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Preface

We had some contention in Oslo over what is needed from RAP/LRP and from a CNC.

I realized that part of the confusion is because everyone, including this author, has assumed that one specification of one UNI is sufficient for all our purposes.

This is an attempt to clarify that confusion, and to offer a plan for further development of the CNC.
Preface

The following presentation is an attempt to reconcile our differing assumptions, so that we can proceed with a clear plan for RAP and at least one other project. Outline:

- Evolution from MSRP to RAP/LRP
- How many controllers are there?
- How many UNIs are there?
- Summary
Evolution from MSRP to RAP/LRP

How many controllers are there?
How many UNIs are there?

Summary
Step 1: MSRP

- MSRP information follows the data path.
- Every MSRP attribute is tied to one particular target link.
Step 2: MSRP + .1Qcc

- MSRP **STILL** information follows the data path.
- Every MSRP attribute is **STILL** tied to one particular target link.
Step 3: RAP + LRP Native

- RAP information **STILL** follows the data path.
- Every RAP attribute is **STILL** tied to one particular target link.

In case this example worries you, see “Another use case”, below.
Step 4: RAP + LRP + Proxy/Slave

- RAP information **no longer** follows the data path.
- But, every RAP attribute is **STILL** tied to one particular target link.
Constants from MSRP to Proxy RAP/LRP

Every attribute is in an applicant and/or registrar database.

**Each database is locked to a target port.**

MSRP locking: MSRP passes through the target ports.

RAP/LRP locking: LLDP chassis/port ID and My Portal Number are in the Hello LRPDU, then My Portal Number is in every LRPDU.
Example 1: **Peer-to-peer**

Eight Talkers. Six Bridges.

Running MSRP or RAP/LDP peer-to-peer.

All using **Talker UNI**. (Listeners not shown.)

**Key:**
- `Tn`: Applicant + Registrar database living in a Talker
- `Bn`: Applicant + Registrar database living in a Bridge
Example 1: **Peer-to-peer**

**Figure 46-1 — Fully Distributed Model**
Example 2: **CUC = Talker Proxy**

**CUC** pretends to be **8 Talkers** using RAP/LRP or 802.1Qcc.

**Bridges don’t care** whether CUC or individual Talkers – it’s the same Talker UNI.
Example 2: **CUC = Talker Proxy**

(No figure representing this in 802.1Qcc)
Example 3: **CNC = Edge Bridge Proxy**

**CNC** pretends to be **6 Bridges** using RAP/LRP or 802.1Qcc

**Talkers don’t care** whether CNC or individual Bridges – it’s the same Talker UNI.
The centralized network/distributed user model is similar to the fully distributed model, in that end stations communicate their Talker/Listener requirements directly over the TSN UNI. In contrast, in the centralized network/distributed user model the configuration information is directed to/from a Centralized Network Configuration (CNC) entity. All configuration of Bridges for TSN Streams is performed by this CNC using a remote network management protocol.

The CNC has a complete view of the physical topology of the network, as well as the capabilities of each Bridge. This enables the CNC to centralize complex computations. The CNC can exist in either an end station or a Bridge. The CNC knows the address of all Bridges at the edge of the network (those with an end station connected). The CNC configures those edge Bridges to act as a proxy, transferring Talker/Listener information directly between the edge Bridge and the CNC, rather than propagate the information to the interior of the network.

Figure 46-2 provides a graphical representation of the centralized network/distributed user model. In the figure, the solid arrows represent the protocol that is used as the UNI for exchange of configuration information between Talkers/Listeners (users) and Bridges (network). This configuration information is specified in 46.2. In the figure, the dashed arrows represent the protocol that transfers configuration information between edge Bridges and the CNC. This configuration information is specified in 46.2. In the figure, dotted arrows represent the remote network management protocol. The CNC acts as the management client, and each Bridge acts as the management server. The CNC uses remote management to discover physical topology, retrieve Bridge capabilities, and configure TSN features in each Bridge. Talkers and Listeners are not required to participate in this remote network management protocol. The information carried by the remote network management protocol is specified in clause 12.

NOTE 1 — If the Talker/Listener protocol of the fully distributed model is selected to be the same as the Talker/Listener protocol of the centralized network/distributed user model, end stations can support both models without explicit knowledge of how the network is configured.

The following TSN features can be configured by the CNC using this model:

a) Credit-based shaper algorithm (8.6.8.2) and its configuration
b) Frame preemption (6.7.2)
Example 4: **CUC/CNC Both Proxy**

CUC proxies Talkers, CNC proxies for Bridges.

CUC/CNC can still the Talker UNI over a single TCP connection, and still don’t care whether the other end is a controller or an individual.
Example 4: CUC/CNC Both Proxy

In the figure, the solid arrows represent the protocol that is used as the UNI for exchange of configuration information between the CUC and the CNC. This configuration information is specified in 46.2.

In the figure, the dotted arrows represent the remote network management protocol. The CNC acts as the management client, and each Bridge acts as the management server. The CNC uses remote management to discover physical topology, retrieve Bridge capabilities, and configure TSN features in each Bridge. Talkers and Listeners are not required to participate in this remote network management protocol. The information carried by the remote network management protocol is specified in clause 12.

