What Talkers / Listeners Want

Rodney Cummings
National Instruments

March 2014

Intro

- My preference is to move beyond concepts for TSN, and on to specifics
  - E.g. SRP changes for 802.1Qcc

Intro

- My preference is to move beyond concepts for TSN, and on to specifics
  - E.g. SRP changes for 802.1Qcc

- That being said… here's some vague concepts

Basic TSN Workflow

1. Talkers and listeners say what they want
2. Bridges say what they are capable of
3. “The Network” takes that input and calculates result
   - Result is installed into bridges
   - Result is communicated to talkers and listeners

What the Heck is “The Network”?

- We’ve discussed various definitions
  1. AVB: Bridges decide for default topology
  2. IS-IS: Bridges decide new routes/schedules
  3. Management: New routes/schedules are engineered
     - Tends to be non-volatile / design-time
  4. PCE: New routes/schedules are engineered
     - Tends to be volatile / run-time

- All of these are valid!
  - But talkers and listeners don’t care about the details

Proposal

- **Use SRP for talkers and listeners to**
  - **Transmit what they want**
  - **Receive what they got (result)**
- Other protocols are used for stuff in between
- Rationale
  - SRP is used already for AVB
  - SRP works fine for these parameters
    - No long lists of explicit routes or schedules
  - Isolates applications from “the network” implementations

Some Detail on SRP Changes

- What I want
  - Need to allow listeners to provide
    - Today this is limited to talkers
  - Includes “Here is the latency I want”
  - Talker may want things that AVB doesn’t support
    - Unicast DA, Untagged, …
- What I got (result)
  - Need to defer “Ready” until this is done
  - Includes “Here is the latency I got”

- These concepts help to frame 802.1Qcc work