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Objective: Rain on 1Tb/s Parade

Unhappy 1Tb/s Researchers
Know Your Audience

- First version of this presentation was given at the Tera Santa Workshop in Tel Aviv on 13 April 2011
- Tera Santa is consortium of leading companies and universities in Israel backed by Israeli Office of the Chief Scientist with the objective to develop world's first Tb/s OFDM-based optical network
- The Workshop audience was unperturbed by being rained on
- This was later explained by Prof. Dan Sadot, Chairman, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Ben Gurion University (Tera Santa member):

  In Israel, as we are a relatively dry country, every type of rain is considered "blessing rain"
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Ethernet & Transport Compatibility

- 100Gb/s Ethernet Technology
- Beyond 100Gb/s Ethernet Technology
- 100Gb/s Transport Technology
- Beyond 100Gb/s Transport Technology
- Recommendations
10GbE and OTU2

- OTU2 defined by ITU-T $\rightarrow \sim 10.7\text{Gb/s}$
  - $\sim 10\text{Gb/s}$ payload; SONET OC-192 or SDH STM-64
- 10GbE LAN and WAN subsequently defined by IEEE
  - 10GBASE-R LAN Physical Coding Layer: 10Gb/s data with 64B/66B encoding $\rightarrow \sim 10.3\text{Gb/s} > 10\text{Gb/s}$ payload
  - 10GBASE-W WAN Interface Sub-layer defined to be compatible with 10Gb/s SONET and SDH $\rightarrow \sim 10\text{Gb/s}$
- 10GbE PHY ICs initially supported both LAN and WAN
  - required two separate processing cores; expensive
  - Not needed by vast majority of 10GbE users (data center operators) who only use LAN
- 10GbE LAN became the dominant interface
10GbE and OTU2, cont.

- 10GbE LAN Transport alternatives:
  - remove Preamble or IPG → not transparent
  - over-clock OTU2: OTU2e → not networkable

- Mess
4x 10GbE and OTU3

- OTU3 defined by ITU-T $\rightarrow \sim 43$Gb/s
  - $\sim 40$Gb/s payload; SONET OC-768 or SDH STM-256
- 10GbE LAN is the dominant interface
- 4x 10GbE LAN $\rightarrow \sim 41.2$Gb/s $> 40$Gb/s payload
- 4x 10GbE LAN Transport alternatives:
  - remove Preamble or IPG $\rightarrow$ not transparent
  - over-clock OTU3: OTU3e $\rightarrow$ not networkable
- Mess
40GbE and OTU3

- 40GbE LAN defined by IEEE → ~41.2Gb/s
- 40GbE PCS layer defined to have a small control word set to enable fixed trans-coding to OTU3
- 40GbE LAN Transport:
  - OTU3 → transparent and networkable
- No mess
100GbE and OTU4

- 100GbE LAN defined by IEEE → \( \sim 103 \text{Gb/s} \)
- OTU4 initial proposals in ITU-T → \( \sim 160 \text{Gb/s} \) & \( \sim 130 \text{Gb/s} \)
  - Efficiently carry multiple 40Gb/s payloads
  - Inefficiently carry 100GbE payload
- OTU4 then defined by ITU-T → \( \sim 112 \text{Gb/s} \)
  - Efficiently carries 100GbE payload
  - transparent and networkable
- No mess
Future Ethernet and Transport Rates

IEEE and ITU-T are strongly committed to:
- Full Ethernet and OTN compatibility
- OTN support in Ethernet Specifications, ex. 40GbE
- Efficient carrying of Ethernet over OTN, ex. OTU4

OTU5 will be the next OTN rate after OTU4
- OTU5 will be defined to efficiently carry next Ethernet rate after 100GbE

OTU6 will be the following OTN rate after OTU5
- OTU6 will be defined to efficiently carry following Ethernet rate
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- Ethernet & Transport Compatibility
  - 100Gb/s Ethernet Technology
  - Beyond 100Gb/s Ethernet Technology
  - 100Gb/s Transport Technology
  - Beyond 100Gb/s Transport Technology
  - Recommendations
100GbE WDM SMF Gen1 Transceiver

100GBASE-ER4, 40km Transceiver places a SOA before the DeMux
100GbE WDM SMF Gen2 Transceiver

Long term, high volume architecture
100GbE WDM SMF Key Technology

- High yield Photonic Integrated Circuit (PIC) WDM quad DFB array
- Ex. monolithic InP quad 1310nm band DFB laser array with AWG, 1.1mm x 2.4mm PIC, CyOptics Inc.
100GbE Parallel MMF Gen1 Transceiver
100GbE Parallel MMF Gen2 Transceiver

Long term, high volume architecture
100GbE Parallel MMF Key Technology

- High yield Photonic Integrated Circuit (PIC*) parallel quad VCSEL array
- Ex. monolithic GaAs quad 850nm VCSEL array, 0.25mm x 1.0mm PIC, Finisar Corp.

