RF and EF Ultra Wide Lens Comparisons

Lens (Introduced)	Price (approx)	Weight	Filter Size	Diaphragm blades	IS?	Zoom type	Min Focus	Optical Design	Comments	Pros	Cons	B&H Rating
RF 10-20mm f/4 (Oct 2023)	$2299.00	1.3lb	rear gel	9	Yes	STM	9.8"	16E, 12G	Not a fish eye - rectilinear corrected. 10mm gives 2x the width view compared to 14mm. -IS probably not useful at such wide angles except for video. Ideal for architecture and landscapes	- Extreme wide angle yet rectilinear. (world's wides full frame rectilinear lens) - Dust and moisture sealed - Unique for landscapes, architecture, and interiors. - Extremely light and small compared to EF 11-24 w/adaptor - In-lens IS (probably helpful for video)	- Expensive -Not a lot of zoom range. - F4 may not be bright enough in low light conditions. - STM focus motor (but still pretty fast focus due to short focus range).	4.8 ☆ 20 reviews
RF 14-35mm f/4 (Sep 2021)	$1299 (1099 refurb)	1.2lb	77mm	9 rounded	Yes	USM	7.9"	16E, 12G	- Price is mid-range for Ultra Wide Zoom options. Can sometimes get Canon Refurb for around $1000 or even less.	- Very useful ultra wide range - Dust and Moisture sealed - Light weight and compact - IN-lens IS - Shares filter size (77mm) with many mid-range RF lenses. - USM for faster focusing - Rounded 9 blade aperture for nicer bokeh in some cases. - Better min focus (7.9") than most other options - Lens hood included	- Heavy vignetting and distortion that must be corrected digitally. - Some reports of softness in corners - F4 may not be bright enough in low light conditions.	4.7 ☆ 95 reviews
RF 15-30 f/4.5-6.3 (Aug 2022)	$449.00	13.8 oz	67mm	7	Yes	STM	5.1"	13E,11G	Cheapest RF Full Frame Ultra Wide but man that aperture is probably only good for relatively good light situations.	- Versatile focal range - Inexpensive - Very Light so great for backpacking. - In-lens IS - Very good min focus distance at 5.1"	- Not weather sealed - No dedicated focus ring. AF-Manual focus switch must be done in camera menu - No lens hood included - Not great in low light - Only 7 blades probably not going to yield nice bokeh. - Small aperture probably only good in good lighting. - STM focus motor	4.7 ☆ 22 reviews
RF 15-35mm f/2.8 (Sep 2019)	$2199.00	1.85lb	82mm	9 rounded	Yes	USM	11.02"	16E, 12G	More Expoensive, heavier, yet brighter option to the RF 14-35 f/4	- Bright aperture for good low light conditions. - Dust and weather sealed - USM for fast focus - IN-lens IS	- Very Expensive - Larger/ heavy compared to RF 14-35 - 82mm filter size may require expensive filters.	4.9☆ 169 reviews
RF 16-28mm f/2.8 (Feb 2025)	$1149.00	1lb	67mm	9	Yes	STM	9.84"	16E, 13G	Relatively new RF lens. Min focus distance 0f 9.84" a little better than some, but still not great	- Relatively inexpensive (slightly cheaper than the 14-35 new) - Bright Aperture for good low light - "Relatively" inexpensive - Very Light and compact - great for backpacking - 9 blade aperture for good bokeh - Dust and weather sealed even though not "L" lens	- STM but still focuses pretty fast if you believe reviews - Somewhat limited zoom range (12mm total - Not an "L" lens so no lens hood included	No ratings yet as of this time it's still for pre-order
EF 11-24mm f/4 (Feb 2015)	$2999.00 $1799[A]	2.6lb	rear gel	9, rounded	NO	USM	11.02	16E, 11G	A heavy beast that is more expensive than the RF 10-20 alternative. I'd not consider this over the RF 10-20 unless I found a killer deal used.	- Ultra-wide with a bit more zoom range over all than the RF 10-20. - Unique for landscapes, architecture, and interiors. - Maybe available cheaper on grey market or used.	- Very heavy - Very Expensive - much larger, esp with adaptor - Not great min focal range - No IS (probably only an issue for video - F4 may not be bright enough in low light conditions.	4.9☆ 121 reviews
EF 16-35 F/4 (Jun 2014)	$1299.00 $749[A]	1.35lb	77mm	9, rounded	Yes	USM	11.02"	16E, 12G	If looking at any of the EF versions, this is definitely a less expensive option to its f/2.8 EF brother - Weight is mid-range. Wouldn't call it a pro or con	- Relatively inexpensive, especially grey market or used. - Common Filter Thread - 9 blade, rounded diaphragm for nice bokeh - In-Lens IS - USM focus motor	- Poor min focus distance - Requires EF/RF adaptor - f/4 might not be bright enough for some low light conditions.	4.9 stars 433 reviews
EF 16-35 f/2.8 iii (Oct 2016)	$1999.00 $1499.00[A]	1.74lb	82mm	9,rounded	NO	USM	11.02"	16E, 11G	A little lighter than the RF version, but probably a wash with the adaptor.	- Similar Range to the RF 15-35 at f/2.8 but a lot less money. - Bright aperture for low light situations. - 9 blade, rounded diaphragm for nice bokeh - USM focus motor	- Expensive - Bulky and heavy - Poor min focus distance - requires EF/RF adaptor - Large filter thread size = expensive filters.,	4.9 stars 156 reviews
EF 17-35mm f/2.8 April 1996	$250-350	1.2lb	77mm	7	NO	USM	16.54	15E, 10G	Very old lens. Mixed reviews. Probably cheapest L series Wide angle you can get. An inexpensive option for blogging and YouTube	- Very inexpensive - Light weight - Small - Bright aperture	- Old technology - Very poor min focus - Most reviews report poor IQ at wide zoom angles and wide apertures, but improves when zoomed in and stopped down.	NA
EF 17-40mm f/4 (May 2003)	$599.00	1.1lb	77mm + gel rear	7, rounded	NO	USM	11.02"	12E, 9G	- For the price, this might be worth looking at since it's fairly light. For the price one could afford an RF 16mm f/2.8 for a little wider and brighter option and still have money to spare,	- USM for fast/quiet AF - Very inexpensive especially for an L lens. - Probably the least expensive Ultra Wide "L" Zoom you can get - Light Weight - USM motor - Common Filter size + uses rear gels - Versatile zoom range. Loses a little on the wide end, but can zoom in more than any other Ultra Wide options.	- Only 7 blade diaphragm so bokeh maybe not great? - requires EF/RF adaptor - No IS (probably only an issue for video or when zoomed to longer focal lengths) - Poor min focus distance. - F4 may not be bright enough in low light conditions.	4.7 ☆ 1152 ratings
Notes:	A = Grey Market											