



PCI Express® 2.0 Cards and Slots

Dan Froelich
Intel Corporation



* Third party marks and brands are the property of their respective owners.

Work In Progress

NOTE: The information in this presentation refers to the .5 PCI Express 2.0 Card Electromechanical (CEM) specification still in the development process. This presentation reflects the current thinking of the workgroup, but all material is subject to change before the specification is released.

Agenda

- **Areas of Change For 1.1 CEM Specification**
- **Form Factor vs Base Specification**
- **Deriving CEM Eye Diagrams From Base Spec**
- **Specific CEM Test Cases**
 - ✓ Motherboard TX, Clock, RX
 - ✓ Add In Card TX, RX
- **300 Watt Graphics**
- **Areas For Further Study**
- **Summary**

PCIe 1.x to PCIe 2.0 CEM Changes

PCIe 1.1 CEM Spec Section	Areas Of Change
Auxiliary Signals	Reference Clock (Jitter)
Hot Insertion And Removal	None
Electrical Requirements	Electrical Budgets Eye Diagrams
Connector Specification	Signal Integrity Requirements and Test Procedures
Add-in Card Form Factors And Implementation	Card Interoperability


No Required Mechanical* Changes From 1.1 CEM Spec

***Connector Retention Ridge Optional**

PCI Express 2.0 Base Spec


- Base spec guarantees interop for components
 - ✓ Transmitter, Receiver, Refclk, Channel
- All parameters referenced to pin location
 - ✓ Only location with guaranteed accessibility
- Each component is characterized in isolation
 - ✓ Tx: Test coupon with “Ideal” refclk
 - ✓ Rx: Calibration channel and pattern generator
 - ✓ Refclk: Test channel into capacitive load
 - ✓ Channel: s-parameter model convolved with W/C Tx behavioral model
- Methodology evolved to specify individual PCIe components without dependencies

Base Spec - TX



Base TX Spec Is A Chip Spec At Chip Pins

CEM Spec – TX Path




**CEM Spec Defines TX Requirements for Chip + Interconnect
No Separate TX Chip Or Interconnect Only Requirements.**

Agenda

- Areas of Change For 1.1 CEM Specification
- Form Factor vs Base Specification
- **Deriving CEM Eye Diagrams From Base Spec**
- Specific CEM Test Cases
 - ✓ Motherboard TX, Clock, RX
 - ✓ Add In Card TX, RX
- 300 Watt Graphics
- Areas For Further Study
- Summary

CEM Budgets and Topologies

1.1 CEM @ 10⁻¹²




Relative budget percentages unchanged between 2.5 and 5.0 GT/s. Overall budget half the size.

■ TX
■ Clock
■ Channel
■ RX

$$T_J = \sum D_J + \sqrt{\sum R_J^2} \leq 400 \text{ ps}$$

2.0 CEM @ 10⁻¹²





$$T_J = \sum D_J + \sqrt{\sum R_J^2} \leq 200 \text{ ps}$$

	2.5G – One Connector	2.5G – Two Connector	5G – One connector	5G – Two Connector
Channel Impedance	100Ω	100Ω	85Ω proposed	85Ω proposed
Trace Type	Microstrip	Microstrip	Microstrip	Stripline
MB Length	12"+	16"+	N/A – 100Ω 6-8" – 85Ω	N/A – 100Ω 16" – 85Ω


Deriving CEM Eye Diagrams From Base Spec - System Board TX Eye Methodology

- Select system board topologies



Deriving CEM Eye Diagrams From Base Spec - System Board TX Eye Methodology

- Select add-in card topologies



062

4 Layer

Worst Case AIC

Simulation Parameters


- Motherboard channel parameters and variations
 - 85 Ohm +/- 22% (Desktop)
 - Trace Length (Desktop)
 - 3-6", 6-10", ~.5" Breakout
 - Microstrip
 - 5-7-5-15 85 Ohms, 4-8-4-15 100 Ohms, 4-4-4-8 Breakout
 - Lab Measured Connector Model

- Vary Add-in Card parameters (Reasonable range)
 - 85 Ohm +/- 17.5%
 - Microstrip
 - 5-7-5-15 85 Ohms, 4-8-4-15 100 Ohms, 4-4-4-8 Breakout (~.5")
 - Spec Load (50 Ohm terminations).


