# intel

#### 60802 Dynamic Time Sync Error – Monte Carlo Analysis Results for Comparison with Time Series Simulations

David McCall (Intel)

March 2022 IEEE 802 - 802.1 TSN - IEEE/IEC 60802



#### Abstract

- Industrial Automation Systems require microsecond-accurate time across long daisychains of devices using IEEE Std. 802.1AS<sup>™</sup>-2020 as specified by IEEE/IEC 60802.
- Simulated protocol and system parameters have thus far either been judged impractical or have failed to meet the time-accuracy requirement.
- An analysis of how errors accumulate suggested that a Monte Carlo method analysis could support fast iteration of potential scenarios and deliver insights into cause and effect. See...
  - <u>60802-McCall-et-al-Time-Sync-Error-Model-0921-v03.pdf</u>
  - <u>60802-McCall-Stanton-Time-Sync-Error-Model-and-Analysis-2021-11-v02.pdf</u>
  - <u>60802-McCall-Stanton-Time-Sync-Error-Model-and-Analysis-0222-v03.pdf</u>
  - <u>60802-McCall-Stanton-Time-Sync-Error-Model-and-Analysis-0322-v01.pdf</u>
- In this contribution:
  - Present Monte Carlo analysis results to compare with upcoming Time Series simulation results

#### Content

- Addition of Error due to Clock Drift during Sync Messaging to Error Breakdown Charts
- Summary of Cases
- Summary of Results
  - Including contribution from different error factors
- Backup Detailed Results
  - Graphs from Monte Carlo Analysis

# Error Breakdown Charts

			Input Errors					
2427 ns						GM Clock Drift Max	+1.5	ppm/s
						GM Clock Drift Min	-1.5	ppm/s
						GM Nodes w/ Clock Drift	80%	
		· · · · ·				Clock Drift Max (non-GM)	+1.5	ppm/s
					Clock Drift Min (non-GM)	-1.5	ppm/s	
MLD		RT			ES	Non-GM Nodes w/ Clock Drift	80%	
						Timestamp Granularity TX	4	±ns
						Timestamp Granularity RX	4	±ns
						Dynamic Time Stamp Error TX	8	±ns
TS m	IRR TS				φ .	Dynamic Time Stamp Error RX	8	±ns
						Input Parame	ters	
						pDelay Interval	31.25	ms
				CD		Sync Interval	125	ms
TS	CD TS					pDelay Turnaround Time	1	ms
						residenceTime	1	ms
						Input Correction	Factors	
						Mean Link Delay Averaging	0	%
TS	CD TS			CD		NRR Drift Rate Correction	0	%
						RR Drift Rate Error Correction	0	%
						pDelayResponse → Sync	0	%
						mNRR Smoothing N	1	
						mNRR Smoothing M	1	
				Configuratio	on			
						Hops		100
						Runs	10	0,000

# Summary of Cases

# Proposed Time Series Simulations – Details

		Err		Parame	Correction Factors					
Experiment	Reason	Clock Drift Model – 40°C ↔ +85°C Hold for 1min at Each (Each node's position in cycle distributed at random across 100% of Cycle)	Timestamp Granularity (ns)	Dynamic Timestamp Error (±ns)	pDelay Interval (ms)	Residence Time (ms)	pDelay Turnaround Time (ms)	Mean Link Delay Averaging	mNRR Smooting Factor N	
A	Baseline with previous assumptions		8	8	31.25	1	1			
В			8	4	1000	10	10		1	
С	verify optimised	Ramn Rate 1°C / s			250	10	10	_		
D	pbelayinterval	(Cycle of 310 s)			31.25	10	10			
E	Verify effect of reduced Timestamp Error (reduced DTE when pDelay Interval is low, i.e. 31.25ms)		4	2	31.25	10	10	Off		
F	Verify effect of reduced Clock Drift (reduced DTE when pDelay Interval is high, i.e. 1000ms)	Ramp Rate 0.5°C / s Cycle of 560s	8	4	1000	10	10			

Timestamp Granularity and Dynamic Timestamp Error are uniform distributions unless otherwise stated

Sync Interval: 125ms pDelay Interval variation is +0-30% with uniform distribution

