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• Review of Motivation/History/Project Plan

• Boulder (NIST) to Schriever (USNO)
  – Transfer results using SONET, OTN
  – Asymmetry investigation
  – PTP fiber vs. GPS carrier phase
  – Long-term measurements

• Solving asymmetry – APTS – New Standard

• Next steps
  – Circuit from Boulder to Chicago
Motivation

• Need to back up critical infrastructure for time at microsecond (µs) or better
  – NTP over internet no better than ~ 1millisecond (ms)
• Research use of public telecom networks to transfer time
  – Optical fibers excellent for two-way time transfer
  – Public network fiber rather than dedicated dark fiber
• Need a method that is commercially viable
  – IEEE 1588 (PTP) is a new standard for time transfer
  – Commercial equipment exists
History of Project

- CenturyLink provider agreed in principle to two-year experiment linking NIST Boulder and USNO AMC at Schriever AFB (Source of UTC from GPS)
- DHS issued RFI, December 2011
- One vendor, Symmetricom-Microsemi, gave a detailed plan
- Tri-lateral MOU written: DoC (NIST)-DHS-DoD (USNO)
- Three-way Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (CRADA) NIST with CenturyLink and Symmetricom-Microsemi signed in January 2013
- CRADA now extended to January 2019
NIST-AMC Timing Experiment
Microsemi PTP + CenturyLink Circuit

• Microsemi provides PTP timing signals over Gigabit Ethernet
• CenturyLink provides two different circuits to carry the timing signals
  – STS over SONET with varied bandwidths on an OC-192
  – OTN on an ODU-0, within an ODU-2 transport
Time Transfer Experiment

• Two-way time transfer using neighboring unidirectional fibers
  – No time-awareness anywhere in network
  – No routers in path
  – No real traffic, though traffic noise can be added

• Measurements at NIST and AMC against UTC(NIST) and UTC(USNO)
PTP Over SONET/OTN

- April 2014 - July 2014: studied SONET
- July 2014 – present: studying OTN
  - Better performance
  - Better for studying asymmetry

PDV measurements made in two directions
- GM at USNO AMC and PTP probe at NIST
- Forward means USNO AMC to NIST
- Reverse means NIST to USNO AMC

PTP over SONET vs. PTP over OTN
- **Asymmetry**: Both show large asymmetry of 40 µs between forward and reverse directions
- **Delay**: Both show ~2 ms delay over 150 km of fiber
- **Jitter**: SONET: 200 ns; OTN: <4ns
- **Wander**: SONET: Variations on order of 300 ns; OTN: Usually close to 0 ns, occasional excursions 10’s of ns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asymmetry</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Jitter</th>
<th>Wander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTP over SONET</td>
<td>40 µs</td>
<td>2 ms</td>
<td>200 ns</td>
<td>300 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTP over OTN</td>
<td>40 µs</td>
<td>2 ms</td>
<td>&lt; 4 ns</td>
<td>10’s of ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results from “Asymmetry” Experiment

- Isolated sources of 40 microsecond asymmetry
  - Latency divided approximately equally between NIST-D, D-CS, CS-AMC
  - 75% of the asymmetry is accounted for by the Denver-Colorado Springs link

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AMC to NIST delay</th>
<th>NIST to AMC delay</th>
<th>Asymmetry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct circuit</td>
<td>2025 µs</td>
<td>2066 µs</td>
<td>40.5 µs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit broken in CS</td>
<td>2270 µs</td>
<td>2300 µs</td>
<td>30.2 µs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit broken in D</td>
<td>2232 µs</td>
<td>2278 µs</td>
<td>46.5 µs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Two important points
  - When circuits are rebuilt, latency and asymmetry change (see table above)
  - Asymmetry is static and can be calibrated out as long as the circuit stays up
    (several measurements of two to three months or more have shown this to be the case)
Asymmetry Step

Two-way time error steps from 20 µs to 19.5 µs after 18 days in 56-day measurement

Close analysis of forward and reverse PDV flows shows the a 4 minute stoppage followed by each moving a different amount in opposite directions

The Boulder-Schriever circuit went down for 4 minutes and then came back up with different latencies and asymmetry
PTP fiber vs. GPS Carrier Phase

PTP (blue) and GPS carrier-phase (red) measurements comparing UTC(NIST) and UTC (USNO) sites

**Normal:**
The two measurements generally match though the timestamp resolution of the PTP equipment does not have the precision to show the sub-nanosecond movement.

**Failure:**
The two measurements match well with the 180 ns excursion occurring over the 12-hour period of timing distribution equipment failure at one of the UTC sites. The PTP timestamp resolution can be seen in the 4 nanosecond quantization and 16 nanosecond steps.
Two-way time error calculation on 95-day measurement shows 26 ns peak-to-peak over the entire run.

These results support the possibility that this method could provide time holdover below 100 ns indefinitely.

MDEV calculation on 95-day PTP fiber measurement.

The Modified Allan Deviation shows the capability of frequency transfer approaching 1 part in $10^{15}$ at 10 days.
Solving Asymmetry - APTS

G.8275.2 “Precision time protocol telecom profile for time/phase synchronization with partial timing support from the network”

- Published document released August 2016
- Includes “assisted partial timing support” which uses GNSS to calibrate out asymmetry

Raw data 87 day measurement has constant 21 µs bias

With APTS, the constant 21 µs bias is corrected for and removed
Next Phase: Long-range Circuit (Early 2017)

Current: Boulder (NIST) to Schriever (USNO) **150 km**

Next phase: Boulder (NIST) to Chicago **1700 km**
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