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## Introduction

- One of P802.3bm adopted objectives :
"Define a $100 \mathrm{~Gb} / \mathrm{s}$ PHY for operation up to at least 500 m of SMF"
- WDM PMD has been discussed as a cost-efficient solution
vlasov_01_0312_NG100GOPTX.pdf, martin_01_0712_optx.pdf, weirich_01_0712_optx.pdf martin_02_0912_optx.pdf, martin_01_0912_optx.pdf
- WDM4 PMD is proposed here
- 4ch CWDM, Uncooled, Retimed
- Single die DFB laser array
- Link budget up to 3.5 dB
- Link reach up to 2 km
- Link transmit and receive characteristics and illustratuve link budget are presented
- Relative Cost Analysis is presented


## WDM4 block diagram



- All components, except CW DFB laser array, can be integrated monolithically on a single silicon die
- DFB laser array is a single InP die containing 4 CW DFB lasers
vlasov_01_0312_NG100GOPTX.pdf


## Alternative WDM4 block diagram


-TOSA with 4 DML lasers + ROSA

- Duplex SMF


## Link transmit and receive characteristics

1. CWDM is proposed to avoid cooling and to remove the cost of TEC from the module cost
2. $E R=4 d B$ is maintained as in 100GBASE_LR4 to provide capability of driving silicon MZI modulator directly from CMOS 1Vpp driver
3. Minimal launched power $\left(\mathrm{OMA}_{\min }-\mathrm{TDP}\right)$ is reduced to -2.5 dBm to accommodate additional insertion loss in silicon MZI modulator as well as in WD mux and to decrease the average laser launch power to 20 mW .
4. Maximum channel insertion loss is reduced to 3.5 dB to accommodate for 0.94 dB fiber loss at 1264.5 nm and connectors for a double link channel
5. Sensitivity is reduced to $-6.0 \mathrm{dBm}(\mathrm{OMA})$ to accommodate additional insertion loss on WD demux.
6. Additional savings are expected with optimized WDM grid to decrease the laser cost and increase yield
see also gill_01_1112.pdf

## 100GBASE-WDM4 transmit characteristics

| Parameter | IEEE Std 802.3ba 100GBASE-LR4 10km | vlasov_01_1112_optx 100GBASE-WDM4 2km | Unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signaling rate, each lane (range) | $25.78125 \pm 100 \mathrm{ppm}$ | $25.78125 \pm 100 \mathrm{ppm}$ | Gbd |
| Lane wavelength (range) (nm) | $\begin{aligned} & 1294.53 \text { to } 1296.59 \\ & 1299.02 \text { to } 1301.09 \\ & 1303.54 \text { to } 1305.63 \\ & 1308.09 \text { to } 1310.19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1264.5 \text { to } 1277.5 \\ & 1284.5 \text { to } 1297.5 \\ & 1304.5 \text { to } 1317.5 \\ & 1324.5 \text { to } 1337.5 \end{aligned}$ | nm |
| Single-mode suppression ratio (SMSR), (min) | 30 | 30 | dB |
| Total average launch power (max) | 10.5 |  | dBm |
| Average launch power, each lane (max) | 4.5 |  | dBm |
| Average launch power, each lane (min) | -4.3 |  | dBm |
| Optical modulation amplitude (OMA), each lane (max) | 4.5 |  | dBm |
| Optical modulation amplitude (OMA), each lane (min) | -1.3 |  | dBm |
| Difference in launch power between any two lanes (OMA), (max) | 5 |  | dB |
| Launch power in OMA minus TDP, each lane, (min) | -2.3 | -2.5 | dBm |
| Transmitter and dispersion penalty (TDP), each lane (max) | 2.2 |  | dBm |
| Average launch power of OFF transmitter, each lane (max) | -30 | -30 | dBm |
| Extinction ratio (min) | 4 | 4 | dB |
| $\mathrm{RIN}_{20} \mathrm{OMA}$ (max) | -130 | -130 | $\mathrm{dB} / \mathrm{Hz}$ |
| Optical return loss tolerance (max) | 20 | 20 | dB |
| Transmitter reflectance (max) | -12 | -12 | dB |
| Transmitter eye mask definition $\{\mathrm{X} 1, \mathrm{X} 2, \mathrm{X} 3, \mathrm{Y} 1, \mathrm{Y} 2, \mathrm{Y} 3\}$ | $\{0.25,0.4,0.45,0.25,0.28,0.4\}$ | $\{0.25,0.4,0.45,0.25,0.28,0.4\}$ |  |

