# Extended Spectrum DOCSIS®: A Pragmatic Approach

A Technical Paper prepared for SCTE•ISBE by

**Steve Condra**
Senior Engineering Director and Product Manager
Teleste Intercept LLC
440 Forsgate Drive, Cranbury NJ 08512
+1 (678) 641 8099
steven.condra@telesteintercept.com

**Kari Maki**
Manager, R&D
Teleste Corporation
Telestekatu 1, 20660 Littoinen, Finland
+357 405540506
kari.maki@teleste.com

**Arttu Purmonen**
VP, Systems Marketing
Teleste Corporation
Telestekatu 1, 20660 Littoinen, Finland
+357 405540506
kari.maki@teleste.com

# Table of Contents

# List of Figures

# List of Tables

# Introduction

Extended Spectrum DOCSIS (ESD) has been a topical subject due to ever-increasing broadband speeds in the digital landscape. While cable industry veterans have competed over who boasts the highest frequency, very little, if anything, has been published about what moving towards 1.8 GHz or even beyond that means in practice. We have performed real 1.8 GHz full spectrum measurements and, in the process, have revealed what it takes to offer new services using frequencies of up to 1.8 GHz. Our focus is on the amplifiers that are often needed even after distributed access roll-outs. The results of our measurements are enriched by cable operators who have contributed to and grounded our research by providing feedback and real network challenges. Our study covers variables that are expected to limit ESD implementations in North America, such as 1) length of cables, 2) length of amplifier cascades, 3) existing taps, 4) performance of the state-of-the-art amplifiers equipped with the latest hybrids and 5) capabilities of the latest Remote PHY (RPD) products. The results of our study provide pragmatic proposals for how DOCSIS OFDM frequency blocks are placed above currently employed frequencies and what kinds of limitations these proposals have. Our objective is to offer the latest information and unbiased practical proposals that can help cable operators obtain the most out of their networks with minimal changes. Although some changes will be crucial, significant costs can be mitigated through careful planning. Careful planning is not limited to the choice of amplifiers and taps, given that managing the interplay between RPDs and amplifiers must be considered to reach the rising broadband speed expectations of subscribers.Please take note of the following instructions for your technical paper or operational practice:

# Content

## 1. Introduction

It might be fairly easy to convert some cable networks to support N+0 architectures, while other networks will utilize amplifiers and amplifier cascades even when the next decade arrives. These amplifiers should work up to 1.8 GHz, which is not a walk in the park for engineers. In comparison to 1 GHz networks, the attenuation of coaxial cables at 1.8 GHz is over 40% more. Besides this challenge, also taps and splitters, even when designed for 1.8 GHz networks, cannot have the same attenuation at 1.8 GHz as their predecessors had at 1 GHz. To cope with these challenges, higher amplifier output levels or alternative workarounds are needed. Real tests in real conditions reveal to us what can be expected when the latest amplifier technologies enter the markets in 2020.

Before the tests, we wanted to be sure that the measurements describe a new reality and unlearn old parameters that would falsify our results. Existing amplifier cascades in the field today were built when old-school cable experts used to discuss many parameters, including composite second order (CSO) and composite triple beat (CTB) intermodulation distortion. However, new indicators are needed when services are digital and advanced modulation methods overtake cable networks. These new indicators, Modulation Error Ratio (MER), Bit Error Ratio (BER), Total Composite Power (TCP) and Carrier to Interference Noise Ratio (CINR), are valid scales for analyzing how networks and devices perform when the load is digital. While BER is the only thing that matters for end users, MER is faster for measuring and can be used to indicate BER. MER is also a better indicator than BER as new Forward Error Correction (FEC) methods introduced along DOCSIS 3.1 are extremely effective. The combination of Bose-Chaudhuri-Hocquenghem (BCH) and low-density-parity-check (LDPC) coding is so strong that BER values are either perfect or inferior, but seldom something between, while MER offers a more comprehensive overall snapshot of how tight margins networks have. It should be noted that although DOCSIS standards define MER, they still define carrier to noise ratio (CNR) as well. However, we can use MER and CNR analogously in calculations because network noise can be assumed to have a Gaussian distribution, as we will see in later chapters.