* The “C” in PIC is a stretch since there are no optical connections.
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- Ethernet & Transport Compatibility
- 100Gb/s Ethernet Technology
  - Beyond 100Gb/s Ethernet Technology
- 100Gb/s Transport Technology
- Beyond 100Gb/s Transport Technology
- Recommendations
Beyond 100GbE Rate Requirements

- Requirements from end users
  - Provide meaningful data rate increase
  - Maintain parity with 100GbE bit/sec cost

- Requirements from developers
  - Leverage 100GbE R&D investment
  - Leverage ramping 100GbE product volumes

- Next data rate products should be based on 100GbE technology to control R&D and unit costs

- 400GbE meets these requirements

- Technology for above 400GbE (ex. 1TbE) does not exist, will require extensive R&D, and does not meet these requirements
400GbE WDM SMF Gen1 Transceiver

Different Gen2 architecture is required to support higher I/O density
### 400GbE WDM SMF λ Specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane</th>
<th>Center Frequency THz</th>
<th>Center Wavelength nm</th>
<th>Approximate Wavelength @nm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1330 band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L33</td>
<td>225.8</td>
<td>1327.69</td>
<td>1328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L32</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>1323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L31</td>
<td>227.4</td>
<td>1318.35</td>
<td>1318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L30</td>
<td>228.2</td>
<td>1313.73</td>
<td>1313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310 band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L23</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1309.14</td>
<td>1310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L22</td>
<td>229.8</td>
<td>1304.58</td>
<td>1305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L21</td>
<td>230.6</td>
<td>1300.05</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L20</td>
<td>231.4</td>
<td>1295.56</td>
<td>1295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290 band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L13</td>
<td>232.2</td>
<td>1291.1</td>
<td>1292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1286.66</td>
<td>1287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>233.8</td>
<td>1282.26</td>
<td>1282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10</td>
<td>234.6</td>
<td>1277.89</td>
<td>1277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270 band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L03</td>
<td>235.4</td>
<td>1273.55</td>
<td>1275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L02</td>
<td>236.2</td>
<td>1269.23</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L01</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1264.95</td>
<td>1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L00</td>
<td>237.8</td>
<td>1260.69</td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
400GbE Parallel MMF Gen1 Transceiver

Different Gen2 architecture is required to support higher I/O density
400GbE MTP Connector Specifications

- USCONEC Proposal
- Same core technology as originally developed by NTT Laboratories researchers T. Satake and colleagues
- Same critical dimensions as existing MTP connectors
- Width increased to support 2x16 fibers
400GbE Transceiver Alternatives

- **On/Off modulation**
  - 16 x 25Gb/s NRZ lasers (VCSEL and DFB) baseline
  - Linear extension of 100GbE technology
  - Only requires process yield improvements
  - Benchmark against which to measure other proposals

- **Multi-level amplitude modulation**
  - Ex. 8 x 50Gb/s PAM-N lasers (VCSEL and DFB)
  - Coding DSP (ex. TCM)
  - Multiple implementation and SNR challenges

- **Complex (amplitude and phase) modulation**
  - Ex. 4 x 100Gb/s PM-QPSK (MZM)
  - Coherent DSP
  - No technology exists that can be commercialized
Beyond 400GbE Alternatives

Following after 400GbE:

- 1TbE?
  - 2.5x is a small increase from 400GbE
  - unlikely to justify a huge investment
  - unlikely to meet bandwidth growth demands

- 1.2TbE?
  - 3x is a small increase from 400GbE
  - unlikely to justify a huge investment
  - 3 is an odd number

- 1.6TbE?
  - 4x increase from 400GbE (same as 10GbE to 40GbE)
  - Sufficient increase to justify a huge investment
1.6TbE Transceiver Alternatives

- 64 x 25Gb/s NRZ lasers
  - Not practical
  - Too many channels

- 32 x 50Gb/s PAM4 lasers
  - Not practical
  - Too many channels

- Complex (amplitude and phase) modulation
  - Only feasible alternative to control channel count
    - Ex1. 16 x 100Gb/s PM-QPSK (MZM)
    - Ex2. 8 x 200Gb/s PM-16QAM (MZM)
  - Requires complex CMOS ICs and PICs
  - No technology exists that can be commercialized
  - Excellent opportunity for long term academic research
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- 100Gb/s Ethernet Technology
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- 100Gb/s Transport Technology
- Beyond 100Gb/s Transport Technology
- Recommendations
OTU4 28GBd PM-QPSK TX

