Reach and Energy Efficiency in NG-BASE-T

Mike Bennett

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Pedro Reviriego

Universidad Antonio de Nebrija

IEEE 802.3 Meeting November 2012

1

- Efficiency can be measured with the TEER
 - Telecommunications Energy Efficiency Ratio*

$$TEER = \frac{L_{max}}{a * P_{idle} + b * P_{u} + c * P_{100}}$$

- Takes into account power consumption dependency on traffic load
- Efficiency can be increased by
 - Reducing consumption when the link is idle (P_{idle}, P_u)
 - Reducing consumption when the link is active (P_u, P₁₀₀)

- Existing approach (LPI/Energy Efficient Ethernet)
 - Focuses on reducing energy consumption during idle periods
 - The reduction during idle periods can be very large (>90%)
 - Works well at very low loads (end user)
 - Mode transition overhead reduces savings at medium loads
 - Further savings possible with coalescing (but impacting delay)

Energy Efficient Ethernet (EEE)

• 10GBASE-T



* P. Reviriego, J.A. Hernández, D. Larrabeiti, J.A. Maestro, "Performance Evaluation of Energy Efficient Ethernet", IEEE Communications Letters, Vol. 13, No 9, September 2009, pp. 697-699.

4

- An example for 10GBASE-T
 - Assume P₁₀₀ is 4 Watts
 - At 10% load power consumption is approx 60% (P_u = 2.4 Watts)
 - P_{idle} can be 0.4 Watts or less
- For an end user we can have a= 0.99, b= 0.009 and c = 0.0001 leading to

 $TEER = 10/(0.99*0.4+0.009*2.4+0.0001*4) \cong 24$

Which is dominated by P_{idle} and much better than 2.5 without EEE

- Limitations of LPI scheme (like in EEE) for NG-BASE-T
 - Traffic load will be significant
 - Higher speeds will mean significant mode transition overhead
 - Low latency requirements will restrict the use of coalescing
- This means that power consumption in active mode has to be optimized to achieve good energy efficiency

- An example for 10GBASE-T
 - Assume P₁₀₀ is 4 Watts
 - At 10% load power consumption is approx 60% (P_u = 2.4 Watts)
 - P_{idle} can be 0.4 Watts or less
- For a data center server we can have a= 0.1, b= 0.8 and

c = 0.1 (in line with*) leading to

 $TEER = 10/(0.1*0.4+0.8*2.4+0.1*4) \cong 4.2$

Which is dominated by P_u and close to the value of 2.5 without EEE

^{*} ENERGY STAR® Program Requirements Product Specification for Large Network Equipment Preliminary Approach For Determining Energy Efficiency Rev. Oct-2012

Power consumption versus Reach

'ower Multiplier wrt 10GB-T vs. Reach for 40Gbps. TXlaunch=3dBm, TotalMargin=10dB, Self Noise C 10 Every ~12m increase in reach approximately doubles power 10^{1} About 4x Power/port Power Multiplier @ 46m (same pJ/bit as 10GBASE-T) About 2x Power/port 10⁰ @ 34m About 1x Power/port @ 22m 10 10 20 30 50 70 0 40 60 80 90 100 reach (m)

*Will Bliss A Simple Model of Relative Power vs. Reach, Sept. 17, 2012 for IEEE 802.3 Next Generation BASE-T study group

8

- Power consumption versus Reach
 - Most links are short, specially in data centers
 - Potential for large energy savings if designs are optimized or adapt to reach
 - Savings complement those of LPI
- In the previous example if power for a 10m link can be reduced to 2 Watts then

TEER = $10/(0.1*0.2+0.8*1.2+0.1*2) \cong 8.5$

Much better than with LPI only

Conclusions

- Optimizing consumption during idle periods provides only limited savings
- Reducing consumption when active is possible by optimizing the PHY for short channel lengths
- Options to optimize/adapt PHYs for different reach should be considered