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# How TSN could be used in a utility operational network

In the context of this white paper, the utility is considered an entity (or entities) that manage the distribution of electricity on the transmission grid and the distribution grid. The power distribution network involves substations, and various protective and control devices that communicate over communications networks.

Low latency or “real-time” performance of the network is important for specific grid use cases and applications.

The real-time behavior of Ethernet based communication networks is defined in IEC 61784-2. There are 6 (plus one technology specific) consistent sets of parameters described to define the requested and achieved Real-time Ethernet behavior of end-to-end stations. For the network components, using TSN is an effort ongoing in IEC SC 65C.PT61784-6, dealing with a TSN profile for industrial automation applications.

## Teleprotection

Protective relays protect electrical transmission lines against fault conditions (line down, short circuits between conductors or to ground). Simple protection schemes measure voltage and current at one end of the transmission line. Differential protection schemes determine fault conditions by measuring real-time differences in voltage and current between the ends of the line. This requires an independent communication link with very low (<10mS) end to end latency to carry the measurements between the relays at the ends of the line. The communication link latency must be highly consistent and predictable. The latency requirement is less than one cycle of the AC waveform (16.6 mS, or 20 mS), because time must be allowed for the mechanical operation of the relay in the case of a fault.

The communication link connection is typically fiber, although copper circuits are also used. Power Line Carrier and point to point microwave are less commonly used.

## Intra-substation LAN

Support for IEC 61850 Generic Object Oriented Substation Event (GOOSE) messages for controlling relays and switches within the substation. TR61850-90-13 addresses this

* Type of connection – typically Ethernet (copper or fiber)
* GOOSE and MMS traffic.
* TSN could be a help on the process bus -

## Shared IT/OT networks over a common medium.

Operational Technology (OT) networks require a controlled, predictable latency, and freedom from dropped or lost packets. This behavior is required regardless of the loading or overloading of the Information Technology (IT) network.

How does TSN affect this? The important benefit is providing a converged multi-service architecture. Critical services can have guaranteed performance and bounded latency. This saves cost by converging several networks into one.

But not all TSN behaviors can be built in one network component without complicating the engineering. A profile for Utilities is needed to reduce the effort of engineering. IEC TC57 is looking for such a profile and is collaborating with the IEC SC65C/MT9.PT61784-6 project team. IEEE 802.3br provides the best basis for this instead of using only shapers.

In addition to teleprotection and SCADA, voice services from field or substation locations are also a critical application. Ensuring voice traffic is unaffected by other data flow on the common network medium is a requirement for the shared IT/OT network.

## Field Area Network Applications

Fault Location Identification and Service Restoration (FLISR) requires predictable low latency to re-route distribution power grids to isolate faulted areas and restore power to customers so quickly that they don’t notice an interruption. TSN capabilities in the FAN could be used to enable FLISR to operate on shared medium networks. The same low latency communication with a Distributed Energy Resources Management System (DERMS) will allow local DER devices to participate in the restoration. The DERMS may be located at a central location (away from the DER equipment). End to end connectivity between the DERMS and the DER equipment may require multiple networks, each able to support low latency applications.

The communications requirements for supporting MicroGrids have similar low-latency needs, and are further extended with the need to coordinate Dynamic protection and manage the potential for reverse power flows.

## Wind Farm Applications

Wind Farms may be connected into the transmission grid or distribution grid, depending on their size and scale. Although each unit requires communication for management and monitoring, grid protection algorithms are the main driver with a requirement for low-latency communications. Integrating wind resources into a distribution grid is often part of a microgrid, which brings the set of requirements mentioned above. As with microgrids, there may be situations where TSN can provide a benefit.

# Overview of TSN functionality

TSN enables low latency, and the ability to manage maximum worst case latency, leading to the reduction or elimination of congestion loss. It is a new optimization, compared to the (typically) best-effort packet world. It is not just low latency (on average), but a bounded, deterministic worst-case latency. That enables the applications.

TSN shifts the paradigm from acting on the packet to acting when the packet says to act. Secondarily, it can provide the ability to guard against equipment failure.

