

*INCITS Technical Report
for Information Technology –
Fibre Channel –
Methodologies for Signal Quality
Specification - 2
(FC-MSQS-2)*

INCITS TR-50-2014

Developed by



Where IT all begins

This is a preview of "INCITS/TR-50-2014 (R...)". [Click here to purchase the full version from the ANSI store.](#)

INCITS TR-50-2014

INCITS Technical Report
for Information Technology –
Fibre Channel –
Methodologies for Signal Quality
Specification - 2
(FC-MSQS-2)

Secretariat

Information Technology Industry Council

Abstract

This technical report compiles and provides additional information beyond that supplied in FC-MSQS. The technical report further clarifies jitter and signal quality specification clauses of relevant physical interfaces. The technical report focuses on FC-PI-6 signal characteristics and test methods. It specifies budget methods for equalized links and specifies and describes methods of measurement for links using a reference receiver.

INCITS' Technical Report Series

This Technical Report is one in a series produced by the International Committee for Information Technology Standards (INCITS). The secretariat for INCITS is held by the Information Technology Industry Council (ITI), 1101 K Street, NW, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20005.

As a by-product of the standards development process and the resources of knowledge devoted to it, INCITS from time to time produces Technical Reports. Such Technical Reports are not standards, nor are they intended to be used as such.

INCITS Technical Reports are produced in some cases to disseminate the technical and logical concepts reflected in standards already published or under development. In other cases, they derive from studies in areas where it is found premature to develop a standard due to a still-changing technology or inappropriate to develop a rigorous standard due to the existence of a number of viable options, the choice of which depends on the user's particular requirements. These Technical Reports, thus, provide guidelines, the use of which can result in greater consistency and coherence of information processing systems.

When the draft Technical Report is completed, the Technical Committee approval process is the same as for a draft standard. Processing by INCITS is also similar to that of a draft standard.

CAUTION: The developers of this Technical Report have requested that holders of patents that may be required for the implementation of the Technical Report disclose such patents to the publisher. However, neither the developers nor the publisher have undertaken a patent search in order to identify which, if any, patents may apply to this Technical Report. As of the date of publication of this Technical Report, following calls for the identification of patents that may be required for the implementation of the standard, notice of one or more such claims has been received. By publication of this Technical Report, no position is taken with respect to the validity of this claim or of any rights in connection therewith. The known patent holder(s) has (have), however, filed a statement of willingness to grant a license under these rights on reasonable and nondiscriminatory terms and conditions to applicants desiring to obtain such a license. Details may be obtained from the publisher. No further patent search is conducted by the developer or publisher in respect to any Technical Report it processes. No representation is made or implied that this is the only license that may be required to avoid infringement in the use of this Technical Report.

Published by

**American National Standards Institute, Inc.
25 West 43rd Street, New York, NY 10036**

Copyright © 2014 by Information Technology Industry Council (ITI)
All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form, in an electronic retrieval system or otherwise, without prior written permission of ITI, 1101 K Street NW, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20005.

Printed in the United States of America

Contents

1 Scope	1
2 References	1
2.1 General	2
2.2 Normative references	2
2.2.1 Approved references	2
2.2.2 References under development	2
2.3 Informative references	2
3 Compliance test methodology for 32GFC	5
3.1 Test method general overview	5
3.2 Test point definitions	5
3.2.1 Host test points	5
3.2.2 Module test points	6
3.2.3 Module input calibration points	7
3.2.4 Host input calibration point	7
3.3 Compliance boards for 32GFC	7
3.3.1 Host Compliance Board and Module Compliance Board reference through response	8
3.3.2 Specification of mated Host and Module Compliance Boards	10
4 32GFC compliance tests	13
4.1 Introduction	13
4.2 Compliance test configurations	14
4.2.1 Host output test configuration	14
4.2.2 Host input test configuration	15
4.2.3 Module electrical output test configuration	16
4.2.4 Module electrical input stressed receiver test configuration	18
4.2.5 Module optical output test configuration	20
4.2.6 Module optical input stressed receiver test configuration	21
4.2.7 Module optical input jitter tracking test configuration	22
4.2.8 Reference receiver	23
4.2.8.1 Reference clock recovery unit (CRU)	23
4.2.8.2 Reference continuous time linear equalizer (CTLE)	23
4.2.9 Pattern generator configurations	25
4.2.10 Frequency dependent attenuation	27
4.3 Electrical compliance test methods	28
4.3.1 Eye width EW6, eye height EH6, and module output Vertical Eye Closure (VEC)	28
4.3.2 Electrical input stressed receiver test	29
4.3.3 Electrical input jitter tracking test	30
4.3.4 Crosstalk signal calibration	30
4.3.5 Common mode noise rms	30
4.4 Optical compliance test methods	31
4.4.1 Transmitter and Dispersion Penalty (TDP) for 3200-SM variants	31
4.4.1.1 Reference transmitter requirements	31
4.4.1.2 Reference receiver requirements	31
4.4.2 VECPq	31
4.4.3 Relative intensity noise RINxOMA	31
4.4.4 Stressed receiver sensitivity	31
4.4.5 Unstressed receiver sensitivity	33
4.4.6 Optical receiver jitter tracking	33
Annex A	
Reference receiver implementations	35
A.1 Introduction	35

