Nortel
Converged Data Network Solution
Evaluation of Energy Consumption and Projected Costs for a Converged LAN Campus, Data Center and WAN

Premise: With the growing emphasis on energy efficiency within enterprise networks, network managers need to understand the energy consumption of network switches, WAN routers and even IP phones at the desktop, and the related costs of operating that equipment in a network over an extended period.

Nortel commissioned The Tolly Group to evaluate a converged network infrastructure for enterprise users utilizing a wide array of Nortel switches, routers and IP phones to determine the energy usage at critical areas of deployment and to project the energy costs of operating the equipment over a five-year span.

Tolly Group engineers compared the energy consumption of the Nortel products, in terms of the power to operate the devices, as well as the power consumed in relation to heat dissipation. Results were compared with products from Cisco Systems, Inc.

Tolly Group engineers measured the energy usage (in terms of watts) for switch operation and heat dissipation for switches deployed in large- and medium-sized enterprise networks, in mid-sized companies, and enterprise branch offices. Engineers also tested IP phone endpoints from both companies.

Tests were conducted in May 2008.

Test Highlights

Users can pay as much as 64% more in electricity costs to operate a Cisco core switch versus a comparable Nortel device:

- Nortel ERS 8600 uses 39% less energy than comparable Cisco Catalyst 6500s, helping to reduce data center operation costs
- Nortel IP Phone 1140E uses up to 40% less energy than the comparable Cisco Unified IP Phone 7961G-GE
- Branch offices can reduce network energy consumption by 25% with Nortel Secure Router versus Cisco ISR

Average Power Consumption of Core Switches with All Copper Ports Active, Plus Projected Five-Year Operational Costs in U.S. Dollars

![Graph showing energy consumption and costs comparison between Nortel ERS 8600 and Cisco Catalyst 6506-E](Figure 1)

Notes: 96 copper ports (48 Gigabit Ethernet ports and 48 Fast Ethernet ports) were connected. Cost projection is based on the 2006/2007 Average Commercial Electric Price of US$0.0946 per kilowatt hour.

Source: The Tolly Group, May 2008
Executive Summary

Nortel’s Converged Data Solution, consisting of ERS 8600, 8300, 5520-48T-PWR, 4548GT-PWR switches and Nortel Secure Router 4134 consistently demonstrated that they use as much as 40% less energy than comparable Cisco devices tested and deliver considerable energy cost savings over a five-year deployment.

The Tolly Group’s hands-on evaluation of Nortel’s Converged Data Network Solution demonstrates that Nortel ERS switches and routers consistently consume less energy than Cisco devices tested.

Engineers measured the power consumed (watts) in an idle state with no ports active, and in an idle state with all ports active. No data traffic passed through the switches.

In a scenario with chassis-based switches used in large network cores, the Nortel ERS 8600 used an average of 1,072 watts, or 39% fewer than a Cisco Catalyst 6506 in both test scenarios with the devices running at idle state with and without cables connected. (See Figure I.)

Nortel’s advantage becomes more dramatic as the cost savings accrue over time. Engineers utilized the average energy usage to compute a projected five-year electric cost, using the 2006-2007 average U.S. commercial electric price. The Cisco large core switches tested cost US$7,288 to power and cool over that five-year period, versus US$4,444 for the Nortel devices — meaning users would spend almost 64% more to operate the Cisco switches.

The operational cost discrepancy really hits home when buyers begin to examine the Nortel savings applied across a broad enterprise network.

