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## Objectives for this Work

- Provide Phvsical Laver specifications which support $40 \mathrm{~Gb} / \mathrm{s}$ operation over:
- at least 100 m on OM3 MMF
802.3ba

Objectives
a at least tum over a copper canse assembly

- at least 1 m over a backplane
- Support a MAC data rate of $100 \mathrm{~Gb} / \mathrm{s}$
- Provide Physical Layer specifications which support $100 \mathrm{~Gb} /$ s operation over:
- at least 40 km on SMF
a at least 10 km on. SME
- at least 100 m on OM3 MMF
- at least 10 m over a copper cable assembly

Follow-up work from sun_01_1107

- In previous work, sub-optimum driving of the TOSA gave higher B2B sensitivities between -11.5 and -12.5 dBm (OMA).
- Rx sensitivities here range from -13 to -13.5 dBm (OMA).
- Penalty is reduced from 2.5 dB (previously) to 1.7 dB (now) for the same 300m, corner-case not-quite-OM4 fiber with a 0.56 nm RMS spectral width TOSA.
- Effect of spectral width remains under study
- Electrical filter ("rise time converter") employed to explore slow rise/fall times

Continue to study the tradeoffs between Tx and fiber properties and reach:

- IEEE P802.3ba needs an option for supporting longer reach, approaching 300m, on MMF
- OM4 MMF is commercially available with $4700 \mathrm{MHz}-\mathrm{km}$ minimum modal bandwidths
- How can this bandwidth be used?


## Approach for Study

Select TOSAs with RMS spectral widths of $\sim 0.42$ and $\sim 0.56 \mathrm{~nm}$

Use a 7.5G B-T filter in front of the TOSA to increase the rise/fall time of the laser from $\sim 38 \mathrm{ps}$ to $\sim 48 \mathrm{ps}$

OM3 and "almost OM4" Fibers

- 100m and 200m length for OM3 fibers with EMB ~ $2600 \mathrm{MHz}-\mathrm{km}$
- Not a corner-case OM3 fiber, but we had the right lengths on hand
- $100 \mathrm{~m}, 200 \mathrm{~m}, 300 \mathrm{~m}$ length almost-OM4 fibers, EMB $\sim 4300-4400 \mathrm{MHz}-\mathrm{km}$
- Represent the lower bounds for OM4 performance
- Are labeled "OM4" in the figures, but do not meet OFS' OM4 specifications

Compare transmission penalties between experiment and spreadsheet model

- Show trends in penalty as fiber or spectral width changes
- These experiments do not combine all of the simultaneous relaxations that have been proposed, so the measured absolute penalties may be lower bounds.


## Experimental Diagram



RTC: Rise/Fall time conversion with a $7.5 \mathrm{G} 4^{\text {th }}$ order BT filter

## Optical Eyes at TP3 <br> (TOSA A: RMS spectral width $\sim 0.56 \mathrm{~nm}$ )
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## TOSA A with Spectral Width ~0.56nm



Black = measured penalty; Red = spreadsheet penalty

## Optical Eyes at TP3

## (TOSA B: RMS spectral width $\sim 0.42 \mathrm{~nm}$ )
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## TOSA B with Spectral Width ~0.42nm



Black = measured penalty; Red = spreadsheet penalty

## Penalties vs. EMB, spectral width and rise time



## Summary

High bandwidth OM4 MMF offers an added degree of freedom for preserving long reach while permitting transmitter cost reduction

## Transmitter RMS spectral width relaxation

$>$ For links $>200 \mathrm{~m}$, penalty increases rapidly with spectral width $\geq \sim 0.55 \mathrm{~nm}$
$>$ Caution should be exercised when relaxing spectral width
$>$ If spectral width is relaxed to 0.65 nm , it may be desirable to also define a class of Tx with narrow spectral width $\leq 0.45 \mathrm{~nm}$

An un-retimed PMD follows current trends for SR in SFP+
> Spreadsheet predictions with DJ=1.9*DCD, DCD=20 ps (jewell_01_0308) indicate that reach of 100 m vs. 250 m might be obtained by varying a few transceiver specs:

|  |  | Pisi | $\frac{\text { V.E.C.P. }}{3.7}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $>100 \mathrm{~m}$ OM3, 0.65 nm RMS, 45ps R/F time, 2dB connector loss: | $<3.0 \mathrm{~dB}$ | 3.7 dB |  |
| $>250 \mathrm{~m}$ OM4, 0.45 nm RMS, 41ps R/F time, 2dB connector loss: | $<3.0 \mathrm{~dB}$ | 3.75 dB |  |

