

# PROCEEDINGS OF SPIE

[SPIDigitalLibrary.org/conference-proceedings-of-spie](https://SPIDigitalLibrary.org/conference-proceedings-of-spie)

## Study of short and mid-wavelength infrared telecom links performance for different climatic conditions

Chloé Sauvage, Clélia Robert, Béatrice Sorrente, Frédéric Grillot, Didier Erasme

Chloé Sauvage, Clélia Robert, Béatrice Sorrente, Frédéric Grillot, Didier Erasme, "Study of short and mid-wavelength infrared telecom links performance for different climatic conditions," Proc. SPIE 11153, Environmental Effects on Light Propagation and Adaptive Systems II, 111530I (4 November 2019); doi: 10.1117/12.2533209

**SPIE.**

Event: SPIE Remote Sensing, 2019, Strasbourg, France

# Study of short and mid-infrared telecom links performance for different climatic conditions

Choé Sauvage  <sup>a,b</sup>, Clélia Robert <sup>a</sup>, Béatrice Sorrente <sup>a</sup>, Frédéric Grillot <sup>b</sup>, and Didier Erasme <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> DOTA, ONERA, Université Paris Saclay, 92320 Chatillon - France

<sup>b</sup> LTCI, Télécom Paris, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, 75013 Paris - France

## ABSTRACT

This study assesses the performance in terms of availability of a FSO (Free Space Optics) link for two wavelengths, belonging to atmospheric windows, the standard telecom wavelength  $1.55 \mu\text{m}$  and the mid-infrared wavelength  $4 \mu\text{m}$ . To do so, we compute the transmission rate under various atmospheric conditions, including fog. Using the atmospheric transmission rate from our radiative transfer software MATISSE, the link budget is derived for a simple direct emission and detection system. The source and detector components characteristics, from commercial data-sheet, are considered to compute the reception noise. An estimate of the Bit Error Rate (BER) of the FSO link for the two wavelengths is presented as a function of visibility. Assuming a bit error correction and the corresponding BER value, it is possible to derive the limit of visibility under which the optical link is cut. A weather visibility database has been collected and compiled for a year to obtain the theoretical availability of the FSO system. As an example the availability at Velizy-Villacoublay (France) weather station throughout the year 2017 is used. In this case the theoretical link availability wins 30 hours of operation in January 2017 with the  $4 \mu\text{m}$  optical wavelength, that shows the benefit of using mid-infrared for FSO when fog occurs.

**Keywords:** Free Space Optics, Link budget, Infrared transmittance, Scintillation

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Free Space Optics (FSO) is a growing up technology offering a higher bandwidth with fast and cost-effective deployment compared to fiber technology associated to a lack of regulation unlike radio frequencies [1] and more directivity induced discretion. Multiple applications are envisioned including but not limited to campus-scaled network, substitution for a fiber network after a disaster (e.g., earthquake, attack, etc.) or connecting a drone as a relay in white spot. Despite that, FSO performances are restricted by atmospheric phenomena [2] (e.g., turbulence [3], fog or scattering [4]). Therefore, the operating wavelength is an important parameter that has to be chosen wisely so as to reduce the impact of the environmental parameters. In order to improve the FSO availability, performance and range, the investigation of the cross relation between the climatic conditions and the wavelength is highly required.

The main scope of this study is to evaluate and compare the performance and the availability of a FSO link of a few kilometers in urban environment for two infrared wavelengths matching the appropriate atmospheric windows [5].

We will compare the standard telecom wavelengths  $\lambda = 1.55 \mu\text{m}$  and the mid infrared  $\lambda = 4 \mu\text{m}$ . The wavelength  $\lambda = 1.55 \mu\text{m}$  is very interesting because it is a well known technology with low cost and dedicated telecom components. It would be very easy to make a transition with the current fiber network. The drawbacks of this wavelength are the hazard of retinal damage, its high level of scintillation in turbulent air and poor transmittance compared to  $4 \mu\text{m}$  [6]. The  $4 \mu\text{m}$  does not show such problems, indeed the use of  $\lambda = 4 \mu\text{m}$  for a FSO link is very interesting and emerging [7].

