

Improving Time Measurement in TTM

Thomas Wana, RIPE NCC

Mark Santcroos, RIPE NCC

Agenda


- TTM - Current performance
- NTP performance
- Kernel level timestamping
- Device polling
- DAG-TTM

Motivation


- TTM started in 2000
- New developments since then

TTM performance – PPS offsets


PPS offset plot, standard testbox



PPS offset histogram – standard testbox




TTM performance – DAG setup




TTM performance – DAG offsets


DAG offset plot, standard testbox



DAG offset density, standard testbox



TTM performance – receiver




NTP performance


- TTM uses PPS_SYNC
- NTP provides a PPS (ATOM) driver

NTP performance - ATOM

PPS offset plot, standard testbox




PPS offset plot - NTP PPS



	<i>Med.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>IQR</i>	<i>1-99</i>	<i>sdev</i>
<i>PPS_SYNC</i> μs	-0.017	-0.013	0.894	2.786	0.628
<i>ATOM</i> μs	0.007	-0.005	0.689	1.866	0.446

NTP performance - ntpns

- New NTPd by Poul-Henning Kamp for FreeBSD 5
- No monotonic timers for FreeBSD 4
- Not considered





NTP performance - Conclusions

- Using ATOM instead of PPS_SYNC → slight improvements
- Easy to switch
- No stability concerns


Kernel level timestamping

- TTM sender: userland timestamping
- TTM receiver: already uses kts (BPF)
- Kernel patch: kernel timestamping
- ioctls:


```
setsockopt(sock, SOL_SOCKET, SO_RIPETSENABLE, 1);  
setsockopt(sock, SOL_SOCKET, SO_RIPETSOFFSET, 40);  
sendto(sock, buf, len, 0, &to, sizeof(to));
```

Kernel level TS – sending results

DAG offset plot, standard testbox



DAG offset plot, PPS_SYNC, kernel timestamping




	<i>Med.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>IQR</i>	<i>1-99</i>	<i>sdev</i>
<i>Userland μs</i>	33.65	33.75	0.96	3.92	1.64
<i>Kernel μs</i>	20.87	20.90	0.77	2.75	0.75

Kernel level TS - Conclusions

- Improves sending side: offset, variation
- Patch is small and simple
- TTM Software changes minimal
- Production ready

Device polling


TTM receiving performance plot – offsets




- Slow network interrupts
- Device polling: no interrupts used
- Polling in the timer interrupt and idle loop

Device polling - results

Receiving offsets: interrupts



Receiving offsets: device polling




	<i>Med.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>IQR</i>	<i>1-99</i>	<i>sdev</i>
<i>Interrupts μs</i>	100	99.9	62	124	36.33
<i>Device polling μs</i>	76.93	78.74	4.95	23.43	29.68

Device polling & system load

- Good results because of idle-loop polling
- What happens under load?

Device polling & system load




Device polling - conclusions

- Theoretically very good results
- Can't be used in TTM because of load behaviour


DAG-TTM

- Hardware-timestamping solution



DAG TTM – direct connection

Two DAG cards cross-connected: offset plot




Med.	0.00
Mean	0.0038
IQR	0.00
1-99	0.12
stddev	0.036


DAG TTM – Integration into TTM

- Backwards compatibility
- Having a DAG card in a testbox is *optional*, not *mandatory*!
- Biggest change: calculate final delays centrally instead of at the receiver
- Use preliminary delays for plots on the testboxes

DAG TTM – Integration into TTM



DAG TTM – Integration into TTM



DAG TTM - Conclusions

- Very good results: no host processing effects at all
- Needs some work
- Price tag

Summary

- NTP ATOM driver: good replacement
- Kernel level timestamping: improves sender
- Device polling: can't be used in TTM
- DAG-TTM: very good results, needs some work, perhaps student project 😊

Questions?

