

# **CALNEX PARAGON-X**

#### Testing 1588v2 PTP



#### **Introducing Calnex Solutions Ltd**



- Company founded in January 2006.
- Executive team with over 100 years of experience in telecom test instrumentation.
- Rapporteur of the ITU-T study group 15 Q13
- First customer shipments February 2008.
  - Tier1 Service Providers
  - Tier1 & Tier2 Equipment Manufacturers
  - Component & Clocking Vendors
- De-facto Test Equipment for 1588v2, Sync-E, CES, NTP testing & Eth-OAM.





#### 1588v2 and SyncE in the Network



#### **ITU-T standards**







# **Part 1 – Testing Network Elements**



# **Ordinary Clocks**

(1588v2 Slave Clocks)

## A network with no BCs/TCs





- In a network with non 1588-aware switches, PDV and Asymmetry can be significant.
- Slave clock recovery is a challenge.
  - Tests have shown Frequency recovery is easier but Phase/Time recovery is a challenge

#### Test the Slave Clock's robustness to PDV and Asymmetry

#### **Test the Slave Clock**





#### **Real-world testing**







# **Boundary Clocks (BCs)**

## **Boundary Clocks**





# Boundary Clocks reduce PDV accumulation by:

Terminating the PTP flow and recovering the reference timing.

Generating a new PTP flow using the local time reference, (locked to the recovered time).

There is no direct transfer of PDV from input to output.

A Boundary Clock is in effect a backto-back Slave+Master.

## A network with 1588v2 BCs





- Boundary Clocks (BCs) are back-to-back Slave-Masters
- BCs recover and re-generate the 1588v2 clocking
- With a network of BCs, PDV contribution (per hop) is only from BC and link
- PDV experienced by Slave is minimised

Test the BC's Output Noise, Noise Transfer and Noise Tolerance

#### Why Test Boundary Clocks?





#### **Potential Sources of PDV:**

#### a) Clock Wander

- Each BC recovers the clock and regenerates a new timing signal. This can lead to the introduction of low frequency clock wander,
- Chains of BCs can lead to the accumulation of low-frequency clock wander.

#### b) High-freq. PDV from BC

- PDV from BC Output Buffer Queue;
  - 12 µs for 1514 byte packet
  - 525 µs for 64kB Jumbo packet
- PDV from other internal queues.
- Affected by other High Priority Traffic?

#### **Test the Boundary Clock**





ITU-T **G.8273.2** will specify the performance of a BC.

**Noise generation** 

**Noise tolerance** 

**Noise transfer** 

**Phase Transient Response** 



# **Transparent Clocks (TCs)**

#### **Transparent Clocks**



Packet Delay in TC Device inserted into correctionField \_\_\_\_ at output of Transparent Clock device



#### Transparent Clocks reduce PDV by;

Calculating the time a PTP packet resides in the TC device (in nsec) and insert the value into the CorrectionField.

Using the CorrectionField, the Slave or terminating BC can effectively remove the PDV introduced by the TC.

PTP Message Header Format									
Bits									
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0		
transportSpecific				messageType					
Reserved				versionPTP					
messageLength									
domainNumber									
Reserved									
Flags									
→ correctionField									
Reserved									

18

18

## A network with 1588v2 TCs





Test the TC's Accuracy by measuring CorrectionField error

## **Testing TC Accuracy**





- 1. Measure the packet-by-packet latency across the TC.
- 2. Determine the change to the correctionField value for each message.
- 3. Accuracy is the difference in the actual latency compared to the change in Correctionfield value.
- Measure impact of correctionField on Sync PDV.
  - 1. Vary traffic packet size.
  - 2. Vary traffic priority.
  - 3. Vary traffic utilisation.
- Repeat for Sync & Del\_req PDV. Test in 1-Step and 2-Step modes.
- Accuracy Spec is < 50ns (IEEE C.37.238)</li>
- Calnex Paragon-X measurement accuracy is 5ns