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the system architecture of the FSO link, Section 3 is dedicated to the computing of the link budget of our system. In Section 4 we discuss about the BER performance and the availability of our link, and Section 5 summarizes conclusions and prospects.

---

For more informations send correspondence to C.Sauvage (chloe.sauvage@onera.fr) or C.Robert (clelia.robert@onera.fr)

## 2. METHODOLOGY: SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE

To make the comparative study of these two wavelengths, we design a simple and shared optical system. The Figure 1 depicts the optical system, where laser is used as a transmitter. The beam is then enlarged and launched into the atmosphere with a diameter lens  $D_E = 10$  cm whose coefficient of transmission is  $l_E = 0.95$ . The beam crosses the atmosphere along a  $Z = 4$  km horizontal path with a  $t(\lambda)$  atmospheric transmittance. The flux is collected by an other  $D_R = 10$  cm diameter lens of coefficient transmission  $l_R = 0.95$ , which focuses the beam on the detector.




Figure 1. System architecture

The laser light is directly modulated with an On Off Keying Return to Zero (OOK-RZ) format. The emitted power is 0 mW for bit 0 and 70 mW for bit 1. An emitted power of 70 mW is easily reached by laser diodes and quantum cascade lasers which are found on the market [8]. The binary rate of the modulation is 666 Mbits/s which corresponds to a bandwidth  $\Delta f = 532$  MHz. This rate is determined by our signal clock recovery. The characteristics of the laser and the detectors come from commercial components. Their specifications are displayed on Table 1 for both wavelengths.

$\lambda$ ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	1,55	4
$R_L$ ( $\Omega$ )	50	50
$R$ (A/W)	1	1,3
$RIN$ (dB/Hz)	-120	-150
$\lambda_1$ ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	0,8	2,5
$\lambda_2$ ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	1,75	5
$\theta_M$ ( $^\circ$ )	20	18
Area ( $\text{mm}^2$ )	$\pi \times 0,05^2$	$0,5 \times 0,5$

Table 1. Specifications of components for each wavelength.

## 3. LINK BUDGET

### 3.1 Atmospheric transmittance

The first step is to compute the transmittance versus the visibility for the two wavelengths.

For this study, two weather cases are compared with MATISSE [9], our radiative transfer software. The first simulation, on Figure 2a, is made with a winter profile, tropospheric aerosols and advection fog. Fog is defined to have a visibility lower or equal to 1 km. The second simulation, on Figure 2b, is similar but without fog. In the two cases which are shown on Figure 2 the transmittance is better at 4  $\mu\text{m}$  than 1.55  $\mu\text{m}$ . These values of transmittance are essential in order to compute the received power for a 4 km path.




Figure 2. Transmittance as a function of visibility for the two wavelengths. For a winter profile and tropospheric aerosols a) with advection fog b) without fog.

### 3.2 Received power

The link between the emitted signal flux  $P_E$  (in W) and the received signal flux  $P_R$  (in W) in case of atmospheric attenuation is given by the Beer-Lambert law:

$$P_R = P_E t(\lambda) , \tag{1}$$

where  $t(\lambda)$  the atmospheric transmittance coefficient.

Our system is a non diffracted limited system so the Beer Lambert law follows this equation [10] :

$$P_R = P_E \frac{D_R^2}{(D_E + \phi_E Z)^2} t(\lambda) l_E l_R, \tag{2}$$

reminding  $Z$  is the link path (in m),  $D_{E,R}$  (in m) and  $l_{E,R}$  are respectively the diameters and lens losses of the transmitter and receiver. We define  $\phi_E$  as the beam divergence angle which is given by  $\phi_E = \frac{\lambda}{\pi \omega_0}$  (using the usual truncation equation  $\omega_0 = \frac{D_E}{3}$ ).

