

Network Working Group  
Internet Draft  
Intended status: Informational  
Expires: July 2019

L. Dunbar  
A. Malis  
Huawei  
C. Jacquenet  
Orange  
M. Toy  
Verizon  
January 25, 2019

Seamless Interconnect Underlay to Cloud Overlay Problem Statement  
draft-dm-net2cloud-problem-statement-06

Abstract

This document describes the problems that enterprises face today when connecting their branch offices to dynamic workloads in third party data centers (a.k.a. Cloud DCs).

It examines some of the approaches interconnecting cloud DCs with enterprises' on-premises DCs & branch offices. This document also describes some of the (network) problems that many enterprises face when they have workloads & applications & data split among hybrid data centers, especially for those enterprises with multiple sites that are already interconnected by VPNs (e.g., MPLS L2VPN/L3VPN).

Current operational problems are examined to determine whether there is a need to improve existing protocols or whether a new protocol is necessary to solve them.

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#). This document may not be modified, and derivative works of it may not be created, except to publish it as an RFC and to translate it into languages other than English.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that

other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/lid-abstracts.txt>

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>

This Internet-Draft will expire on July 25, 2019.

#### Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2019 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the [Trust Legal Provisions](#) and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

#### Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction.....	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Definition of terms.....	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Current Practices in Interconnecting Enterprise Sites with Cloud DCs.....	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	Interconnect to Cloud DCs.....	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	Interconnect to Hybrid Cloud DCs.....	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">3.3.</a>	Connecting workloads among hybrid Cloud DCs.....	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Desired Properties for Networks that interconnect Hybrid Clouds8	
<a href="#">5.</a>	Problems with MPLS-based VPNs extending to Hybrid Cloud DCs....	<a href="#">9</a>

- [6. Problem with using IPsec tunnels to Cloud DCs.....10](#)
- [6.1. Complexity of multi-point any-to-any interconnection.....10](#)
- [6.2. Poor performance over long distance.....11](#)
- [6.3. Scaling Issues with IPsec Tunnels.....11](#)
- [7. Problems of Using SD-WAN to connect to Cloud DCs.....12](#)
- 7.1. SD-WAN among branch offices vs. interconnect to Cloud DCs12
- [8. End-to-End Security Concerns for Data Flows.....15](#)
- [9. Requirements for Dynamic Cloud Data Center VPNs.....15](#)
- [10. Security Considerations.....16](#)
- Solution drafts resulting from this work will address security concerns inherent to the solution(s), including both protocol aspects and the importance (for example) of securing workloads in cloud DCs and the use of secure interconnection mechanisms.....16
- IANA Considerations.....16
- [11. References.....16](#)
- [11.1. Normative References.....16](#)
- [11.2. Informative References.....16](#)
- [12. Acknowledgments.....17](#)

[1. Introduction](#)

The ever-increasing use of cloud applications for communication services change the way corporate business works and shares information. Such cloud applications use resources hosted in third party DCs that also host services for other customers.

With the advent of widely available third party cloud DCs in diverse geographic locations and the advancement of tools for monitoring and predicting application behaviors, it is technically feasible for enterprises to instantiate applications and workloads in locations that are geographically closest to their end-users. Such proximity improves end-to-end latency and overall user experience. Conversely, an enterprise can easily shutdown applications and workloads whenever end-users are in motion (thereby modifying the networking connection of subsequently relocated applications and workloads). In addition, an enterprise may wish to take advantage of more and more business applications offered by third party private cloud DCs.

Most of those enterprise branch offices & on-premises data centers are already connected via VPNs, such as MPLS-based L2VPNs and L3VPNs. Then connecting to the cloud-hosted resources may not be straightforward if the provider of the VPN service does not have direct connections to the corresponding cloud DCs. Under those

circumstances, the enterprise can upgrade the CPEs deployed in its various premises to utilize SD-WAN techniques to reach cloud resources (without any assistance from the VPN service provider), or wait for their VPN service provider to make new agreements with data center providers to connect to the cloud resources. Either way has additional infrastructure and operational costs.

In addition, it is an uptrend with more enterprises instantiating their apps & workloads in different cloud DCs to maximize the benefits of geographical proximity, elasticity and special features offered by different cloud DCs.

