

HOW CONFIDENT ARE YOU ABOUT YOUR CONNECTOR CLEANLINESS?

Vincent Racine, Product Line Manager, Francis Audet, Advisor, CTO Office, François Marcotte, Senior Technical Sales Specialist
Gwennaél Amice, Senior Application Engineer

At the turn of the millennium, fiber inspection was performed with a microscope. This required technicians to stick their eye on a potentially live fiber, which meant risking personal injury every time they had to assess fiber endface quality.

In mid-2005, the eye care community breathed a sigh of relief when the first fiber inspection probes made their way to the market. These probes were able to display an image of the endface on an LCD display rather than directly on a tech's retina. However, this image had to be interpreted. What constituted a defect or contaminant had to be based on user knowledge and gut instinct, and depending on the quality of the focus, image centering and several other parameters, there was always a chance of misinterpretation.

By 2010, the first intelligent analysis software for fiber inspection, which was based on the IEC standard, had arrived. The software automatically detected and analyzed any defect, highlighted it on the display screen and gave an overall pass-fail status, thereby removing the burden of interpretation and human error from the equation. Or did it?

Regardless of the power of the on-board intelligence, poor focus and poor image capture will lead to errors. More often than not, an out-of-focus speck, scratch or trace will simply not appear on the screen. The intelligent software will give the connector a thumbs up, when in reality, it should not have. This is what is referred to as a false positive. As the saying goes, garbage in, garbage out.

The following images compare manual centering and focusing to automatic centering and focusing. The methodology involved inspecting the connector, cleaning it and inspecting it again (with the manual focus probe) until a pass was obtained. The same port was then inspected with an automated unit.




Figure 1. Manual versus automatic focusing

EXFO

überreicht durch:

Opternus

Opternus GmbH Optische Spleiss- & Messtechnik

Bahnhofstr. 5
D-22941 Bargteheide

Tel. +49(0)4532-20 44-0
Fax +49(0)4532-20 44-25

Büro Süd:

Katharinenstr. 57
D-73728 Esslingen

Tel. +49(0)711-3 10 59 99-0
Fax +49(0)711-3 10 59 99-99

E-Mail: info@opternus.de - www.opternus.de - www.opternus-shop.de




Figure 2. Manual versus automatic focusing

Many papers and studies have shown the impact that connector cleanliness has on network issues and failures. Unfortunately, very few technicians, operators and managers acknowledge this. As mentioned before, regardless of the on-board intelligence and analysis software, when the endface is slightly out-of-focus or slightly over-exposed or the image is slightly off-center, false positives will occur. In order to truly rid the world of the connector cleanliness plague, the last remaining unknowns and variables must be removed from the equation.

The following are examples of the impact that not-so-squeaky-clean connectors can have.

1. IMPACT ON HIGHER DATA RATES

A tier-1 datacenter test covers link budget only. If it fails, the cause of the failure is not analyzed. The connectors are changed, and if that does not work, the link is broken up and shortened. This is expensive, but often cheaper than locating and troubleshooting the issue. Since the standardization of 1 Gbit/s Ethernet (i.e., 100GBASE-SX) in 2002, the 3.56 dB total channel IL for 50/125 micron multimode fiber was reduced to 2.6 dB for 10GBASE-SR and to 1.9 dB for 40GBASE-SR4 (or 100GBASE-SR10). Consequently, for 40GBASE-SR4, a maximum connector loss of 1.0 dB is required for a 150-meter channel containing multiple connector interfaces and high-bandwidth OM4 fiber. Therefore, in datacenters, upgrades to higher data rates such as 40G/100G may fail because the tolerance to insertion loss (IL) becomes much tighter.

	IEEE	Designation	Mbit/s	Fiber Type	Number of fibers	Maximum link length (m)	Maximum channel insertion loss (dB)
10-Gbit Ethernet	802.3ae	10GBase-SR	10,000	OM3	2	300	2.6
40-Gbit Ethernet	P802.3ba	40GBase-SR4	40,000	OM3	8	100	1.9
40-Gbit Ethernet	P802.3ba	40GBase-SR4	40,000	OM4	8	150	1.5
100-Gbit Ethernet	P802.3ba	100GBase-SR10	100,000	OM3	20	100	1.9
100-Gbit Ethernet	P802.3ba	100GBase-SR10	100,000	OM4	20	150	1.5

Figure 3. High data rate Ethernet specs

Since 2010, the ISO/IEC-11801 specification on general-purpose telecommunication cabling systems has also tightened the loss budget for connectors:

Previous version:

Mated pair transmission performance			
Maximum insertion loss ^{b, c} dB	Other	0,75	IEC 61300-3-34
	Splice	0,3	IEC 61073-1

Current version:

Maximum insertion loss ^b dB	Other	100% ≤ 0,75 dB 95% ≤ 0,50 dB 50% ≤ 0,35 dB	IEC 61300-3-34
	Splice	0,3	IEC 61073-1

Figure 4. ISO/IEC-11801 specification

At higher speeds on OM4 fibers, 50% of the fibers must have a maximum IL of 0.35 dB or less. Therefore, the need to properly inspect connectors has never been greater.