## Introduction: Three kinds of packet service

**Best effort packet service** is familiar to users of routers and bridges. It delivers most packets, most of the time, mostly in order. There are no guarantees. Certain service classes or can be given preferential treatment over other classes or flows. Performance is statistical. If one plots a histogram (Figure 1) of the probability of delivery, end-to-end latency, or variation in latency over a given time interval, one sees long, low-probability tails on every curve.[[1]](#footnote-1)

Loss probability

Buffers allocated

End-to-end latency

Latency variation

Probability

Probability

Figure 1 Best-effort packet service

**Constant Bit Rate (CBR) service** is typically offered by time-division multiplexing (TDM) facilities such as SDH or OTN. Latency is fixed, and jitter is essentially zero (Figure 2). The service offers connections; every packet flows end-to-end through the connection. The packet loss curve shows that CBR eliminates congestion loss, so is almost zero if the proper buffering is present. If we assume that 1+1 protection is used, packets are lost at a low rate, but in large groups, when an equipment failure is detected and an alternate path activated.
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Figure 2 Constant Bit Rate packet service

**Deterministic service** is another kind of service that is gaining users and market attention. It is based on a best-effort packet network, but the network and an application have a contract. This contract limits the transmitter to a certain bandwidth (max packet size and max packets per time interval). The network, in return, reserves bandwidth and buffering resources for the exclusive use of these critical traffic flows. For these flows, the contracts offer bounded latency and zero congestion loss. In addition, packets belonging to a stream can be sequenced and delivered simultaneously along multiple paths, with the duplicates deleted at or near their destinations. The curves for this service are shown in Figure 3.
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Figure 3 Deterministic packet service

The biggest differences between Figure 2 and Figure 3 is that the latency and latency variation curves have a larger range, though they are still bounded. The packet loss curve for Deterministic service has a much lower tail than the CBR curve, because Deterministic Networking uses a different protection scheme (see Packet Replication and Elimination, below) than the 1+1 protection usually employed in CBR. (Both services could employ either protection scheme, in which case they can have the same packet loss curve.)

Some applications are a natural fit to Constant Bit Rate (CBR) service. The original CBR services, telephony and telegraphy, are obvious examples. Some applications are a natural fit to best-effort packet service. Web browsing is typical of this usage.

Best effort services are much cheaper to deploy than CBR, and work reasonably well, even for the original CBR applications such as voice. The volume of internet traffic vastly exceeds that of voice, so best-effort has become the dominant form of digital communication.

Some applications, however, have never been able to use best-effort service. Examples are industrial control (including electrical transmission teleprotection), audio and video production, and automobile control. When these industries moved from mechanical or analog technologies to digital technologies in the 1980s, best-effort packet technologies, including Ethernet, were not suitable, so these industries had to invent special-purpose digital systems. The problem with Ethernet included its high cost, compared to special-purpose digital connections, and its inherent unpredictability. Collision detection and retransmission algorithms were not suitable for physical control systems.

Networking technology is now at the point where best-effort networking equipment can, at a modest expense, supply Deterministic services (in addition to normal best-effort services) that meet the needs of many applications that formerly required either CBR service or special-purpose digital connections. Because of the huge increase in the demand for networking, Ethernet is now cheaper than special-purpose digital connections, so there is significant incentive for these industrial and control applications to migrate to Ethernet.

# Essential features of Deterministic Networks

Deterministic Networking is a feature supplied by a network that is primarily a best-effort packet network consisting of bridges, routers, and/or MPLS label switches. The Deterministic quality of service is supplied to flows designated as being critical to a real-time application. Other than the bandwidth required for the critical traffic, the quality of the network as observed by best-effort traffic is typically not affected by the critical traffic.

