

# Three-way\_timestamps\_win10

October 12, 2019

## 1 Comparison of timestamps in three alternative NMEA data paths

### 1.0.1 Windows 10 - OpenCPN v5.0.0 - Signal K v1.17.0 - DashT v0.5.2

We observe a five minute sampling period stored in InfluxDB database for each of the use case for single value of Apparent Wind Angle:

1. data via Signal K delta TCP channel with Signal K timestamps at its own reception
2. data via Signal K to NMEA-0183 via TCP channel timestamps at reception at the InfluxDB instruments
3. data directly from USB to OpenCPN

In all above cases the USB is set to 115200 baud at reception on Win10 (Surface 3 i7) running OpenCPN v5.0.0. Data is originated from Raymarine SeaTalk (4800 baud) and converted to USB in MiniPlex II multiplexer - about 40 values per second are transmitted through this channel but only Apparent Wind Angle timestamp behaviour is observed.



```
[1]: import numpy as np
import pandas as pd
```

## 1.1 1. Data via Signal K delta TCP channel



(zoom)

```
[2]: df = pd.read_csv("2019-10-05_224308_SignalK_delta_zoom.csv", sep=',', header=3)
```

```
[3]: df.head()
```

```
[3]:   Unnamed: 0  result  table      _start      _stop \
0         NaN     NaN     0  2019-10-05T20:06:00Z  2019-10-05T20:11:00Z
1         NaN     NaN     0  2019-10-05T20:06:00Z  2019-10-05T20:11:00Z
2         NaN     NaN     0  2019-10-05T20:06:00Z  2019-10-05T20:11:00Z
3         NaN     NaN     0  2019-10-05T20:06:00Z  2019-10-05T20:11:00Z
4         NaN     NaN     0  2019-10-05T20:06:00Z  2019-10-05T20:11:00Z
```

```
      _time  _value  _field _measurement  prop1
0  2019-10-05T20:06:00.969Z    16.0  angleApparent  environment  wind
1  2019-10-05T20:06:02.904Z    17.0  angleApparent  environment  wind
2  2019-10-05T20:06:04.841Z    23.0  angleApparent  environment  wind
3  2019-10-05T20:06:06.775Z    30.5  angleApparent  environment  wind
4  2019-10-05T20:06:08.71Z    31.0  angleApparent  environment  wind
```

```
[4]: df._value.describe()
```

```
[4]: count    158.000000
mean      16.382911
std       8.111321
min       0.500000
25%       9.500000
50%      17.250000
75%      23.000000
max      34.000000
Name: _value, dtype: float64
```

```
[5]: df1 = pd.to_datetime(df['_time'])
```

```
[6]: df1.describe()
```

```
[6]: count          158
     unique         158
     top    2019-10-05 20:09:49.403000+00:00
     freq           1
     first 2019-10-05 20:06:00.969000+00:00
     last   2019-10-05 20:10:58.127000+00:00
     Name: _time, dtype: object
```

```
[7]: df2 = df1.astype(np.int64).div(1e6)
```

```
[8]: df3 = df2.diff()
```

```
[9]: df3.describe()
```

```
[9]: count      157.000000
     mean    1892.726115
     std     188.331733
     min     1001.000000
     25%     1925.000000
     50%     1935.000244
     75%     1940.000000
     max     2058.000244
     Name: _time, dtype: float64
```

## 1.2 2. Data via Signal K to NMEA-0183 converter TCP channel



(zoom)

```
[10]: nf = pd.read_csv("2019-10-05_224509_SignalK_NMEA_TCP_zoom.csv", sep=',',  
    ↳header=3)
```

```
[11]: nf.head()
```

```
[11]: Unnamed: 0  result  table          _start          _stop \
0      NaN      NaN      0  2019-10-05T20:16:00Z  2019-10-05T20:21:00Z
1      NaN      NaN      0  2019-10-05T20:16:00Z  2019-10-05T20:21:00Z
2      NaN      NaN      0  2019-10-05T20:16:00Z  2019-10-05T20:21:00Z
3      NaN      NaN      0  2019-10-05T20:16:00Z  2019-10-05T20:21:00Z
4      NaN      NaN      0  2019-10-05T20:16:00Z  2019-10-05T20:21:00Z
```