## [2.](#) Definition of terms

**Cloud DC:** Third party Data Centers that usually host applications and workload owned by different organizations or tenants.

**Controller:** Used interchangeably with SD-WAN controller to manage SD-WAN overlay path creation/deletion and monitoring the path conditions between two or more sites.

**DSVPN:** Dynamic Smart Virtual Private Network. DSVPN is a secure network that exchanges data between sites without needing to pass traffic through an organization's headquarter virtual private network (VPN) server or router.

**Heterogeneous Cloud:** applications & workloads split among Cloud DCs owned & managed by different operators.

**Hybrid Clouds:** Hybrid Clouds (usually plural) refer to enterprises using their own premises DCs in addition to Cloud services provided by multiple cloud operators. For example, an enterprise not only have applications running in their own DCs, but also have applications hosted in multiple third party cloud DCs ((AWS, Azure, Google, Salesforces, SAP, etc). . ONUG also has a notion of heterogeneous cloud, refers to enterprises does not have its own DC, only uses services by 3rd party cloud operators.

- SD-WAN: Software Defined Wide Area Network. In this document, "SD-WAN" refers to the solutions specified by ONUG (Open Network User Group), <https://www.onug.net/software-defined-wide-area-network-sd-wan/>, which is about pooling WAN bandwidth from multiple underlay networks to get better WAN bandwidth management, visibility & control. When the underlay networks are private networks, traffic can traverse without additional encryption; when the underlay networks are public, such as Internet, some traffic needs to be encrypted when traversing through (depending on user provided policies).
- VPC: Virtual Private Cloud. A service offered by Cloud DC operators to allocate logically-isolated cloud resources, including compute, networking and storage.

### 3. Current Practices in Interconnecting Enterprise Sites with Cloud DCs

#### 3.1. Interconnect to Cloud DCs

Most Cloud operators offer some type of network gateway through which an enterprise can reach their workloads hosted in the Cloud DCs. For example, AWS (Amazon Web Services) offers the following options to reach workloads in AWS Cloud DCs:

- Internet gateway for any external entities to reach the workloads hosted in AWS Cloud DC via the Internet.
- Virtual gateway (vGW) where IPsec tunnels [[RFC6071](#)] are established between an enterprise's own gateway and AWS vGW, so that the communications between those gateways can be secured from the underlay (which might be the public Internet).
- Direct Connect, which allows enterprises to purchase direct connect from network service providers to get a private leased line interconnecting the enterprises gateway(s) and the AWS Direct Connect routers. Via Direct Connect, an AWS Transit Gateway can be used to interconnect multiple VPCs in different Availability Zones.



### [3.2.](#) Interconnect to Hybrid Cloud DCs

According to Gartner, by 2020 "hybrid will be the most common usage of the cloud" as more enterprises see the benefits of integrating public and private cloud infrastructures. However, enabling the growth of hybrid cloud deployments in the enterprise requires fast and safe interconnection between public and private cloud services. For an enterprise to connect to applications & workloads hosted in multiple Cloud DCs, the enterprise can use IPsec tunnels established over the Internet or a (virtualized) leased line service to connect its on-premises gateways to each of the Cloud DC's gateways, virtual routers instantiated in the Cloud DCs, or any other suitable design (including a combination thereof).

Some enterprises prefer to instantiate their own virtual CPEs/routers inside the Cloud DC to connect the workloads within the Cloud DC. Then an overlay path is established between customer gateways to the virtual CPEs/routers for reaching the workloads inside the cloud DC.

### [3.3.](#) Connecting workloads among hybrid Cloud DCs

There are multiple approaches to interconnect workloads among different Cloud DCs:

- Utilize Cloud DC provided transit gateways, which usually does not work if Cloud DCs are owned and managed by different Cloud providers.
- Hairpin all the traffic through the customer gateway, which creates additional transmission delay & incurs cost when exiting Cloud DCs, or
- Establish direct tunnels among different VPCs (Virtual Private Clouds) via client's own virtual routers instantiated within Cloud DCs. DMVPN (Dynamic Multipoint Virtual Private Network) or DSVPN (Dynamic Smart VPN) techniques can be used to establish direct Multi-point-to-Point or multi-point-to multi-point tunnels among those client's own virtual routers.