2. IMPACT ON OTHER TEST RESULTS

Since a dirty connector will typically exhibit more reflectance and loss, the optical return loss (ORL) and IL readings taken by an OTDR will be higher. The image below illustrates this common problem. The experiment was conducted on a very short, 101.4-meter singlemode fiber link. Fiber loss in itself accounts for approximately 0.003 dB at 1310 nm, which is deemed inconsequential. The ORL and IL reading at 1310 nm for connector 2 is 0.638 dB, with a reflection of -31.5 dB. The link ORL is 27.86 dB.




Figure 5. ORL and IL readings on an uncleaned connector

After cleaning the connectors, the loss reading dropped to 0.053 dB at 1310 nm, with a reflectance of -55.9 dB. The link ORL also dropped to 50.4 dB. Everything is back to normal.

If we apply these results to the datacenter example above, only three of these bad connections would have failed at 40G data rates and higher.




Figure 6. ORL and IL readings on a cleaned connector

The image below shows connector 2 before and after cleaning. It is interesting to note that the contaminant here is not grease or oil from the technician's fingers, but simply dust collected from the environment (e.g., drywall, concrete, skin particles and sand). Therefore, even when a technician does not touch the connector endface, it can still be contaminated.




Figure 7. Connector 2 before and after cleaning

3. IMPACT ON OTN BIT ERROR RATE TESTS (BERT)

Another example involves erratic readings during 40G or 100G OTN BERTs. Dirty connectors reduce the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) at the receiver, and most PIN receivers react the same way to noise: proportional increase in BER. Problems such as forward error correction (FEC), alarm indication signal (AIS) or backward defect indicator (BDI) may also occur and lead to the unnecessary troubleshooting of Tx and Rx equipment. This means sending a technician to the site to retest the link in order to obtain clear results. This can be a very time-consuming, especially when you consider that a BERT needs to be error free for 24 hours.

Case in point, a major operator in America used pre-installed fibers to deploy a 40 Gbit/s system across three states in 2013. They were using the “clean and connect” method without any inspection. They had to perform three BERTs because errors were showing up after 14 hours of testing.

The lesson here is that paying attention to fiber inspection will save time and eliminate the need to perform additional BERTs.

4. IMPACT ON ORL

Every system has a maximum ORL, and clean connectors are vital to it. One area where ORL can be extremely detrimental is in high-speed coherent transmission (40G and 100G transport). In most of these deployments, whether they are greenfield or brownfield, low loss amplification is required to optimize distance. This means deploying a mix of Erbium-doped fiber amplifiers (EDFA) and more recently, Raman amplifiers. Raman is a low-noise amplification that uses the fiber itself as the amplifying media. It can easily be added to any existing infrastructure with little engineering, but since the fiber is the amplifier, every light travelling within it will be amplified (i.e. the signal and unwanted reflections). Reflections must therefore be kept to a minimum in every single Raman-amplified system.

CONCLUSION

To recap, false positives and the four examples above can be avoided by implementing the best troubleshooting and maintenance practices, which includes proper connector inspection and cleaning.

In today's telecommunication environment, where OPEX is the name of the game, long, tedious and ultimately, misdirected troubleshooting efforts are not welcome. Field technicians and engineers will waste precious time looking for issues at the fiber level (macro bends, splice points) or the transmission level (transmission and receiving cards) before checking the connectors. A fiber inspection probe that not only analyzes the connector endface image, but auto-centers, auto-focuses and freezes it, will ensure the integrity and repeatability of inspection results.

This is where the new FIP-430B inspection probe comes into play. Thanks to its fully automated features, the FIP-430B ensures optimized image quality. This inspection probe automatically centers the image adjusts the focus as well as captures and analyzes the image in accordance with preprogrammed IEC, IPC or custom standards—delivering accurate results in just ONE step.

EXFO Headquarters > Tel.: +1 418 683-0211 | Toll-free: +1 800 663-3936 (USA and Canada) | Fax: +1 418 683-2170 | info@EXFO.com | www.EXFO.com

EXFO serves over 2000 customers in more than 100 countries. To find your local office contact details, please go to www.EXFO.com/contact.