



PCB Design Magazine, Oct. 2014, p. 12-23

How to validate interconnect analysis software for 28 Gbps data links

Yuriy Shlepnev, Simberian Inc. In collaboration with Wild River Technology LLC DesignCon IBIS Summit, Santa Clara, January 30, 2015

© 2015 Simberian Inc.

Outline

- Introduction
- Validation process overview
- Example of analysis to measurement validation
 - Measured S-parameters pre-qualification
 - Geometry adjustments
 - Material models identification
 - Comparing analysis to measurements
- Conclusion



Introduction

- Design of PCB and packaging interconnects for data links running at bitrates 28-32 Gbps and beyond is a challenging problem:
 - It requires electromagnetic analysis over extremely broad frequency bandwidth from DC to 40-50 GHz
 - No frequency-continuous dielectric models available from manufactures
 - No conductor roughness models available from manufacturers
 - Boards are not manufactured as designed large variations and manipulations by manufacturers
 - Making accurate measurements over this bandwidth is very difficult
- Is it possible to design interconnects and have acceptable analysis to measurement correlation from DC up to 40-50 GHz systematically?



Analysis correlates with measurements if...

I/O Buffer Model

- 1) Quality of S-parameter models is ensured
- Simulation of all elements in isolation is possible or coupling is properly accounted



- Broadband material models are identified or confirmed
- 4) Models are validated with measurements

4 elements of design success – see App Notes #2013_03 and #2013_05 at http://www.simberian.com/AppNotes.php



Analysis to measurement validation process for 28-32 Gbps interconnects

- Design and manufacture a board with a set of typical or useful interconnect links
- □ Measure S-parameters up to 40-50 GHz
- Load board design into EDA tool, and compute S-parameters of the links
- Compare S-parameters magnitudes and phases
- Optionally compare TDR/TDT and eye diagrams
- □ As simple as that...☺



Validation platforms simplify the process!

- Channel modeling platform was developed by Wild River Technology to promote systematic approach to interconnect analysis to measurement validation up to 40/50 GHz or up to 28/32 Gbps
 - Contains 27 micro-strip and strip-line interconnect structures equipped with 2.92 mm or 2.4 mm connectors and can be used to validate signal integrity simulations, models, and measurement technique
- Electromagnetic signal integrity software from Simberian is used here to illustrate all elements of the analysis to measurement validation



Complete description of the platform with all validation results are available here.



Example of analysis to measurement validation

- 1. Use VNA to measure S-parameters and validate quality of the measurements
- 2. Get board geometry adjustments (stackup and trace widths) from manufacturer (if any) and use consistently in the material identification and the analysis (use cross-sectioning if no data provided)
- 3. Identify broad-band dielectric and conductor roughness models with Generalized Modal S-parameters (GMS-parameters)
- Simulate all structures with the identified or validated material models and confirmed adjustments consistently and compare with the measurements (no further manipulations with data)

4 steps with live demo are covered in webinar #4 at http://www.simberian.com/Webinars.php



Step 1: Ensure S-parameters quality

 Accuracy of discrete S-parameters approximation with frequency-continuous macro-model, passive from DC to infinity

$$RMSE = \max_{i,j} \left[\sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left| S_{ij}(n) - S_{ij}(\omega_n) \right|^2} \right]$$

original tabulated data
$$S_{i,j}(i\omega) = \left[d_{ij} + \sum_{n=1}^{N_{ij}} \left(\frac{r_{ij,n}}{i\omega - p_{ij,n}} + \frac{r_{ij,n}^*}{i\omega - p_{ij,n}^*} \right) \right] \cdot e^{-s \cdot T_{ij}}$$

Can be used to estimate quality of the original data

$$Q = 100 \cdot \max(1 - RMSE, 0)\%$$

Model Icon/Quality	Quality Metric	RMSE
🥝 - good	[99, 100]	[0, 0.01]
- acceptable	[90, 99)	(0.01, 0.1]
? - inconclusive	[50, 90)	(0.1, 0.5]
🤤 - bad	[0, 50)	> 0.5
I - uncertain	[0,100], not passive or not reciprocal	

Rational model can be used for FD and TD analysis instead of the original data

Introduced at IBIS forum in 2010

Quality estimation theory is covered in webinar #1 at http://www.simberian.com/Webinars.php