DMVPN & DSVPN use NHRP (Next Hop Resolution Protocol) [[RFC2735](#)] so that spoke nodes can register their IP addresses & WAN ports with

the hub node. The IETF ION (Internetworking over NBMA (non-broadcast multiple access) WG standardized NHRP for connection-oriented NBMA network (such as ATM) network address resolution more than two decades ago.

There are many differences between virtual routers in Public Cloud DCs and the nodes in an NBMA network. NHRP & DSVPN are not cannot be used for registering virtual routers in Cloud DCs unless an extension of such protocols is developed for that purpose. Other protocols such as BGP can be used, as described in [[BGP-SDWAN](#)].

**4. Desired Properties for Networks that interconnect Hybrid Clouds**  
The networks that interconnect hybrid cloud DCs must address the following requirements:

- High availability at any time, whatever the duration of the connection to the cloud DC.  
Many enterprises include cloud infrastructures in their disaster recovery strategy, e.g., by enforcing periodic backup policies within the cloud, or by running backup applications in the Cloud, etc. Therefore, the connection to the cloud DCs may not be permanent, but rather needs to be on-demand.
- Global reachability from different geographical zones, thereby facilitating the proximity of applications as a function of the end users' location, to improve latency.
- Elasticity and mobility, to instantiate additional applications at Cloud DCs when end-users' usages increase and shut down applications at locations when there are fewer end-users.  
Some enterprises have front-end web portals running in cloud DCs and database servers in their on-premises DCs. Those Front-end web portals need to be reachable from the public Internet. The backend connection to the sensitive data in database servers hosted in the on-premises DCs might need secure connections.
- Scalable security management. IPsec is commonly used to interconnect cloud gateways with CPEs deployed in the

enterprise premises. For enterprises with a large number or branch offices, managing the IPsec's Security Associations among many nodes can be very difficult.

## 5. Problems with MPLS-based VPNs extending to Hybrid Cloud DCs

Traditional MPLS-based VPNs have been widely deployed as an effective way to support businesses and organizations that require network performance and reliability. MPLS shifted the burden of managing a VPN service from enterprises to service providers. The CPEs attached to MPLS VPNs are also simpler and less expensive, since they do not need to manage routes to remote sites; they simply pass all outbound traffic to the MPLS VPN PEs to which the CPEs are attached (albeit multi-homing scenarios require more processing logic on CPEs). MPLS has addressed the problems of scale, availability, and fast recovery from network faults, and incorporated traffic-engineering capabilities.

However, traditional MPLS-based VPN solutions are sub-optimized for connecting end-users to dynamic workloads/applications in cloud DCs because:

- The Provider Edge (PE) nodes of the enterprise's VPNs might not have direct connections to third party cloud DCs that are used for hosting workloads with the goal of providing an easy access to enterprises' end-users.
- It usually takes some time to deploy provider edge (PE) routers at new locations. When enterprise's workloads are changed from one cloud DC to another (i.e., removed from one DC and re-instantiated to another location when demand changes), the enterprise branch offices need to be connected to the new cloud DC, but the network service provider might not have PEs located at the new location.

One of the main drivers for moving workloads into the cloud is the widely available cloud DCs at geographically diverse locations, where apps can be instantiated so that they can be as close to their end-users as possible. When the user base changes, the applications may be migrated to a new cloud DC location closest to the new user base.

- Most of the cloud DCs do not expose their internal networks, so the MPLS-based VPNs can only reach Cloud DC's Gateways, not to the workloads hosted inside.
- Many cloud DCs use an overlay to connect their gateways to the workloads located inside the DC. There has not been any standard to address the interworking between the Cloud Overlay and the enterprise' existing underlay networks.

Another roadblock is the lack of a standard way to express and enforce consistent security policies for workloads that not only use virtual addresses, but in which are also very likely hosted in different locations within the Cloud DC [[RFC8192](#)]. The current VPN path computation and bandwidth allocation schemes may not be flexible enough to address the need for enterprises to rapidly connect to dynamically instantiated (or removed) workloads and applications regardless of their location/nature (i.e., third party cloud DCs).

