



TRANSPACKET

Bursts: Creation, impact and shaping

IEEE 802.1 Plenary Meeting - Vancouver 15th March 2017

Steinar Bjørnstad, Mickaël Fontaine

Bursts and impact on latency

1

How may bursts occur in TSN?

1.1

Bursty sources

1.2

Multiplexing chains

1.3

Other causes?

2

Experiment: Burst impact on CBR stream

3

Summary and examples on how to deal with bursts

Background: Burst discussion on January 802.1 meeting

- How may bursts occur in e.g. a fronthaul network?
- How may bursts impact the delay of traffic streams?
- Do we have an example on how the scheduler of a typical bridge may behave in real life?
 - How deterministic are the scheduling of the packets?

Self queuing

- Self queuing in 802.1CM
- Lower figure shows non-guaranteed order among ports
- Experiment: How are packets scheduled in a bridge?
 - What is the Frame Delay Variation (FDV)?




Figure B-1—Self-queuing in case of assured time order among Ports





Figure B-2—Self-queuing in case of non-guaranteed order among Ports

How bursts may be created: Examples


- Bursty source
- CBR sources being multiplexed

CBR sources




How bursts may be created: E.g. multiplexing chain

- Burst first created by multiplexing CBR traffic sources
- Burst is then multiplexed with a CBR source (or multiplex of these), CBR sources may have different rates
- Results in an extended burst
- Target of experiment: Find the latency impact on the CBR stream multiplexed with a bursty stream




Experimental setup: Self-queuing

- The experiment is only one example of performance and bridge behavior
 - Performance depends on scheduler implementation
- Performance is likely to vary between different type of bridges
- Typical 1U Ethernet bridge from well known bridge vendor
 - 48 x GE interfaces and 4 X 10GBE interfaces
- Experimental setup
 - Two GE streams multiplexed into one GE output stream
 - Measure PDV on CBR GE stream for characterization of how deterministic the scheduler behaves



Experiment: Measure impact on CBR stream (stream 1)



- How does the burst impact the FDV of the CBR stream?
- 1400 Byte of data in all packets (+ 22 byte overhead)
- Two streams at approx. 49 % load each
- Stream 1: CBR stream, 1500 Byte gap between frames
- Stream 2: CBR burst
 - Varying number of frames in burst “b”
 - Gap between frames in burst (IFG) = 12 Byte
 - Gap between bursts (IBG) = b X 1500 Byte.



Example with burst length $b = 2$




Experimental results $b = 2$: Deterministic scheduling

- Frame duration 12 us
- Measured Frame Delay Variation (FDV) = 13 us
- FDV corresponds to single frame from burst (stream 2) multiplexed in between CBR frames (stream 1)




Experimental results $b = 6$: Non-deterministic scheduling

- Frame duration 12 us
- Measured Frame Delay Variation (FDV) = 50 us ($> 4 \times 12$ us)
- FDV value corresponds to four frames from burst *sometimes* multiplexed in between CBR frames



Experimental results $b = 12$

- Frame duration 12 us
- Measured Frame Delay Variation (FDV) = 80 us
- FDV value corresponds to six frames from burst sometimes multiplexed in between CBR frames



Summary of experimental results

- The results from the experiment should be seen as only one example of performance and behavior of a bridge
 - Results depend on scheduler implementation
- Order of frames within each stream is maintained
- Order among ports being served when a bursty stream is multiplexed with a CBR stream is not always deterministic
 - Bursty stream creates non-deterministic FDV on CBR stream
- FDV impact on CBR stream increases with burst length
- Creates non-deterministic latency characteristics

Do we need to cope with bursty streams?

How to handle bursts - Examples

- Implement (and specify?) schedulers in bridges that serve ports in a deterministic way
 - Specification of FDV behavior may be required
 - Maintaining gaps in streams when aggregating streams minimizes FDV
- Shaper mechanisms in one or more bridges along a path smoothing out bursts, inserting gaps
- Minimize chains of multiplexers
- Minimize burst lengths from sources

Is there a need for new mechanisms and/or specifications?

Deterministic scheduler for aggregation of packets

- Figure illustrates time-slot based scheduler for aggregation of packets
 - Sum of bitrate of aggregated streams < bitrate of aggregated stream
 - E.g. 10GE multiplexing into 100GE
- Ports are served in time-slots and round-robin
 - 802.1Qbv type of scheduler
 - Long bursts entering a port will be chopped in smaller pieces
- Packet gaps in stream preserved for minimizing FDV
 - Accurate reconstruction of stream after de-aggregation possible
 - Gaps in the streams are stored in the buffer together with packets