1x 100Gb/s λ Architecture

Soft Decision (SD) FEC requires 32Gb/s TX
OTU4 28GBd PM-QPSK RX

1x 100Gb/s λ Architecture

SD FEC requires 32Gbd RX
OTU4 OSNR Limited BER

![Graph showing BER vs. Q (dB) for different generations of FEC codes.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Coding Scheme</th>
<th>Net Coding Gain (@ 10^{-13})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Block Turbo Code, LDPC</td>
<td>~10dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Concatenated RS, BCH</td>
<td>7~9dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>RS(255,239)</td>
<td>5.8dB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Ethernet & Transport Compatibility
- 100Gb/s Ethernet Technology
- Beyond 100Gb/s Ethernet Technology
- 100Gb/s Transport Technology
  - Beyond 100Gb/s Transport Technology
- Recommendations
OTN Spectral Efficiency Limits

- OTU4 rate: $\sim112\text{Gb/s}$
- OTU4 technology: 100Gb/s in 50GHz: $\sim2\text{bits/sec-HZ}$
- Theoretical capacity of standard SMF: $\sim8\text{bits/sec-HZ}$


- Practical equipment and fiber limit for standard SMF over typical LH distances (1000km or longer): $\sim4\text{bits/sec-HZ}$


- 2x left for improving spectral efficiency for LH applications, ex. 400Gb/s in 100GHz: $\sim4\text{bits/sec-Hz}$
OTU5 Rate

- 400GbE rate = \(~412\text{Gb/s}\)
- To efficiently carry 400GbE, OTU5 = \(~450\text{Gb/s}\)
- 20% SD FEC transport rate = \(~500\text{Gb/s}\)
- 100GHz channel bandwidth gives \(~2\times\) spectral efficiency increase over OTU4
- Maintains 4x traditional OTN rate jump, ex. OTU2 to OTU3
- Allows extending OTU4 DP-QPSK technology
- Higher OTU5 rate has no spectral efficiency benefits ex.\(1\text{Tb/s}\) only increases bandwidth
OTU5 28GBd PM-16QAM TX (1 of 2)

2x 200Gb/s λ Architecture
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OTU5 28GBd PM-16QAM RX (1 of 2)

2x 200Gb/s λ Architecture
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Linear analysis of 224Gb/s λ in 50GHz channel with ASE noise
OTU5 28GBd PM-TC-32QAM TX (1 of 2)

2x 200Gb/s λ Architecture

TCM: Trellis Coded Modulation
OTU5 28GBd PM-TC-32QAM RX (1 of 2)

2x 200Gb/s λ Architecture

OTU5 28GBd PM-TC-32QAM BER

Linear analysis of 224Gb/s λ in 50GHz channel with ASE noise
OTU5 18GBd PM-TC-16QAM TX (1 of 4)

4x 100Gb/s λ Architecture

TCM: Trellis Coded Modulation
OTU5 18GBd PM-TC-16QAM BER

Linear analysis of 112Gb/s λ in 25GHz channel with ASE noise
## OTU5 400Gb/s Alternatives Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Per λ channel BW GHz</th>
<th>Rate GBaud</th>
<th>Spectral Efficiency bits/sec-Hz</th>
<th>ΔOSNR* pre-FEC BER=1.e-3 dB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>single 112 Gb/s λ PM-QPSK</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dual 224 Gb/s λ PM-16QAM</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dual 224 Gb/s λ PM-TC-32QAM</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quad 112 Gb/s λ PM-TC-16QAM</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* At constant 50GHz channel AOP without non-linear constraints
OTN Rate Beyond OTU5

- OTU5 = ~450Gb/s to efficiently carry 400GbE
- OTU6 will efficiently carry following Ethernet
- If following Ethernet is 1.6TbE, OTU6 = ~1.8Tb/s
- 20% SD FEC transport rate = ~2Tb/s
- Spectral efficiency will only increase with new type of fiber or fundamentally different approaches to the SMF channel
- Technology for transport rates above 500Gb/s (ex. 1Tb/s) does not exist and will require extensive R&D
Outline

- Ethernet & Transport Compatibility
- 100Gb/s Ethernet Technology
- Beyond 100Gb/s Ethernet Technology
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- Beyond 100Gb/s Transport Technology

➢ Recommendations
Recommendations

Next Ethernet and OTN (OTU5) rates are likely to be ~400Gb/s

- Focus engineering development on 500Gb/s
- Double OTN spectral efficiency to 4bits/sec-Hz
- Extend 100GbE and OTU4 28GBd PM-QPSK technology

Following Ethernet and OTN rates are preferably >1.6Gb/s

- Focus fundamental research on at least 2Tb/s
- Quadruple OTN spectral efficiency to at least 8bits/sec-Hz
- Invent new modulation, DSP, device and fiber technology

There will be no ~1Tb/s Ethernet or OTN rates

- Neither a good engineering or research objective
Conclusion

1Tb/s Researchers praying for guidance