

BESS Workgroup  
(Editor)  
INTERNET-DRAFT

A. Sajassi

Cisco  
Intended Status: Standards Track  
(Editor)

J. Drake

Juniper

N.

Bitar

Nokia

R.

Shekhar

Juniper

J.

Uttaro

AT&T

W.

Henderickx

Nokia

Expires: August 9, 2018  
2018

February 9,

**A Network Virtualization Overlay Solution using EVPN  
draft-ietf-bess-evpn-overlay-12**

Abstract

This document specifies how Ethernet VPN (EVPN) can be used as a Network Virtualization Overlay (NVO) solution and explores the various tunnel encapsulation options over IP and their impact on the

EVPN control-plane and procedures. In particular, the following encapsulation options are analyzed: Virtual Extensible LAN (VXLAN), Network Virtualization using Generic Routing Encapsulation (NVGRE), and MPLS over Generic Routing Encapsulation (GRE). This specification

is also applicable to Generic Network Virtualization Encapsulation (GENEVE) encapsulation; however, some incremental work is required which will be covered in a separate document. This document also specifies new multi-homing procedures for split-horizon filtering and

mass-withdraw. It also specifies EVPN route constructions for VXLAN/NVGRE encapsulations and Autonomous System Boundary Router (ASBR) procedures for multi-homing of Network Virtualization (NV) Edge devices.

Status of this Memo

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

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/1id-abstracts.html>

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

### Copyright and License Notice

Copyright (c) 2018 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="#">4</a>	<a href="#">2</a> Requirements Notation and Conventions . . . . .
<a href="#">5</a>	<a href="#">3</a> Terminology . . . . .
<a href="#">5</a>	<a href="#">4</a> EVPN Features . . . . .
<a href="#">6</a>	<a href="#">5</a> Encapsulation Options for EVPN Overlays . . . . .
<a href="#">8</a>	<a href="#">5.1</a> VXLAN/NVGRE Encapsulation . . . . .
<a href="#">8</a>	<a href="#">5.1.1</a> Virtual Identifiers Scope . . . . .
<a href="#">9</a>	<a href="#">5.1.1.1</a> Data Center Interconnect with Gateway . . . . .
<a href="#">9</a>	<a href="#">5.1.1.2</a> Data Center Interconnect without Gateway . . . . .
<a href="#">9</a>	<a href="#">5.1.2</a> Virtual Identifiers to EVI Mapping . . . . .

[10](#)            [5.1.2.1](#) Auto Derivation of RT . . . . .

[11](#)            [5.1.3](#) Constructing EVPN BGP Routes . . . . .

[13](#)            [5.2](#) MPLS over GRE . . . . .

[14](#)            [6](#) EVPN with Multiple Data Plane Encapsulations . . . . .

[15](#)            [7](#) Single-Homing NVEs - NVE Residing in Hypervisor . . . . .

[15](#)            7.1 Impact on EVPN BGP Routes & Attributes for VXLAN/NVGRE  
                Encapsulation . . . . .

[16](#)

[7.2](#) Impact on EVPN Procedures for VXLAN/NVGRE Encapsulation . . .  
[16](#)

[8](#) Multi-Homing NVEs - NVE Residing in ToR Switch . . . . .  
[17](#)

[8.1](#) EVPN Multi-Homing Features . . . . .  
[17](#)

[8.1.1](#) Multi-homed Ethernet Segment Auto-Discovery . . . . .  
[18](#)

[8.1.2](#) Fast Convergence and Mass Withdraw . . . . .  
[18](#)

[8.1.3](#) Split-Horizon . . . . .  
[18](#)

[8.1.4](#) Aliasing and Backup-Path . . . . .  
[18](#)

[8.1.5](#) DF Election . . . . .  
[19](#)

[8.2](#) Impact on EVPN BGP Routes & Attributes . . . . .  
[20](#)

[8.3](#) Impact on EVPN Procedures . . . . .  
[20](#)

[8.3.1](#) Split Horizon . . . . .  
[20](#)

[8.3.2](#) Aliasing and Backup-Path . . . . .  
[21](#)

[8.3.3](#) Unknown Unicast Traffic Designation . . . . .  
[21](#)

[9](#) Support for Multicast . . . . .  
[22](#)

[10](#) Data Center Interconnections - DCI . . . . .  
[23](#)

[10.1](#) DCI using GWs . . . . .  
[23](#)

[10.2](#) DCI using ASBRs . . . . .  
[24](#)

[10.2.1](#) ASBR Functionality with Single-Homing NVEs . . . . .  
[25](#)

[10.2.2](#) ASBR Functionality with Multi-Homing NVEs . . . . .  
[25](#)

[11](#) Acknowledgement . . . . .  
[27](#)

[12](#) Security Considerations . . . . .  
[27](#)

[13](#) IANA Considerations . . . . .  
[28](#)

[14](#) References . . . . .  
[28](#)

[14.1](#) Normative References . . . . .  
[28](#)

[14.2](#) Informative References . . . . .  
[29](#)

Contributors . . . . .  
[30](#)

Authors' Addresses . . . . .

[30](#)

Sajassi-Drake et al. Expires August 9, 2018 [Page  
3]

## 1 Introduction

This document specifies how Ethernet VPN (EVPN) [[RFC7432](#)] can be used as a Network Virtualization Overlay (NVO) solution and explores the various tunnel encapsulation options over IP and their impact on the

the EVPN control-plane and procedures. In particular, the following encapsulation options are analyzed: Virtual Extensible LAN (VXLAN) [[RFC7348](#)], Network Virtualization using Generic Routing

Encapsulation

(NVGRE) [[RFC7637](#)], and MPLS over Generic Routing Encapsulation (GRE) [[RFC4023](#)]. This specification is also applicable to Generic Network Virtualization Encapsulation (GENEVE) encapsulation [[GENEVE](#)]; however, some incremental work is required which will be covered in

a

separate document [[EVPN-GENEVE](#)]. This document also specifies new multi-homing procedures for split-horizon filtering and mass-withdraw. It also specifies EVPN route constructions for VXLAN/NVGRE encapsulations and Autonomous System Boundary Router (ASBR) procedures for multi-homing of Network Virtualization (NV) Edge devices.

In the context of this document, a Network Virtualization Overlay (NVO) is a solution to address the requirements of a multi-tenant data center, especially one with virtualized hosts, e.g., Virtual Machines (VMs) or virtual workloads. The key requirements of such a solution, as described in [[RFC7364](#)], are:

- Isolation of network traffic per tenant
- Support for a large number of tenants (tens or hundreds of thousands)
- Extending L2 connectivity among different VMs belonging to a given tenant segment (subnet) across different Point of Deliveries (PODs) within a data center or between different data centers
- Allowing a given VM to move between different physical points of attachment within a given L2 segment

The underlay network for NVO solutions is assumed to provide IP connectivity between NVO endpoints (NVEs).

This document describes how Ethernet VPN (EVPN) can be used as an NVO solution and explores applicability of EVPN functions and procedures.

In particular, it describes the various tunnel encapsulation options for EVPN over IP, and their impact on the EVPN control-plane and procedures for two main scenarios:





- a) single-homing NVEs - when a NVE resides in the hypervisor, and
- b) multi-homing NVEs - when a NVE resides in a Top of Rack (ToR) device

The possible encapsulation options for EVPN overlays that are analyzed in this document are:

- VXLAN and NVGRE
- MPLS over GRE

Before getting into the description of the different encapsulation options for EVPN over IP, it is important to highlight the EVPN solution's main features, how those features are currently supported, and any impact that the encapsulation has on those features.