## **TC Accuracy example results**





#### **1588v2** Application Notes



22



# Part 2 – Testing Networks

#### **Step 1 - Determine Network SLA**





#### Step 2 – Measure SLA in the Network and Troubleshoot Issues







# PTP Analysis Graphical measurements

#### PDV Distribution Probability Distribution Function





#### PDV Distribution Cumulative Delay Function







Calnex

End Application

# **PDV Metrics**

#### Floor Packet Population (G.8261.1)

- Packet Delay Variation network limit at

#### PDV Packet metrics – Pass FPP (Single microwave hop + multiple other hops)





#### PDV Packet metrics – Fail FPP (Network included 10+ Microwave hops)





#### E1 analysis





#### **1pps Analysis with Pass/Fail limits**







# **Real-World Results**

#### **BC/TC– Trial Network Test**





#### **Example Network Configurations;**

- **1. 9** switches, No On-path Support, **No Synce**  $\Rightarrow$  PTP for Frequency & PTP for Phase **2. 9** switches, all **BC** mode, **Synce**  $\Rightarrow$  SyncE for Frequency & PTP for Phase
- **3. 5** switches, all **BC** mode,
- 4. 9 switches, all BC mode,
- 5. 9 switches, all TC mode,
- 6. 9 switches, all TC mode,
- SyncE $\Rightarrow$  SyncE for Frequency & PTP for PhaseNo SyncE $\Rightarrow$  PTP for Frequency & PTP for PhaseNo SyncE $\Rightarrow$  PTP for Frequency & PTP for PhaseSyncE $\Rightarrow$  SyncE for Frequency & PTP for PhaseSyncE $\Rightarrow$  SyncE for Frequency & PTP for PhaseNo SyncE $\Rightarrow$  PTP for Frequency & PTP for Phase

#### Results: BC networks





Test Set-up PDV at input to slave		E1 wander (MTIE @ 5000sec)	1pps (pk-to-pk)	MKR:      Data:      Currer Coords:        1: x=      824253 splet, y=      0.000 000 880 sec x=      -249301 pkt x=      392733 pkt        2: x=      574953 splet, y=      0.000 000 785 sec y=      -0.000 000 105 sec y=      0.000 000 775 sec        0.0000001080
PEC + 9*Sw	86µsec	2.44µsec	2.70µsec	Sync PDV (TIE)
EEC + 9*BC	0.055µsec	0.019µsec	0.028µsec	(secondi) 2
PEC + 5*BC	0.070µsec	0.188usec	0.176µsec	
PEC + 9*TC	0.105µsec	0.210µsec	0.220µsec	0.00000580 225042 Packet #

#### **Observations when BCs utilised;**

- SyncE (EEC) + PTP gave the best results.
- BCs reduce the impact of congestion traffic,
  but congestion can still impact the transfer of frequency &/or Phase.

#### Results: TC networks





Test Set-up	PDV at input to slave	E1 wander (MTIE @ 5000sec)	1pps (pk-to-pk)	
PEC + 9*Sw	86µsec	2.44µsec	2.70µsec	
EEC + 9*TC	245nsec 0.137µsec		0.112µsec	
PEC + 9*TC	(86µsec)*	1.10µsec	1.75µsec	

#### Observations when TCs utilised;

- SyncE (EEC) + PTP gave the best results.
- TCs reduce the impact of congestion traffic, but congestion can still impact the transfer of frequency &/or Phase.



## Why Calnex?



#### • Trust us, Calnex knows Sync

- Organisation-wide understanding of Sync and Testing
- Leadership at Standards bodies
- De-facto 1588v2 and SyncE test equipment it's what your customer uses

#### • The ONLY Full 1588v2 and SyncE Conformance tester

- G.8261 etc 1588v2 tests
- G.8262 SyncE Jitter AND Wander
- G.8264 SyncE ESMC tests

#### • Clear Pass/Fail Analysis and Troubleshooting features

- Packet Metrics pktMTIE, pktTDEV, MAFE, PDF, CDF, FPP, FFO, etc, etc.
- PDV graphs is mutliple formats for clear and thorough analysis
- 1pps and Time of Day
- E1/T1/BITS MTIE/TDEV

#### Dedicated 1588v2 BC and TC one-box solution

- Complete G.8273.2 and other BC tests
- The only way to test TC accuracy to nanoseconds



# **THANK YOU**

calnexsol.com