On Figure 3 we compare the evolution of the received power as a function of visibility for an emitted power  $P_E$  of 70 mW, which corresponds to bit 1. Figure 3a presents the case with advection fog, showing that  $\lambda = 4 \mu\text{m}$  is the most powerful link. However Figure 3b, which corresponds to the case without fog, shows that the  $4 \mu\text{m}$  is more interesting in terms of power up to 2.4 km of visibility, whereas beyond, the  $1.55 \mu\text{m}$  wavelength is better. This effect is due to the divergence of the beam and the geometric losses.

## 4. PERFORMANCE

### 4.1 Bit Error Rate

The BER enables to assess the performance of a digital communication. For a OKK-RZ modulation, the BER expression is given by [11] :

$$BER = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \operatorname{erfc} \left( \frac{Q}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \right] , \tag{3}$$

with the  $Q$  factor following this equation [11] :

$$Q = \frac{I_1 - I_0}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_0} . \tag{4}$$




Figure 3. Received power as a function of visibility for the two wavelengths. With an emitted power of 70 mW for a winter profile and tropospheric aerosols a) with advection fog b) without fog.

In Equation (4)  $I_{0,1}$  are the photocurrents for the bits  $\{0, 1\}$ , and  $\sigma_{0,1}$  are their respective noise. When the bit is 0 the photocurrent  $I_0 = 0$ , and when the bit is 1 the photocurrent  $I_1 = I_{max}$ . The photocurrent is given by this equation :

$$I = R \cdot P_R , \quad (5)$$

with R the responsivity (in A/W) of the detector.

By replacing  $Q$  (Equation (4)) in the BER (Equation (3)), it turns to :

$$BER = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \operatorname{erfc} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot \frac{I_1 - I_0}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_0} \right) \right] . \quad (6)$$

In section 3.2 we computed the power received, these values are used in the determination of the BER. Now we can focus on the detection noise of our system, and study its composition.

## 4.2 Noises

Various noises affect the performance of a telecommunication link. The first one is the shot noise defined by :

$$\sigma_{Sh}^2 = 2eI\Delta f , \quad (7)$$

where  $e$  is the elementary charge of the electron,  $I$  the photocurrent (in A) and  $\Delta f$  the bandwidth (in Hz).

The second noise is the detector thermal noise :

$$\sigma_{Th}^2 = \frac{4kT_{room}}{R_L} \Delta f , \quad (8)$$

with  $k$  the Boltzmann constant,  $T_{room}$  the room temperature (in K),  $R_L$  the load resistance (in  $\Omega$ ).

The third noise is the thermal background noise which comes from the thermal radiation of the optics and of the atmosphere. This noise has the following expression :

$$\sigma_{Back}^2 = 2eP_{Back}R\Delta f , \quad (9)$$

with  $P_{Back}$  (in W) the power of the background which is given by :

$$P_{Back} = S_{Detec}E_{Back} . \quad (10)$$

We denote  $S_{detec}$  as the detector area (in  $m^2$ ) and  $E_{Back}$  as the background irradiance (in  $W/m^2$ ).

The total background irradiance is given by :

$$E_{Back} = \pi \sin^2 \theta_D \sum_N L_{medium} , \quad (11)$$

where  $\theta_D$  is the field of view of the detector,  $N$  the number of crossed medium (atmosphere and lenses) by the beam and  $L_{medium}$  the luminance for each medium.

Assuming that each medium produces a black body radiation, the luminance  $L_{medium}$  (in  $W/m^2 sr^1$ ) follows this expression :

$$L_{medium} = t'_{medium} \times \int_{\lambda_1}^{\lambda_2} L_{\Omega,\lambda}(\lambda, T_{medium}) d\lambda , \quad (12)$$

with  $t'_{medium}$  a combination between the emissivity of the regarded medium and the transmission coefficient of crossed path by the background radiation from the emitted medium to the detector.  $L_{\Omega,\lambda}(\lambda, T_{medium})$  (in  $W/m^2 m^1 sr^1$ ) is computed by using the Planck law that describes the distribution of the spectral energetic luminance emitted by a black body at the thermodynamic equilibrium for a given temperature. Here  $T_{medium}$  is the temperature of the medium for which the background radiation is created. The spectral range of the luminance calculation is delimited by the two wavelengths  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  of the detector sensitivity.