see also gill_01_1112.pdf

## 100GBASE-WDM4 receive characteristics

| Parameter | IEEE Std 802.3ba 100GBASE-LR4 10km | vlasov_01_1112_optx 100GBASE-WDM4 2 km | Unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signaling rate, each lane (range) | $25.78125 \pm 100 \mathrm{ppm}$ | $25.78125 \pm 100 \mathrm{ppm}$ | Gbd |
| Lane wavelength (range) ( nm ) | $\begin{aligned} & 1294.53 \text { to } 1296.59 \\ & 1299.02 \text { to } 1301.09 \\ & 1303.54 \text { to } 1305.63 \\ & 1308.09 \text { to } 1310.19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1264.5 \text { to } 1277.5 \\ & 1284.5 \text { to } 1297.5 \\ & 1304.5 \text { to } 1317.5 \\ & 1324.5 \text { to } 1337.5 \end{aligned}$ | nm |
| Damage threshold | 5.5 |  | dBm |
| Average receive power, each lane (max) | 4.5 |  | dBm |
| Average receive power, each lane (min) | -10.6 |  | dBm |
| Receive power, each lane (OMA) (max) | 4.5 |  | dBm |
| Difference in receive power between any two lanes (OMA) (max) | 5.5 |  | dB |
| Receiver reflectance (max) | -26 | -26 | dB |
| Receiver sensitivity (OMA), each lane (max) | -8.6 | -6.0 | dBm |
| Receiver 3dB electrical upper cutoff frequency, each lane (max) | 31 | 31 | GHz |
| Stressed receiver sensitivity (OMA), each lane (max) | -6.8 |  | dBm |

## 100GBASE-WDM4 illustrative link power budget

| Parameter | IEEE Std 802.3ba <br> 100GBASE-LR4 <br> 10 km | vlasov_01_1112_optx <br> 100GBASE-WDM4 <br> 2km | Unit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Power budget (for maximum TDP) | 8.5 | 5.7 |  |
| Operating distance | 10 | 2 | dB |
| Channel insertion loss | 6.3 | km |  |
| Maximum discreet reflectance | -26 | dB |  |
| Allocation for penalties (for maximum TDP) | 2.2 | -26 | dB |
| Additional insertion loss allowed | 0 | 2.2 | dB |

a The channel insertion loss is calculated using maximum distance of 2 km and fiber attenuation of $0.47 \mathrm{~dB} / \mathrm{km}$ at 1264.5 nm plus an allocation for connection and splice loss of 2.5 dB

- Link budget implies laser average output power of $13 \mathrm{dBm}(20 \mathrm{~mW})$
- This looks quite reasonable for CW DFB at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with $20 \%$ slope efficiency
- Total power consumption of a 4 channel DFB laser array is 400 mW

Feasibility of WDM4

## ITU G694．2 CWDM grid for 100GbE 2km PMD

## Guard band 7nm



Channel width 13nm
－LAN WDM requires active wavelength locking and tracking
－CWDM is OK，but not optimal
$\rightarrow 100 \%$ laser yield，no wavelength testing
$\rightarrow$ Up to $130^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ can be accommodated
$\rightarrow$ leverage existing 40GBASE－LR4 components（PLCs or TF filters）
－Further optimization of WDM grid is possible to decrease the laser cost $\rightarrow$ see gill＿01＿1112．pdf
Resemble 4－year old discussions：traverso＿01＿0108．pdf，traverso＿01＿0308．pdf，cole＿01＿0308．pdf

