COMMSCOPE®

PMD Solution Set Analyzer "Kolesar_Kalculator_2011_11_14.xls"

Paul Kolesar IEEE 802.3 Next Gen 100G Optics Study Group MMF ad-hoc teleconference Nov. 29, 2011



Read Me (1 of 3)

- SolutionAnalyzer_2011_11_14 description
- This spreadsheet permits comparison of PMD solution sets targeted to support data center environments.
- The worksheet "PMD Sol'n Set" allows comparison of up to four sets, each with up to four PMDs, on a variety of metrics.
- The cells in columns B, C and D in **bold** font are inputs to the analysis.
 - In column B input the description of the PMDs within the sets, in order of ascending reach (i.e. ascending supportable distance) capability.
 - In column C input relative values of the metric to be compared such as cost, power consumption, size, etc.
 - In column D input the reach capability in meters. The column E reach values in US customary units of feet are calculated, not input.
 - Note: The default input values are placeholders.



Read Me (2 of 3)

- The calculation produces Figures of Merit for each of the five data center channel length cumulative density functions (CDFs) provided in columns M thru S and plotted to the right in both metric (meters) and US customary (feet) units.
 - The originating source of the CDFs is referenced within the comments imbedded in the title cells above the CDF columns.
- Two categories of channel CDFs are provided.
 - Columns O and P are the CDFs for access channels between servers and switches in two different time periods that illustrate migration of switch placement closer to servers.
 - Columns Q, R and S are the CDFs for aggregation channels between switches for three different topology mixes detailed in the referenced source material.



Read Me (3 of 3)

- The calculation proceeds as follows.
 - The channel coverage of each PMD is determined by comparison to the CDFs using linear interpolation starting with the first PMD listed in the set.
 - The channel coverage of the next PMD in the set is determined from where the previous PMD stopped, and so on, thus necessitating ascending reach order.
 - A coverage check is determined by summing the coverage of all the PMDs in the set for each CDF, wherein a value less than 100% indicates that a portion of that CDF is not covered.
 - The Figures of Merit are determined by summing coverage-weighted comparison metrics. These are plotted below the PMD tables in the order of channels with decreasing CDF (i.e. longer channel lengths).
 - Note: Setting reach to 0 effectively eliminates a PMD from the calculation provided that PMD is listed before others in compliance with the ascending reach ordering requirement.

Overall Dashboard





Numerical CDF Dashboard



Input/Output Dashboard (1 of 2)

| | Microsoft Excel - Kolesar_Kalculat | | | | ª Co ∕car | Comparison metric can be anything: e.g. | | | | uestion for h | | × | |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| | 1 | SUM A PMD set number | B PMD description | Sector Sector C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C | 1 COSI, PC | | PMD coverage for server-to-switch channels | | H PM switch | H I J PMD coverage for switch-to-switch channels | | Coverage for 5 CI | output DFs |
| Define PMD | 2 | | increasing reach) | (relative values) | (m) | (ft) | server-to- switch | server-to- | single-link switch-to- switch | switch-to- | switch-to | | |
| solution set | 4 | | B1 (SR4) | 1 | 0 100 | 0.0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% 79.3% | 0.8% | | |
| in ascending | 5 6 7 | | D (LR4) | 4 20 | 1000 10000 cover | 3281.0 32810.0 age check: | 0.0% | 0.1% 0.0% 100.0% | 0.0% 100.0% | 20.7% 0.0% 100.0% | 38.3% 0.8% 100.0% | | |
| reach order | 8 | | A (AOC) | | Figur | es of Merit: | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.58 | 1.82 | 2.30 | Coverage | check |
| | 11 | 2 | B1 (SR4) C (PR4) | 1 1.25 4 | 100 1000 | 328.1 3281.0 | 00.2% 13.8% 0.0% | 31.3% 0.1% | 79.0% 11.8% | 73.2% | 61.79 38.39 | (should = | 100%) |
| Fold calculation: | | | D (LR4) | 20 | 10000 cover | 32810.0 age check: 10*E10+\$C | 0.0% 100.0% 11*E11+\$C12* | 0.0% 100.0% | 0.0% 100.0% | 0.0% 100 | 0.0% | | |
| coverage-weighted | | | | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | | for 5 | | |
| comparison metric | | | B2 (SR4) C (PR4) D (LR4) | 1.5 4 20 | 150 1000 10000 | 492.2 3281.0 32810.0 | 100.0% 0.0% 0.0% | 100.0% 0.0% 0.0% | 96.3% 3.7% 0.0% | 92 8.0.0 0.0% | | | |
| 22 | | | | | cover Figur | age check: es of Merit: | 100.0% | 100.0% 1.50 | 100.0% 1.59 | 100.0% 1.70 | 100.0% 1.92 | | |
| | 23 24 25 | 4 | A (AOC) B2 (SR4) | 1 | 20 150 | 65.6 492.2 | 86.2% 13.8% | <u>68.6%</u> (31.4%) | 9.2% 87.1% | 6.1% 85.9% | 0.1% 83.3% | - | |
| | 26 27 | | C (PR4) D (LR4) | 4 20 | 1000 10000 | 3281.0 32810.0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3.7% 0.0% | 8.0% 0.0% | 16.6% 0.0% | | |
| | | | | | Figur | age check: es of Merit: | 1.07 1.16 | | 1.55 | Coverage values | | | |
| | Edit | aw ▼ 🗟 | A <u>u</u> toShapes • | | | | A | <u>⊿ - A</u> - = | | linea | arly int from | erpolated CDF | 7 |

Input/Output Dashboard (2 of 2)



Future Work

- Add worksheet with cabling cost analyzer
 - To permit complete physical layer cost comparisons.



Questions?