In our system we have  $N = 4$  media, they are indexed with their contribution to the luminance in the Table 2.

Medium	$t'_{medium}$	$T_{medium}$ (in °C)
Transmitting lens	$0.05 \times 0.95 \times t(\lambda)$	20
Atmosphere	$0.95 \times t(\lambda)$	10
Receiving lens	0.05	20
Room	1	20

Table 2. Contribution of each medium in luminance calculation.

The last noise comes from the intensity fluctuations of the laser, i.e Relative Intensity Noise (RIN). The RIN (dB/Hz) is expressed like in Ref. [12] :

$$RIN = 10 \log \left( \frac{\langle \delta P(t)^2 \rangle}{P_R^2} \right) - 10 \log(\Delta f) , \quad (13)$$

with  $\langle \delta P(t)^2 \rangle$  the temporal square average of intensity fluctuation. So the noise of the laser equals to :

$$\sigma_{Laser} = R \cdot P_R \sqrt{\Delta f \cdot 10^{RIN/10}} , \quad (14)$$

$$\sigma_{Laser}^2 = R^2 \cdot P_R^2 \cdot \Delta f \cdot 10^{RIN/10} . \quad (15)$$

Finally we sum quadratically the noise variances to obtain the total noise of the signal, so that :

$$\sigma_{TOTAL}^2 = \sigma_{Sh}^2 + \sigma_{Th}^2 + \sigma_{Back}^2 + \sigma_{Laser}^2 . \quad (16)$$

The laser noise and the shot noise depend directly on the laser source, contrary to the thermal and background noises.

We focus on the scenario with advection fog that is indeed the most restrictive case because of the weakness of atmospheric coefficient transmission. On Figure 4 we investigate the contribution of the noises versus wavelength and visibility. Figure 4a shows the noises contribution for  $\lambda = 1.55 \mu m$ . We can observe that the thermal noise dominates until 700 m of visibility and the laser noise dominates after 700 m of visibility. On Figure 4b we focus on noise contribution for  $\lambda = 4 \mu m$ , the thermal noise is the major contribution for higher visibility, then for a visibility of 1 km the laser noise dominates. The background noise seems to have no variation on both parts of




Figure 4. Contribution of noises as a function of visibility for an emitted power of 70 mW and advection fog for a)  $\lambda = 1.55 \mu\text{m}$  and for b)  $\lambda = 4 \mu\text{m}$ .

the Figure 4, because of the large scale which use in our case. Between 100 m and 1 km of visibility the variation of this noise is 0.22% for  $\lambda = 1.55 \mu\text{m}$  and 3.2% for  $\lambda = 4 \mu\text{m}$ , that is negligible and so not visible.

Moreover we can notice that the total level of noises are very close for  $\lambda = 1.55 \mu\text{m}$  and  $\lambda = 4 \mu\text{m}$  up to 800 m of visibility, then the total level noise is higher at  $\lambda = 1.55 \mu\text{m}$  than at  $\lambda = 4 \mu\text{m}$ . To study this effect we focus on the evolution of atmospheric transmittance as a function of visibility (cf. Figure 2a). Indeed from 700 m of visibility  $t(\lambda = 1.55 \mu\text{m})$  increases non linearly, that induces a quadratic increase of  $\sigma_{Laser}^2(\lambda = 1.55 \mu\text{m})$  as a function of visibility. This increase also appears for  $t(\lambda = 4 \mu\text{m})$  from 500 m of visibility. However we can observe on Figure 4b that  $\sigma_{Laser}^2(\lambda = 4 \mu\text{m})$  increases less than at  $\sigma_{Laser}^2(\lambda = 1.55 \mu\text{m})$ , this is due to the fact that the RIN for a  $\lambda = 1.55 \mu\text{m}$  diode laser is smaller than the RIN for a  $\lambda = 4 \mu\text{m}$  QCL (cf. Table 1).