The essential features of Deterministic networks are:

1. Time synchronization. All network devices and hosts can synchronize their internal clocks to an accuracy between 1 µs and 10 ns. Synchronization is accomplished using some variant of the IEEE 1588 Precision Time Protocol. Most, though not all, Deterministic networking applications require that the end stations be synchronized in time. Some queuing algorithms (see “Queuing algorithms”, below) require that the network nodes be synchronized, and some do not.
2. Contracts between transmitters and the network: Every critical flow is the subject of a contract arranged between the transmitter of the flow and the network. This enables Deterministic networks to provide:
3. Bounded latency and zero congestion loss. Congestion loss, the statistical overflowing of an output buffer in a network node, is the principle cause of packet loss in a best-effort network. By pacing the delivery of packets and allocating sufficient buffer space for critical flows, congestion is eliminated. Therefore, any given critical flow can be promised a maximum latency for delivering its packet end-to-end through the network.
4. Ultra-reliable packet delivery. Having eliminated congestion loss, the next most important cause of packet loss is equipment failure. Deterministic networks can send multiple copies of a sequence-numbered data stream over multiple paths, and eliminate the duplicates at or near the destinations. There is no cycle of failure detection and recovery – every packet duplicated and taken to or near its destinations, so a single random event or a single equipment failure does not cause the loss of even one packet.
5. Flexibility. New contracts can be made and old ones revoked. As critical flows come and go, the proper functioning of all critical flows is maintained at all times.
6. Coexistence with best-effort services. Unless the demands of the critical flows consume too much[[2]](#footnote-2) of a particular resource, such as the bandwidth of a particular link, the critical traffic can be paced so that the customary best-effort Quality of Service practices such as priority scheduling, hierarchical QoS, weighted fair queuing, random early discard, etc., still function in their usual manner, except that the bandwidth available to these capabilities reduced by the critical traffic. (See “Coexistence of Deterministic and Best-Effort QoS”, below.)

The reader should note that item 2:c above, flexibility, is the most radical change to existing paradigms for supporting real-time applications over best-effort networks. All other alternatives to Deterministic Networking (see “Alternatives to Deterministic Networking”, below) require network simulation, prototyping, and/or run-time testing to determine whether a change to the critical flows can or cannot be supported. Changes can only be made to such real-time networks when the applications are down. Deterministic networks can be built to support a dynamic environment.

In a sense, Deterministic Networking (DetNet) is just one more QoS offered by a best-effort network. The DetNet service provides an absolute upper bound on end-to-end latency, and at some cost in buffer space and timers, can provide a lower bound, as well. It also provides, as a natural consequence, zero packet loss due to output port congestion. The DetNet service is most useful where much of the traffic over the network as a whole is best-effort, but there is a significant component of DetNet traffic, perhaps even a majority of DetNet traffic in some parts of the network.

# Understand IEC 61850 activities and relationships

IEC TC57 WG 10 has started to work on the Technical Report IEC 61850-90-13 - Deterministic Networking Technologies (in IEC 61850 networks). The scope comprises use cases, potential improvements, key challenges, technology considerations (TSN, IETF DetNet), profile definitions and compatibility aspects. The set of IEEE 802.1 TSN standards (profile) is in discussion and not decided yet. The use cases and applications are structured and mapped to the following two core domains: substation automation (station and process bus) and WAN-based applications such as tele-protection and DER (Distributed Energy Resources). For substation automation network, TSN will be considered as one solution to meet functional and non-functional requirement. The following features of TSN are especially interesting for applications and networks based in IEC 61850:

* Bounded latency
* Low bounded jitter
* Zero congestion loss
* A converged network architecture

According to the network architecture recommendation in IEC 61850, a substation network is partitioned into a station and process bus. The process bus connects the IED’s (Intelligent Electronic Devices) on the level of the primary equipment, typically to Merging Units (MU). The deterministic behavior of TSN can help to foster the adoption and deployment of the process bus. Furthermore, non-functional requirements such as manageability, usability, and flexibility are addressed in the Technical Report as well as network security consideration. While the first three bullet points provide excellent support to meet functional requirements for critical protection and control applications, the converged network architecture enables a multi-service architecture. A multi-service architecture allows critical traffic on the same physical network with best-effort services such as configuration, engineering, and monitoring. This approach is a requirement specified by utilities in order to make networking more efficient. Another important aspect is guidance how to achieve co-existence and interoperability with existing technologies such as PTP (IEC 61850-9-3 Profile), PRP and HSR. This encompasses potential impact on applications, the requirement to define migration paths and to outline support for brownfield installations. The latter point addresses the fact that today’s Digital Protections Devices/IED’s do not implement a TSN-enabled network stack in order to function as a listener or talker, using the notion of TSN. On the other hand, IED’s typically have a long life-cycle (15 years and longer) and there will be a need to integrate them into a TSN-enabled network. A gateway approach addressing the specifics of IEC 61850 messages such as GOOSE and Sampled Values (SV) is in consideration. Finally, to address new use cases and opportunities derived from the capabilities of deterministic networking is another objective.