In this fully centralized model, a protocol is used between the CUC and end stations (Talkers and Listeners) in order to retrieve end station capabilities and requirements, as well as configure the end stations. Since that protocol is user-to-user, its configuration information is considered to be outside the scope of this standard, and it is not shown in Figure 46-3.

The following TSN features can be configured by the CNC using this model:

a) Credit-based shaper algorithm (8.6.8.2) and its configuration (34)
b) Frame preemption (6.7.2)
c) Scheduled traffic (8.6.8.4, 8.6.9)
d) Frame Replication and Elimination for Reliability (IEEE Std 802.1CB)
e) Per-stream filtering and policing (8.6.5.1)
f) Cyclic queuing and forwarding (Annex T)

YANG (IETF RFC 7950) is a data modeling language used to model configuration data and state data for remote network management protocols. The remote network management protocol uses a specific encoding such as XML or JSON. For a particular feature, a YANG module specifies the organization and rules for the feature's management data, and a mapping from YANG to the specific encoding enables the data to be understood correctly by both client (e.g., network manager) and server (e.g., Bridge). Technically speaking, the TSN user/network configuration is not network management, in that information is exchanged between user and network, and not between a network manager and the network's Bridges (clause 12). Nevertheless, the concepts are sufficiently similar that YANG is useful for modeling the configuration and state data for the TSN user/network configuration information.
Evolution from MSRP to RAP/LRP

How many controllers are there?
How many UNIs are there?

Summary
Talker requests vs. Third-party requests

**Talker request:** I am “A”. I want to send to destination address “B”.
- By definition, a Talker request is from a TSN participant.
- It can come from a CUC, but from the CUC-as-Talker-Proxy.
- A Talker request is tied to a target port. It is the first hop of a (potentially) peer-to-peer protocol.

**Third-party request:** Source “A” wants to send to destination “B”.
- A Third-party request is, by definition, from a CUC.
- It may control only a small part of the network, but it is a CUC.
- A third-party request is not tied to a target port.
MSRP and third-party requests

Imagine giving peer-to-peer MSRP a third-party request.

- MSRP does not accept requests except from AVB/TSN-capable devices. A CUC need not be an AVB/TSN-capable device.

- How would a bridge receiving the request know where to find the Talker, the first target port, and the edge bridge serving that Talker? (I’m not saying it’s impossible – but it’s far beyond the scope of the current MSRP.)

- When the reservation is complete, how would the approval get to the original requester?

- Would the CUC have to have L2 connectivity? Why should it?
Not caring

Two of the goals of LRP/RAP:

- The Talker does not know or care whether it is making a request to a Bridge or a CNC/Proxy.
- The Bridge does not know or care whether it is receiving a request from a Talker or a CUC/Proxy.

But, **this only works for Talker requests**, not third-party requests.

CUCs make third-party requests. A CUC knows it’s a CUC. A non-CNC Bridge can’t handle a third-party request. A system that can handle a third-party request knows it is a full-service CNC.
Two kinds of CNC, two kinds of CUC

A CNC can just Proxy for Bridges, and handle only Talker requests
A CNC can be a full-service CNC, and handle third-party requests
A CUC can just Proxy for Talkers, and make only Talker requests.
A CUC can be a full-service CUC, and make third-party requests.

If one issues third-party requests, then one is a full-service CUC, and that CUC knows it is talking to a full-service CNC.
Evolution from MSRP to RAP/LRP

How many controllers are there?

How many UNIs are there?

Summary
How many kinds of UNIs?

From the above arguments, there are clearly **two UNIs**:

- A **Talker UNI** is used for Talker requests.
  - At one end of the Talker UNI is a Native Talker or a Proxy Talker CUC.
  - At the other end of the Talker UNI is a Native Bridge or a Proxy Bridge CNC.
  - No request is defined for the Talker UNI that cannot be handled by a peer-to-peer implementation using the rules defined in MSRP/RAP/LRP. (If this were not true, then the requestor does care what it’s talking to.)

- A **Third-party UNI** is used for Third-party requests.
  - At one end of the Third-party UNI is a full-service CUC.
  - At the other end of the Third-party UNI is a full-service CNC.
  - Any request we can think of in the future could be defined for third Third-party UNI.
Example 5: **CUC/CNC use Third-party UNI**

We can do anything we want for the Third-party UNI.

It is not tied to applicant/registrar databases that are, in turn, tied to specific physical links.
Evolution from MSRP to RAP/LRP
How many controllers are there?
How many UNIs are there?

Summary
Two kinds of CNC, two kinds of CUC

A CUC or CNC can implement one UNI + function or both.

The fact that most of the information elements (TLVs) are common between the two UNIs confused most of us (certainly me) into thinking that we were talking about only one UNI.
Suggestion

- We limit RAP/LRP capabilities to things that can be done with a peer-to-peer implementation.
- We start a new project for the Full-Service CNC + Third-party UNI.

With the suggested distinction between Proxy and Full-service CUC and CNC, the implementors, operators, and system designers all have a common set of expectations about cost vs. capability.
Thank you
Third-party UNI

The attributes crossing the Third-party UNI are very similar to those on the Talker UNI, so we should use the same TLVs, mostly or entirely those in 802.1Qcc.

We may find the applicant/registrar database idea useful for the Third-party UNI. But, we would probably have one Portal in the CUC for each CNC it connects to, and vice-versa, rather than one Portal per data path link, as in the Talker UNI.