A.2 Clock recovery unit architectures	35
A.2.1 Golden PLL	35
A.2.2 Definitions	38
A.2.2.1 PLL Type	38
A.2.2.2 PLL Order	38
A.2.2.3 Jitter Transfer Function (JTF)	38
A.2.2.4 Observed Jitter Transfer Function (OJTF)	39
A.2.2.5 Loop Bandwidth (LBW)	39
A.2.2.6 PLL Peaking	39
A.3 Continuous time linear equalizer (CTLE)	39
A.3.1 Sampling scope with open eye	39
A.3.2 Sampling scope with closed eye: hardware CTLE	40
A.3.3 Real-time scope	41
A.3.4 Sampling scope, closed eye, and parallel data channels	41
A.4 A comment on pattern lengths	42

Annex B

Extending the Link Budget Spreadsheet Model	45
B.1 Scope and overview	45
B.2 Composite optical link response	46
B.2.1 Dominant power penalty is P_{isi}	46
B.2.2 Derivation of the unit pulse response	47
B.2.3 Vertical eye closure	56
B.2.4 TWDP unit pulse profile	59
B.3 Linear equalizer	60
B.3.1 3-tap feed forward equalizer (FFE) block diagram	60
B.3.2 Unit pulse response with equalization	60
B.3.3 Tap setting policy	61
B.3.4 Eye diagrams and P_{isi}	64
B.4 Laser relative intensity noise (RIN)	65
B.4.1 Block diagram of the noise model	65
B.4.2 Measures of noise statistics	68
B.4.3 Noise frequency spectrum	69
B.4.3.1 Noise spectrum in the absence of an equalizer	69
B.4.3.2 Noise spectrum with an equalizer	70
B.4.4 RIN power penalty	71
B.5 Noise impact on optimum equalizer tap weights	72
B.6 Mode partition noise (MPN)	75
B.6.1 Introduction to MPN concepts	75
B.6.2 Chromatic dispersion	76
B.6.3 Ogawa koma factor	77
B.6.4 MPN with no equalization	79
B.6.5 MPN with equalization	81
B.7 Forward Error Correction (FEC) in link budget analysis	84

List of tables

Table 4.1 - Tests defined in this clause and corresponding test patterns	13
Table 4.2 - Reference receiver equalizer coefficients	23
Table B.1 - Partial listing of critical link design parameters for a 16GFC and a 32GFC variant	46
Table B.2 - Symbol definitions	48
Table B.3 - Gaussian impulse response expressions	53
Table B.4 - Comparison of 16GFC and 32GFC performance	58
Table B.5 - MPN impairment for typical 32GFC unequalized link	80
Table B.6 - MPN impairment for typical 32GFC equalized link	83
Table B.7 - Sample forward error correction (FEC) performance	85