### 4.3 Yearly availability

We choose to present here the variation of the BER as function of visibility with advection fog (cf. Figure 5), by using the results previously obtained.

The red line on Figure 5 corresponds to a BER limit of  $10^{-4}$ , assuming an error correction code that brings the BER down to a low value of  $10^{-9}$ .  $\text{BER} = 10^{-4}$  is the limit above which the FSO link is strongly disrupted and does not operate. Thus, looking at Figure 5, the minimum visibility required to get an effective FSO link is respectively 600 m at  $1.55 \mu\text{m}$  and 400 m at  $4 \mu\text{m}$ . The transmissions for visibility larger than 900 m for  $\lambda = 1.55 \mu\text{m}$  and larger than 400 m for  $\lambda = 4 \mu\text{m}$ , are error free, so they are not plotted.

In order to prepare a future telecom link at ONERA-Chatillon laboratory, we compute a practical availability. We created a weather visibility database which indexes the visibility for each hour at Velizy-Villacoublay (France), a station near our laboratory. The statistics of the database is depicted by the histogram on Figure 6 that represents the visibility variation in 2017. We show in green the visibility lower or equal to 1 km and in blue the visibility larger to 1 km to discriminate fog conditions. On the left part of the graph, we make a focus on low visibility, typical for fog, for the January month. By combining this statistics and the visibility limits, it is easy to estimate an availability for each wavelength. Table 3 indexes the availability for each month and each wavelength.




Figure 5. Bit Error Rate versus visibility for two wavelengths and for winter profile with advection fog.

We can observe with the histogram on Figure 6 that in January 2017, fog occurs 15,1 % of the time, so it is an interesting month to make an experiment at low visibility. Hence for January 2017, Table 3 shows that the availability is 87.9 % for the 1.55  $\mu\text{m}$  against 92 % for 4  $\mu\text{m}$ , which represents an increase of 30 hours of operation.




Figure 6. Histogram which depicts the visibility variation in 2017 at Velizy-Villacoublay (France). Focus on visibility  $\leq 1$  km on January (at left).

Note that between April and July, the availability are the same for both wavelengths. However, the 4  $\mu\text{m}$  will have an advantage against scintillation : making an experimentation at this period of the year, through hot air



could be interesting to lower the impact of the scintillation on the received signal. Indeed the scintillation index  $\sigma_I^2$  is proportional to  $\lambda^{-7/6}$  so scintillation decreases as a function of wavelength. The impact of scintillation on the availability will be studied in a future work.

$\lambda$ \backslash Mos.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	2017
1.55 $\mu\text{m}$	87.9	95.2	99.7	100	100	100	99.9	98.9	98.3	96.8	99.4	94.4	97.6
4 $\mu\text{m}$	92.0	96.7	99.9	100	100	100	99.9	99.2	98.9	97.7	99.7	95.3	98.3

Table 3. Availability for each months of 2017 at Velizy-Villacoublay for the two wavelengths.

## 5. CONCLUSION AND PROSPECTS

The choice of wavelength has an impact on the telecom channel availability especially in the case of fog : the availability of a FSO link will be increased in winter by using a mid-infrared wavelength (4  $\mu\text{m}$ ) instead of a short-infrared wavelength (1.55  $\mu\text{m}$ ). We saw in this paper that a telecom link at 4  $\mu\text{m}$  wins 30 hours of operation in a foggy month (January 2017 at Velizy-Villacoublay). This result shows the very interesting perspectives of using the mid-infrared wavelength for future FSO links.

In this paper we have presented the transmission simulation on a 4-km horizontal line of sight in a urban environment. We developed a link budget calculation by specifying the received power. Then we described the different detection noises and estimated the BER of our system. Finally we discussed about the availability of our FSO link for the two wavelengths.

In the near future, it will be possible to evaluate statistical atmospheric profiles on long period (5 years) and all around the world with a quite good spatial resolution (a few km in western Europe), by using the new operational version of MATISSE which will be linked to Meteo France database. This will help to assess the FSO availability for many conditions (clouds, fog, rain and turbulence) and perform instrument sizing.