## 2. Tests

We started our tests by exploring 1.8 GHz hybrids. After these tests, we proceeded to amplifiers and amplifier cascades. Amplifier cascades were also modelled theoretically to understand if theoretical models and real test results are consistent with each other. In such a case, theoretical models could be used to complement and overcome possible uncertainties raised by real measurement results.

### 2.1. Hybrids

In February 2019, we tested the latest 1.8 GHz hybrids in our R&D, which were still prototypes. We used a various mixed single carry QAM (SC-QAM) and OFDM loads (an example is shown in Figure 1). The used frequency ranges were 602 MHz … 1218 MHz and 1218 MHz … 1794 MHz, respectively. The source MER was 51 dB over the whole frequency range. This source MER was selected because it is a realistic, perhaps even pessimistic, portrayal of performance that current RPD products are capable of if we ignore their amplifier stages. However, it is enough to fulfil DOCSIS specification for OFDM (*CM-SP-PHY*) and SC-QAM

**Figure 1 - Downstream Load**

(*CM-SP-DRFI*) when 51 dB MER is deteriorated by the amplifier stages that are integrated to the RPD nodes. Figure 2 reveals the performance of the very best hybrid model that we tested in several TCP points. The lines have some angularity as values between the TCP points are approximations. The figure shows interesting spots at 609 MHz (SC-QAM) and 1.7 GHz (OFDM). The worse OFDM MER was clearly caused by the higher frequency, not by OFDM. Indeed, tests with various load mixes revealed that the load caused by SC-QAM and OFDM does not differ if the level and frequency are the same. We increased the full spectrum load until MER at 1.7 GHz in the output of the hybrid reached 40 dB, while Pre-FEC BER was better than 1E-9. At this point, the impact of the source MER was negligible (less than 0.5 dB) and SC-QAM MER at lower frequencies was sound. The best performing hybrid model was able to produce 72 dBmV TCP, while the worst (not in the figure) hybrid reached 70 dBmV. In June 2019, we had improved 1.8 GHz hybrids in our R&D. Now the highest performing hybrid model was able to produce 74 dBmV TCP in the similar setup under the same criteria as in February 2019. Our current estimate is that once hybrids are available in volumes their performance will reach 76 dBmV TCP under the same conditions, and amplifiers equipped with these hybrids are available in 2020.

**Figure 2 - Performance of the best hybrid**

## 2.2. Amplifiers

Amplifiers have signal losses after hybrid components as additional components such as feedthrough current chokes, diplexers and connectors are needed in them. In total, these components have around a 6 dB loss at 1.8 GHz. As higher frequencies carry higher power and cause worse non-linearity, we can estimate that a 1.8 GHz amplifier equipped with the state-of-the-art hybrid (76 dBmV TCP) has at least 70 dBmV TCP in the output port. Figure 3 illustrates what it means in practice if the lowest downstream channels are around 500 MHz and the full load burdens an amplifier up to 1.8 GHz. The output is sloped up to 1.2 GHz, meaning that the virtual level at 1.8 GHz is 56 dBmV, while the practical level is around 48 dBmV for channels above 1.2 GHz. The virtual level can be used to calculate the needed gain. Before calculating the gain we must know the lowest allowed downstream input level that does not lead to poor amplifier CNR impacting MER negatively. Our target is to reach 57 dB CNR, while the noise figure (NF) is 10 dB.

$$CNR = The\ lowest\ input\ level - NF - Thermal\ noise$$

$$The\ lowest\ input\ level = CNR + NF + Thermal\ noise$$

$$The\ lowest\ input\ level = 57\ dB + 10\ dB + (-57\ dBmV) = 10\ dBmV$$

**396/490 MHz split**

*Figure 3 - An example load leading to 70 dBmV TCP*

On the other hand, the output level is limited to 56 dBmV as Figure 3 shows. Although the 56 dBmV limitation is virtual, it matters as it defines the needed gain through the needed slope illustrated in Figure 3. Thus, we can calculate that a 46 dB gain is needed as we know that the lowest input level is 10 dBmV.

$$56\ dBmV - 10\ dBmV = 46\ dB$$

The 46 dB gain covers a loss of 1300 ft. cable (P3 500) or, alternatively, it can compensate a feedthrough loss of seven 1.8 GHz taps (3.5dB@1.8GHz) and 90 ft. cable between the taps.