List of figures

Figure 3.1 - Host compliance board	6
Figure 3.2 - Module compliance board	6
Figure 3.3 - Module input calibration point B"	7
Figure 3.4 - Host input calibration point C"	7
Figure 3.5 - Host compliance board reference through response	9
Figure 3.6 - Module compliance board reference through response.	9
Figure 3.7 - Mated MCB-HCB return loss	10
Figure 3.8 - Mated MCB-HCB differential through response.	11
Figure 3.9 - 32GFC Mated MCB-HCB differential to common mode response.	12
Figure 3.10 - 32GFC mated MCB-HCB differential to common mode return loss.	12
Figure 4.1 - Host output compliance test configuration (left) and crosstalk calibration (right)	13
Figure 4.2 - Host input compliance test configuration (left) and calibration (right)	15
Figure 4.3 - Module electrical output compliance	16
Figure 4.4 - Module electrical input stress test configuration (left) and calibration (right) for the high loss channel test	18
Figure 4.5 - Module optical output compliance test configuration	20
Figure 4.6 - Module optical input stressed receiver sensitivity test configuration	21
Figure 4.7 - Module optical input jitter tracking test configuration	22
Figure 4.8 - Host output reference receiver equalizer (CTLE) transfer function for gains of 1-10 dB	24
Figure 4.9 - Pattern generator for electrical stress tests	25
Figure 4.10 - Optical stressed receiver pattern generator (left) and optical jitter tracking pattern generator (right)	26
Figure 4.11 - Frequency dependent attenuation through response	27
Figure 4.12 - Compliance test point B and C' jitter and eye height measurement	28
Figure 3.13 - Required characteristics of the conformance test signal at gamma R.	32
Figure A.1 - Block diagram of a typical clock recovery unit.	35
Figure A.2 - Example of a first order phase lock loop.	36
Figure A.3 - Example of a third order phase lock loop ($f_2 = 0.2 \cdot f_1$; $f_3 = 5 \cdot f_1$).	37
Figure A.4 - Typical sampling oscilloscope configuration with a hardware CRU and a software CTLE.	40
Figure A.5 - A secondary channel is used as a sub-rate clock source	41
Figure A.6 - The oscilloscope characterizes channel 1 transmitting a PRBS or other test pattern while it recovers the clock from channel 2 transmitting a square wave.	42
Figure B.1 - Typical eye diagrams for 16GFC (left) and 32GFC (right) MMF variants	45
Figure B.2 - 32GFC link eye diagram with 3-tap feed forward equalizer (FFE).	46
Figure B.3 - Breakdown of link power penalties for the 32GFC candidate specification.	46
Figure B.4 - Link model block diagram.	46
Figure B.5 - Typical unit pulse profiles for various values of the composite link rise time T_c	52
Figure B.6 - Composite fiber link edge response.	54
Figure B.7 - Height of the unit pulse profile $h(t)$ at decision times $t=nT$ for $n=0,1,2$	55
Figure B.8 - Examples of pulse width shrinkage	56
Figure B.9 - Typical unequalized link eye diagrams	57
Figure B.10 - Linear eye opening (left) and P_{isi} (right) for link without equalization	58
Figure B.11 - TWDP fit compared with a Gaussian composite response with $T_c = T$	59
Figure B.12 - Block diagram of a 3-tap feed forward equalizer (FFE).	60
Figure B.13 - Comparison of 3-tap FFE unit pulse response defined by a "naïve" policy and by a MMSE policy.	62
Figure B.14 - Response to a 11111 bit sequence (the red line) sags below the desired 1 level.	63
Figure B.15 - Typical 3-tap FFE eye diagrams.	63
Figure B.16 - Eye closure comparison of non-equalized and 3-tap FFE link	64
Figure B.17 - Block diagram of laser relative intensity noise (RIN) impairment model	65
Figure B.18 - Measures of signal amplitude	66
Figure B.19 - Measurement of laser relative intensity noise (RIN ₁₂), based on FC-PH	67
Figure B.20 - Measurement of laser relative intensity noise (RIN ₁₂ OMA), based on FC-MSQS	67
Figure B.21 - Noise enhancement factor (NEF) vs. composite rise time T_c	71

List of figures

Figure B.22 - Plot of tap ratio a as a function of composite rise time T_c	73
Figure B.23 - Demonstration of mode partition effect, from Cunningham and Lane.	75
Figure B.24 - Maximum slope of 3-tap FFE eye at optimum decision time	81
Figure B.25 - Comparison of MPN power penalty for unequalized and equalized links.	83
Figure B.26 - Example of forward error correction (FEC) coding gain	89

Foreword (This foreword is not part of American National Standard INCITS TR-50-2014.)

This document is an INCITS technical report on the definitions and measurement requirements for parameters related to signal quality on Fibre Channel (FC) links. The document describes measurement methods for non-equalized and equalized links. The document describes new types of jitter associated with reference receivers and methods for determining signal quality in closed eye systems. MSQS-2 does not supersede the previously published Fibre Channel Methods for Signal Quality Specification technical report (hereinafter referred to as FC-MSQS). MSQS-2 represents additional information and methods that are not included in MSQS.

