Suggestions for Automotive Profile outline

Norman Finn
Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd
dg-finn-auto-prof-outline-0119-v01
Fundamental questions to answer, first

- Are we describing **one** way to build an in-vehicle network, or a **box of tools** for people designing automotive networks?
  - This presentation assumes we want a box of as few tools as possible.
- Are we building relationships (as with P802.1CM ↔ CPRI) with other SDOs who are writing standards that call out P802.1DF?
  - This presentation assumes that the answer is, “Yes.”
- How much security do we do?
  - This presentation assumes that we will describe some available security features. The industry needs a comprehensive security plan.
- These questions have a big impact on the document. If the above assumed answers are incorrect, this presentation is of questionable value.
The toolbox assumption leads this contribution to describe the tools in a bit more detail before dropping into the actual profiles that select among the tools presented. It is even possible that we will want to define tools that no profile requires. But, the document is a toolbox, not a catalog. We only pick features that are definitely applicable, and do not describe obscure options. Security affects all aspects of the document. That’s why the Security section is near the front of the document. Security is likely too large a subject to be comprehensively covered in this document. Every clause will refer back to the Security clause.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Outline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Normative references</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Definitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Abbreviations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conformance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Automotive In-Vehicle Networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Traffic separation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Latency and congestion loss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Topology and reliability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Protocols</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Maintenance mode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Profiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Information elements for carriage in other protocols</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- These sections, of course, are mandated by the IEEE Standards Association.
- Also:
  - Introduction
  - Table of Contents
  - Annex A: PICS proforma
  - Annex <last>: Non-normative references
  - Annex Z: Working Group scratch pad
5. Conformance

1. Requirements terminology (explains shall, must, should)
2. PICS: describes use of PICS in Annex A
3. Automotive Bridge
4. Two-port Chained Station (3-port Bridge + end station)
5. Automotive end station

● There may be more than one profile defined, in which case the some of 5.3, 5.4, or 5.5 may be doubled.
6. Automotive In-Vehicle Networks

- The purpose of this clause is not historical or simply informative; the purpose is to justify a number of requirements on an automotive in-vehicle Bridged LAN. These requirements will be called out throughout the rest of the document to drive/justify the specifications.

1. Brief introduction to existing in-vehicle networks
2. Interfacing with existing non-Ethernet networking technologies
3. Related standards’ requirements on DF (e.g. AutoSAR)
4. Failure mode operations
5. Fast start-up issues
6. Maintenance mode operations
7. Supported physical media
7. Security

- See “notes”
1. Summary of useful external documents.
2. Threats
3. Cryptographic tools
4. Physical security tools
5. Application of these tools to following sections of this document
8. Traffic separation

1. Separation by VLAN
   - Separating groups of functional units on different VLANs

2. Topology separation
   - Multiple versions of the active topology can share a physical network: MST, SPB, SPB+PCR, configuration, network manager.

3. Physical separation
   - Separating groups of functional units on different LANs.

4. Connectivity by router
   - Selectively connecting different groups by IETF routing

5. Connectivity by application gateway
   - Selectively connecting different groups above the frame/packet layers.
9. Latency and congestion loss

1. Best effort flows
2. Continuous vs. Intermittent flows
   - Intermittent flows can be scheduled. Hard to mix both types on same port.
3. Time scheduling for intermittent flows.
4. Bounded latency, zero congestion loss
   - Pick (ideally) one queuing method for continuous flows.
5. Frame preemption
6. Cut-through forwarding
10. Topology and reliability

1. Physical topology verification and/or determination
   ● Does the physical topology match expectations?

2. Best-effort active topology determination
   ● Pick one: MST, SPB, none (no loops) or a non-802.1 ring protocol.

3. Critical flow active topology determination
   ● Pick one: None (no loops), FRER paths, or a non-802.1 ring protocol.

4. Frame Replication and Elimination for Reliability
   ● End-to-end, not ladder. Pick one: Configuration, SPB+PCR, net manager.

5. End station duplication.
   ● Also, the interaction between 9.1 and 9.2.
11. Protocols

1. Other IEEE 802 protocols required
   • One section for each protocol. 802.1AX? LLDP? Ether OAM? CFM?

2. Configured reservations for TSN flows
   • This will certainly be required. Where do addresses come from? (9.1?)

3. Reservations made by network controller
   • Pick one: NETCONF? RESTCONF? SNMP? Application controller?

4. Reservations made by peer-to-peer protocols
   • Or not. If allowed, RAP? MSTP? A variant of either?
12. Maintenance mode

- What about the network behavior changes when the vehicle is in the shop? (Perhaps nothing)
13. Profiles

- One or two (hopefully one) profiles, for devices conformant to Clause 5, that will meet the needs of a significant market.

1. Profile 1
   1. Overview
   2. Selection of tools
   3. Specific profile parameters

2. Profile 2 ...
Annex C. Information elements for carriage in other protocols

- There are likely other protocols for which this document needs to define TLVs or other IEs: IEEE 802.1AB LLDP comes to mind. There may be some other high-level protocols that need bits defined.
Thank you