

simDM ACT & TDD Simulation

Contribution to 802.3dm Task Force Ad Hoc January 20, 2024

Ragnar Jonsson - Marvell

Introduction

- This presentation evaluates the performance of an ACT in various operating environment
- TDD simulation is presented for comparison
- The simulation is based on simulation framework presented in a separate presentation (<u>jonsson_3dm_01_12_19_24.pdf</u>), and the simulation code is provided for reference and to allow more thorough review
- The simulation uses the good and bad 15m cables from jonsson_3dm_02_09_15_24.pdf

Simulation Details

- The simulation uses a 22.5GHz sampling rate to represent analog signals, and analog signal levels are represented in Volts
- No echo cancelation is used for either high or low data rate signals
- No equalization is used for the 100Mbps DME signal
- T/2-spaced equalizers are used for the high data rate signals, to minimize ambiguity due to sampling phase at the ADC
- No quantization is done at the ADC (only down-sampling), to minimize ambiguity due to signal quantization
- Equalizer coefficients for high data rate signals are calculated using line probing signals and closed form minimum mean square equalizer algorithm from [1]

 ^[1] R. H. Jonsson, "DSL Channel Equalization" in *Fundamentals of DSL Technology* P. Golden, H. Dedieu, and K. S. Jacobsen, Eds. CRC Press, 2005, pp. 299-350.



Cable Characteristics

Simulated Cables

- The cables simulated in this presentation are taken from jonsson_3dm_02_09_15_24.pdf
- The s-parameters for these cables have been shared with the task force
- Both the good and the bad cables are based on RTK044 cable with four inline connectors: 4.5m+2m+ 2m+4.5m
- The difference between them is that the bad cable has very bad simulated inline connectors
- The following slides show the impulse response, and the frequency transfer functions for the good and the bad cables
- Simulations have been run for number of other cables, and they have shown similar results to what is presented here

Good Cable Impulse Responses



Good Cable Transfer Functions



Bad Cable Impulse Responses



Bad Cable Transfer Functions



Signal Path on Good Cable

100Mbps DME Transmit Signals

The eye is open without any equalization





2.5Gbps PAM4 Transmit Signals

 The eye is closed without equalization





2.5Gbps PAM2 Transmit Signals

 The eye is closed without equalization





10Gbps PAM4 Transmit Signals

 The eye is closed without equalization





Good vs Bad Cable

100Mbps DME **Transmit Signals**

- The bad cable attenuates the signal more and introduces secondary reflections
- The bad cable introduces much more echo
- No echo cancelation or equalization is required



Open eve

Time Ins

14

400

-400

-600

-800

400

-400

-600 -800



2.5Gbps PAM4 Transmit Signals

- The bad cable attenuates the signal more and introduces secondary reflections
- The bad cable introduces much more echo
- The equalizer in this experiment can only partially open the eye for the bad cable





Bad Cable



2.5Gbps PAM2 Transmit Signals

- The equalizer in this experiment can open the eye for the bad cable
- For the bad cable, the PAM2 modulation is performing better than the PAM4 modulation on previous slide





Bad Cable



10Gbps PAM4 Transmit Signals

 The equalizer in this experiment can not open the eye for the bad cable









10Gbps PAM4 Transmit Signals

- The plots on the right compare the effect of insertion loss (IL) and return loss (RL) on the failed link for 10Gbps PAM4 on bad cable
- The plot shows that the failure is due to the bad IL, not the bad RL



ACT vs TDD

2.5Gbps PAM4 **Transmit Signals**

- The plots on the right compare ACT (top row) to TDD (bottom row)
- TDD is emulated by using ideal RL (no echo)
- For more direct comparison, the TDD uses the same modulation as ACT high data rate
- The plot shows that the echo has little impact on the ACT receiver



Host slicer input for Good IL and Ideal RL (2.5Gbps PAM4

400 500 600

Time [ns]

Open Eve

700 800

15

1 and a second the states of the

100 200

E

Open Eye Contraction Street, Vol. 100 200 300 400 500 700 800 Time Insl Host slicer input for Bad IL and Ideal RL (2.5Gbps PAM4) 1 a million and the second state of the second second places of the second second second second second second s المستحصر ومحاطقه والمحصر فتعر محيد المردانية والمحاف والمحافظ محصر ومنازعهم والمحافظ والمحافظ والمحاف والمساوع an advanced to an advantage and share with a strong to a specific the specific strong states and a second restance water and the second state and a second second second second second second second second the model and the stand of the state of the second state of the se the state of the second state of the state o Open Eve 4. Harris -----1 ------- at a transform

Time Insl

100 200 300 400 500 600

Bad Cable

Host slicer input for Bad IL and Bad RL (2.5Gbps PAM4

Service Contract

and a particular in the stands

IEEE 802.3dm Task Force

700 800

2.5Gbps PAM2 Transmit Signals

- The plots on the right compare ACT (top row) to TDD (bottom row)
- TDD is emulated by using ideal RL (no echo)
- For more direct comparison, the TDD uses the same modulation as ACT high data rate
- The plot shows that the echo has little impact on the ACT receiver







Time Ins

Bad Cable

Host slicer input for Bad IL and Bad RL (2.5Gbps PAM2

10Gbps PAM4 Transmit Signals

- The plots on the right compare ACT (top row) to TDD (bottom row)
- TDD is emulated by using ideal RL (no echo)
- The plot shows that the echo has minimal impact on the ACT receiver
- At high symbol rate both ACT and TDD fail on the bad cable due to secondary reflections











100Mbps Transmit Signals

- The plots on the right compare ACT (top row) to TDD (bottom row)
- TDD is emulated by using ideal RL (no echo)
- ACT uses the low rate DME for the 100Mbps
- 100Mbps TDD is simulated using 2.5Gbps data rate PAM2 for the 100Mbps
- The plot shows that the echo has little impact on the ACT receiver





Open Eye

Time Insl

Summary

- The simulations shows that the ACT can operate over good and bad cables without echo cancelation and without equalization in the camera
- The simulations shows that even in the presence of severe echo, the ACT degradation is very limited
- The simulations show that the absence of echo is not a significant benefit for TDD over ACR
- The simulations show that comparison of PAM2 and PAM4 deserves a closer look
- The simulations show that the camera receiver is much simpler for ACT, compared to TDD

The higher complexity of the TDD (compared to ACT) is not justified



Essential technology, done right[™]