

Network Working Group
Internet Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: August 5, 2020

L. Dunbar
Futurewei
Andy Malis
Independent
C. Jacquenet
Orange
M. Toy
Verizon
February 5, 2020

Dynamic Networks to Hybrid Cloud DCs Problem Statement
draft-ietf-rtgwg-net2cloud-problem-statement-06

Abstract

This document describes the problems that enterprises face today when interconnecting their branch offices with dynamic workloads in third party data centers (a.k.a. Cloud DCs). There can be many problems associated with network connecting to or among Clouds, many of which probably are out of the IETF scope. The objective of this document is to identify some of the problems that need additional work in IETF Routing area. Other problems are out of the scope of this document.

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 different 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](#).

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/1id-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 August 5, 2020.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 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

1.	Introduction.....	3
1.1.	Key Characteristics of Cloud Services:.....	3
1.2.	Connecting to Cloud Services.....	3
1.3.	The role of SD-WAN in connecting to Cloud Services.....	4
2.	Definition of terms.....	5
3.	High Level Issues of Connecting to Multi-Cloud.....	6
3.1.	Security Issues.....	6

3.2.	Authorization and Identity Management.....	6
3.3.	API abstraction.....	7
3.4.	DNS for Cloud Resources.....	8
3.5.	NAT for Cloud Services.....	8
3.6.	Cloud Discovery.....	9
4.	Interconnecting Enterprise Sites with Cloud DCs.....	9
4.1.	Sites to Cloud DC.....	10
4.2.	Inter-Cloud Interconnection.....	12
5.	Problems with MPLS-based VPNs extending to Hybrid Cloud DCs...	13
6.	Problem with using IPsec tunnels to Cloud DCs.....	15
6.1.	Scaling Issues with IPsec Tunnels.....	15
6.2.	Poor performance over long distance.....	15
7.	Problems of Using SD-WAN to connect to Cloud DCs.....	16
7.1.	More Complexity to Edge Nodes.....	16
7.2.	Edge WAN Port Management.....	17
7.3.	Forwarding based on Application.....	17
8.	End-to-End Security Concerns for Data Flows.....	17
9.	Requirements for Dynamic Cloud Data Center VPNs.....	17
10.	Security Considerations.....	18
11.	IANA Considerations.....	18
12.	References.....	18
12.1.	Normative References.....	18
12.2.	Informative References.....	19
13.	Acknowledgments.....	19

1. Introduction

1.1. Key Characteristics of Cloud Services:

Key characteristics of Cloud Services are on-demand, scalable, highly available, and usage-based billing. Cloud Services, such as, compute, storage, network functions (most likely virtual), third party managed applications, etc. are usually hosted and managed by third parties Cloud Operators. Here are some examples of Cloud network

functions: Virtual Firewall services, Virtual private network services, Virtual PBX services including voice and video conferencing systems, etc. Cloud Data Center (DC) is shared infrastructure that hosts the Cloud Services to many customers.

1.2. Connecting to Cloud Services

With the advent of widely available third-party cloud DCs and services in diverse geographic locations and the advancement of

tools for monitoring and predicting application behaviors, it is very attractive for enterprises to instantiate applications and workloads in locations that are geographically closest to their end-users. Such proximity can improve 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, enterprises may wish to take advantage of more and more business applications offered by cloud operators.

The networks that interconnect hybrid cloud DCs must address the following requirements:

- High availability to access all workloads in the desired cloud DCs.
Many enterprises include cloud in their disaster recovery strategy, such as enforcing periodic backup policies within the cloud, or running backup applications in the Cloud.
- Global reachability from different geographical zones, thereby facilitating the proximity of applications as a function of the end users' location, to improve latency.
- Elasticity: prompt connection to newly instantiated applications at Cloud DCs when usages increase and prompt release of connection after applications at locations being removed when demands change.
- Scalable security management.

1.3. The role of SD-WAN in connecting to Cloud Services

Some of the characteristics of SD-WAN [SDWAN-BGP-USAGE], such as network augmentation and forwarding based on application IDs instead of based on destination IP addresses, are very essential for connecting to on-demand Cloud services.

Issues associated with using SD-WAN for connecting to Cloud services are also discussed in this document.

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 and workloads split among Cloud DCs owned or managed by different operators.

Hybrid Clouds: Hybrid Clouds refers to an enterprise using its own on-premises DCs in addition to Cloud services provided by one or more cloud operators. (e.g. AWS, Azure, Google, Salesforces, SAP, etc).

SD-WAN: Software Defined Wide Area Network. In this document, "SD-WAN" refers to the solutions of 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 is a virtual network dedicated to one client account. It is logically isolated from other virtual networks in a Cloud DC. Each client can launch his/her desired resources, such as compute, storage, or network functions into his/her VPC. Most Cloud operators' VPCs only support private addresses, some support IPv4 only, others support IPv4/IPv6 dual stack.

