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## Introduction

- he 3ck adhoc 01a_010219 showed some simulation results on different FEC schemes for 100G FEC sublayer.
- This presentation added one more case, where 2 FEC codewords are symbol interleaved into two lanes, and the 100 G lane is formed by $2: 1$ bit multiplexing in the PMA.


## Background

- FEC interleaving was discussed in gustlin_3ck_01_1118.
- anslow_3ck_01_1118 \& anslow_3ck_01_0918 compared many options including interleaving two FEC codewords to form a 100G lane, and 2:1 and 4:1 bit-muxing.
- It was shown that symbol interleaving outperformed 2:1 or 4:1 bit muxing.
- Precoding effects for DFE based model was also studied (zhang_3ck_01a_0918).
- We did some more analysis based on the contributions above and some measured channel data provided in previous meetings, to show the benefit of symbol interleaving.


## Precoding Disabled

- We did some analysis based on different possibilities of burst continuing "a" values.
- The model was based on the block diagram below.

- Precoding only helps when "a" is greater than 0.6 , as shown in the calculated data below:


* In these figures, (SNR - 6.99) is the SNR as defined in anslow 3ck $01 \quad 1118$.
- Our simulation in the following slides was performed on ADC-based model with low tap values, so we disabled precoding.


## Simulation Setup

- The simulations were done based one channel data provided in mellitz_3ck_adhoc_02_081518.
- The first set of data shown in this contribution was based on "CaBP_BGAVia_Opt2_28dB".
- More channels will be simulated, including mellitz_3ck_adhoc_02_081518 \& kareti 3ck_01a_1118
- This work is done with ADC-based SerDes model*.
- TX side:
- Matlab environment generates the RS $(544,514)$ FEC codewords;
- Perform the distribution and interleaving/bit-muxing;
- Modulates the signal stream and sends them over channels that suffer of insertion loss and cross talk.
- RX side:
- Equalization is provided by the CTLE whose output is connected to the ADC, followed by the FFE/DFE equalization.
- The received demodulated codewords are error corrected and statistics extracted.
- 1000 codewords per encoder is simulated for each data point.
* No precoding. DFE: Tap $1=0.3$, Tap $2=0.05$


## Case 1 - 1 codeword, 1 lane, direct symbol output.

- This case is provided as a reference.
- It shows the performance of a native $\operatorname{RS}(544,514)$ FEC without any symbol interleaving or bit-muxing.

- The data was taken on different ICN values.
- Pre-FEC and post-FEC BER values were extracted.
- The average and worse SNR at FEC decoder for each run were recorded.
- Two different flavors of plots were tried
- post-FEC BER vs Pre-FEC BER
- Pre-FEC BER vs SNR(worst) \& SNR (average)

| $\mathrm{ICN}(\mathrm{mV})$ | preFEC BER | SNR (dB) <br> (Worst) | SNR (dB) <br> (Average) | postFEC BER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.6 | $9.04 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 10.549892 | 12.169264 | 1.05E-04 |
| 1.2 | $5.59 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 10.719422 | 12.305772 | $2.43 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| 1.0 | $4.50 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 10.995735 | 12.339306 | $1.33 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| 0.8 | $3.82 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 11.086742 | 12.358319 | $7.45 \mathrm{E}-06$ |



## Case 2-1 codeword, 2 lanes, bit mux

Round robin distribution of FEC symbols from 1 FEC codeword to two lanes. 2:1 bit multiplexing in the PMA.


- This is equivalent to 802.3cd defined FEC
- Plotting the pre-FEC BER and SNR makes a clearer comparison.
- Worst SNR is directly related to the number of error bits in a codeword.
- Average SNR does not reflect the real situation where many error bits are located in one codeword (burst cases).

| ICN(mV) | preFEC BER | SNR (dB) (Worst) | SNR (dB) <br> (Average) | postFEC BER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.6 | 8.05E-04 | 10.184004 | 12.142603 | 8.31E-05 |
| 1.2 | $5.26 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 10.396164 | 12.242248 | $3.15 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| 1 | $4.09 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 10.58238 | 12.312874 | $1.40 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| 0.8 | $3.20 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 11.134963 | 12.347067 | $4.41 \mathrm{E}-06$ |



## Case 3-2 codewords, 1 lane, symbol mux

2:1 Symbol interleave from 2 FEC codewords to a single 100G lane.


- Symbol interleaving improves FEC performance.
- No post-FEC errors were detected for $\mathrm{ICN}<=1.2 \mathrm{mV}$.
- The result is almost 0.8 mV better than the reference case in terms of ICN value.

| ICN(mV) | preFEC BER | SNR (dB) <br> (Worst) | SNR (dB) <br> (Average) | postFEC BER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.6 | 8.35E-04 | 11.040394 | 12.213918 | $4.60 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| 1.2 | $4.84 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 11.137942 | 12.382493 |  |
| 1 | $3.80 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 11.185276 | 12.431798 |  |
| 0.8 | $3.33 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 11.479653 | 12.446318 |  |



## Case 4-2 codewords, 2 lanes, bit mux

2 FEC codewords symbol interleaved into two lanes. 2:1 bit multiplexing in the PMA.


- Only "20a20b" is simulated.
- No post-FEC errors were detected for ICN <= 1.0mV.
- Slightly worse than 2 codewords, 1 lane, symbol mux case.
- "10ab10ba" could be slightly better.

| $\mathrm{CN}(\mathrm{mV})$ | preFEC BER | SNR (dB) (Worst) | SNR (dB) <br> (Average) | postFEC BER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.6 | 7.84E-04 | 10.719422 | 12.183344 | 3.37E-05 |
| 1.2 | $4.81 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 11.134963 | 12.326718 | 3.86E-06 |
| 1 | $3.66 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 11.251666 | 12.382125 | 0 |
| 0.8 | $3.06 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 11.237942 | 12.410276 |  |



## Case Study Summary



- Preliminary conclusion:
- 2 codewords performs better based on the channel simulated.
- The performance of 802.3cd type of bit-muxing is not as good as native RS $(544,514)$ FEC.
- Table below shows some example codewords with error bits that may be corrected by one case but failed in another.

| Codeword \# with <br> > $\mathbf{1 5}$ errored bits | Number of <br> error bits | Adjacent errored <br> bit positions | Number of error <br> symbols | Correctable by 1 CW, <br> $\mathbf{2}$ Lanes, Bit Mux | Correctable by 1 CW, 1 <br> Lane, Direct Symbol Output |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 369 | 22 | 3 | 15 | NO | YES |
| 817 | 19 | 2 | 14 | NO | YES |
| 1160 | 22 | 2 | 14 | NO | YES |
| 1499 | 31 | 2 | 14 | NO | YES |
| 1549 | 46 | 4 | 24 | NO | NO |

## Conclusions and Questions

- This contribution compares different RS( 544,514 ) FEC options against a reference $\operatorname{RS}(544,514)$ FEC with direct symbol output.
- Performance ranking high to low:
- 2 codewords, 1 lane, symbol mux
- 2 codewords, 2 lanes, bit mux
- 1 codeword, 1 lane, direct symbol output
- 1 codeword, 2 lanes, bit mux
- 1 codeword, 4 lanes, but mux (pending update)
- PCS/FEC/PMA: How many codewords? How many lanes? PMA mux at bit level or symbol level?
- 2 codewords $-2 \times 50$ G FEC encoders
- Better performance than 1 codeword.
- 1 codeword $-1 \times 100$ G FEC encoder
- Backward compatible.
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