## 6. Problem with using IPsec tunnels to Cloud DCs

As described in the previous section, many Cloud operators expose their gateways for external entities (which can be enterprises themselves) to directly establish IPsec tunnels. Enterprises can also instantiate virtual routers within Cloud DCs to connect to their on-premises devices via IPsec tunnels. If there is only one enterprise location that needs to reach the Cloud DC, an IPsec tunnel is a very convenient solution.

However, many medium-to-large enterprises usually have multiple sites and multiple data centers. For workloads and apps hosted in cloud DCs, multiple sites need to communicate securely with those cloud workloads and apps. This section documents some of the issues associated with using IPsec tunnels to connect enterprise premises with cloud gateways.

### 6.1. Complexity of multi-point any-to-any interconnection

The dynamic workload instantiated in cloud DC needs to communicate with multiple branch offices and on-premises data centers. Most

enterprises need multi-point interconnection among multiple locations, which can be provided by means of MPLS L2/L3 VPNs.

Using IPsec overlay paths to connect all branches & on-premises data centers to cloud DCs requires CPEs to manage routing among Cloud DCs gateways and the CPEs located at other branch locations, which can dramatically increase the complexity of the design, possibly at the cost of jeopardizing the CPE performance.

The complexity of requiring CPEs to maintain routing among other CPEs is one of the reasons why enterprises migrated from Frame Relay based services to MPLS-based VPN services.

MPLS-based VPNs have their PEs directly connected to the CPEs. Therefore, CPEs only need to forward all traffic to the directly attached PEs, which are therefore responsible for enforcing the routing policy within the corresponding VPNs. Even for multi-homed CPEs, the CPEs only need to forward traffic among the directly connected PEs. However, when using IPsec tunnels between CPEs and Cloud DCs, the CPEs need to compute, select, establish and maintain routes for traffic to be forwarded to Cloud DCs, to remote CPEs via VPN, or directly.

### [6.2.](#) Poor performance over long distance

When enterprise CPEs or gateways are far away from cloud DC gateways or across country/continent boundaries, performance of IPsec tunnels over the public Internet can be problematic and unpredictable. Even though there are many monitoring tools available to measure delay and various performance characteristics of the network, the measurement for paths over the Internet is passive and past measurements may not represent future performance.

Many cloud providers can replicate workloads in different available zones. An App instantiated in a cloud DC closest to clients may have to cooperate with another App (or its mirror image) in another region or database server(s) in the on-premises DC. This kind of coordination requires predictable networking behavior/performance among those locations.

### [6.3.](#) Scaling Issues with IPsec Tunnels

IPsec can achieve secure overlay connections between two locations over any underlay network, e.g., between CPEs and Cloud DC Gateways.

If there is only one enterprise location connected to the cloud gateway, a small number of IPsec tunnels can be configured on-demand

between the on-premises DC and the Cloud DC, which is an easy and flexible solution.

However, for multiple enterprise locations to reach workloads hosted in cloud DCs, the cloud DC gateway needs to maintain multiple IPsec tunnels to all those locations (e.g., as a hub & spoke topology). For a company with hundreds or thousands of locations, there could be hundreds (or even thousands) of IPsec tunnels terminating at the cloud DC gateway, which is not only very expensive (because Cloud Operators usually charge their customers based on connections), but can be very processing intensive for the gateway. Many cloud operators only allow a limited number of (IPsec) tunnels & bandwidth to each customer. Alternatively, you could use a solution like group encryption where a single IPsec SA is necessary at the GW but the drawback here is key distribution and maintenance of a key server, etc.

## 7. Problems of Using SD-WAN to connect to Cloud DCs

SD-WAN can establish parallel paths over multiple underlay networks between two locations on-demand, for example, to support the connections established between two CPEs interconnected by a traditional MPLS VPN ([[RFC4364](#)] or [[RFC4664](#)]) or by IPsec [[RFC6071](#)] tunnels.

SD-WAN lets enterprises augment their current VPN network with cost-effective, readily available Broadband Internet connectivity, enabling some traffic offloading to paths over the Internet according to differentiated, possibly application-based traffic forwarding policies, or when the MPLS VPN connection between the two locations is congested, or otherwise undesirable or unavailable.