## Feasibility: CMOS WDM4 transceiver 4×25G

Single-die 4x25G WDM4 CMOS transceiver
Die photo of cascaded 4-stage MZI filter


Die size 3.5 mmx 2 mm
WDM filters at no additional cost:

- No additional mask levels
- No additional processing

See also: gill_01_1112_optx.pdf
vlasov_01_0312_NG100GOPTX.pdf

# Relative Cost Analysis 

## Laser cost

- Nowell_01_1111 has suggested that number of lasers have direct impact on cost.
- PAM8 and PSM4 utilize 1 laser. WDM4 needs 4 lasers.


## Q\&A to 3 major laser vendors:

Question: What is cost ratio between 1ch CW DFB die and 4ch CW DFB array die?
Answer: Cost of 4-channel CW DFB laser array die is about 1X-2X (two answers) to 5 X (one answer, case of CWDM) the cost of a single channel DFB laser die.

However, all universally agreed that cost of a bare laser die is "insignificant" portion of a final cost.

Final cost ratio is predominantly defined by:

- Volumes
- Yield with respect to specs (output power, power variations, wavelength grid, temperature range, RIN, linewidth, SMSR, etc.)
- Packaging


## Packaging cost comparison

28nm CMOS ASIC
4ch FEC Encoder 4ch FEC Decoder 34Gs/s DAC 34Gs/s ADC 8ch CDR CAUI4

Schematic representation of PAM8 block diagram
e.g. ghiasi_01a_0912_optx.pdf


4-6 chips packaging
Board size larger, RF packaging
34Gb/s signaling, complicated traces
High power laser, RIN $=-143 \mathrm{~dB} / \mathrm{Hz}$

## WDM4

After vlasov_01_0312_NG100GOPTX.pdf 28Gbps TRX


2-4 chips packaging Board size small, amenable for flip-chip 28Gb/s signaling, short traces
Low power laser array, RIN = $-130 \mathrm{~dB} / \mathrm{Hz}$

Observations on relative cost:

| Component | PAM8 | PSM4 | WDM4 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Laser | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1 |
| Chips | 2 | 1.5 | 1 |
| Board | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Assy | 2 | 1.5 | 1 |
| Total Module | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ |

## Relative cost comparison

Table 1. Module cost
Reference LR4 (CFP4) taken from cole_02_0512_optx.pdf

|  | LR4 | PAM8 | PSM4 | WDM4 | Notes |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total module cost | 3 | 2 | 1.5 | 1 | This presentation |

Table 2. Fiber cable plant cost

|  | LR4 | PAM8 | PSM4 | WDM4 | Notes |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unity cabling cost | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | cole_01a_0512_optx |
| Double link channel at CCL | 1.75 | 1.75 | 7 | 1.75 | kolesar_01a_0512_opt |

$$
\text { Channel Cost }=\text { Fiber cable }+2 \times \text { Module }
$$

Table 3. Total channel cost Following example on p.9 of kolesar_01a_0512_optx.pdf

|  | LR4 | PAM8 | PSM4 | WDM4 | Notes |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Double link channel at CCL | 2.96 | 1.96 | 1.54 | 1 |  |

Conclusion: WDM4 PMD can provide as low cost solution for reaching the 802.3bm TF objective as other proposed PMDs

## Summary

- New WDM4 PMD is proposed based on 4-channel CWDM DFB lasers externally modulated with NRZ 25 Gbps signal
- WDM4 utilizes the lowest cost duplex SM fiber cable plant
- Feasibility of silicon integrated WDM filter is verified
- WDM4 PMD can provide a significant cost reduction for reaching the 802.3bm TF objective
- Cost reduction is at least as good as expected for other proposed PMDs (e.g. PSM4 PMD and PAM8 PMD)