This technical report compiles and provides additional information beyond that supplied in MSQS to provide definitions for the physical interface parameters used in FC-PI-6. The existing signal and jitter specifications are incomplete as a result of changes in how the electronics industry is implementing Fibre Channel systems today compared to how systems were expected to be implemented in the past.

Examples of such changes are the use of adaptive or predictive compensation schemes implemented in active elements or ports, forward error correction (FEC), and higher speed operation at longer distance.

The goals of this technical report are:

- To specify budget methods for equalized links;
- To define host and module test points for 32GFC;
- To define host and module compliance boards for 32GFC;
- To define 32GFC optical and electrical compliance test methodology;
- To give insight into reference receiver implementation;
- To review the extended link spreadsheet model;
- To review forward error correction (FEC) used in the link budget analysis;
- To enable standardized specification enforcement for compliance testing.

The Methods for Signal Quality Specification 2 (MSQS-2) technical report is generated by an Ad Hoc group of companies interested in providing a standard low-cost interface for FC applications. This Ad Hoc group is sanctioned by and operates under the jurisdiction of the T11.2 technical committee of INCITS.

This technical report is informative. Certain contents of this document may be normatively referenced or incorporated into appropriate standards.

Requests for interpretation, suggestions for improvements or addenda, or defect reports are welcome. They should be sent to the INCITS Secretariat, Information Technology Industry Council, 1101 K Street NW Suite 610, Washington, DC 20005-3922.

This technical report was processed and approved for submittal to ANSI by the International Committee for Information Technology Standards (INCITS). Committee approval of the technical report does not necessarily imply that all committee members voted for its approval. At the time it approved this technical report, INCITS had the following members:

Philip Wennblom, Chair
Jennifer Garner, Secretary

<i>Organization Represented</i>	<i>Name of Representative</i>
Adobe Systems Inc.	Scott Foshee
	Steve Zilles (Alt.)
AIM Global, Inc.	Steve Halliday
	Chuck Evanhoe (Alt.)
	Dan Kimball (Alt.)
Apple.....	Helene Workman
	Marc Braner (Alt.)
	David Singer (Alt.)
Distributed Management Task Force	John Crandall
	Jeff Hilland (Alt.)
	Lawrence Lamers (Alt.)
EMC Corporation	Gary Robinson
	Stephen Diamond (Alt.)
Farance, Inc.....	Frank Farance
	Timothy Schoechle (Alt.)
Futurewei Technologies, Inc.	Yi Zhao
	Timothy Jeffries (Alt.)
	Wilbert Adams (Alt.)
GS1GO	Frank Sharkey
	Charles Biss (Alt.)
Hewlett-Packard Company	Karen Higginbottom
	Paul Jeran (Alt.)
IBM Corporation	Alexander Tarpinian
	Robert Weir (Alt.)
	Arnaud Le Hors (Alt.)
	Steve Holbrook (Alt.)
	Gerald Lane (Alt.)
IEEE	Jodi Haasz
	Terry deCourcelle (Alt.)
	Bob Labelle (Alt.)
	Tina Alston (Alt.)
Intel	Philip Wennblom
	Stephen Balogh (Alt.)
	Grace Wei (Alt.)
	Steven Balogh (Alt.)
Microsoft Corporation.....	Jim Hughes
	Dick Brackney (Alt.)
	John Calhoon (Alt.)
National Institute of Standards & Technology	Michael Hogan
	Sal Francomacaro (Alt.)
	Dan Benigni (Alt.)
	Fernando Podio (Alt.)
	Teresa Schwartzhoff (Alt.)
	Wo Chang (Alt.)
	Elaine Newton (Alt.)
Oracle Corporation.....	Donald R. Deutsch
	Jim Melton (Alt.)
	Michael Kavanaugh (Alt.)
	Toshihiro Suzuki (Alt.)
	Jeff Mischkinsky (Alt.)
	Tony DiCenzo (Alt.)
	Patrick Curran (Alt.)
Purdue University	Stephen Elliott
	Kevin O'Connor (Alt.)
Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA).....	Herb Congdon, II
	Cheryl Blum (Alt.)
	Florence Otieno (Alt.)
US Department of Defense.....	Jerry Smith
	Dennis Devera (Alt.)
	Dave Brown (Alt.)
	Leonard Levine (Alt.)
	Matthew Young (Alt.)
	Thomas D'Agostino (Alt.)
US Department of Homeland Security	Peter Shebell
	Gregg Piermarini (Alt.)
	Juan Gonzalez (Alt.)