Example of S-parameter quality estimation with rational compact model (RCM)

S-parameters are measured by expert; Models include connectors and adapters; RCM are built with options: "Extrapolate to infinity" and "Extract Delay" and "Auto-adjust" are OFF)

Touchstone Analyzer										
te 🔲 S 🔎	1									
File name	Touchstone Analyzer									
C:\Repositc	E 🔲 C 🔍									
Cmp28_m	File name	Quality	Passivity	Reciprocity	Causality	^				
Cmp28_m	C:\Repository\Simbeor\CMP-28_Simbeor_Kit	_Rev4\CMP-3	28_Rev4\T	ouchstone_F	iles\1stc					
Cmp28_m	<pre>Cmp28_gnd_voids_p1J74_p2J75.s2p</pre>	99.5	100	99.4	-					
Cmp28_m	Cmp28_graduated_coplanar_p1J70_p2J69.s2p	99.7	100	99.5	-					
Cmp28_m	Cmp28_mstrp_2in_p1J1_p2J2.s2p	99.5	100	99.7	-					
Cmp28_m	Cmp28_mstrp_8inch_p1J4_p2J3.s2p	99.7	100	99.8	-		ALL			
Cmp28_m	cmp28_mstrp_Beatty_25ohm_p1J25_p2J26.s2p	99.6	100	99.4	-					
Cmp28_m	Cmp28_mstrp_multiZ_p1J31_p2J32.s2p	99.6	100	99.3	-					
Cmp28_m	@cmp28_mstrp_p1J30_p2J29.s2p	99.6	100	99.8	-					
Cmp28_m	Cmp28_mstrp_resonator_p1J22_p2J22.s2p	99.7	100	99.7	-					
Cmp28_m	Cmp28_mstrp_whiskers_p1J68_p2J67.s2p	99.5	100	99.8	-					
Cmp28_str	Cmp28_strpl_2in_50ohm_p1J6_p2J5.s2p	99.6	100	99.1	-					
Cmp28_str	Cmp28_strpl_2in_Capacitive_p1J10_p2J09.s2p	99.5	100	99.5	-					
C:\Repositc	Cmp28_strpl_2in_Inductive_p1J12_p2J11.s2p	99.5	100	99.4	-					
Cal_Thru_	Cmp28_strpl_8inch_p1J7_p2J8.s2p	99.6	100	99.7	-					
Cal_Thru_	Cmp28_strpl_Beatty_25ohm_p1J28_p2J27.s2p	99.7	100	99.4	-					
Cal_Thru_	Cmp28_strpl_resonator_p1J23_p2J24.s2p	99.6	100	99.4	-					
Cmp28_m	Cmp28_via_pathology_p1J65_p2J66.s2p	99.6	100	99.8	-	~				
Cmp28_m	<				>					
Cmp28_ms	up_via_inducuve_p1010_p2010.52p	100 0.	7.0		Soo ha	M/ +	l o do it in dor			
Cmp28_strpl_via_backdrilled_p1J14_p2J13.s2p 97.7 100 99.4 -					2011 0	vv li D				
Cmp28_strp	pl_via_capacitive_p1J18_p2J17.s2p 93.4	100 99	9.7	-	2011_0	z a	t http://www.			
Ci.	mborian			_		0	a 2015 Simbor			

ectromagnetic Solutions

ALL PASSED!

See how to do it in demo-videos #2011_01 and 0011_02 at http://www.simberian.com/ScreenCasts.php

Step 2: Board geometry adjustments

- Stackup is adjusted from data provided by manufacturer
- Width adjustments before analysis to match the impedance observed on TDR:
 - Micro-strip single-ended line widths are adjusted from 14.5 to 13.5 mil
 - Strip line single-ended widths are adjusted from 11.0 to 10.5 mil
 - All other widths and dimensions are exactly as in the board design (may need consistent adjustments as follows from the validation)
- Cross-sectioning may be needed to investigate all adjustments



Step 3: Identify material models with Generalized Modal S-parameters (GMS-parameters)



See App Notes #2014_02 and 2014_03 for details on identification with GMS-parameters at http://www.simberian.com/AppNotes.php and webinar #2 at http://www.simberian.com/Webinars.php



Step 3: Dielectric and conductor roughness model identification with strip line





GM - Generalized Modal (reflection-less);

About 35 GHz useful bandwidth from the measured data due to mechanical differences;

Models are usable up to 50 GHz!