## **2 Requirements Notation and Conventions**

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in

[BCP](#)

[14](#) [[RFC2119](#)] [[RFC8174](#)] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

## **3 Terminology**

Most of the terminology used in this documents comes from [[RFC7432](#)] and [[RFC7365](#)].

VXLAN: Virtual Extensible LAN

GRE: Generic Routing Encapsulation

NVGRE: Network Virtualization using Generic Routing Encapsulation

GENEVE: Generic Network Virtualization Encapsulation

POD: Point of Delivery

NV: Network Virtualization

NVO: Network Virtualization Overlay

NVE: Network Virtualization Endpoint

VNI: Virtual Network Identifier (for VXLAN)



VSID: Virtual Subnet Identifier (for NVGRE)

EVPN: Ethernet VPN

EVI: An EVPN instance spanning the Provider Edge (PE) devices participating in that EVPN

MAC-VRF: A Virtual Routing and Forwarding table for Media Access Control (MAC) addresses on a PE

IP-VRF: A Virtual Routing and Forwarding table for Internet Protocol (IP) addresses on a PE

Ethernet Segment (ES): When a customer site (device or network) is connected to one or more PEs via a set of Ethernet links, then that set of links is referred to as an 'Ethernet segment'.

Ethernet Segment Identifier (ESI): A unique non-zero identifier that identifies an Ethernet segment is called an 'Ethernet Segment Identifier'.

Ethernet Tag: An Ethernet tag identifies a particular broadcast domain, e.g., a VLAN. An EVPN instance consists of one or more broadcast domains.

PE: Provider Edge device.

Single-Active Redundancy Mode: When only a single PE, among all the PEs attached to an Ethernet segment, is allowed to forward traffic to/from that Ethernet segment for a given VLAN, then the Ethernet segment is defined to be operating in Single-Active redundancy mode.

All-Active Redundancy Mode: When all PEs attached to an Ethernet segment are allowed to forward known unicast traffic to/from that Ethernet segment for a given VLAN, then the Ethernet segment is defined to be operating in All-Active redundancy mode.

PIM-SM: Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse-Mode

PIM-SSM: Protocol Independent Multicast - Source Specific Multicast

Bidir PIM: Bidirectional PIM

#### **4 EVPN Features**

EVPN [[RFC7432](#)] was originally designed to support the requirements detailed in [[RFC7209](#)] and therefore has the following attributes which directly address control plane scaling and ease of deployment



issues.

1) Control plane information is distributed with BGP and Broadcast and Multicast traffic is sent using a shared multicast tree or with ingress replication.

2) Control plane learning is used for MAC (and IP) addresses instead of data plane learning. The latter requires the flooding of unknown unicast and Address Resolution Protocol (ARP) frames; whereas, the former does not require any flooding.

3) Route Reflector (RR) is used to reduce a full mesh of BGP sessions among PE devices to a single BGP session between a PE and the RR. Furthermore, RR hierarchy can be leveraged to scale the number of BGP routes on the RR.

4) Auto-discovery via BGP is used to discover PE devices participating in a given VPN, PE devices participating in a given redundancy group, tunnel encapsulation types, multicast tunnel type, multicast members, etc.

5) All-Active multihoming is used. This allows a given customer device (CE) to have multiple links to multiple PEs, and traffic to/from that CE fully utilizes all of these links.

6) When a link between a CE and a PE fails, the PEs for that EVI are notified of the failure via the withdrawal of a single EVPN route. This allows those PEs to remove the withdrawing PE as a next hop for every MAC address associated with the failed link. This is termed 'mass withdrawal'.

7) BGP route filtering and constrained route distribution are leveraged to ensure that the control plane traffic for a given EVI is only distributed to the PEs in that EVI.

8) When a 802.1Q interface is used between a CE and a PE, each of the VLAN ID (VID) on that interface can be mapped onto a bridge table (for upto 4094 such bridge tables). All these bridge tables may be mapped onto a single MAC-VRF (in case of VLAN-aware bundle service).

9) VM Mobility mechanisms ensure that all PEs in a given EVI know the ES with which a given VM, as identified by its MAC and IP addresses, is currently associated.

10) Route Targets are used to allow the operator (or customer) to define a spectrum of logical network topologies including mesh, hub

&  
spoke, and extranets (e.g., a VPN whose sites are owned by different  
enterprises), without the need for proprietary software or the aid  
of

Sajassi-Drake et al.

Expires August 9, 2018

[Page

7]

other virtual or physical devices.

Because the design goal for NVO is millions of instances per common physical infrastructure, the scaling properties of the control plane for NVO are extremely important. EVPN and the extensions described herein, are designed with this level of scalability in mind.

## **5 Encapsulation Options for EVPN Overlays**

### **5.1 VXLAN/NVGRE Encapsulation**

Both VXLAN and NVGRE are examples of technologies that provide a data plane encapsulation which is used to transport a packet over the common physical IP infrastructure between Network Virtualization Edges (NVEs) - e.g., VXLAN Tunnel End Points (VTEPs) in VXLAN network. Both of these technologies include the identifier of the specific NVO instance, Virtual Network Identifier (VNI) in VXLAN and Virtual Subnet Identifier (VSID) in NVGRE, in each packet. In the remainder of this document we use VNI as the representation for NVO instance with the understanding that VSID can equally be used if the encapsulation is NVGRE unless it is stated otherwise.

Note that a Provider Edge (PE) is equivalent to a NVE/VTEP.

VXLAN encapsulation is based on UDP, with an 8-byte header following the UDP header. VXLAN provides a 24-bit VNI, which typically provides

a one-to-one mapping to the tenant VLAN ID, as described in [\[RFC7348\]](#). In this scenario, the ingress VTEP does not include an inner VLAN tag on the encapsulated frame, and the egress VTEP discards the frames with an inner VLAN tag. This mode of operation in [\[RFC7348\]](#) maps to VLAN Based Service in [\[RFC7432\]](#), where a tenant VLAN ID gets mapped to an EVPN instance (EVI).

VXLAN also provides an option of including an inner VLAN tag in the encapsulated frame, if explicitly configured at the VTEP. This mode of operation can map to VLAN Bundle Service in [\[RFC7432\]](#) because all the tenant's tagged frames map to a single bridge table / MAC-VRF, and the inner VLAN tag is not used for lookup by the disposition PE when performing VXLAN decapsulation as described in [section 6 of \[RFC7348\]](#).

[\[RFC7637\]](#) encapsulation is based on GRE encapsulation and it mandates

the inclusion of the optional GRE Key field which carries the VSID. There is a one-to-one mapping between the VSID and the tenant VLAN ID, as described in [\[RFC7637\]](#) and the inclusion of an inner VLAN tag is prohibited. This mode of operation in [\[RFC7637\]](#) maps to VLAN Based

Service in [[RFC7432](#)].

Sajassi-Drake et al. Expires August 9, 2018

[Page  
8]



As described in the next section there is no change to the encoding of EVPN routes to support VXLAN or NVGRE encapsulation except for the use of the BGP Encapsulation extended community to indicate the encapsulation type (e.g., VXLAN or NVGRE). However, there is potential impact to the EVPN procedures depending on where the NVE is located (i.e., in hypervisor or TOR) and whether multi-homing capabilities are required.