**Results**

**Core Switches**

Tolly Group engineers measured the average watts consumed to operate a network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network Type</th>
<th>Product/Model</th>
<th>Idle state with no copper ports active</th>
<th>Idle state with copper ports active</th>
<th>Nortel power savings (%)</th>
<th>Five-year operational cost (US$)</th>
<th>Nortel power savings (%)</th>
<th>Number of active ports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large core</td>
<td>Nortel ERS 8006 with 8602SF, 8648GTR, 8648TX, two units of 8630GBR, two units of 805AC power supply, fan tray</td>
<td>1,017.23  4,214.87</td>
<td>1,072.46  4,443.71</td>
<td>40.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39.03</td>
<td>96 copper ports (48 GbE ports &amp; 48 FE ports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium core</td>
<td>Cisco Catalyst 6506 -E with two units of WS-SUP720-3B, WS-X6748-GE-TX, WS-X6624-4P, WS-X6624-4P, WS-X6748-SPF, 2 units of WS-CAC-2500W power supplies, fan tray</td>
<td>1,697.94  7,005.40</td>
<td>1,759.01  7,288.42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium core</td>
<td>Nortel ERS 8300 with 2 units of 8348TX, 8324GTX, 8394SF, 2 units of 8310AC, fan tray</td>
<td>426.64  1,767.79</td>
<td>494.93  2,050.72</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>120 copper ports (24 GbE &amp; 96 FE ports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium core</td>
<td>Cisco Catalyst 4506-E with two units of WS-X4516-10GE Supervisor Engine V-10GE, WS-X4424-GB-RJ45, two units of WS-X4148-RJ, 2800AC power supply, 1300AC power supply, fan tray</td>
<td>497.78  2,062.54</td>
<td>551.94  2,286.96</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium core</td>
<td>Nortel ERS 5520-48T-PWR</td>
<td>143.35  511.11</td>
<td>181.54  752.21</td>
<td>16.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>48 GbE copper ports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium core</td>
<td>Cisco Catalyst 3750-E PoE-48</td>
<td>146.87  608.57</td>
<td>189.04  783.28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium core</td>
<td>Nortel ERS 4548GT-PWR</td>
<td>85.73  355.22</td>
<td>127.98  530.28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise branch offices</td>
<td>Nortel Secure Router 4134 with two GbE copper ports and two GbE fiber ports with MM-8T1E1 (total of eight T1/E1 ports), MM-24FE-PoE (total of 24 FE ports), MM-10DS3/CT3 (one T3/E3 port), PS-SRAK-600W-AC-POE, FAN-SRAK</td>
<td>140.82  583.49</td>
<td>151.51  627.79</td>
<td>42.77</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise branch offices</td>
<td>Cisco 3845 Integrated Services Router (2 GbE copper ports and 1 GbE fiber port) with Cisco 3845-MIB (connected with four units of WIC 2MFT-T1: total of eight T1 ports), NME-XD-24ES-1S-P (total of 24 FE ports and 1 GbE fiber port), MM-10DS3/CT3 (one T3/E3 port, one power supply)</td>
<td>194.93  807.67</td>
<td>203.31  842.41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.48</td>
<td>8 T1/E1, 24 FE, 2 GbE, 1 T3/E3 ports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP phone</td>
<td>Nortel IP Phone 1140E</td>
<td>6.59  27.31</td>
<td>6.92  28.32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.04</td>
<td>2 GbE copper ports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP phone</td>
<td>Cisco Unified IP Phone 7961G-GE</td>
<td>10.99  45.54</td>
<td>15.97  65.38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.48</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: IP phone data was directly reported by the power measurement tool without including additional power to cope with heat dissipation.

Source: The Tolly Group, May 2008
switch and to drive heat dissipation.

In a test of core switches used in “medium” size network cores, engineers found that a Nortel ERS 8300 used almost 495 watts versus 552 watts for a Cisco Catalyst 4506-E. In an idle state scenario with no cables connected, the ERS 8300 consumed 427 watts. In both scenarios, Nortel used from 10% to 14% less energy than the Catalyst 4506-E. (See Figures 2 & 3.)

The cost implications also swing in favor of Nortel. The ERS 8300 would cost US$2,051 to operate over five years, or about US$236 less per switch than the Catalyst 4506-E, which cost US$2,287 to operate over five years. The cost advantage of moving to Nortel becomes clear when users begin to multiply the Nortel cost savings across the number of network core switches.

