# Review Approval Form

Type of Review:  FDR

Project Name:  TeraPixel APS for CALICE:    (TPAC1.2)

| Documents Reviewed |
|---|
| TPAC1.1 problem reports 1,2,3,4,5<br>Supporting information (slides)<br><br><br>Copies of all review documents, agenda and minutes are held on PDR web site:<br>http://www.hep.ph.imperial.ac.uk/calice/maps/fdr3/fdr3.html |

| Comments |
|---|
| All 5 problem reports were reviewed, of which two are being addressed in this revision of the design.<br><br>The review was structured with PowerPoint slides:<br><br>There was an inconsistency identified on slide 10, where the schematic-sim gains for TPAC1.1 and TPAC1.2 were different – <u>ACTION</u>: these will be checked before submission – most likely a simple error, these should be the same as no parts of the schematic circuit were modified.<br><br>Slide 11 showed an old artefact present on TPAC1.0, but since removed on TPAC1.1 pixels – it had not been possible to reproduce this in the lab, therefore casting some doubt over the reliability of RCX simulations.  In considering Mike T's suggestion, it is suspected that the test pixel breaks the critical signal before it couples to the analog node (in the test pixel only) therefore the effect is not visible in the lab – <u>ACTION</u>: this should be checked.<br><br>Note after review: the number of polygon changes on the CS layer were confirmed by Paul as correct. |

**Approval:**  emails indicating approval are an adequate substitute for hardcopy signatures

**<u>Review Report agreed</u>**
Group Leader (sign/date) as required by the Project Management Plan




Customer (sign/date) as required by the Project Management Plan




Others – as stated in the Project Management Plan




**<u>Review Report agreed and any changes incorporated</u>**
Project Manager (sign/date) always required