**5.1.1 Virtual Identifiers Scope**

Although VNIs are defined as 24-bit globally unique values, there are scenarios in which it is desirable to use a locally significant value for VNI, especially in the context of data center interconnect:

**5.1.1.1 Data Center Interconnect with Gateway**

In the case where NVEs in different data centers need to be interconnected, and the NVEs need to use VNIs as a globally unique identifiers within a data center, then a Gateway needs to be employed at the edge of the data center network. This is because the Gateway will provide the functionality of translating the VNI when crossing network boundaries, which may align with operator span of control boundaries. As an example, consider the network of Figure 1 below. Assume there are three network operators: one for each of the DC1, DC2 and WAN networks. The Gateways at the edge of the data centers are responsible for translating the VNIs between the values used in each of the data center networks and the values used in the WAN.




Figure 1: Data Center Interconnect with Gateway

**5.1.1.2 Data Center Interconnect without Gateway**

In the case where NVEs in different data centers need to be interconnected, and the NVEs need to use locally assigned VNIs (e.g.,

similar to MPLS labels), then there may be no need to employ Gateways at the edge of the data center network. More specifically, the VNI

Sajassi-Drake et al. Expires August 9, 2018

[Page 9]

value that is used by the transmitting NVE is allocated by the NVE that is receiving the traffic (in other words, this is similar to "downstream assigned" MPLS label). This allows the VNI space to be decoupled between different data center networks without the need for a dedicated Gateway at the edge of the data centers. This topic is covered in [section 10.2](#).




Figure 2: Data Center Interconnect with ASBR

### 5.1.2 Virtual Identifiers to EVI Mapping

When the EVPN control plane is used in conjunction with VXLAN (or NVGRE encapsulation), just like [RFC7432] where two options existed for mapping broadcast domains (represented by VLAN IDs) to an EVI, in

here there are also two options for mapping broadcast domains represented by VXLAN VNIs (or NVGRE VSIDs) to an EVI:

1. Option 1: Single Broadcast Domain per EVI

In this option, a single Ethernet broadcast domain (e.g., subnet) represented by a VNI is mapped to a unique EVI. This corresponds to the VLAN Based service in [RFC7432], where a tenant-facing interface,

logical interface (e.g., represented by a VLAN ID) or physical, gets mapped to an EVPN instance (EVI). As such, a BGP RD and RT are needed

per VNI on every NVE. The advantage of this model is that it allows the BGP RT constraint mechanisms to be used in order to limit the propagation and import of routes to only the NVEs that are interested

in a given VNI. The disadvantage of this model may be the provisioning overhead if RD and RT are not derived automatically from VNI.

In this option, the MAC-VRF table is identified by the RT in the

control plane and by the VNI in the data-plane. In this option, the specific MAC-VRF table corresponds to only a single bridge table.

## 2. Option 2: Multiple Broadcast Domains per EVI

In this option, multiple subnets each represented by a unique VNI are mapped to a single EVI. For example, if a tenant has multiple segments/subnets each represented by a VNI, then all the VNIs for that tenant are mapped to a single EVI - e.g., the EVI in this case represents the tenant and not a subnet. This corresponds to the VLAN-aware bundle service in [[RFC7432](#)]. The advantage of this model is that it doesn't require the provisioning of RD/RT per VNI. However, this is a moot point when compared to option 1 where auto-derivation is used. The disadvantage of this model is that routes would be imported by NVEs that may not be interested in a given VNI.

In this option the MAC-VRF table is identified by the RT in the control plane and a specific bridge table for that MAC-VRF is identified by the <RT, Ethernet Tag ID> in the control plane. In this option, the VNI in the data-plane is sufficient to identify a specific bridge table.



### 5.1.2.1 Auto Derivation of RT

When the option of a single VNI per EVI is used, in order to simplify configuration, the RT used for EVPN can be auto-derived. RD can be auto generated as described in [[RFC7432](#)] and RT can be auto-derived as described next.

Since a gateway PE as depicted in figure-1 participates in both the DCN and WAN BGP sessions, it is important that when RT values are auto-derived from VNIs, there is no conflict in RT spaces between DCN and WAN networks assuming that both are operating within the same AS.

Also, there can be scenarios where both VXLAN and NVGRE encapsulations may be needed within the same DCN and their corresponding VNIs are administered independently which means VNI spaces can overlap. In order to avoid conflict in RT spaces arises, the 6-byte RT values with 2-octet AS number for DCNs can be auto-derived as follow:





The 6-octet RT field consists of two sub-field:

- Global Administrator sub-field: 2 octets. This sub-field contains an Autonomous System number assigned by IANA.
- Local Administrator sub-field: 4 octets

\* A: A single-bit field indicating if this RT is auto-derived

- 0: auto-derived
- 1: manually-derived

\* Type: A 3-bit field that identifies the space in which the other 3 bytes are defined. The following spaces are defined:

- 0 : VID (802.1Q VLAN ID)
- 1 : VXLAN
- 2 : NVGRE
- 3 : I-SID
- 4 : EVI
- 5 : dual-VID (QinQ VLAN ID)

\* D-ID: A 4-bit field that identifies domain-id. The default value of domain-id is zero indicating that only a single numbering space exist for a given technology. However, if there are more than one number space exist for a given technology (e.g., overlapping VXLAN spaces), then each of the number spaces need to be identify by their corresponding domain-id starting from 1.





\* Service ID: This 3-octet field is set to VNI, VSID, I-SID,  
or VID.

It should be noted that RT auto-derivation is applicable for 2-octet AS numbers. For 4-octet AS numbers, RT needs to be manually configured since 3-octet VNI fields cannot be fit within 2-octet local administrator field.

### **5.1.3 Constructing EVPN BGP Routes**

In EVPN, an MPLS label for instance identifying forwarding table is distributed by the egress PE via the EVPN control plane and is placed

in the MPLS header of a given packet by the ingress PE. This label is

used upon receipt of that packet by the egress PE for disposition of that packet. This is very similar to the use of the VNI by the egress

NVE, with the difference being that an MPLS label has local significance while a VNI typically has global significance. Accordingly, and specifically to support the option of locally-assigned VNIs, the MPLS Label1 field in the MAC/IP Advertisement route, the MPLS label field in the Ethernet AD per EVI route, and the

MPLS label field in the PMSI Tunnel Attribute of the Inclusive Multicast Ethernet Tag (IMET) route are used to carry the VNI. For the balance of this memo, the above MPLS label fields will be referred to as the VNI field. The VNI field is used for both local and global VNIs, and for either case the entire 24-bit field is used to encode the VNI value.

For the VLAN-based service (a single VNI per MAC-VRF), the Ethernet Tag field in the MAC/IP Advertisement, Ethernet AD per EVI, and IMET route MUST be set to zero just as in the VLAN Based service in [\[RFC7432\]](#).

For the VLAN-aware bundle service (multiple VNIs per MAC-VRF with each VNI associated with its own bridge table), the Ethernet Tag field in the MAC Advertisement, Ethernet AD per EVI, and IMET route MUST identify a bridge table within a MAC-VRF and the set of Ethernet

Tags for that EVI needs to be configured consistently on all PEs within that EVI. For locally-assigned VNIs, the value advertised in the Ethernet Tag field MUST be set to a VID just as in the VLAN-aware

bundle service in [\[RFC7432\]](#). Such setting must be done consistently on all PE devices participating in that EVI within a given domain. For global VNIs, the value advertised in the Ethernet Tag field SHOULD be set to a VNI as long as it matches the existing semantics of the Ethernet Tag, i.e., it identifies a bridge table within a

MAC-

VRF and the set of VNIs are configured consistently on each PE in that EVI.