**WIRING CLOSET SWITCHES**

Next, The Tolly Group examined a series of wiring closet switches designed to support mid-size organizations and enterprise branch offices. Engineers tested a Nortel ERS 4548GT-PWR and a Nortel ERS 5520-48T-PWR versus a Cisco Catalyst 3560-E PoE-48 and a Cisco Catalyst 3750-E PoE-48, respectively.

The Nortel energy savings was 16% to 43% less energy used when compared to Cisco, depending on the device and the scenario. (See Figs. 2 and 4.)

The five-year energy cost savings of the Nortel solution also is apparent. At idle state with no ports active, the Nortel ERS 4548GT-PWR costs just over US$355 to operate over a five-year period, versus almost US$621 to operate a Cisco Catalyst 3560-E PoE-48 over the same time period — or 75% more to power the Cisco device.

**ENTERPRISE BRANCH OFFICES**

Tolly Group engineers measured the power consumption of the Nortel Secure Router 4134 and the Cisco 3845 Integrated Services Router. Here, too, the Nortel energy and cost advantage was apparent.

The Nortel Secure Router 4134 consumed almost 152 watts, on average, versus almost 203 watts for the Cisco ISR 3845 — meaning the Nortel Secure Router consumes about 25% less energy than its Cisco rival.

The five-year operational cost for the Nortel Secure Router was US$628, while the Cisco ISR cost almost US$842 — a savings of US$214 for the Nortel router. While that may seem small on a per-switch basis, in the 5,000-user network example, with 25 WAN routers in use, the Nortel Secure Router 4134 costs US$19,570 to operate over five years, versus US$21,050 for the Cisco ISR 3845s, or about a 25% savings.

**IP PHONES**

Tolly Group engineers also measured the power consumed by Nortel IP Phone 1140E compared to Cisco Unified IP Phone 7961G-GE. Both devices drew power over Ethernet.

Both devices were measured in an idle state: the IP phone’s external GbE switch ports were connected to the PoE GbE switch and a client PC.

Results showed that the Nortel 1140E used 6.59 watts while the Cisco 7961G-GE used 10.99 watts. (See Figure 2.)

Source: Nortel, July 2008
Test Setup & Methodology

Tolly Group engineers measured the power consumption on the Nortel ERS 8606 series running software 4.1.3 (with two units of 8692SF switch fabric, a total of four line cards [one 8648GTR, one 8648TX and two 8630GBR units], two units of 8005AC power supply and a fan tray).

Engineers also measured the power consumption of the ERS 8306 series running software 4.0.0.0 (one switch fabric of 8394SF, plus three line cards [one 8324GTX and two 8348TX units] plus two 8301 AC power supplies and a fan tray), and measured the ERS 5500 series running software 5.1.0. ERS 4548GT-PWR running software 5.0.1, Secure Router 4134 running software version 10.0 (one unit of each module: MM-8T1E1, MM-24FE-PoE, NM-1T3/E3, PS-SR4K-600W-AC-POE and FAN-SR4K). In addition, tests focused on the Nortel IP Phone 1140E (Ver. 02.00.06.00).

These Nortel devices were measured against comparable Cisco offerings: Cisco Catalyst 6506-E series running software 12.2(18) SXF7 (two WS-SUP720-3B supervisor engines, a total of four line cards: one WS-X6748-GE-TX, one WS-X6248-RJ-45, one WS-X6724SFP, and one WS-X6748-SF, plus two WS-CAC-2500W power supplies and a fan tray), Catalyst 4506-E running software 12.2(37)SG (a WS-X4516-10GE Supervisor Engine V-10GE, a total of three line cards: one WS-X4424-GS-RJ45 and two WS-X4148RJ units, one 2800AC power supply, one 1300AC power supply and a fan tray).

Tests also focused on the Catalyst 3750-E PoE-48 running software 12.2(35)SE5, and the Catalyst 3560-E PoE-48 running software 12.2 (35) SE2, plus the Cisco ISR 3845 running software Cisco 3845-MIB IOS: 12.4(16) and NME-XD-24ES-1S-P IOS: 12.2(25)SEE3 (Cisco 3845-MIB with four units of VWIC 2MFT-T1, NME-XD-24ES-1S-P, NM-1T3/E3 and a power supply), Cisco Unified IP Phone 7961G-GE (Firmware ver. SIP 41.8-2-2SR2S).