In the coming months we wish to establish a first FSO link at 4  $\mu\text{m}$  at ONERA-Chatillon, at a bit rate around 600 MHz and for a 4-5 km horizontal path at 40 m height. We plan to do experimentation in winter with low visibility and in summer with strong turbulence. We propose to use our  $\text{Cn}^2$  profiler, SCINDAR (SCINTillation Detection And Ranging), working at 4  $\mu\text{m}$  to build this future experiment to get a simultaneously diagnostic of the channel. The SCINDAR will make the channel diagnostic, by gathering intensity, phase at its telescope aperture and estimating  $\text{Cn}^2$  profiles series. This instrument is composed by an infrared Shack-Hartmann wavefront sensor ( $\lambda = 3.4$  to 4.2  $\mu\text{m}$ ) which aims at two halogen lamps 1 m-apart located at several kilometers from the receiver [13]. We have already modified this instrument in order to record the telecom signal on a splitted arm of this bench just before the infrared wavefront sensor. The 4  $\mu\text{m}$  QCL source will be launched by a telescope next to the halogen lamps in a distant building.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Khalighi, M. A. and Uysal, M., "Survey on Free Space Optical Communication: A Communication Theory Perspective," *IEEE Communications Surveys Tutorials* **16**(4), 2231–2258 (2014).
- [2] Sunilkumar, K., Anand, N., Satheesh, S. K., Krishna Moorthy, K., and Ilavazhagan, G., "Performance of free-space optical communication systems: effect of aerosol-induced lower atmospheric warming," *Optics Express* **27**, 11303 (Apr. 2019).
- [3] Stotts, L. B., Stadler, B., Hughes, D., Kolodzy, P., Pike, A., Young, D. W., Sluz, J., Juarez, J., Graves, B., Dougherty, D., Douglass, J., and Martin, T., "Optical communications in atmospheric turbulence," **7464**, 746403, International Society for Optics and Photonics (Aug. 2009).
- [4] Esmail, M. A., Fathallah, H., and Alouini, M. S., "Outdoor FSO Communications Under Fog: Attenuation Modeling and Performance Evaluation," *IEEE Photonics Journal* **8**, 1–22 (Aug. 2016).
- [5] Wallace, J. M. and Hobbs, P. V., [*Atmospheric Science - An Introductory Survey*], Elsevier, second edition ed. (2006).

- [6] Ghassemlooy, Z. and Popoola, W. O., “Terrestrial Free-Space Optical Communications,” *Mobile and Wireless Communications Network Layer and Circuit Level Design* (2010).
- [7] Delga, A. and Leviandier, L., “Free-space optical communications with quantum cascade lasers,” in [*Quantum Sensing and Nano Electronics and Photonics XVI*], **10926**, 1092617, International Society for Optics and Photonics (Feb. 2019).
- [8] Patel, C. K. N., “High power infrared QCLs: advances and applications,” in [*Quantum Sensing and Nanophotonic Devices IX*], **8268**, 826802, International Society for Optics and Photonics (Jan. 2012).
- [9] “MATISSE-V3.0 | Matisse.” <https://matisse.onera.fr/en>.
- [10] El-Wakeel, A. S., Mohammed, N. A., and Aly, M. H., “Free space optical communications system performance under atmospheric scattering and turbulence for 850 and 1550 nm operation,” *Applied Optics* **55**, 7276–7286 (Sept. 2016).
- [11] Agrawal, G. P., [*Fiber-Optic Communication Systems*], John Wiley & Sons (Feb. 2012).
- [12] Hashemi, S. E., “Relative Intensity Noise (RIN) in High-Speed VCSELs for Short Reach Communication,” (2012).
- [13] Nguyen, K.-L., Robert, C., Cohard, J. M., Lagouarde, J.-P., Irvine, M., Conan, J.-M., and Mugnier, L. M., “Measurement of the spatial distribution of atmospheric turbulence with SCINDAR on a mosaic of urban surfaces,” **10425**, 104250L, International Society for Optics and Photonics (Oct. 2017).