In order to indicate which type of data plane encapsulation (i.e.,

VXLAN, NVGRE, MPLS, or MPLS in GRE) is to be used, the BGP Encapsulation extended community defined in [RFC5512] is included with all EVPN routes (i.e. MAC Advertisement, Ethernet AD per EVI, Ethernet AD per ESI, Inclusive Multicast Ethernet Tag, and Ethernet Segment) advertised by an egress PE. Five new values have been assigned by IANA to extend the list of encapsulation types defined in [RFC5512] and they are listed in [section 13](#).

The MPLS encapsulation tunnel type, listed in [section 13](#), is needed in order to distinguish between an advertising node that only supports non-MPLS encapsulations and one that supports MPLS and non-MPLS encapsulations. An advertising node that only supports MPLS encapsulation does not need to advertise any encapsulation tunnel types; i.e., if the BGP Encapsulation extended community is not present, then either MPLS encapsulation or a statically configured encapsulation is assumed.

The Next Hop field of the MP\_REACH\_NLRI attribute of the route MUST be set to the IPv4 or IPv6 address of the NVE. The remaining fields in each route are set as per [RFC7432].

Note that the procedure defined here to use the MPLS Label field to carry the VNI in the presence of a Tunnel Encapsulation Extended Community specifying the use of a VNI, is aligned with the procedures described in section 8.2.2.2 of [TUNNEL-ENCAP] ("When a Valid VNI has not been Signaled").

## **[5.2](#) MPLS over GRE**

The EVPN data-plane is modeled as an EVPN MPLS client layer sitting over an MPLS PSN-tunnel server layer. Some of the EVPN functions (split-horizon, aliasing, and backup-path) are tied to the MPLS client layer. If MPLS over GRE encapsulation is used, then the EVPN MPLS client layer can be carried over an IP PSN tunnel transparently. Therefore, there is no impact to the EVPN procedures and associated data-plane operation.

The existing standards for MPLS over GRE encapsulation as defined by [RFC4023] can be used for this purpose; however, when it is used in conjunction with EVPN, it is recommended that the GRE key field be present and be used to provide a 32-bit entropy value only if the P nodes can perform Equal-Cost Multipath (ECMP) hashing based on the GRE key; otherwise, the GRE header SHOULD NOT include the GRE key. The Checksum and Sequence Number fields MUST NOT be included and the corresponding C and S bits in the GRE Packet Header MUST be set to zero. A PE capable of supporting this encapsulation, SHOULD advertise its EVPN routes along with the Tunnel Encapsulation extended

community indicating MPLS over GRE encapsulation as described in

Sajassi-Drake et al.  
14]

Expires August 9, 2018

[Page

previous section.

## **6 EVPN with Multiple Data Plane Encapsulations**

The use of the BGP Encapsulation extended community per [[RFC5512](#)] allows each NVE in a given EVI to know each of the encapsulations supported by each of the other NVEs in that EVI. i.e., each of the NVEs in a given EVI may support multiple data plane encapsulations. An ingress NVE can send a frame to an egress NVE only if the set of encapsulations advertised by the egress NVE forms a non-empty intersection with the set of encapsulations supported by the ingress NVE, and it is at the discretion of the ingress NVE which encapsulation to choose from this intersection. (As noted in [section 5.1.3](#), if the BGP Encapsulation extended community is not present, then the default MPLS encapsulation or a locally configured encapsulation is assumed.)

When a PE advertises multiple supported encapsulations, it MUST advertise encapsulations that use the same EVPN procedures including procedures associated with split-horizon filtering described in [section 8.3.1](#). For example, VXLAN and NVGRE (or MPLS and MPLS over GRE) encapsulations use the same EVPN procedures and thus a PE can advertise both of them and can support either of them or both of them simultaneously. However, a PE MUST NOT advertise VXLAN and MPLS encapsulations together because (a) the MPLS field of EVPN routes is set to either an MPLS label or a VNI but not both and (b) some EVPN procedures (such as split-horizon filtering) are different for VXLAN/NVGRE and MPLS encapsulations.

An ingress node that uses shared multicast trees for sending broadcast or multicast frames MAY maintain distinct trees for each different encapsulation type.

It is the responsibility of the operator of a given EVI to ensure that all of the NVEs in that EVI support at least one common encapsulation. If this condition is violated, it could result in service disruption or failure. The use of the BGP Encapsulation extended community provides a method to detect when this condition is violated but the actions to be taken are at the discretion of the operator and are outside the scope of this document.

## **7 Single-Homing NVEs - NVE Residing in Hypervisor**

When a NVE and its hosts/VMs are co-located in the same physical device, e.g., when they reside in a server, the links between them are virtual and they typically share fate; i.e., the subject



hosts/VMs are typically not multi-homed or if they are multi-homed, the multi-homing is a purely local matter to the server hosting the VM and the NVEs, and need not be "visible" to any other NVEs residing on other servers, and thus does not require any specific protocol mechanisms. The most common case of this is when the NVE resides on the hypervisor.

In the sub-sections that follow, we will discuss the impact on EVPN procedures for the case when the NVE resides on the hypervisor and the VXLAN (or NVGRE) encapsulation is used.

### **7.1 Impact on EVPN BGP Routes & Attributes for VXLAN/NVGRE Encapsulation**

In scenarios where different groups of data centers are under different administrative domains, and these data centers are connected via one or more backbone core providers as described in [RFC7365], the RD must be a unique value per EVI or per NVE as described in [RFC7432]. In other words, whenever there is more than one administrative domain for global VNI, then a unique RD must be used, or whenever the VNI value has local significance, then a unique RD must be used. Therefore, it is recommended to use a unique RD as described in [RFC7432] at all time.

When the NVEs reside on the hypervisor, the EVPN BGP routes and attributes associated with multi-homing are no longer required. This reduces the required routes and attributes to the following subset of four out of the total of eight listed in [section 7 of \[RFC7432\]](#):

- MAC/IP Advertisement Route
- Inclusive Multicast Ethernet Tag Route
- MAC Mobility Extended Community
- Default Gateway Extended Community

However, as noted in [section 8.6 of \[RFC7432\]](#) in order to enable a single-homing ingress NVE to take advantage of fast convergence, aliasing, and backup-path when interacting with multi-homed egress NVEs attached to a given Ethernet segment, the single-homing ingress NVE should be able to receive and process Ethernet AD per ES and Ethernet AD per EVI routes.

### **7.2 Impact on EVPN Procedures for VXLAN/NVGRE Encapsulation**

When the NVEs reside on the hypervisors, the EVPN procedures associated with multi-homing are no longer required. This limits the procedures on the NVE to the following subset of the EVPN procedures:

1. Local learning of MAC addresses received from the VMs per section





10.1 of [\[RFC7432\]](#).