In the tests, engineers measured the power consumption of both vendor products at idle mode without cables plugged in and idle mode with all available ports connected.

For the power measurement of Nortel ERS 8600 series and Cisco Catalyst 6500 series, engineers used 96 copper ports (48 GbE ports and 48 Fast Ethernet ports). In tests of the ERS 8300 versus a Catalyst 4500, engineers used 120 copper ports (24 GbE and 96 Fast Ethernet ports). For tests with
the ERS 4500 and ERS 5500 series versus Catalyst 3560 and 3750 series, testers used 48 GbE ports. Finally, for the Nortel Secure Router 4134 versus Cisco 3845 Integrated Services Router, engineers used eight T1/E1, 24 Fast Ethernet, two GbE and one T3/E3 ports. Engineers used an Amprobe ACD-14 FX Clamp Multimeter and P3 International Corporation P4400 Kill A Watt power measurement tools to record the power consumed. Engineers calculated the estimated heat dissipation (or cooling) obtained from an article titled “Power and Storage: The Hidden Cost of Ownership – Storage Management,” at: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0BRZ/is_10_2%20/3/ai_111062988.

Engineers used the national average retail price of commercial electricity, sourced from Energy Information Administration of the Official Energy Statistics from the U.S. Government (US$0.0946 cents per kilowatt hour, 1995 to 2006) to calculate the cost of operating a switch over five years.
The Tolly Group is a leading global provider of third-party validation services for vendors of IT products, components and services.

The company is based in Boca Raton, FL and can be reached by phone at (561) 391-5610, or via the Internet at:

Web: http://www.tolly.com
E-mail: sales@tolly.com

---

**Test Bed Diagram**

- **Devices under test**
  - ERS 8600 Series
  - ERS 8300 Series
  - ERS 5500 Series
  - ERS 4500 Series
  - Secure Router 4134
  - IP Phone 1140E

- **Power measuring tools**
  - P3 International Kill A Watt
  - Amprobe ACD-14 FX Clamp Multimeter
  - ~ 110 AC power source
  - ~ 220 AC power source

Source: The Tolly Group, May 2008
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**Fair Testing Charter™**

**Interaction with Competitors**

The Tolly Group invited representatives from Cisco Systems to participate in the test as per The Tolly Group’s Fair Testing Charter. Representatives from Cisco did not respond to the invitation.

Nortel supplied the products under test to The Tolly Group; Cisco products were acquired through normal distribution channels. Default configurations were used for all tests since only power consumption was measured.

---

**Terms of Usage**

**USE THIS DOCUMENT ONLY IF YOU AGREE TO THE TERMS LISTED HEREIN.**

This document is provided, free-of-charge, to help you understand whether a given product, technology or service merits additional investigation for your particular needs. Any decision to purchase must be based on your own assessment of suitability.

This evaluation was focused on illustrating specific features and/or performance of the product(s) and was conducted under controlled, laboratory conditions and certain tests may have been tailored to reflect performance under ideal conditions; performance may vary under real-world conditions. Users should run tests based on their own real-world scenarios to validate performance for their own networks. Commercially reasonable efforts were made to ensure the accuracy of the data contained herein but errors and/or oversights can occur. In no event shall The Tolly Group be liable for damages of any kind including direct, indirect, special, incidental and consequential damages which may result from the use of information contained in this document.

The test/audit documented herein may also rely on various test tools the accuracy of which is beyond our control. Furthermore, the document relies on certain representations by the sponsor that are beyond our control to verify. Among these is that the software/hardware tested is production or production track and is, or will be, available in equivalent or better form to commercial customers.

When foreign translations exist, the English document is considered authoritative. To assure accuracy, only use documents downloaded directly from The Tolly Group’s Web site.

All trademarks are the property of their respective owners.