Based on the requirements, the task force responsible for IEC 61850-90-13 is asked to coordinate the work with other working groups in IEC TC 57 (Power systems management and associated information exchange) as well as with IEC SC65C, WG 15 (High Availability Networks).

How standardized APIs are integrated into 61850

What is the set used for grid applications? Relate to IEC TC57 Profiles

Harmonization of TC65 (automation) with TC57 profiles

# Time synchronization

The TSN standards assume usage of a time synchronization protocol that provides the same time to nodes in the TSN network, within a known precision and accuracy. There are a variety of uses for synchronized time, but with respect to TSN specifically, synchronized time is related to the TSN goal of providing bounded latency.

## 1.1. IEEE Std 1588 profiles

For packet-switched networks, one of the most commonly used standards for time synchronization is IEEE Std 1588, which specifies the Precision Time Protocol (PTP). The IEEE Std 1588 standard specifies a variety of features for synchronization of time. For a given application, usage of PTP features will vary based on the size of the network, topology, assumptions regarding the support of PTP in all nodes, and so on. Due to this variation in needs, most PTP features are specified as optional in the IEEE Std 1588 document. In order to accommodate the requirements of different applications, IEEE Std 1588 specifies the concept of a PTP profile. A PTP profile document specifies the set of PTP features that are required for a given application. Since the PTP profile narrows the set of features to a specific set, the PTP profile typically serves as the specification that determines interoperability from one company's product to another company's product.

As part of the family of TSN standards, the IEEE 802.1 Working Group has specified a PTP profile: IEEE Std 802.1AS. The PTP profile of IEEE Std 802.1AS applies to a LAN in which all nodes support the 802.1AS PTP profile with hardware-level timestamping. Although 802.1AS provides a high degree of accuracy and precision, its PTP profile does not necessarily fit all applications.

The family of TSN standards supports use of any standard for time synchronization, including any PTP profile. For example, the TSN standard for scheduled traffic (IEEE Std 802.1Qbv-2015) depends on synchronized time, but any PTP profile can be used (802.1AS is not required).

Utility standardization organizations have specified PTP profiles for their applications, including IEEE Std C37.238, and IEC 62439-3 (PRP-HSR). These PTP profiles provide an excellent fit for utility applications, and either PTP profile can be used with the TSN family of standards.

## 1.2 Usage of synchronized time

The following lists provide example use cases for synchronized time. Each use case is an example only, and is not required in order to use TSN standards.

### Application (i.e. in end nodes of network)

#### Timestamp of input:

This refers to measuring physical input data along with a synchronized timestamp of the measurement, and encoding both data and timestamp in a message sent over the network, for correlation and/or analysis in the receiver. Today's synchrophasor measurements are one example. TSN standards are not necessarily applicable to this example.

#### Timestamp to apply output data:

This refers to a TSN talker that sends data in a message to multiple TSN listeners, and the message contains a synchronized timestamp that specifies when the data is to be applied to a physical output. For example, professional audio applications use this technique to ensure that audio data is output to multiple speakers in a synchronized manner. The TSN latency bound is used to determine the timestamp for output.

#### Timestamp to detect stale data:

For some closed-loop control applications, data that is received late (i.e. after latency bound) is not usable. Although TSN can guarantee bounded latency for a normal configuration, there is always the possibility of a flawed configuration or a software bug. In order to validate TSN latency, the TSN talker can include a timestamp in the message that corresponds to the time of transmit. The TSN listener takes a timestamp when the message is received, and if the difference between transmit and receive time exceeds the latency bound, the listener can discard the data and take appropriate action for mitigation of the fault.