### 7.1. SD-WAN among branch offices vs. interconnect to Cloud DCs

SD-WAN interconnection of branch offices is not as simple as it appears. For an enterprise with multiple sites, using SD-WAN overlay

paths among sites requires each CPE to manage all the addresses that local hosts have the potential to reach, i.e., map internal VPN addresses to appropriate SD-WAN paths. This is similar to the complexity of Frame Relay based VPNs, where each CPE needed to maintain mesh routing for all destinations if they were to avoid an extra hop through a hub router. Even though SD-WAN CPEs can get assistance from a central controller (instead of running a routing protocol) to resolve the mapping between destinations and SD-WAN paths, SD-WAN CPEs are still responsible for routing table

maintenance as remote destinations change their attachments, e.g., the dynamic workload in other DCs are de-commissioned or added.

Even though originally envisioned for interconnecting branch offices, SD-WAN offers a very attractive way for enterprises to connect to Cloud DCs.

The SD-WAN for interconnecting branch offices and the SD-WAN for interconnecting to Cloud DCs have some differences:

- SD-WAN for interconnecting branch offices usually have two end-points (e.g., CPEs) controlled by one entity (e.g., a controller or management system operated by the enterprise).
- SD-WAN for Cloud DC interconnects may consider CPEs owned or managed by the enterprise, while remote end-points are being managed or controlled by Cloud DCs (For the ease of description, let's call such CPEs asymmetrically-managed CPEs).





- MPLS-based VPNs and IPsec-based VPNs (or any combination thereof) that run over the public Internet.
- The solution should not require an enterprise to upgrade all their existing CPEs.
  - The solution should support scalable IPsec key management among all nodes involved in DC interconnect schemes.
  - The solution needs to support easy and fast, on-the-fly, VPN connections to dynamic workloads and applications in third party data centers, and easily allow these workloads to migrate both within a data center and between data centers.
  - Allow VPNs to provide bandwidth and other performance guarantees.
  - Be a cost-effective solution for enterprises to incorporate dynamic cloud-based applications and workloads into their existing VPN environment.

## [10](#). Security Considerations

The draft discusses security requirements as a part of the problem space, particularly in sections [4](#), [5](#), and [8](#).

Solution drafts resulting from this work will address security concerns inherent to the solution(s), including both protocol aspects and the importance (for example) of securing workloads in cloud DCs and the use of secure interconnection mechanisms.

### IANA Considerations

This document requires no IANA actions. RFC Editor: Please remove this section before publication.

## [11](#). References

### 11.1. Normative References

### 11.2. Informative References

[RFC2735] B. Fox, et al "NHRP Support for Virtual Private networks". Dec. 1999.

[RFC8192] S. Hares, et al "Interface to Network Security Functions (I2NSF) Problem Statement and Use Cases", July 2017

[ITU-T-X1036] ITU-T Recommendation X.1036, "Framework for creation, storage, distribution and enforcement of policies for network security", Nov 2007.

[RFC6071] S. Frankel and S. Krishnan, "IP Security (IPsec) and Internet Key Exchange (IKE) Document Roadmap", Feb 2011.

[RFC4364] E. Rosen and Y. Rekhter, "BGP/MPLS IP Virtual Private Networks (VPNs)", Feb 2006

Dunbar, et al.

Expires Dec 25, 2019

[Page 16]

---

Internet-Draft

Net2Cloud Problem Statement

January 2019

[RFC4664] L. Andersson and E. Rosen, "Framework for Layer 2 Virtual Private Networks (L2VPNs)", Sept 2006.

[BGP-SDWAN] L. Dunbar, et al. "BGP Extension for SDWAN Overlay Networks", [draft-dunbar-idr-bgp-sdwan-overlay-ext-03](#), work-in-progress, Nov 2018.

## 12. Acknowledgments

Many thanks to Ignas Bagdonas, Michael Huang, Liu Yuan Jiao, Katherine Zhao, and Jim Guichard for the discussion and contributions.

Internet-Draft

Net2Cloud Problem Statement

January 2019

#### Authors' Addresses

Linda Dunbar  
Huawei  
Email: Linda.Dunbar@huawei.com

Andrew G. Malis  
Huawei  
Email: agmalis@gmail.com

Christian Jacquenet  
Orange  
Rennes, 35000  
France  
Email: Christian.jacquenet@orange.com

Mehmet Toy  
Verizon  
One Verizon Way  
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920  
Email: mehmet.toy@verizon.com