Sync Interval variation is ±10% with 90% probability with gamma distribution

Note: 8ns Timestamp Granularity in Time Series Simulation is equivalent to ±4ns Timestamp Granularity Error in Monte Carlo Analysis

1°C / s temperature ramp rate is the equivalent of ±1.5 ppm/s clock drift rate in Monte Carlo Analysis

No difference between base (PHY related) propagation delay for pDelay and Sync messages

# Number of Sync Messages



# Summary of Results

# Generating Results to Match Time Series

- For each Case: 7,440,000 Runs
  - Same number of Sync messages as 300 Time Series Replications
- Divide into 300 sections, each of 24,800 Runs
  - Same number of Sync messages as 1 Time Series Replication
  - Nothing special; just take 1<sup>st</sup> 24,800 runs, then 2<sup>nd</sup>, then 3<sup>rd</sup>, etc...
- Find max | DTE | for each section (i.e. 300 instances of max | DTE | )
- Find 99% confidence interval for the 0.95 quantile
  - Order the list of max | DTE | instances, lowest to highest, then...
  - Lower Confidence Limit: 275<sup>th</sup> Value
  - Point Estimate: 285<sup>th</sup> Value
  - Upper Confidence Interval: 294<sup>th</sup> Value

# Summary of Results - MAXabs Charts



# Summary of Results - MAXabs Charts

Case	Reason	Key Factor	max DTE	
A	Baseline with previous assumptions	pDelayInterval 31.25ms; 1ms Residence Time & pDelay Turnaround; 8ns Dyn. Timestamp Error	2,941	
В		pDelay Interval 1000ms	15,566	
С	Verify optimised pDelayInterval	pDelay Interval 250ms	4,609	
D	-	pDelay Interval 31.25ms	6,915	
E	Verify effect of reduced Timestamp Error	Timestamp Errors halved pDelay Interval 31.25ms	3,996	
F	Verify effect of reduced Clock Drift	Clock Drift halved pDelay Interval 1000ms	7,775	

# Comparison with Time Series Simulation

See 60802-garner-mult-replic-time-series-simul-resutls-for-comparison-with-monte-carlo-simuls-0322-v01.pdf

Confidence Intervals & MAX →				Monte Carlo			Time Series – Unfiltered			Time Series – Filtered				
Case	Reason	Key Factor	Lower	Point	Upper	МАХ	Lower	Point	Upper	МАХ	Lower	Point	Upper	МАХ
	A Baseline with previous assumptions	pDelayInterval 31.25ms; 1ms Residence	2.542	2 657	2,774	2,941	2,265	2,315	2,375	2,515	1,624	1,688	1,772	1,887
А		Dynamic Timestamp Error	2,543	2,657			-10.9%	-12.9%	-14.4%	-14.5%				
5	_	pDelay Interval 1000ms	13,621	13,927	14,505	15,566	9,756	11,865	33,242	127,184	9,213	9,478	9,989	15,939
в							-28.4%	-14.8%	129.2%	717.1%				
С	Verify optimised	pDelay Interval 250ms	4,175	4,285	4,498	4,609	Not Run							
D	pDelayintervar	pDelay Interval 31.25ms	6,326	6,469	6,710	6,915	5,894	5,969	6,304	7,089	5,483	5,546	5,800	6,407
D							-6.8%	-7.7%	-6.1%	2.5%				
-	Verify effect of reduced	Timestamp Errors halved	2.622	3,623 3,684	3,915	3,996	3,307	3,366	3,503	3,845	3,024	3,090	3,256	3,578
E	Timestamp Error	pDelay Interval 31.25ms	3,623				-8.7%	-8.6%	-10.5%	-3.8%				
F	Verify effect of reduced	Clock Drift halved	C 91C	C 0.01	7,224	7,775	7,096	11,108	24,077	4,090,674	4,808	4,989	5,240	13,087
F	Clock Drift	pDelay Interval 1000ms	0,810	0,901			4.1%	59.6%	233.3%	52513.2%				

#### Thank you!

# Backup Material

**Detailed Results** 

Case A – Baseline





#### Case A – Baseline









Case A – Baseline











































































