#### Scheduling of application code:

For closed-loop control applications in which inputs, outputs, and/or control algorithms are located in different nodes of the network, scheduling of application code helps to reduce the loop rate down to the fastest possible. Although scheduling of application code is not directly related to TSN, it does work well with certain TSN standards such as scheduled traffic.

### Interior network (i.e. bridges and routers)

#### Scheduled traffic:

IEEE Std 802.1Qbv-2015 specifies use of synchronized time to open/close gates for each traffic class of a bridge/router. This prevents lower-priority traffic (i.e. best-effort) from interfering with TSN traffic. As with scheduling of application code, scheduled traffic provides the lowest latency bound, but when latency requirements are not tight, alternative TSN traffic standards can be used. When scheduled traffic is used, the TSN standard for traffic policing (IEEE Std 802.1Qci-2017) provides features to police the scheduled traffic to help detect faulty or malicious equipment.

#### Cyclic queuing and forwarding:

IEEE Std 802.1Qch-2017 specifies use of synchronized time in bridges and routers to provide a cycle-per-hop bound for latency. The bounded latency is higher than scheduled traffic, but the standard is simple to configure and use.

# Relationship to IETF DETNET and RTCWEB

DETNET works over a routed network.

RTCWEB is focused on video and audio mostly, but supports it over the Internet.

# What is the opportunity for wireless standards to leverage?

The work of the IETF DETNET working group targets the same network “quality of service” (QoS) properties as TSN, namely bounded, deterministic worst-case latency that enables certain classes of applications. However, the IETF work will apply these properties to network operation at layer 3, which is the traditional purview of the IETF. The key goal of the IETF DETNET work is to utilize the common themes of congestion control and traffic scheduling to offer bounded latency to applications with these requirements.

## Wired vs. Wireless

In addition to the common obstacles to bounded latency faced by wired networks (congestion control, resource reservation), wireless networks have additional problems not faced by wired topologies, including:

* **RF interference**: even if the issues of congestion control and resource reservation are solved, local RF interference can cause packets to be lost and/or require packets to be re-transmitted, causing increased latency.
* **Bandwidth**: many wireless mesh networks (802.15.4, LPWANs, etc.) have limited bandwidth, and operate at speeds in kilobits-per-second, as opposed to megabits-per-second or higher.
* **Resource constraints**: on wireless mesh networks, network devices will be constrained in their resources and have limited buffer space to manage congestion control.
* **Mobility**: for wireless networks supporting mobility, the potential for variances in RF interference are higher than wireless topologies that are configured statically, with no mobility support.
* **Low**-**Power**: In some wireless mesh topologies, there are battery-powered devices that need to limit their packet transmission rates, which add additional latency.

## Example Use-Cases

The use-case examples enumerated below apply to existing wireless 802.15.4 mesh network scenarios

### Network-wide Firmware Download

When functional or security issues are found in deployed devices, it is critical to remediate the situation as quickly as possible. Many of these situations require an entire network to be updated with new firmware. Since these networks often are associated with critical infrastructure, some measure of bounded latency will be required so that operations can be reestablished in a predictable fashion.

### Ad-Hoc communications

Many wireless mesh applications have “automated” network traffic patterns that periodically occur, without human intervention. However, there are applications that allow operators to manually generate ad-hoc queries to network equipment. For these “interactive” applications, there is a desire for network response times to be “user friendly”, since there is a human operator awaiting response information.

### Mesh Network “Boot”

After systemic power loss, or firmware upgrade of large portions of a wireless mesh, there is a need to “reboot” the mesh. In large wireless mesh networks, there is a “joining process” whereby each node in the network must perform a set of roundtrip packet transactions across the mesh with a network “controller”. These network transactions effectively comprise the joining process. Once joined, the devices enter their normal functional state. Operators need to be able to predict when the network is fully up and operational (all nodes joined).