Technical Committee T11 on Fibre Channel, which reviewed this technical report, had the following members:

Steve Wilson, Chair
 Claudio DeSanti, Vice-Chair
 Richard Johnson, Secretary

<i>Organization Represented</i>	<i>Name of Representative</i>
ADVA.....	Ulrich Schlegel
Agilent.....	Joachim Vobis Stephen Didde (Alt.) Steve Sekel (Alt.)
Amphenol.....	Gregory McSorley Michael Wingard (Alt.) Alex Persaud (Alt.) Chris Lyon (Alt.)
Avago.....	Randy Clark David Cunningham (Alt.) Evan Beauprez (Alt.) John Petrilla (Alt.)
Broadcom	Pat Thaler
Brocade	Steven L. Wilson David Peterson (Alt.) Scott Kipp (Alt.) John Crandall (Alt.)
Cisco.....	Claudio DiSanti Landon Noll (Alt.) Fabio Maino (Alt.) Joe Pelisser (Alt.)
Crossroads Systems.....	Bill Moody
Commscope.....	G. Mabud Choudhury Richard Baca (Alt.) Richard Case (Alt.) Paul Kolesar (Alt.) Joe Livingston (Alt.) Jack Jewell (Alt.)
Corning	Doug Coleman Steven E. Swanson (Alt.)
DCS	Jack Edwards Kevin Ehringer (Alt.)
Dell.....	Joesph White Gaurav Chawla (Alt.) Jeff Young (Alt.) Manish Patil (Alt.)
DSI A*STAR	Khin Mi Mi Aung
EMC.....	Gary S. Robinson David Black (Alt.) Erik Smith (Alt.) Louis Ricci (Alt.)
Emulex.....	Gautam Shiroor David Baldwin (Alt.) Jeff Scotten (Alt.)
FCI	Daniel Dillow David Sideck (Alt.) Mike Davis (Alt.)
Finisar	Chris Yien Richard Johnson (Alt.)
Fujitsu	Sandy Wilson Eugene Owens (Alt.) Kun Katsumata (Alt.) Jim DeCaires (Alt.) Osamu Kimura (Alt.) Mark Malcolm (Alt.)
Futurewei.....	Hao Chen Wei Song (Alt.) Serge Manning (Alt.)

<i>Organization Represented</i>	<i>Name of Representative</i>
Hewlett-Packard	Barry Maskas Krishna Babu Puttagunta (Alt.) Rupin Mohan (Alt.) Nadaraha (Nava) Navaruparajah (Alt.) Siamack Ayandeh (Alt.)
Hitachi DS	Eric Hibbard Vincent Franceschini (Alt.)
IBM	Michael Hay (Alt.) Roger Hathorn Patty Driever (Alt.) Henry May (Alt.)
INTEL	Mark Wunderlich
JDS Uniphase	Dave Lewis Jason Rusch (Alt.) Scott Baxter (Alt.) Paul Gentieu (Alt.)
LSI	Adam Healy John Lohmeyer (Alt.) Harvey Newman (Alt.)
Luxtera	Tom Palkert
Microsoft	Steve Olsson Calvin Chen (Alt.) James Borden (Alt.) Paul Luber (Alt.)
Molex	Jay Neer Mark Bugg (Alt.)
NetApp	Frederick Knight Heather Lanigan (Alt.)
OFS	Roman Shubochkin (Alt.)
Oracle	Roger Dickerson Matt Gaffney (Alt.) Michael Roy (Alt.)
Panduit	Robert Elliot Jose Castro (Alt.) Steve Skiest (Alt.) Robert Reid (Alt.)
Pegatron	Michael Hsu
QLogic	Craig W. Carlson Alan Spaulding (Alt.) Dean Wallace (Alt.)
Solution Technology	David Deming David Deming, Jr. (Alt.)
TE	Nathan Tracy Melissa Knox (Alt.) Andrew Nowak (Alt.)
Teradyne	Eracar Yonet
Texas Instruments	Rajeev Jain Stephen Hubbins (Alt.)
Unisys	Jeffrey Dremann Diep Nguyen (Alt.) Jose Macias (Alt.) Phil Shelton (Alt.)
Virtual Instruments	Skip Bacon
VMware	Neil MacLean Murali Rajagopal (Alt.) Lawrence Lamers (Alt.) Ahmad Tawil (Alt.)