2. Advertising locally learned MAC addresses in BGP using the MAC/IP Advertisement routes.

3. Performing remote learning using BGP per [Section 10.2 of \[RFC7432\]](#).

4. Discovering other NVEs and constructing the multicast tunnels using the Inclusive Multicast Ethernet Tag routes.

5. Handling MAC address mobility events per the procedures of [Section 16 in \[RFC7432\]](#).

However, as noted in [section 8.6 of \[RFC7432\]](#) in order to enable a single-homing ingress NVE to take advantage of fast convergence, aliasing, and back-up path when interacting with multi-homed egress NVEs attached to a given Ethernet segment, a single-homing ingress NVE should implement the ingress node processing of Ethernet AD per ES and Ethernet AD per EVI routes as defined in sections [8.2](#) Fast Convergence and [8.4](#) Aliasing and Backup-Path of [\[RFC7432\]](#).

## **8 Multi-Homing NVEs - NVE Residing in ToR Switch**

In this section, we discuss the scenario where the NVEs reside in the

Top of Rack (ToR) switches AND the servers (where VMs are residing) are multi-homed to these ToR switches. The multi-homing NVE operate in All-Active or Single-Active redundancy mode. If the servers are single-homed to the ToR switches, then the scenario becomes similar to that where the NVE resides on the hypervisor, as discussed in [Section 7](#), as far as the required EVPN functionality are concerned.

[RFC7432] defines a set of BGP routes, attributes and procedures to support multi-homing. We first describe these functions and procedures, then discuss which of these are impacted by the VXLAN (or NVGRE) encapsulation and what modifications are required. As it will be seen later in this section, the only EVPN procedure that is impacted by non-MPLS overlay encapsulation (e.g., VXLAN or NVGRE) where it provides space for one ID rather than stack of labels, is that of split-horizon filtering for multi-homed Ethernet Segments described in [section 8.3.1](#).

### **8.1 EVPN Multi-Homing Features**

In this section, we will recap the multi-homing features of EVPN to highlight the encapsulation dependencies. The section only describes the features and functions at a high-level. For more details, the reader is to refer to [\[RFC7432\]](#).



### **8.1.1 Multi-homed Ethernet Segment Auto-Discovery**

EVPN NVEs (or PEs) connected to the same Ethernet Segment (e.g. the same server via LAG) can automatically discover each other with minimal to no configuration through the exchange of BGP routes.

### **8.1.2 Fast Convergence and Mass Withdraw**

EVPN defines a mechanism to efficiently and quickly signal, to remote NVEs, the need to update their forwarding tables upon the occurrence of a failure in connectivity to an Ethernet segment (e.g., a link or a port failure). This is done by having each NVE advertise an Ethernet A-D Route per Ethernet segment for each locally attached segment. Upon a failure in connectivity to the attached segment, the NVE withdraws the corresponding Ethernet A-D route. This triggers all NVEs that receive the withdrawal to update their next-hop adjacencies for all MAC addresses associated with the Ethernet segment in question. If no other NVE had advertised an Ethernet A-D route for the same segment, then the NVE that received the withdrawal simply invalidates the MAC entries for that segment. Otherwise, the NVE updates the next-hop adjacency list accordingly.

### **8.1.3 Split-Horizon**

If a server is multi-homed to two or more NVEs (represented by an Ethernet segment ES1) and operating in an all-active redundancy mode, sends a BUM packet (ie, Broadcast, Unknown unicast, or Multicast) to one of these NVEs, then it is important to ensure the packet is not looped back to the server via another NVE connected to this server. The filtering mechanism on the NVE to prevent such loop and packet duplication is called "split horizon filtering".

### **8.1.4 Aliasing and Backup-Path**

In the case where a station is multi-homed to multiple NVEs, it is possible that only a single NVE learns a set of the MAC addresses associated with traffic transmitted by the station. This leads to a situation where remote NVEs receive MAC advertisement routes, for these addresses, from a single NVE even though multiple NVEs are connected to the multi-homed station. As a result, the remote NVEs are not able to effectively load-balance traffic among the NVEs connected to the multi-homed Ethernet segment. This could be the case, for e.g. when the NVEs perform data-path learning on the access, and the load-balancing function on the station hashes traffic from a given source MAC address to a single NVE. Another scenario

where this occurs is when the NVEs rely on control plane learning on the access (e.g. using ARP), since ARP traffic will be hashed to a

single link in the LAG.

To alleviate this issue, EVPN introduces the concept of Aliasing. This refers to the ability of an NVE to signal that it has reachability to a given locally attached Ethernet segment, even when it has learnt no MAC addresses from that segment. The Ethernet A-D route per EVI is used to that end. Remote NVEs which receive MAC advertisement routes with non-zero ESI should consider the MAC address as reachable via all NVEs that advertise reachability to the relevant Segment using Ethernet A-D routes with the same ESI and with the Single-Active flag reset.

Backup-Path is a closely related function, albeit it applies to the case where the redundancy mode is Single-Active. In this case, the NVE signals that it has reachability to a given locally attached Ethernet Segment using the Ethernet A-D route as well. Remote NVEs which receive the MAC advertisement routes, with non-zero ESI, should consider the MAC address as reachable via the advertising NVE. Furthermore, the remote NVEs should install a Backup-Path, for said MAC, to the NVE which had advertised reachability to the relevant Segment using an Ethernet A-D route with the same ESI and with the Single-Active flag set.

#### **8.1.5 DF Election**

If a host is multi-homed to two or more NVEs on an Ethernet segment operating in all-active redundancy mode, then for a given EVI only one of these NVEs, termed the Designated Forwarder (DF) is responsible for sending it broadcast, multicast, and, if configured for that EVI, unknown unicast frames.

This is required in order to prevent duplicate delivery of multi-destination frames to a multi-homed host or VM, in case of all-active redundancy.

In NVEs where .1Q tagged frames are received from hosts, the DF election should be performed based on host VLAN IDs (VIDs) per [section 8.5 of \[RFC7432\]](#). Furthermore, multi-homing PEs of a given Ethernet Segment MAY perform DF election using configured IDs such as VNI, EVI, normalized VIDs, and etc. as long as the IDs are configured consistently across the multi-homing PEs.

In GWs where VXLAN encapsulated frames are received, the DF election is performed on VNIs. Again, it is assumed that for a given Ethernet Segment, VNIs are unique and consistent (e.g., no duplicate VNIs exist).



## **8.2 Impact on EVPN BGP Routes & Attributes**

Since multi-homing is supported in this scenario, then the entire set of BGP routes and attributes defined in [[RFC7432](#)] are used. The setting of the Ethernet Tag field in the MAC Advertisement, Ethernet AD per EVI, and Inclusive Multicast routes follows that of [section 5.1.3](#). Furthermore, the setting of the VNI field in the MAC Advertisement and Ethernet AD per EVI routes follows that of [section 5.1.3](#).

## **8.3 Impact on EVPN Procedures**

Two cases need to be examined here, depending on whether the NVEs are operating in Single-Active or in All-Active redundancy mode.

First, let's consider the case of Single-Active redundancy mode, where the hosts are multi-homed to a set of NVEs, however, only a single NVE is active at a given point of time for a given VNI. In this case, the aliasing is not required and the split-horizon filtering may not be required, but other functions such as multi-homed Ethernet segment auto-discovery, fast convergence and mass withdraw, backup path, and DF election are required.

Second, let's consider the case of All-Active redundancy mode. In this case, out of all the EVPN multi-homing features listed in [section 8.1](#), the use of the VXLAN or NVGRE encapsulation impacts the split-horizon and aliasing features, since those two rely on the MPLS client layer. Given that this MPLS client layer is absent with these types of encapsulations, alternative procedures and mechanisms are needed to provide the required functions. Those are discussed in detail next.