# Appendix 1 – Standards Summary

## IEEE 802.1 AVB, 802.1 TSN, and 802.3 standards

Standards listed as “IEEE Std 802.xyz-2xxx” are complete, published standards. Those listed as “IEEE P802.xyz” (note the “P”) are works in progress. A given standard or work in progress can be either a stand-alone document, or an amendment to a previous standard, as indicated in the text. See [the 802.1 web site](http://www.ieee802.org/1) for the most up-to-date information. (The time to completion shown for P802.xxx projects are minimums; they are likely to take longer.)

IMPORTANT NOTE: IEEE 802 standards must be purchased from an [IEEE web site](http://standards.ieee.org/findstds/) for the first six months after publication, and are available free from the [GetIEEE web site](http://standards.ieee.org/about/get/) after that time. IEEE 802.1 work in progress is are available from the [IEEE private web site](http://www.ieee802.org/1/files/private/), using a username and password, to anyone, IEEE member or not, interested in making helpful comments to further the work of the committee. Contact the chair of IEEE 802.1 to get the password.

1. [IEEE Std 802.1AS-2011](http://standards.ieee.org/about/get/802/802.1.html) Timing and Synchronization

Defines a profile of IEEE 1588 Precision Time Protocol that is 1) plug-and-play, and 2) does not use transparent clocks.

1. [IEEE Std 802.1Q-2014](http://standards.ieee.org/about/get/802/802.1.html) Bridges and Bridged Networks

The root document for VLAN bridges. Earlier AVB standards, that were originally amendments to 802.1Q-2011, are included in [IEEE Std 802.1Q-2014](http://standards.ieee.org/about/get/802/802.1.html):

* IEEE Std 802.1Qat-2010 Stream Reservation Protocol (clause 34 of 802.1Q-2014)

Defines a peer-to-peer protocol among Talkers, Listeners, and Bridges, that 1) identifies the extent of the AVB network, and 2) reserves resources for specific flows.

* IEEE Std 802.1Qav-2009 Forwarding and Queuing Enhancements for Time-Sensitive Streams (clause 35 of 802.1Q-2014)

Defines the credit based shaper. Note that this shaper does not guarantee zero congestion loss without a certain amount of overprovisioning.

1. [IEEE Std 802.1BA-2009](http://standards.ieee.org/about/get/802/802.1.html) Audio Video Bridging (AVB) Systems

A set of usage-specific profiles to help interoperability between networked devices using the AVB specifications, including 802.1AS, 802.1Qat, and 802.1Qav.

1. [P802.1AS-Rev](http://www.ieee802.org/1/pages/802.1AS-rev.html) Timing and Synchronisation for Time-Sensitive Applications – Revision

Rewrite of 802.1AS-2011 to 1) allow implementation on any device (e.g. a router or a firewall), not just a bridge; 2) be more compatible with 1588 v3, currently in progress; and 3) provide better support for multiple instances of the protocol in a network. (1 year from completion)

1. [P802.1CB](http://www.ieee802.org/1/pages/802.1cb.html) Frame Replication and Elimination for Reliability

This is the basic technique used by both TSN and DetNet to overcome random packet errors and one or more equipment failures. (complete)

1. [IEEE Std 802.1Qbu-2016](http://standards.ieee.org/about/get/802/802.1.html) Frame Preemption, and
2. IEEE Std 802.3br Interspersing Express Traffic

Provide for interrupting a packet one or more times, after it has started transmission, in order to transmit packets with more immediate requirements for low latency. Only one packet can be interrupted.

1. [P802.1Qcc](http://www.ieee802.org/1/pages/802.1cc.html) Stream Reservation Protocol (SRP) Enhancements and Performance Improvements

Provides the parameters for resource reservation required by the queuing algorithms that have been developed since 802.1Qav. (six months from completion)

1. [IEEE Std 802.1Qbv-2015](http://standards.ieee.org/about/get/802/802.1.html) Enhancements for Scheduled Traffic

Attaches a time-synchronized rotating schedule to every output queue, so that transmissions can be tightly controlled in time.

1. [IEEE Std 802.1Qca-2015](http://www.ieee802.org/1/pages/802.1ca.html) Path Control and Reservation

Enhances the ISIS protocol used by 802.1Q-2014 to support the creation of the multiple paths required for P802.1CB.