Emeritus

James Coomes
 William Ham
 Robert Kembel
 Joseph Mathis
 Schelto vanDoorn
 Gary Stephens
 Horst Truestedt

Task Group T11.2 on Physical Variants, which developed this technical report, had the following members:

Tom Palkert, Chair
 Dean Wallace, Vice-Chair
 Richard Johnson, Secretary

<i>Organization Represented</i>	<i>Name of Representative</i>
Agilent.....	Joachim Vobis Steve Sekel (Alt.) Stephen Didde (Alt.)
Amphenol.....	Greg McSorley Alex Persaud (Alt.) Michael Wingard (Alt.)
Avago Technologies	Randy Clark John Petrilla (Alt.) Evan Beauprez (Alt.)
Broadcom	Pat Thaler
Brocade	Steven Wilson Scott Kipp (Alt.) David Peterson (Alt.)
Commscope.....	G. Mabud Choudhury Richard Baca (Alt.) Richard Case (Alt.) Paul Kolesar (Alt.) Joe Livingston (Alt.) Jack Jewell (Alt.)
Corning	Doug Coleman Steven E. Swanson (Alt.)
EMC.....	Gary Robinson Louis Ricci (Alt.) David Black (Alt.) Eric Smith (Alt.)
Emulex.....	Jeff Scotten Gautam Shiroor (Alt.) David Baldwin (Alt.)
FCI.....	Daniel Dillow David Sideck (Alt.) Mike Davis (Alt.) CK Wong (Alt.)
Finisar	Chris Yien Richard Johnson (Alt.)
Fujitsu	Sandy Wilson Jim DeCaires (Alt.) Eugene Owens (Alt.) Mark Malcolm (Alt.) Kun Katsumata (Alt.)
Hewlett-Packard	Barry Maskas Krishna Puttagunta (Alt.) Nava Navaruparajah (Alt.) Rupin Mohan (Alt.)
IBM	John Ewen Roger Hathorn (Alt.) Patty Driever (Alt.) Adrian Butter (Alt.)

<i>Organization Represented</i>	<i>Name of Representative</i>
JDSU	Dave Lewis
Juniper	(Representation Vacant)
	Jaya Bandyopadhyay (Alt.)
LSI	Adam Healey
	John Lohmeyer (Alt.)
	Harvey Newman (Alt.)
Luxtera	Tom Palkert
Molex	Jay H. Neer
	Mark Bugg (Alt.)
Oclaro	Ram Rao
Panduit	Jose Castro
	Steve Skiest (Alt.)
	Robert Elliot (Alt.)
	Robert Reid (Alt.)
QLogic	Dean Wallace
	Mike Dudeck (Alt.)
	Craig Carlson (Alt.)
Semtech	David Brown
	Ed Friar (Alt.)
	Francois Tremblay (Alt.)
TE Connectivity	Nathan Tracy
	Melissa Knox (Alt.)
	Andrew Nowak (Alt.)
Vitesse	Marty Spadaro
	Gary Paules (Alt.)

This is a preview of "INCITS/TR-50-2014 (R...)". [Click here to purchase the full version from the ANSI store.](#)

INCITS Technical Report
for Information Technology –

Fibre Channel – Methodologies for Signal Quality Specification - 2 (FC-MSQS-2)

1 Scope

This technical report compiles and provides additional information beyond that supplied in FC-MSQS. The technical report further clarifies jitter and signal quality specification clauses of relevant physical interfaces. The technical report focuses on FC-PI-6 signal characteristics and test methods. It specifies budget methods for equalized links and specifies and describes methods of measurement for links using a reference receiver.

2 References

2.1 General

The documents named in this clause contain provisions that, through reference in this text, constitute provisions of this document. At the time of publication, the editions indicated were valid. All standards and technical reports are subject to revision, and parties to agreements based on this technical report are encouraged to investigate the possibility of applying the most recent editions of the following list of documents. Members of IEC and ISO maintain registers of currently valid international standards.

Some references may not be specifically cited in the text but contain information generally related to the subject matter of FC-MSQS-2.

The URLs cited in this clause were valid at the time of publication.

Approved references are those that have been approved by a standards organization. Copies of the following documents may be obtained from ANSI, an ISO member organization:

- Approved ANSI standards;
- Approved ANSI technical reports;
- Approved and draft regional and international standards (ISO, IEC); and
- Approved foreign standards (including JIS and DIN).

For further information, contact the ANSI Customer Service Department:

- Phone: 212-642-4980
- Fax: 212-302-1286
- Web: <http://www.ansi.org>
- E-mail: info@ansi.org