### **8.3.1 Split Horizon**

In EVPN, an MPLS label is used for split-horizon filtering to support

All-Active multi-homing where an ingress NVE adds a label corresponding to the site of origin (aka ESI Label) when encapsulating the packet. The egress NVE checks the ESI label when attempting to forward a multi-destination frame out an interface, and

if the label corresponds to the same site identifier (ESI) associated with that interface, the packet gets dropped. This prevents the occurrence of forwarding loops.

Since VXLAN and NVGRE encapsulations do not include the ESI label, other means of performing the split-horizon filtering function must be devised for these encapsulations. The following approach is recommended for split-horizon filtering when VXLAN (or NVGRE)



encapsulation is used.

Every NVE track the IP address(es) associated with the other NVE(s) with which it has shared multi-homed Ethernet Segments. When the NVE receives a multi-destination frame from the overlay network, it examines the source IP address in the tunnel header (which corresponds to the ingress NVE) and filters out the frame on all local interfaces connected to Ethernet Segments that are shared with the ingress NVE. With this approach, it is required that the ingress NVE performs replication locally to all directly attached Ethernet Segments (regardless of the DF Election state) for all flooded traffic ingress from the access interfaces (i.e. from the hosts). This approach is referred to as "Local Bias", and has the advantage that only a single IP address needs to be used per NVE for split-horizon filtering, as opposed to requiring an IP address per Ethernet Segment per NVE.

In order to allow proper operation of split-horizon filtering among the same group of multi-homing PE devices, a mix of PE devices with MPLS over GRE encapsulations running [[RFC7432](#)] procedures for split-horizon filtering on the one hand and VXLAN/NVGRE encapsulations running local-bias procedures on the other on a given Ethernet Segment MUST NOT be configured.

### **8.3.2 Aliasing and Backup-Path**

The Aliasing and the Backup-Path procedures for VXLAN/NVGRE encapsulation are very similar to the ones for MPLS. In case of MPLS, Ethernet A-D route per EVI is used for Aliasing when the corresponding Ethernet Segment operates in All-Active multi-homing, and the same route is used for Backup-Path when the corresponding Ethernet Segment operates in Single-Active multi-homing. In case of VXLAN/NVGRE, the same route is used for the Aliasing and the Backup-Path with the difference that the Ethernet Tag and VNI fields in Ethernet A-D per EVI route are set as described in [section 5.1.3](#).

### **8.3.3 Unknown Unicast Traffic Designation**

In EVPN, when an ingress PE uses ingress replication to flood unknown unicast traffic to egress PEs, the ingress PE uses a different EVPN MPLS label (from the one used for known unicast traffic) to identify such BUM traffic. The egress PEs use this label to identify such BUM traffic and thus apply DF filtering for All-Active multi-homed sites.

In absence of unknown unicast traffic designation and in presence of enabling unknown unicast flooding, there can be transient duplicate traffic to All-Active multi-homed sites under the following condition: the host MAC address is learned by the egress PE(s) and advertised to the ingress PE; however, the MAC advertisement has not



been received or processed by the ingress PE, resulting in the host MAC address to be unknown on the ingress PE but be known on the egress PE(s). Therefore, when a packet destined to that host MAC address arrives on the ingress PE, it floods it via ingress replication to all the egress PE(s) and since they are known to the egress PE(s), multiple copies is sent to the All-Active multi-homed site. It should be noted that such transient packet duplication only happens when a) the destination host is multi-homed via All-Active redundancy mode, b) flooding of unknown unicast is enabled in the network, c) ingress replication is used, and d) traffic for the destination host is arrived on the ingress PE before it learns the host MAC address via BGP EVPN advertisement. If it is desired to avoid occurrence of such transient packet duplication (however low probability that may be), then VXLAN-GPE encapsulation needs to be used between these PEs and the ingress PE needs to set the BUM Traffic Bit (B bit) [[VXLAN-GPE](#)] to indicate that this is an ingress-replicated BUM traffic.

## **9 Support for Multicast**

The E-VPN Inclusive Multicast Ethernet Tag (IMET) route is used to discover the multicast tunnels among the endpoints associated with a given EVI (e.g., given VNI) for VLAN-based service and a given <EVI,VLAN> for VLAN-aware bundle service. All fields of this route is

set as described in [section 5.1.3](#). The Originating router's IP address field is set to the NVE's IP address. This route is tagged with the PMSI Tunnel attribute, which is used to encode the type of multicast tunnel to be used as well as the multicast tunnel identifier. The tunnel encapsulation is encoded by adding the BGP Encapsulation extended community as per [section 5.1.1](#). For example, the PMSI Tunnel attribute may indicate the multicast tunnel is of type Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse-Mode (PIM-SM); whereas, the BGP Encapsulation extended community may indicate the encapsulation for that tunnel is of type VXLAN. The following tunnel types as defined in [[RFC6514](#)] can be used in the PMSI tunnel attribute for VXLAN/NVGRE:

- + 3 - PIM-SSM Tree
- + 4 - PIM-SM Tree
- + 5 - Bidir-PIM Tree
- + 6 - Ingress Replication

In case of VxLAN and NVGRE encapsulation with locally-assigned VNIs, just as in [[RFC7432](#)], each PE MUST advertise an IMET route to other PEs in an EVPN instance for the multicast tunnel type that it uses (i.e., ingress replication, PIM-SM, PIM-SSM, or Bidir-PIM tunnel). However, for globally-assigned VNIs, each PE MUST advertise IMET



route to other PEs in an EVPN instance for ingress replication or PIM-SSM tunnel, and MAY advertise IMET route for PIM-SM or Bidir-PIM tunnel. In case of PIM-SM or Bidir-PIM tunnel, no information in the IMET route is needed by the PE to setup these tunnels.

In the scenario where the multicast tunnel is a tree, both the Inclusive as well as the Aggregate Inclusive variants may be used.

In

the former case, a multicast tree is dedicated to a VNI. Whereas, in the latter, a multicast tree is shared among multiple VNIs. For VNI-based service, the Aggregate Inclusive mode is accomplished by

having

the NVEs advertise multiple IMET routes with different Route Targets (one per VNI) but with the same tunnel identifier encoded in the

PMSI

tunnel attribute. For VNI-aware bundle service, the Aggregate Inclusive mode is accomplished by having the NVEs advertise multiple IMET routes with different VNI encoded in the Ethernet Tag field,

but

with the same tunnel identifier encoded in the PMSI Tunnel attribute.

## **10 Data Center Interconnections - DCI**

For DCI, the following two main scenarios are considered when connecting data centers running evpn-overlay (as described here)

over

MPLS/IP core network:

- Scenario 1: DCI using GWs
- Scenario 2: DCI using ASBRs

The following two subsections describe the operations for each of these scenarios.

### **10.1 DCI using GWs**

This is the typical scenario for interconnecting data centers over WAN. In this scenario, EVPN routes are terminated and processed in each GW and MAC/IP routes are always re-advertised from DC to WAN

but

from WAN to DC, they are not re-advertised if unknown MAC address (and default IP address) are utilized in NVEs. In this scenario,

each

GW maintains a MAC-VRF (and/or IP-VRF) for each EVI. The main advantage of this approach is that NVEs do not need to maintain MAC and IP addresses from any remote data centers when default IP route and unknown MAC routes are used - i.e., they only need to maintain routes that are local to their own DC. When default IP route and unknown MAC route are used, any unknown IP and MAC packets from NVEs are forwarded to the GWs where all the VPN MAC and IP routes are

maintained. This approach reduces the size of MAC-VRF and IP-VRF significantly at NVEs. Furthermore, it results in a faster convergence time upon a link or NVE failure in a multi-homed network or device redundancy scenario, because the failure related BGP routes

(such as mass withdraw message) do not need to get propagated all the way to the remote NVEs in the remote DCs. This approach is described in details in section 3.4 of [[DCI-EVPN-OVERLAY](#)].

