell Semiconductor, Inc
Mr. Kevin Witt	Maxim Semiconductor
Mr. Mahbul Bari	Maxim Semiconductor
Mr. Hock Seow	NEC Electronics America, Inc
Mr. Guillaume Fortin	PMC-Sierra
Mr. Yuming Tao	PMC-Sierra
Mr. Tim Symons	PMC-Sierra
Mr. Joseph Chen	Samsung
Mr. Alvin Cox	Seagate Technology
Mr. Allen Kramer	Seagate Technology
Mr. Daniel Smith	Seagate Technology
Mr. Bruce Johnson	Seagate Technology
Mr. Benoit Mercier	STMicroelectronics
Mr. Bent Hessen-Schmidt	Synthesys Research, Inc.
Mr. Larry McMillan	WDC
Mr. Ramya Dissanayake	WDC

23 in attendance

Agenda:

1. Letter ballot comment resolution:

- a. Reference transmitter
- b. Receiver physical testing

Reviewed updates posted by Alvin:

SAS-2 letter ballot comment updates for transmitter and receiver tables

<http://www.t10.org/ftp/t10/document.08/08-202r0.pdf>

Good discussion on the changes.

The maximum rise time will not be added to the specification for the following reason:

The specification for rise time uses a 1010 pattern for the measurement. Maximum times in excess of 0.41 UI only result in a reduction of the measured amplitude (eye opening) with the high transition pattern used for the measurement.

For Tables 65 and 72, the BUJ definition needs to be moved to the definition section. We discussed the aspect of whether DCD should be included in BUJ. Since MJSQ states that DCD is not included in BUJ and since DCD is actually correlated, the definition will be used as currently written (with possible editorial changes).

Table 72 probably needs an additional column to define the point at which the values apply.

There is text preceding the table that states the values apply to point A in Figure 131, however, the last 5 apply at a different point (IR/CR). Rob and Alvin will work the editorial issue.

The note a reference to WDP is considered a placeholder for now. It is hoped that StatEye will prove itself capable of providing the link dispersion penalty. If not, then clarification of what is being defined will be required.

Kevin needs to update figure xxx to clarify the meaning of the measurement, what 1 and 0 are making reference to, and show a histogram (possibly similar to the figure for transmitter equalization measurement).

The question was raised about including SSC in the stressed receiver testing. There may be issues in implementing this with available equipment. In addition, the specification does require SAS-2 compliant receiver devices to be capable of receiving signals with different levels of SSC, depending on the application. If the tracking function is built into the device and the maximum jitter is applied during the stress testing, does SSC really need to be included in the stress test?

c. Section 5.2.6 (Tables 50 and 51)

Barry has information to be posted regarding the numbers in the table not being achieved by cables and backplanes.

The nominals of table 50 are in line with the methodology.

References to figures in table 51 need to be reviewed.

Mickey had left the call so we did not discuss his proposal.

d. SSC slope

Guillaume reviewed his comments regarding the df/dt requirement and the group felt that it should not be normative since other aspects of the specification cover the issue from a receiver standpoint.

Alvin asked that everyone review the material and we will decide on the next call whether to completely remove the df/dt from the specification or keep it as informative information.

2. New items.

None

Next conference call: May 1, 2008

Toll Free Dial In Number: (877)810-9442

International Access/Caller Paid Dial In Number: (636)651-3190

PARTICIPANT CODE: 3243413

Webex information:

<https://seagate.webex.com/seagate>

Topic: SAS-2 PHY WG

Date: Thursday

Time: 10:00 am, Central Daylight Time (GMT -05:00, Chicago)

Meeting number: 826 515 680

Meeting password: 6gbpsSAS