GMS parameters computed from S-parameters measured for 2 and 8 inch strip line segments (red and blue lines) and modeled for 6 inch strip line segment (brown and green lines):

FR408HR model: Wideband Debye, Dk=3.815 (3.66), LT=0.0117 @ 1 GHz; Conductor roughness model: Modified Hammerstad, SR=0.4 um, RF=2;



Step 3: Dielectric and conductor roughness model identification with micro-strip line



GMS parameters computed from S-parameters measured for 2 and 8 inch micro-strip line segments (red and blue lines) and modeled for 6 inch micro-strip line segment (brown and green lines): FR408HR model: Wideband Debye, Dk=3.815 (3.66), LT=0.0117 @ 1 GHz (same as for strip); Taiyo solder mask model: Wideband Debye, Dk=3.85 (3.9), LT=0.02 @ 1 GHz; Conductor roughness model: Modified Hammerstad, SR=0.4 um, RF=3.5;



Step 4: Simulate all 27 structures and compare with the measurements

- Compute and compare S-parameters for all structures (complete adapter-to-adapter links or use de-embedding)
 - Compare simulated and measured magnitudes and phase/group delays in terminal and mixed-mode space up to 50 GHz
- Compute TDR from simulated and measured S-parameters and compare for all structures
 - Use rational compact models and Gaussian step with 20 ps 10-90% rise time
- Compute eye diagrams for 28 Gbps PRBS signals from simulated and measured S-parameters and compare for selected structures

Basics of the de-compositional analysis covered in webinar #3 at http://www.simberian.com/Webinars.php



1) 2-inch microstrip line segment: De-compositional analysis





1) 2-inch microstrip line segment: Magnitude of S-parameters



MS Launch looses the localization at about 30 GHz: Distance from signal via to stitching vias is about quarter of wavelength at 30 GHz – we cannot expect correlation above that frequency! Though, the impedance of the return path remains low due to plenty of stitching vias.





1) 2-inch microstrip line segment: Transmission phase and group delay





1) 2-inch microstrip line segment: TDR with 20 ps Gaussian step



Variations of impedance along the traces visible here indicates that either trace width is varying or dielectric is inhomogeneous (or both); This is not accounted for in the model and partially explains differences in the reflection.



2-inch microstrip line segment: Gbps PRBS, 25 ps rise/fall time



Eyes are on top of each other!



2) 8-inch microstrip line segment







A:Measured.cmp28_mstrp_8inch_p1J4_p2J3.EYE; B:MS_SE_8in_J4_J3.MS_SE_8in_J4_J3.EYE; V_IVI





12) Microstrip line with two capacitive vias

A:Measured.cmp28_via_pathology_p1J65_p2J66.MFP; B:MS_SE_Via_Pathology_J65_J66.MS_SE_Via_Pathology_J65_J66.Simulation(1);



Both narrow and wider sections widths are reduced by 1mil





A:S[2,1] *--



0.03

A:V[1,2]; -----

0.04

B:V[1,2];

0.05



0.07

TimeInterval, [ns]

0.06

B:S[1,2] 0---;

14) 6-inch microstrip differential line





16) Microstrip differential line with vias



DM – Differential Mode CM – Common Mode

Discrepancies in geometry of the transitions from SE to DF





19) 8-inch single-ended strip line





Launch model is the worst case; Localization problem;





26) 6-inch strip differential line





Conclusion

- Systematic process of the interconnect analysis-to-measurement validation up to 50 GHz is introduced – such process should be standardized
- Readily available validation platforms represent a critical SI tool for the manufacturing, measurement and software benchmarking
- The process is illustrated with channel modeling platform from Wild River Technology and electromagnetic signal integrity software from Simberian
- Following the process one can qualify or reveal problems in any signal integrity software and compare accuracy, productivity and cost...
- Contacts and further resources:
 - Simberian web site and contacts: www.simberian.com
 - Wild River Technology web site and contacts: www.wildrivertech.com