## **10.2 DCI using ASBRs**

This approach can be considered as the opposite of the first approach and it favors simplification at DCI devices over NVEs such that larger MAC-VRF (and IP-VRF) tables need to be maintained on NVEs; whereas, DCI devices don't need to maintain any MAC (and IP) forwarding tables. Furthermore, DCI devices do not need to terminate and process routes related to multi-homing but rather to relay these messages for the establishment of an end-to-end Label Switched Path (LSP) path. In other words, DCI devices in this approach operate similar to ASBRs for inter-AS option B - [section 10 of \[RFC4364\]](#). This requires locally assigned VNIs to be used just like downstream assigned MPLS VPN label where for all practical purposes the VNIs function like 24-bit VPN labels. This approach is equally applicable to data centers (or Carrier Ethernet networks) with MPLS encapsulation.

In inter-AS option B, when ASBR receives an EVPN route from its DC over internal BGP (iBGP) and re-advertises it to other ASBRs, it re-advertises the EVPN route by re-writing the BGP next-hops to itself, thus losing the identity of the PE that originated the advertisement.

This re-write of BGP next-hop impacts the EVPN Mass Withdraw route (Ethernet A-D per ES) and its procedure adversely. However, it does not impact EVPN Aliasing mechanism/procedure because when the Aliasing routes (Ether A-D per EVI) are advertised, the receiving PE first resolves a MAC address for a given EVI into its corresponding <ES,EVI> and subsequently, it resolves the <ES,EVI> into multiple paths (and their associated next hops) via which the <ES,EVI> is reachable. Since Aliasing and MAC routes are both advertised per EVI basis and they use the same RD and RT (per EVI), the receiving PE

can

associate them together on a per BGP path basis (e.g., per originating PE) and thus perform recursive route resolution - e.g.,

a

MAC is reachable via an <ES,EVI> which in turn, is reachable via a set of BGP paths, thus the MAC is reachable via the set of BGP

paths.

Since on a per EVI basis, the association of MAC routes and the corresponding Aliasing route is fixed and determined by the same RD and RT, there is no ambiguity when the BGP next hop for these routes is re-written as these routes pass through ASBRs - i.e., the receiving PE may receive multiple Aliasing routes for the same EVI from a single next hop (a single ASBR), and it can still create multiple paths toward that <ES, EVI>.

However, when the BGP next hop address corresponding to the originating PE is re-written, the association between the Mass



Withdraw route (Ether A-D per ES) and its corresponding MAC routes cannot be made based on their RDs and RTs because the RD for Mass Withdraw route is different than the one for the MAC routes. Therefore, the functionality needed at the ASBRs and the receiving PE depends on whether the Mass Withdraw route is originated and whether there is a need to handle route resolution ambiguity for this route. The following two subsections describe the functionality needed by the ASBRs and the receiving PE depending on whether the NVEs reside in a Hypervisors or in TORs.

#### **10.2.1 ASBR Functionality with Single-Homing NVEs**

When NVEs reside in hypervisors as described in [section 7.1](#), there is no multi-homing and thus there is no need for the originating NVE to send Ethernet A-D per ES or Ethernet A-D per EVI routes. However, as noted in [section 7](#), in order to enable a single-homing ingress NVE to take advantage of fast convergence, aliasing, and backup-path when interacting with multi-homing egress NVEs attached to a given Ethernet segment, the single-homing NVE should be able to receive and process Ethernet AD per ES and Ethernet AD per EVI routes. The handling of these routes are described in the next section.

#### **10.2.2 ASBR Functionality with Multi-Homing NVEs**

When NVEs reside in TORs and operate in multi-homing redundancy mode, then as described in [section 8](#), there is a need for the originating multi-homing NVE to send Ethernet A-D per ES route(s) (used for mass withdraw) and Ethernet A-D per EVI routes (used for aliasing). As described above, the re-write of BGP next-hop by ASBRs creates ambiguities when Ethernet A-D per ES routes are received by the remote NVE in a different ASBR because the receiving NVE cannot associated that route with the MAC/IP routes of that Ethernet Segment advertised by the same originating NVE. This ambiguity inhibits the function of mass-withdraw per ES by the receiving NVE in a different AS.

As an example consider a scenario where CE is multi-homed to PE1 and PE2 where these PEs are connected via ASBR1 and then ASBR2 to the remote PE3. Furthermore, consider that PE1 receives M1 from CE1 but not PE2. Therefore, PE1 advertises Eth A-D per ES1, Eth A-D per EVI1, and M1; whereas, PE2 only advertises Eth A-D per ES1 and Eth A-D per EVI1. ASBR1 receives all these five advertisements and passes them to ASBR2 (with itself as the BGP next hop). ASBR2, in turn, passes them to the remote PE3 with itself as the BGP next hop. PE3 receives

these

five routes where all of them have the same BGP next-hop (i.e., ASBR2). Furthermore, the two Ether A-D per ES routes received by PE3 have the same info - i.e., same ESI and the same BGP next hop. Although both of these routes are maintained by the BGP process in

PE3 (because they have different RDs and thus treated as different BGP routes), information from only one of them is used in the L2 routing table (L2 RIB).




Figure 1: Inter-AS Option B

Now, when the AC between the PE2 and the CE fails and PE2 sends NLRI withdrawal for Ether A-D per ES route and this withdrawal gets propagated and received by the PE3, the BGP process in PE3 removes the corresponding BGP route; however, it doesn't remove the associated info (namely ESI and BGP next hop) from the L2 routing table (L2 RIB) because it still has the other Ether A-D per ES route (originated from PE1) with the same info. That is why the mass-withdraw mechanism does not work when doing DCI with inter-AS option B. However, as described previously, the aliasing function works and so does "mass-withdraw per EVI" (which is associated with withdrawing the EVPN route associated with Aliasing - i.e., Ether A-D per EVI route).

In the above example, the PE3 receives two Aliasing routes with the same BGP next hop (ASBR2) but different RDs. One of the Alias route has the same RD as the advertised MAC route (M1). PE3 follows the route resolution procedure specified in [RFC7432] upon receiving the two Aliasing route - ie, it resolves M1 to <ES, EVI1> and subsequently it resolves <ES,EVI1> to a BGP path list with two paths along with the corresponding VNIs/MPLS labels (one associated with PE1 and the other associated with PE2). It should be noted that even though both paths are advertised by the same BGP next hop (ASRB2), the receiving PE3 can handle them properly. Therefore, M1 is reachable via two paths. This creates two end-to-end LSPs, from PE3 to PE1 and from PE3 to PE2, for M1 such that when PE3 wants to forward traffic destined to M1, it can load balanced between the two LSPs. Although route resolution for Aliasing routes with the same BGP next hop is not explicitly mentioned in [RFC7432], this is the expected operation and thus it is elaborated here.