Experimental study of real parts with relaxed specs with corner case fibers is a necessity

## Detailed Summary of Fiber, TOSA and Tx Properties

|  |  | center wavelength (nm) | RMS spectral width (nm) | ER (dB) | Tx 2080\% RT (ps) | Tx 2080\% FT (ps) | Launch OMA (dBm) | B2B receiver sensitivity OMA (dBm) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOSA A | no RTC | 855.4 | 0.56 | 5 | 12.7 | 37.8 | -3 | -13.0 |
|  | w RTC |  |  |  | 29.2 | 47.6 | -2.8 | -12.1 |
| TOSA B | no RTC | 853.53 | 0.42 | 5 | 18.5 | 38.3 | -2.8 | -13.2 |
|  | w RTC |  |  |  | 26.6 | 48.1 | -2.6 | -12.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (de-convolved) |  |  |  |


| fiber data |  |  |  |  | TOSA A |  |  |  | TOSA B |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | penalty (dBm) |  | Rx Sens. OMA |  | penalty (dBm) |  | Rx Sens. OMA |  |
| (m) | (MHz.km) | (ps/m) | (ps/m) | (ps/m) | no RTC | w RTC | no RTC | w RTC | no RTC | w RTC | no RTC | w RTC |
| 100 | 4303 | 0.122 | 0.262 | 0.122 | 0.3 | 0.1 | -12.8 | -12.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | -13.0 | -12.1 |
| 200 | 4303 | 0.122 | 0.262 | 0.122 | 1.0 | 0.9 | -12.1 | -11.2 | 0.7 | 0.9 | -12.5 | -11.6 |
| 300 | 4437 | 0.122 | 0.127 | 0.122 | 1.7 | 2.0 | -11.4 | -10.1 | 1.0 | 1.2 | -12.2 | -11.2 |
| 100 | 2665 | 0.297 | 0.301 | 0.210 | 0.5 | 0.2 | -12.6 | -11.9 |  |  |  |  |
| 200 | 2610 | 0.307 | 0.307 | 0.222 | 1.3 | 1.5 | -11.7 | -10.6 |  |  |  |  |

Notes: 1) Penalties have $\pm 0.25 \mathrm{~dB}$ error bars
2) OM4 fiber limits are MW18, MW23 < 0.14 ("flat mask"), sliding window < $0.11 \mathrm{ps} / \mathrm{m}$
3) OM3 limits are MW18, MW23 < 0.33 ("flat mask"), sliding window < $0.25 \mathrm{ps} / \mathrm{m}$

## Measured vs. Spreadsheet Penalties

| fiber data |  |  |  | TOSA A (RMS 0.56nm) penalty (dBm) |  |  |  | TOSA B (RMS 0.42nm) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| length | $\begin{gathered} \text { EMBc } \\ (\mathrm{MHz.km}) \end{gathered}$ | MW18 (ps/m) | MW23 (ps/m) |  |  |  |  |  | nalty |  |  |
| (m) |  |  |  | no RTC | CALC | w RTC | CALC | no RTC | CALC | w RTC | CALC |
| 100 | 4303 | 0.122 | 0.262 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| 200 | 4303 | 0.122 | 0.262 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| 300 | 4437 | 0.122 | 0.127 | 1.7 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.6 |
| 100 | 2665 | 0.297 | 0.301 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| 200 | 2610 | 0.307 | 0.307 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |

Parameters used in spreadsheet calculations:
Penalties are the difference in LP_pen at stated reach vs. 2 m . Ts(20-80): 35 ps w/o RTC, 45 ps with RTC; DJ=DCD $=6 \mathrm{ps} ; \operatorname{RIN}(\mathrm{OMA})=-130 \mathrm{~dB} / \mathrm{Hz}$; actual values for RMS spectral widths and center wavelengths; other parameters are like those in 10GEPBud3_1_16a.xls

