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Motivation

Everyone needs a *Software Clock*:

- Physical support (e.g. timer chip)
- Software definition (how convert raw timestamp)
- Synchronisation (absolute, and rate)
- Timestamping

And wants performance:

- Inexpensive (off the shelf hardware)
- Inexpensive, convenient synchronisation (off a network)
- Accurate and Robust
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Widely used SW-NTP solution in PC’s not good enough

- Varies rate to drive offset to 0 – but rate essential for $\Delta(t)$ measurement!
- Not robust! jumps can occur, ms to seconds or worse
So Why Can We Do Better?

Advances in hardware have changed the status quo,

From

Local clock is very unreliable, must ask (and trust) the expert

To

Local clock is excellent, must simply calibrate it (ask but don’t blindly trust)
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Still need reference source
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But new perspective: *local* centric & *rate* centric

- defines separate *difference* and *absolute* clocks
- inspires new filtering philosophy → greater accuracy and robustness
- deliver minimally coupled *rate and offset* synchronisation algorithms
The CPU Oscillator as a Clock

TSC (or CCC) register counts CPU cycles, 1 cycle per $p$ [sec].

Two simple ideas, based on *Simple Skew Model* (pure frequency):

- **Difference Clock**: $\Delta(t) = \Delta(\text{TSC register value}) \times p$
- **Absolute Clock**: $t = \theta_0 + (\text{TSC register value}) \times p$
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Features/Advantages

- CPU oscillator and TSC Register stable features of PC architecture
- Hardware updating
- Ultra fast raw timestamping (read register): (< 50 ns)
- Nanosecond resolution

The Catch:

- must estimate the cycle period $p$ and offset $\theta_0$ without special hardware.
Not all ‘TSC Clocks’ are Equal!

The TSC register is already used in software clocks....

Here design new clock from scratch:

- Uses TSC register as *sole* hardware basis
- Built on time scale *characterisation* of hardware performance
- Rate and absolute clocks given *distinct* treatments
- New filtering and calibration/synchronisation algorithms, separately for rate and absolute clocks.

*By TSC clock we mean all of the above*
Limitations of the Simple Skew Model

Laboratory: $\bar{p} = 1.82263812 \times 10^{-9}$ (548.65527 Mhz)

Machine Room: $\bar{p} = 1.82263832 \times 10^{-9}$ (548.65521 Mhz)

Measured using reference: GPS synchronised DAG3.2E card (100ns)
Oscillator Stability

- The Clock: \( C(t) \):
- Offset: \( \theta(t) = C(t) - t \): difference from true time \( t \) at time \( t \).
- Skew: \( \gamma \): average difference in rate from true rate.

Write Offset Error as:

\[
\theta(t) = \theta_0 + \gamma t + \omega(t)
\]

*Simple Skew Model (SKM)* plus fluctuations.

Oscillator Stability:

\[
y_\tau(t) = \frac{\theta(t + \tau) - \theta(t)}{\tau} = \gamma + \frac{\omega(t + \tau) - \omega(t)}{\tau}
\]

Studied through the *Allan Variance*, a scale-dependent ‘variance’ estimation of the family \( \{y_\tau(t)\} \) of relative offset errors.

Allan deviation of \( y_\tau(t) \) is size of rate fluctuations at scale \( \tau \).
The SKM Timescale $\tau^*$, and the $10^{-7}$ Bound

$\tau^* = 1000$ [sec]
Study of **Oscillator Stability** (variability) over different timescales shows:

- **Simple Skew Model**: holds strictly for $\tau^* = 1000$ [sec]
- **Average rate error** never more than $10^{-7}$ no matter the scale

**Very smooth constant rate**: must take advantage!

**Measured using reference**: GPS synchronised DAG3.2E card (100ns)
A Supply of NTP Packets

Timestamps \( \{T_{a,i}, T_{b,i}, T_{e,i}, T_{f,i}\} \) are the raw data from the \( i \)-th NTP packet.

- \( \{T_{a,i}, T_{f,i}\} \): host timestamps in TSC counter units
- \( \{T_{b,i}, T_{e,i}\} \): server timestamps in seconds
Choose RTT based filtering, not one-way (using same clock good!)