When the AC between the PE2 and the CE fails and PE2 sends NLRI withdrawal for Ether A-D per EVI routes and these withdrawals get propagated and received by the PE3, the PE3 removes the Aliasing



route and updates the path list - ie, it removes the path corresponding to the PE2. Therefore, all the corresponding MAC routes

for that <ES,EVI> that point to that path list will now have the updated path list with a single path associated with PE1. This action

can be considered as the mass-withdraw at the per-EVI level. The mass-withdraw at per-EVI level has longer convergence time than the mass-withdraw at per-ES level; however, it is much faster than the convergence time when the withdraw is done on a per-MAC basis.

If a PE becomes detached from a given ES, then in addition to withdrawing its previously advertised Ethernet AD Per ES routes, it MUST also withdraw its previously advertised Ethernet AD Per EVI routes for that ES. For a remote PE that is separated from the withdrawing PE by one or more EVPN inter-AS option B ASBRs, the withdrawal of the Ethernet AD Per ES routes is not actionable. However, a remote PE is able to correlate a previously advertised Ethernet AD Per EVI route with any MAC/IP Advertisement routes also advertised by the withdrawing PE for that <ES, EVI, BD>. Hence, when

it receives the withdrawal of an Ethernet AD Per EVI route, it SHOULD remove the withdrawing PE as a next-hop for all MAC addresses associated with that <ES, EVI, BD>.

In the previous example, when the AC between PE2 and the CE fails, PE2 will withdraw its Ethernet AD Per ES and Per EVI routes. When PE3 receives the withdrawal of an Ethernet AD Per EVI route, it removes PE2 as a valid next-hop for all MAC addresses associated with the corresponding <ES, EVI, BD>. Therefore, all the MAC next-hops for that <ES,EVI, BD> will now have a single next-hop, viz the LSP to PE1.

In summary, it can be seen that aliasing (and backup path) functionality should work as is for inter-AS option B without requiring any addition functionality in ASBRs or PEs. However, the mass-withdraw functionality falls back from per-ES mode to per-EVI mode for inter-AS option B - i.e., PEs receiving mass-withdraw route from the same AS take action on Ether A-D per ES route; whereas, PEs receiving mass-withdraw route from different AS take action on Ether A-D per EVI route.

## **11 Acknowledgement**

The authors would like to thank Aldrin Isaac, David Smith, John Mullooly, Thomas Nadeau, Samir Thoria, and Jorge Rabadan for their valuable comments and feedback. The authors would also like to thank Jakob Heitz for his contribution on [section 10.2](#).

## 12 Security Considerations

Sajassi-Drake et al. Expires August 9, 2018

[Page  
27]

This document uses IP-based tunnel technologies to support data plane transport. Consequently, the security considerations of those tunnel technologies apply. This document defines support for VXLAN [RFC7348] and NVGRE [RFC7637] encapsulations. The security considerations from those RFCs apply to the data plane aspects of this document.

As with [RFC5512], any modification of the information that is used to form encapsulation headers, to choose a tunnel type, or to choose a particular tunnel for a particular payload type may lead to user data packets getting misrouted, misdelivered, and/or dropped.

More broadly, the security considerations for the transport of IP reachability information using BGP are discussed in [RFC4271] and [RFC4272], and are equally applicable for the extensions described in this document.

### **13 IANA Considerations**

This document requests the following BGP Tunnel Encapsulation Attribute Tunnel Types from IANA and they have already been allocated. The IANA registry needs to point to this document.

8	VXLAN Encapsulation
9	NVGRE Encapsulation
10	MPLS Encapsulation
11	MPLS in GRE Encapsulation
12	VXLAN GPE Encapsulation

### **14 References**

#### **14.1 Normative References**

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.

[RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.

[RFC7432] Sajassi et al., "BGP MPLS Based Ethernet VPN", [RFC 7432](#), February 2014

[RFC7348] Mahalingam, M., et al, "VXLAN: A Framework for Overlaying Virtualized Layer 2 Networks over Layer 3 Networks", [RFC 7348](#),

August  
2014





[RFC7637] Garg, P., et al., "NVGRE: Network Virtualization using Generic Routing Encapsulation", [RFC 7637](#), September, 2015

[RFC5512] Mohapatra, P. and E. Rosen, "The BGP Encapsulation Subsequent Address Family Identifier (SAFI) and the BGP Tunnel Encapsulation Attribute", [RFC 5512](#), April 2009.

[RFC4023] T. Worster et al., "Encapsulating MPLS in IP or Generic Routing Encapsulation (GRE)", [RFC 4023](#), March 2005

## **14.2 Informative References**

[RFC7209] Sajassi et al., "Requirements for Ethernet VPN (EVPN)", [RFC 7209](#), May 2014

[RFC4272] S. Murphy, "BGP Security Vulnerabilities Analysis.", January 2006.

[RFC7364] Narten et al., "Problem Statement: Overlays for Network Virtualization", [RFC 7364](#), October 2014.

[RFC7365] Lasserre et al., "Framework for DC Network Virtualization", [RFC 7365](#), October 2014.

[DCI-EVPN-OVERLAY] Rabadan et al., "Interconnect Solution for EVPN Overlay networks", [draft-ietf-bess-dci-evpn-overlay-08](#), work in progress, February 8, 2018.

[RFC4271] Y. Rekhter, Ed., T. Li, Ed., S. Hares, Ed., "A Border Gateway Protocol 4 (BGP-4)", January 2006.

[RFC4364] Rosen, E., et al, "BGP/MPLS IP Virtual Private Networks (VPNs)", [RFC 4364](#), February 2006.

[TUNNEL-ENCAP] Rosen et al., "The BGP Tunnel Encapsulation Attribute", [draft-ietf-idr-tunnel-encaps-08](#), work in progress, January 11, 2018.

[RFC6514] R. Aggarwal et al., "BGP Encodings and Procedures for Multicast in MPLS/BGP IP VPNs", [RFC 6514](#), February 2012

[VXLAN-GPE] Maino et al., "Generic Protocol Extension for VXLAN", [draft-ietf-nvo3-vxlan-gpe-05](#), work in progress October 30, 2017.

[GENEVE] J. Gross et al., "Geneve: Generic Network Virtualization Encapsulation", [draft-ietf-nvo3-geneve-05](#), September 2017



[EVPN-GENEVE] S. Boutros et al., "EVPN control plane for Geneve",  
[draft-boutros-bess-evpn-geneve-00.txt](#), June 2017

#### Contributors

S. Salam  
K. Patel  
D. Rao  
S. Thoria  
D. Cai  
Cisco

Y. Rekhter  
A. Issac  
Wen Lin  
Nischal Sheth  
Juniper

L. Yong  
Huawei

#### Authors' Addresses

Ali Sajassi  
Cisco  
USA  
Email: [sajassi@cisco.com](mailto:sajassi@cisco.com)

John Drake  
Juniper Networks  
USA  
Email: [jdrake@juniper.net](mailto:jdrake@juniper.net)

Nabil Bitar  
Nokia  
USA  
Email : [nabil.bitar@nokia.com](mailto:nabil.bitar@nokia.com)

R. Shekhar  
Juniper  
USA  
Email: [rshekhar@juniper.net](mailto:rshekhar@juniper.net)



INTERNET DRAFT  
2018

EVPN Overlay

February 9,

James Uttaro  
AT&T  
USA  
Email: [uttaro@att.com](mailto:uttaro@att.com)

Wim Henderickx  
Nokia  
USA  
e-mail: [wim.henderickx@nokia.com](mailto:wim.henderickx@nokia.com)