- Behavioral Tx model parameters and variations (Per Base Specification)
 - 800 mV Min Swing into 50 Ohm terminations
 - Deemphasis 3 – 6.5 dB
 - No Jitter Derating
 - Spec Package Model
 - 1pf, 80-120 ohms

System Board TX Eye Methodology

- Simulate end to end eye diagrams



- Identify all end to end failures (worst case pattern)
 - 120 mVolt Eye Height (Base Spec Rx Pin Limit)
 - 142 ps Eye Width (Interconnect only) (Base Spec Channel Limit)




Why Worst Case Patterns?

- PCI Express Scrambler Resets Frequently
- Worst Case Patterns Can Occur Frequently
- Worst Case Pattern Must Be Accounted For To Guarantee E-12 BER
 - ✓ Differences From Pseudo Random or CMM Patterns Can Be Very Large (~ 30 ps eye width)
- Peak Distortion Analysis
 - ✓ Deterministically Calculates Worst Case Patterns Given
 - Channel S Parameters
 - Pulse Response
 - ✓ Used For Simulation Data In This Presentation

System Board TX Eye Methodology


- Simulate end to connector eye diagrams




- Use CMM pattern as with real world test
- Correlate with end to end worst case pattern failures

Results – 3-6” 6 dB, 85 Ohms

End to End Eye Width
90 % Cases Pass



Connector CMM Eye Width
15% Cases Pass





Identify eye diagram at the connector that catches all end to end failures.

6 dB CEM eye eliminates most solution space for client topology.

Results – 3-6” 3.5 dB, 85 Ohms

End to End Eye Width
99 % Cases Pass

Connector CMM Eye Width
71 % Cases Pass




3.5 DB CEM eye catches all end to end failures and allows reasonable solution space for simple client motherboard topology.

Results – 6-10” 6 dB 85 Ohm Impedance

End to End Eye Width

99 % Cases Pass

❏ E2E WC Eye_W



Pass




142 ps

Fail

Connector CMM Eye Width

83% Cases Pass

❏ Midbus CMM EW



Fail

Pass





159 ps

CEM eye catches all failures and still allows reasonable solution space.

Results – 6-10” 6 dB 100 Ohm Impedance


End to End Eye Width

Connector CMM Eye Width
~ 0% Passing Cases



CEM Eye required to catch all end to end failures eliminates almost all solution space if nominal trace impedance is 100 Ohms

MB TX Eye Proposal




Eye methodology works and allows 6-10" motherboard high volume solution space with 85 ohm impedance target.

CEM Add-in Card TX Eye Methodology

- Select Add-in card topologies
 - ✓ Vary parameters slightly outside of reasonable ranges
- Select system board topologies
 - ✓ Vary parameters only through reasonable ranges
- Simulate end to end worst case eye diagrams
Simulate end to edge finger worst case eye diagrams
- Identify all end to end failures
- Identify eye diagram at edge finger that fails all cases that fail end to end

AIC TX Eye Proposal




Eye methodology works and allows ~4" add-in card high volume solution space with 85 ohm impedance target.

Agenda

- Areas of Change For 1.1 CEM Specification
- Form Factor vs Base Specification
- Deriving CEM Eye Diagrams From Base Spec
- **Specific CEM Test Cases**
 - ✓ **Motherboard TX, Clock, RX**
 - ✓ **Add In Card TX, RX**
- 300 Watt Graphics
- Areas For Further Study
- Summary

Testing Transmitter on MB

Compliance
pattern



Motherboard under test

Test Fixture

Fixture
Data Channel

Fixture
Clk Channel

V_{RX-EYE} ,
 T_{RX-EYE} ,
 $T_{RX-MIN-PULSE}$,
 $V_{RX-MIN-MAX-RATIO}$

2x 50Ω
load

2 pf
load

- Data and Refclk Output Tested At Connector
- Refclk margins same as those defined in base spec
- How do you test transmitter jitter on a motherboard with a real clock?
 - ✓ Ref clock jitter appears on transmitter up to transmitter PLL bandwidth


MB TX Jitter Test Options

- Single Port Measurement
 - ✓ Use Different Jitter Transfer Function

- Dual Port Measurement
 - ✓ Worst Case Receiver View Of System

Defining Alternate Transfer Function

- Lexmark* SSC is “worst” case clock impact.
- Generate TX waveform with Lexmark*.
- Test different jitter filters
 - ✓ Find filter that counts $< \sim 5\%$ of budget for Lexmark*.
 - ✓ PCIe 5.0GT/sec
 - 10% is 5 ps.
 - 5% is 2.5 ps



Dual Port Approach

- Sample TX and Clock Simultaneously at MB Connector
- Low Pass Filter Clock with PLL Limits
 - ✓ 5 MHz 1 dB Peaking
 - ✓ 8 MHz 3 dB Peaking
 - ✓ 16 MHz 3 dB Peaking
- Add Transport Delay. Max ~ 3ns for Add-in Card.
- Use Filtered Clock To Calculate TX Jitter With Each Filtered Clock Record
- Apply 1.5 MHz High Pass Step Function
- Select Largest TX+Interconnect+Clock Jitter Val

Single Port vs Dual Port Comparison

■ Single Port

✓ Pros

- Single Port Measurement. Easily supported by many existing tools.

