

Text Contribution for P802.1Qdq

16 March 2023

Toru Osuga, Satoko Itaya, Fumiko Ohori, Takeshi Matsumura (NICT),
Hiroki Nakano (CAHI Corporation)

Overview

- We have investigated the following comment and propose our remedy in this presentation.
 - Comment about neglecting ε
 - [802.1 - 14985] [Qdq] Some Thoughts on Equation (X-5)

[802.1 - 14985] [Qdq] Some Thoughts on Equation (X-5)

As indicated in one of my comments and discussed during comment resolution, (X-5) at this point does not give very good guidance to the user of this document. I have done some playing around and would want to hear your thoughts on it:

I use the following nomenclature, trying to stay close to the document draft:

B ... BlockData size (different from text)

D ... DataSize (different from text!)

n ... number of Frames per cluster

(I stick with Frame for now, although I think Packet would be better to use!)

F ... FrameLength

RM ... RequiredMinimumShapingRate

BL ... BoundedLatency

AL ... AccumulatedLatency

[802.1 - 14985] [Qdq] Some Thoughts on Equation (X-5) (Cont.)

If we use
 $D = F * n$... (a simplification of (X-1)),
then Epsilon (ϵ) in (X-5) actually becomes:
 $\epsilon = 1/n * F / (BL - AL)$

Quantifying the fragmentation overhead of line 3
page 24 as

B ... fragmentation overhead per Frame
we can expand:

$$D = B + O * n$$

and (X-5) can be expressed as:

$$RM = (B + O * n) / (BL - AL) * (1 - 1/n)$$
$$= (F * n) / (BL - AL) * (1 - 1/n)$$

If we look at (V-8) or (V-10) of IEEE Std 802.1Q-
RevD1.0 or (6-1) of IEEE Std 802.1BA-2021, it is a
good assumption that AccumulatedLatency in the
network actually will depend on FrameLength, so you
likely do not get to pick these parameters (F and n)
independently (for a given B).

Assuming AL was determined for a
MaximumFrameSize FM , we get:

$$D = (B + O * n) = FM * n$$

and

$$RM = (FM * n) / (BL - AL) * (1 - 1/n)$$

**If we arbitrarily choose the error introduced by
neglecting $\epsilon' = 1/n$ to be:**

$\epsilon' < 1\%$, then

$n > 100$

and therefore

$B > 100 * (FM - O)$

**Is it worthwhile to give this or a similar criterion to
the reader?**

Response to the commenter

- We agree with the commenter that there is the case ε is too large to be neglected.
- Application developers can take advantage that neglecting ε enables the whole of the BlockData to reach the Listener within the bounded latency regardless of the position of the reference points.
- Therefore, we define ε in detail and then transform Equation (X-4) to Equation (X-5) by using this definition.
- Since the derived variable “RequiredMinimumShapingRate” includes such kind of design decisions, the equations from Equation (X-9) onward are changed to equations using this variable.

Proposed remedy 1

Removed
Added

- Change Page 27 Line 1 and 2 to:

~~DataSize(i) is much larger than the length of the last frame (i.e. FrameLength(iworst)), therefore RequiredMinimumShapingRate can be simplified by introducing a small positive value ϵ as follows;~~ Letting $\epsilon = \text{FrameLength}(i_{\text{worst}}, n_{i_{\text{worst}}}) / (\text{BoundedLatency} - \text{AccumlatedLatency})$ denote as ϵ , Equation (X-4) is transformed as follows;

Proposed remedy 2

Removed
Added

- Change after Page 27 Line 4:

~~ϵ can be zero in actual implementations.~~

Neglecting ϵ makes RequestedMinimumShapingRate larger, therefore the reference of the last frame reaches earlier than configured by bounded latency. Especially, in order to neglect ϵ completely, that is, as zero, ~~in case that an application developer requests to assure bounded latency until the last bit of BlockData delivers,~~ consider the $(n+1)$ th frame and its reference point that are imaginary.

- Insert after Page 27 Line 10 (Equation X-6)

Equation (X-6) is equivalent to Equation (X-5) where ϵ is zero. This enables the whole of the BlockData to reach the Listener within the bounded latency regardless of the position of the reference points.

Proposed remedy 3

X.4.3 Equation X-9

$$\text{CommittedInformationRate} = \frac{\text{MaximumDataSize}}{\text{BoundedLatency} - \text{AccumulatedLatency}} \quad (\text{X-9})$$

changes to

$$\text{CommittedInformationRate} = \text{RequiredMinimumShapingRate}$$

Proposed remedy 4

X.4.4 Equation from (X-10) to (X-13) includes fraction

$$\frac{\text{MaximumDataSize}}{\text{BoundedLatency} - \text{AccumulatedLatency}}$$

for instance,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{MaxIntervalFrames} && \text{(X-11)} \\ & = \left[\frac{1}{\text{MaxFrameSize}} \cdot \frac{\text{MaximumDataSize}}{\text{BoundedLatency} - \text{AccumulatedLatency}} \cdot \text{classMeasurementInterval} \right] \end{aligned}$$

- This fraction is changed to “RequiredMinimumShapingRate”

Summary

- We answered the comment about neglecting ε .
- In some case, ε is too large to be neglected.
- On the other hand, neglecting ε has an advantage for application developers.
- Therefore, we defined ε properly and changed the related sentences and equations.