Round-Trip Times $r_i$ of packet $i$

Model for RTT: $r_i = r + \text{positive random noise}$

Filter using point error: excess over minimum RTT
Naive Rate Synchronisation

Wish to exploit the relation $\Delta(t) = \Delta(TSC) \ast p$

Simple naive estimate based on widely separated packets $j$ and $i$:

$$\hat{p}_{i,j} \equiv \frac{T_{b,i} - T_{b,j}}{T_{a,i} - T_{a,j}}$$

Network delay and timestamping noise $\sim 1/\Delta(TSC)$, but errors not bounded.
Rate Synchronisation Algorithm

Use selected naive estimates based on point error threshold

Key Features

- Error quickly $< 10^{-7}$, In 10mins, better than GPS for most active probing!
- Error reduction (in timestamping, latency, queueing) guaranteed by increasing $\Delta(t)$
- Inherently robust to packet loss, congestion, loss of server..
- Simple algorithm, no need for local estimates
Naive Offset Synchronisation

Wish to exploit SKM over small scales to measure $\theta(t)$

Naive estimate again ignores network congestion, exploits steady rate over RTT from packet $i$:

$$\hat{\theta}_i = \frac{1}{2}(C(t_{a,i}) + C(t_{f,i})) - \frac{1}{2}(T_{b,i} + T_{e,i})$$
Offset Synchronisation Algorithm

Must track, so use all naive estimates, but be very fussy

Algorithm for $\hat{\theta}(t)$

- For packets in SKM window $\tau'$ wide before $t$, define strict weight
- Form weighted estimate over window (If quality very bad, repeat previous packet)
- Sanity check: if behaviour impossible, repeat previous estimate.
Offset Synchronisation Algorithm

Must track, so use all naive estimates, but be very fussy

Algorithm for $\hat{\theta}(t)$

- For packets in SKM window $\tau'$ wide before $t$, define strict weight
- Form weighted estimate over window (If quality very bad, repeat previous)
- Sanity check: if behaviour impossible, ignore.

![Graph showing offset estimates over time]
The Path Asymmetry $\Delta$

Fundamental ambiguity:

Asymmetry $\Delta \equiv d^{\rightarrow} - d^{\leftarrow}$ and error in offset indistinguishable up to a constant.

$\Delta$ unknown: forced to assume $\Delta = 0$

But, error bounded by RTT: $\Delta \in (-r, r)$
### Server Characteristics: RTT and $\Delta$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Server</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>RTT</th>
<th>Hops</th>
<th>$\Delta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ServerLoc</td>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>3 m</td>
<td>0.38 ms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\approx 0.05$ ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ServerInt</td>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>300 m</td>
<td>0.89 ms</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$\approx 0.05$ ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ServerExt</td>
<td>Atomic</td>
<td>1000 km</td>
<td>14.2 ms</td>
<td>$\approx 10$</td>
<td>$\approx 0.5$ ms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For **ServerInt**: $\Delta \approx 50 \mu$s

Theoretical best offset error is: $\Delta / 2 \approx 25 \mu$s

Measured median offset error only: $28 \mu$s

Choice of server is crucial:
- Close server has small RTT
- Close server more likely to have symmetric path: $\Delta \ll r$
- **Aim**: find a stratum–1 NTP server, with small $r \sim 1$ ms, and known, symmetric path.
A Robust Working System

Other Important Issues

- RTT estimation - need for warmup - impact on estimators
- Warm up algorithms (point errors unreliable, $\Delta(t)$ small)
- Coping with level shifts in RTT
  Possible to handle level shifts reliably with almost no dedicated code

Results in Robustness to Diverse Factors

- Changes in environment/oscillator (e.g. temperature)
- Packet loss / loss of connectivity
- Network congestion
- Timestamping errors (e.g. due to scheduling)
- Server errors, route and configuration changes
Histories show 99% of all values, $\tau' = 2\tau^*$
Performance as Function of Window Size $\tau'$

ServerInt, Machine-Room, $E = 4\delta$
Performance as Function of Polling Period

Offset Error [μs]

Polling Period [sec]

ServerInt, Machine-Room, $\tau' = \tau^*$, $E = 4\delta$
Conclusions

- Defined CPU oscillator based software clock for devices with TSC registers
- Absolute Clock:
  - more accurate than SW–NTP
  - far more robust
- Difference Clock:
  - not available under SW–NTP
  - more accurate than SW–GPS for many applications
- Low computational requirements
- Suited to network measurement, or as generic replacement for SW–NTP
Web Resources

- Publications (including preprint):

- Software and documentation (Linux) for TSC clock and early $p$ calibration:

- Software for new algorithms:
  synchronisation C code available, full clock implementations soon (BSD, LINUX)

- TSC based sender/receiver (Linux, LinuxTSC, RT-Linux) for active probing:
Performance as Function of Host – Server Environment

\[ \tau' = \tau^*, \ E = 4\delta, \text{Polling Period} = 64 \]
Zooming in on Extreme Events
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Zooming in on Extreme Events – Shifts

Natural Nice Shift

Induced Nasty Shifts

Offset estimates [ms]
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After detection