## 2.3. Amplifier cascades

A theoretical analysis of amplifier cascades can be done using the following equation:

$$MER_{out} = -10\log_{10}\left(10^{\frac{MER_{in}}{-10}} + 10^{\frac{CNR_{amp_1}}{-10}} + 10^{\frac{CNR_{amp_2}}{-10}} + 10^{\frac{CNR_{amp_n}}{-10}}\right)$$

The equation points how the CNR performance of amplifiers reduces MER in the output. The equation can be simplified when all amplifiers have the same CNR performance.

$$MER_{out} = -10\log_{10}\left(10^{\frac{MER_{in}}{-10}} + n \times 10^{\frac{CNR_{amp}}{-10}}\right)$$

The theoretical analysis of three cascaded amplifiers is shown in Figure 4, illustrating how theoretical MER decreases in function of the output level as amplifiers have a lower CNR when the output level increases. Besides the theoretical calculation, we measured real cascades. Less surprisingly, real cascades behave almost according to the theory. However, even when distortions start to dominate, the theoretical analysis holds, although it should apply only when noise can be assumed to have the Gaussian distribution.

7

**Figure 4 - Three cascaded amplifiers, theoretical MER versus measured MER**

# 3. Methods and implications

## 3.1. Two alternative methods cope with high TCP

The linearity of amplifiers declines at higher frequencies. Therefore, the maximum TCP that 1.2 GHz amplifiers are able to produce is not available with 1.8 GHz amplifiers. As RF load on higher frequencies limits TCP more than the same load on lower frequencies, the solution could reduce the RF load above 1.2 GHz. We propose two alternative methods that can also be done in practice.



**Figure 5 - Method 1**

### 3.1.1. Method 1

In Method 1, the reduction of RF power is performed by a remote PHY device (RPD) node using back-off for OFDM signals as Figure 5 demonstrates. The RPD node is equipped with amplifier stages in combination with high pass filters. First, the RPD staggers OFDM blocks and after the amplifier stages and filters the output of the RPD node is sloped up to 1.2 GHz. While every OFDM block has the same slope their signal level is reduced. Due to the tilt of coaxial cables, the Cable Modem (CM) sees a flat level until 1.2 GHz and the staggered OFDM blocks up to 1.8 GHz.



**Figure 6 - Method 2**

### 3.1.2. Method 2

Figure 6 describes Method 2 that uses a flat top above 1.2 GHz. This is achieved by filters before the last amplifier stage. Channels below 1.2 GHz are sloped in the output of the RPD node in the same way as in Method 1. Due to the tilt of coaxial cables, the cable modem sees a flat top until 1.2 GHz and every received OFDM channel has around -3 dB negative slope. The flat top approach can use, for instance, a 1 GHz verge frequency instead of 1.2 GHz if it is seen as more appropriate for the existing network.

## 3.2. 3.2 Throughput

Based on measurements demonstrating performance of 1.8 GHz amplifiers, we built two example cases demonstrating throughput of the 1.8 GHz network by using method 1. Both cases use 492/602 MHz split and similar upstream load but different downstream modulations and cascade lengths. The throughput and used modulation methods in the cases are presented in Figures 7 and 8. Networks in both cases employ frequencies of up to 108 MHz for legacy services and frequencies between 108 MHz and 492 MHz for four OFDM blocks (each 96 MHz).

**Table 1 - CM Minimum CNR performance (CM-SP-PHYv3.1-I11-170510)**

| Constellation | CNR (dB) Up to 1 GHz | CNR (dB) 1 GHz to 1.2 GHz | Min P6$_{AVG}$ dBmV |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4096 | 41.0 | 41.5 | -6 |
| 2048 | 37.0 | 37.5 | -9 |
| 1024 | 34.0 | 34.0 | -12 |
| 512 | 30.5 | 30.5 | -12 |
| 256 | 27.0 | 27.0 | -15 |

It should be noted that in both cases even the RPD node includes amplifiers as we expose in Figures 5 and 6. Both cases employ cabling and taps but they do not impact MER as they are passive. However, as passives elements attenuate, we made sure that cable modems received enough high signal levels specified in the DOCSIS standard extract presented in Table 1. In both cases, the TCP was in line with limits discussed in the section Amplifiers (2.2).