	_time	_value	_field	_measurement	prop1
0	2019-10-05T20:16:01.101Z	1.5	angleApparent	environment	wind
1	2019-10-05T20:16:03.041Z	13.5	angleApparent	environment	wind
2	2019-10-05T20:16:04.981Z	0.5	angleApparent	environment	wind
3	2019-10-05T20:16:06.015Z	15.0	angleApparent	environment	wind
4	2019-10-05T20:16:07.881Z	7.0	angleApparent	environment	wind

```
[12]: nf._value.describe()
```

```
[12]: count      159.000000
mean         10.710692
std           8.320781
min           0.000000
25%           3.500000
50%           9.500000
75%          15.000000
max          52.000000
Name: _value, dtype: float64
```

```
[13]: nf1 = pd.to_datetime(nf['_time'])
```

```
[14]: nf1.describe()
```

```
[14]: count              159
unique              159
top    2019-10-05 20:16:01.101000+00:00
freq                  1
first    2019-10-05 20:16:01.101000+00:00
last     2019-10-05 20:20:58.255000+00:00
Name: _time, dtype: object
```

```
[15]: nf2 = nf1.astype(np.int64).div(1e6)
```

```
[16]: nf3 = nf2.diff()
```

```
[17]: nf3.describe()
```

```
[17]: count      158.000000
mean      1880.721519
std       212.353998
```

```

min      1004.999756
25%      1917.500000
50%      1935.000000
75%      1944.000000
max      2046.999756
Name: _time, dtype: float64

```

### 1.3 3. Data without Signal K directly from USB



(zoom)

```
[18]: of = pd.read_csv("2019-10-05_224657_USB_to_0_zoom.csv", sep=',', header=3)
```

```
[19]: of.head()
```

```
[19]:
```

	Unnamed: 0	result	table	_start	_stop	\
0	NaN	NaN	0	2019-10-05T20:25:00Z	2019-10-05T20:30:00Z	
1	NaN	NaN	0	2019-10-05T20:25:00Z	2019-10-05T20:30:00Z	
2	NaN	NaN	0	2019-10-05T20:25:00Z	2019-10-05T20:30:00Z	
3	NaN	NaN	0	2019-10-05T20:25:00Z	2019-10-05T20:30:00Z	
4	NaN	NaN	0	2019-10-05T20:25:00Z	2019-10-05T20:30:00Z	

	_time	_value	_field	_measurement	prop1
0	2019-10-05T20:25:00.249Z	3.5	angleApparent	environment	wind
1	2019-10-05T20:25:02.189Z	8.5	angleApparent	environment	wind
2	2019-10-05T20:25:04.106Z	9.0	angleApparent	environment	wind
3	2019-10-05T20:25:06.051Z	17.0	angleApparent	environment	wind
4	2019-10-05T20:25:07.99Z	24.0	angleApparent	environment	wind

```
[20]: of._value.describe()
```

```
[20]:
```

count	165.000000
mean	18.845455
std	8.896015
min	0.500000

```

25%      13.500000
50%      19.000000
75%      24.500000
max       49.000000
Name: _value, dtype: float64

```

```
[21]: of1 = pd.to_datetime(of['_time'])
```

```
[22]: of1.describe()
```

```

[22]: count          165
      unique         165
      top    2019-10-05 20:25:11.876000+00:00
      freq              1
      first 2019-10-05 20:25:00.249000+00:00
      last   2019-10-05 20:29:59.340000+00:00
      Name: _time, dtype: object

```

```
[23]: of2 = of1.astype(np.int64).div(1e6)
```

```
[24]: of3 = of2.diff()
```

```
[25]: of3.describe()
```

```

[25]: count      164.000000
      mean      1823.725610
      std       299.438559
      min      1000.000000
      25%      1896.000000
      50%      1931.500122
      75%      1944.000000
      max      2757.000244
      Name: _time, dtype: float64

```

## 1.4 Summary of results

data path	timestamp	standard deviation	maximum time difference
1 Signal K delta	at source	188 ms	2058 ms
2 Signal K NMEA TCP	at reception	212 ms	2047 ms
3 USB to OpenCPN	at reception	299 ms	2757 ms

## 1.5 Conclusion

Judged by a human eye there is no difference between the three methods - the needles and values are jumping back and forth as always!

The difference will come apparent when we want to eliminate that jumping by applying some statistical and continuous algorithms on the received time series data. The accuracy of the time stamps is, of course important for any time series analysis.

1. It is not surprising that the direct TCP connection to the Signal K emitted delta values is the most efficient what comes to the accuracy of the timestamps - they are set at the reception, *i.e.* at the closest possible position to the source. Although this method is penalized having to transmit also information in its payload to which we are not necessarily willing to be subscribed, the fact that the timestamp travels with the data compensates that inconvenience.
2. The fact that there is so little difference between the timestamp accuracy through the Signal K to NMEA conversion and its actual delta channel is a proof of the excellent quality and efficiency of Signal K and npm. Also, the TCP method of OpenCPN is the preferred one since apparently well implemented.
3. There is nothing to gain by eliminating Signal K to allow the OpenCPN to connect directly to the USB channel: this is the clearly the less desirable configuration for any algorithm which analyzes time series.

Finally, the best improvement in this particular case would be to increase the sampling rate, which is, admittedly, ridiculously slow.