✓ Cons

- Intrinsic TX Low Frequency Jitter Undercounted

■ Dual Port


✓ Pros

- Intrinsic TX Low Frequency Jitter Counted
- Potential For System Margin Gain
 - Real System PLL Factored Into Measurement
 - Real System Delay Factored Into Measurement

✓ Cons

- Dual Port Measurement Enabling Effort
- Simultaneous Probing Solutions Needed
- Supporting Multiple Receiver Architectures

Testing Transmitter on an Adapter



- Test topology similar to that defined in base spec
- Test adapter furnishes a “clean” Refclk
 - Same post processing as used for base spec

Receiver Test Issues

- System Board Reference Clock
 - ✓ Don't have a clean clock for system board test.
- Accounting For Impedance Mismatch
 - ✓ PCIe 1.x CEM Spec used estimated guardband
 - ✓ Simulation work required for more precise solution
- Receiver Test Channel (Base Spec)
 - ✓ How is channel split for add-in card and system board receiver path testing?
 - ✓ Accounting For De-emphasis

Agenda

- Areas of Change For 1.1 CEM Specification
- Form Factor vs Base Specification
- Deriving CEM Eye Diagrams From Base Spec
- Specific CEM Test Cases
 - ✓ Motherboard TX, Clock, RX
 - ✓ Add In Card TX, RX
- **300 Watt Graphics**
- **Areas For Further Study**
- **Summary**

300 Watt Graphics Specification

- 0.3 Spec Completed By CEM Workgroup
- 1.0 Spec release targeted for early 2007
- Spec plans
 - ✓ Support optional 225 W and 300 W graphics requirements for add-in cards and systems
 - ✓ Standardize new power delivery connector and new power sequencing scheme
 - ✓ Define interoperability between 225W/300W graphics components [225W and 300W cards have new interface boundary conditions that may require improvement to existing chassis form factor and power delivery systems.]
 - PCI-SIG investigating ATX form factor
 - No intention to preclude BTX form factor

Card/Slot Interop - New Interoperability Requirements

Connector Card	x1	X4	X8	x16
x1	Required	Required	Required	Required
x4	No	Required	Required	Required
x8	No	No	Required	Required
x16	No	No	No	Required

Table 6-2: Card Interoperability

All PCI Express Add-in Cards must be able to negotiate and operate in all smaller link widths from the full link width down to x1. **x2 and x12 link widths are optional.**

The upstream PCI Express components on a system board must be able to negotiate and operate in all smaller link widths from the full link width down to x1. **x2 and x12 link widths are optional.**

New For CEM 2.0

Areas For Further Study

- De-embedding Test Fixtures
 - ✓ Need to specify a method in the CEM spec?
 - Base spec specifically leaves the method open
- Reference Clock
 - ✓ Is DJ Term Needed At Connector?
- De-emphasis Selection
- Receiver Path Test Methodology

Summary

- Method for deriving CEM Eye Diagrams from Base Spec in place
- Eye diagram methodology demonstrated to be effective and robust
- High volume solution space challenging at 5.0 GT/s
 - ✓ 85 Nominal Channel Impedance Provides Some Solution Space
 - ✓ Other Options Under Investigation.
- Measurement techniques for characterizing motherboard and adapter Tx and Rx defined
- System board reference clock presents measurement challenges
 - ✓ Alternate jitter transfer function for system board TX test
 - ✓ Dual port system measurements
- Stay tuned for further specification updates from PCI-SIG (www.pcisig.com)
 - ✓ Revision 0.5 of 2.0 CEM spec available for member review
 - ✓ Revision 0.3 of 300 Watt Graphic specification available for member review

For more information please go to
www.pcisig.com



PCI Express® 2.0 Cards and Slots

Dan Froelich
Intel Corporation



* Third party marks and brands are the property of their respective owners.