In the first case (Figure 7), we use frequencies between 602 MHz and 814 MHz for 37 SC-QAM channels, frequencies between 814 MHz and 1402 MHz for 1024 OFDM and frequencies between 1402 MHz and 1794 MHz for 512 OFDM. The setup consists of one RPD node and three cascaded 1.8 GHz amplifiers. Table 2 shows MER over four different frequencies, in the RPD node output and after 3 amplifiers. With the given values, the example can be used to reach 9.7 Gbps downstream capacity.



**Figure 7 - Throughput, RPD Node and three cascaded amplifiers**

**Table 2 - MER, N+3 network**

| Frequency | MER (N+3 network) | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | RPD Node | N+3 |
| 830 MHz | 48.0 dB | 43.0 |
| 1.1 GHz | 47.5 dB | 42.5 |
| 1.3 GHz | 45.5 dB | 39.0 |
| 1.7 GHz | 41.5 dB | 34.5 |

In the second case (Figure 8), we stress the network even further through higher order modulation methods and a longer amplifier cascade. Now we use frequencies between 814 MHz and 1218 MHz for 4096 OFDM, frequencies between 1218 MHz and 1410 MHz for 2048 OFDM, frequencies between 1410 MHz and 1602 MHz are used for 1024 OFDM, while frequencies above 1602 MHz are used for 512 OFDM. In this case, we have an RDP node followed by four cascaded amplifiers, the MER is reported in Table 3 over different frequencies in the RPD node output and after four amplifiers. With the given values the example leads to 10.6 Gbps downstream capacity being around 1 Gbps higher than in the first case, although the cascade of the amplifiers is longer. The difference is explained by more effective use of frequencies and lower MER margins than in the first case.



**Figure 8 - Throughput, RPD Node and four cascaded amplifiers**

**Table 3 - MER, N+4 network**

| Frequency | MER (N+4 network) | |
|---|---|---|
| | RPD Node | N+4 |
| 830 MHz | 48.0 dB | 42.0 |
| 1.1 GHz | 47.5 dB | 41.5 |
| 1.3 GHz | 45.5 dB | 38.0 |
| 1.7 GHz | 41.5 dB | 33.5 |

### 3.3. Practical guidelines

Certain practical details must be considered when 1.8 GHz amplifier cascades are built.

1. Amplifiers must have a cable equivalent frequency response apart from the used input equalizer values. This eliminates cumulating errors that a linear frequency response would cause. As these amplifiers will compensate preceding cables, amplifier outputs would have the same linear frequency response that exists in the RPD node output.
2. The accuracy of up and downstream alignments becomes paramount when MER margins turn narrow. Our proposal would be to use automatic adjustments performed by the amplifiers as manual "roughly right" will not be enough when the last decibels matter.
3. Automatic Level and Slope Control (ALSC) must support flexible pilot frequencies if networks will first employ 1.0 GHz or 1.2 GHz frequencies and later on are upgraded to employ frequencies of up to 1.8 GHz. Otherwise, operators are forced to change pilot detection units during the upgrade.
4. 1.8 GHz amplifiers will need more power even if the state-of-the-art technology is used. Not only because of higher downstream frequencies but also because of the higher upstream frequencies. Even if future hybrids become more effective, alternative ways to mitigate increased power consumption should be investigated. Currently available adaptive power methods and active power factor correction are examples, but research producing even more effective methods should continue.

# Conclusion

As we have discussed, amplifier cascades will be a reality in the coming years even though N+0 networks are on the horizon. However, as we substantiate by theoretical and practical methods, even four amplifiers in a cascade can carry the magical 10 Gbps capacity. Our paper presents two methods that cope with high TCP and provides examples of how the methods could be exploited. More importantly, these methods are based on technologies that are commercially available in 2020. Nonetheless, to harvest the full potential of HFC networks, 1.8 GHz amplifiers should perform automatic adjustments or alternatively cable technicians should define rigorous methods to test that amplifier cascades are tuned to perfection even when outdoor conditions such as temperature change.

# Limitations

Our study used a 492/606 MHz split, although it is only one of the options. Moreover, tighter guard bands are possible if more complex diplexer technologies are used, but we wanted to stay pragmatic and use a method that has been widely tested, namely robust but changeable diplexer plug-ins. While FDX amplifiers offer significantly tighter guard band, our study did not cover their use. As industry has discussed their

benefits, we encourage future studies to address their limitations, such as increased complexity, higher power consumption and lower CNR performance.

# Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| ALSC | automatic level and slope control |
| BCH | Bose-Chaudhuri-Hocquenghem |
| BER | bit error ratio |
| CINR | carrier to interference noise ratio |
| CM | cable modem |
| CNR | carrier to noise ratio |
| CSO | composite second order |
| CTB | composite triple beat |
| dB | decibel |
| dBmV | decibel millivolt |
| DOCSIS | Data-Over-Cable Service Interface Specifications |
| ESD | extended spectrum DOCSIS |
| FDX | full duplex |
| FEC | forward error correction |
| Gbps | gigabits per second |
| GHz | gigahertz |
| HFC | hybrid fiber coax |
| LDPC | low-density-parity-check |
| Mbps | megabits per second |
| MER | modulation error ratio |
| MHz | megahertz |
| NF | noise figure |
| OFDM | orthogonal frequency division multiplex |
| QAM | quadrature amplitude modulation |
| RPD | remote PHY device |
| SC-QAM | single carry QAM |
| SNR | signal to noise ratio |
| TCP | total composite power |

# Bibliography & References

(1) Chapman, Emmendorfer, Howald and Shulman. 2012. Mission is Possible: An Evolutionary Approach to Gigabit-Class DOCSIS. http://www.bowe.id.au/michael/isp/DOCSIS/collected-references/mission-possible-evolutionary-approach-to-docsis-whitepaper.pdf. Accessed 10 June 2019.

(2) Werner, Tony. 2015. World's First Live DOCSIS 3.1 Gigabit-Class Modem Goes Online in Philadelphia. https://corporate.comcast.com/comcast-voices/worlds-first-live-docsis-3-1-gigabit-class-modem-goes-online-in-philadelphia#.VnlhdfcTuHJ.twitter. Accessed 10 June 2019.

(3) CableLabs®. Remote PHY specifications. https://specificationsearch.cablelabs.com/?query=&category=DOCSIS&subcat=MHAV2&doctype=&content=false&archives=false&currentPage=1. Accessed 25 June 2019.

(4) Association of German Cable Operators. 2015. ANGA COM Exhibition & Conference program. http://www.angacom.de/fileadmin/user_upload/presse/pdf-downloads/2015/ANGA_COM_2015_Congress_Brochure.pdf. Accessed 25 June 2019.

(5) Teleste Corporation. 2015. Teleste introduces new DOCSIS® 3.1-compliant nodes to celebrate the milestone of 400.000 delivered units for the Teleste AC family. https://www.teleste.com/news/2015/teleste-introduces-new-docsis%C2%AE-31-compliant-nodes-celebrate-milestone-400000-delivered-units-teleste-ac-family. Accessed 25 June 2019.

(6) Baumgartner, Jeff. 2018. Xfinity Mobile Starting to See 'Real Momentum'. https://www.multichannel.com/news/xfinity-mobile-starting-see-real-momentum-417693. Accessed 12 June 2019.

(7) CableLabs®. 2017. CableLabs Completes Full Duplex DOCSIS Specification. https://www.cablelabs.com/cablelabs-completes-full-duplex-docsis-specification. Accessed 27 June 2019.

(8) Breznick, Alan. 2018. Here Comes DOCSIS 4.0. https://www.lightreading.com/cable/docsis/here-comes-docsis-40/d/d-id/743285. Accessed 12 June 2019.

(9) Finkelstein, Jeff. 2018. No Matter Where You Go, There You Are… https://broadbandlibrary.com/no-matter-where-you-go-there-you-are/. Accessed 12 June 2019.

(10) Cloonan, Tom. 2018. Technologies to Help Solve Future Broadband Issues (RMD, RMC, Extended Spectrum DOCSIS & Others). https://www.scte.org/SCTEDocs/Expo/DAA2018/SCTE18_DAA_TomCloonan_Arris_FINAL.pdf. Accessed 10 June 2019.

(11) Baumgartner, Jeff. 2019. CableLabs Kicks Off Pursuit of DOCSIS 4.0. https://www.lightreading.com/cable/docsis/cablelabs-kicks-off-pursuit-of-docsis-40/d/d-id/752355. Accessed 24 June 2019.