1. [P802.1Qch](http://www.ieee802.org/1/pages/802.1ch.html) Cyclic Queuing and Forwarding

A queue-draining technique employing double buffering on each port, with the buffer switching occurring simultaneously in all bridges in a network, in order to give tight control over latency and jitter. (complete)

1. [P802.1Qci](http://www.ieee802.org/1/pages/802.1ci.html) Per-Stream Filtering and Policing

Time- and data-driven input filtering to 1) support 802.1Qch CQF, and 2) to prevent misbehaving transmitters from affecting the service provided to properly-behaving data flows. (complete)

1. [P802.1CM](http://www.ieee802.org/1/pages/802.1cm.html) Time-Sensitive Networking for Fronthaul

A profile document showing how to use the TSN capabilities to serve the cellular fronthaul market. (six months from completion)

1. [P802.1Qcr](http://www.ieee802.org/1/pages/802.1cr.html) Asynchronous Traffic Shaping

A queue-draining technique that does not require the synchronized buffering of 802.1Qch, but gives deterministic results, unlike 802.1Qav. There are two contending techniques for this standard. (one year from completion)

## IETF DetNet drafts

As yet, there are no RFCs or Standards from the IETF Deterministic Networking (DetNet) working group. Internet drafts are works in progress, and quickly become out-of-date. See the [DetNet documents list](https://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/detnet/documents/) for the most up-to-date list of DetNet drafts. The drafts listed, here, are the ones that are most likely (in this author’s opinion) to progress towards standardization.

Drafts whose names start with “draft-ietf-” have been accepted as working documents by the DetNet Working Group, and thus have some official status. Drafts that do not have “ietf” after the first hyphen are submissions by individuals that may or may not be adopted by the Working Group.

1. [draft-ietf-detnet-problem-statement](https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-detnet-problem-statement) Deterministic Networking Problem Statement

A description of the problem that DetNet is trying to solve

1. [draft-ietf-detnet-use-cases](https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-detnet-use-cases) Deterministic Networking Use Cases

A list of descriptions of applications whose requirements can be filled by DetNet.

1. [draft-ietf-detnet-architecture](https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-detnet-architecture) Deterministic Networking Architecture

The overall architecture of DetNet. The best statement of the goals of the Working Group.

1. [draft-ietf-detnet-dp-alt](https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-detnet-dp-alt) DetNet Data Plane Protocol and Solution Alternatives

Discusses possibilities for the DetNet data plane, so that paths can be nailed down and sequence numbers attached to packets.

1. [draft-dt-detnet-dp-sol](https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-dt-detnet-dp-sol) DetNet Data Plane solution

The latest thinking on selecting one of the options in draft-ietf-detnet-dp-alt.

1. [draft-sdt-detnet-security](https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-sdt-detnet-security) Deterministic Networking (DetNet) Security Considerations

This work has just started, but it promises to be important for users.

## Other relevant standards

1. [IEEE Std 1588-2008](https://standards.ieee.org/findstds/standard/1588-2008.html) Precision Clock Synchronization Protocol for Networked Measurement and Control Systems

This is the root standard for all profiles of the Precision Time Protocol. Note that a new version (called 1588v3, informally) is nearing completion. This newer version will be more compatible with IEEE 802.1AS.

1. [ISO/IEC 62439-3:2016](https://webstore.ansi.org/) Industrial Communication Networks—High Availability Automation Networks

This defines 1) High-availability Seamless Redundancy (HSR), which uses dual-connected rings and a sequence number tag to improve the reliability of industrial networks, and 2) the Parallel Redundancy Protocol (PRP), which uses parallel redundant networks to accomplish the same goal.

Informational material: 802.1Qbu, 802.3br, 802.1Qbv, 802.1Qat, 802.1Qca, CB, Qcc, Qch, Qci, Qcn, Qcr, AEcg

1. End-to-end latency and latency variation are per packet. Loss probability is highest if few buffers are allocated, but still finite with many buffers allocated. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. “Too much” has no fixed definition. IEEE 802.1 has used 75% as a design goal for the upper limit to the proportion of traffic that is Deterministic. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)