3. High Level Issues of Connecting to Multi-Cloud

There are many problems associated with connecting to hybrid Cloud Services, many of which are out of the IETF scope. This section is to identify some of the high level problems that can be addressed by IETF, especially by Routing area. Other problems are out of the scope of this document. By no means has this section covered all problems for connecting to Hybrid Cloud Services, e.g. difficulty in managing cloud spending is not discussed here.

3.1. Security Issues

Cloud Services is built upon shared infrastructure, therefore not secure by nature. Security has been a primary, and valid, concern from the start of cloud computing: you are unable to see the exact location where your data is stored or being processed. Headlines highlighting data breaches, compromised credentials, and broken authentication, hacked interfaces and APIs, account hijacking haven't helped alleviate concerns.

Secure user identity management, authentication, and access control mechanisms are important. Developing appropriate security measurements can enhance the confidence needed by enterprises to fully take advantage of Cloud Services.

3.2. Authorization and Identity Management

One of the more prominent challenges for Cloud Services is Identity Management and Authorization. The Authorization not only includes user authorization, but also the authorization of API calls by applications from different Cloud DCs managed by different Cloud Operators. In addition, there are authorization for Workload Migration, Data Migration, and Workload Management.

There are many types of users in cloud environments, e.g. end users for accessing applications hosted in Cloud DCs, Cloud-resource users who are responsible for setting permissions for the resources based on roles, access lists, IP addresses, domains, etc.

There are many types of Cloud authorizations: including MAC (Mandatory Access Control) - where each app owns individual access permissions, DAC (Discretionary Access Control) - where each app requests permissions from an external permissions app, RBAC (Role-based Access Control) - where the authorization service owns roles with different privileges on the cloud service, and ABAC (Attribute-based Access Control) - where access is based on request attributes and policies.

IETF hasn't yet developed comprehensive specification for Identity management and data models for Cloud Authorizations.

3.3. API abstraction

Different Cloud Operators have different APIs to access their Cloud resources, security functions, the NAT, etc.

It is difficult to move applications built by one Cloud operator's APIs to another. However, it is highly desirable to have a single and consistent way to manage the networks and respective security policies for interconnecting applications hosted in different Cloud DCs.

The desired property would be having a single network fabric to which different Cloud DCs and enterprise's multiple sites can be attached or detached, with a common interface for setting desired policies.

The difficulty of connecting applications in different Clouds might be stemmed from the fact that they are direct competitors. Usually traffic flow out of Cloud DCs incur charges. Therefore, direct communications between applications in different Cloud DCs can be more expensive than intra Cloud communications.

It is desirable to have a common API shim layer or abstraction for different Cloud providers to make it easier to move applications from one Cloud DC to another.

3.4. DNS for Cloud Resources

DNS name resolution is essential for on-premises and cloud-based resources. For customers with hybrid workloads, which include on-premises and cloud-based resources, extra steps are necessary to configure DNS to work seamlessly across both environments.

Cloud operators have their own DNS to resolve resources within their Cloud DCs and to well-known public domains. Cloud's DNS can be configured to forward queries to customer managed authoritative DNS servers hosted on-premises, and to respond to DNS queries forwarded by on-premises DNS servers.

For enterprises utilizing Cloud services by different cloud operators, it is necessary to establish policies and rules on how/where to forward DNS queries to. When applications in one Cloud need to communication with applications hosted in another Cloud, there could be DNS queries from one Cloud DC being forwarded to the enterprise's on premise DNS, which in turn be forwarded to the DNS service in another Cloud. Needless to say, configuration can be complex depending on the application communication patterns.

3.5. NAT for Cloud Services

Cloud resources, such as VM instances, are usually assigned with private IP addresses. By configuration, some private subnets can have the NAT function to reach out to external network and some private subnets are internal to Cloud only.

Different Cloud operators support different levels of NAT functions. For example, AWS NAT Gateway does not currently support connections towards, or from VPC Endpoints, VPN, AWS Direct Connect, or VPC Peering. <https://docs.aws.amazon.com/AmazonVPC/latest/UserGuide/vpc-nat-gateway.html#nat-gateway-other-services>. AWS Direct Connect/VPN/VPC Peering does not currently support any NAT functionality.

Google's Cloud NAT allows Google Cloud virtual machine (VM) instances without external IP addresses and private Google Kubernetes Engine (GKE) clusters to connect to the Internet. Cloud NAT implements outbound NAT in conjunction with a default route to allow instances to reach the Internet. It does not implement inbound NAT. Hosts outside of VPC network can only respond to established connections initiated by instances inside the Google Cloud; they

cannot initiate their own, new connections to Cloud instances via NAT.

For enterprises with applications running in different Cloud DCs, proper configuration of NAT have to be performed in Cloud DC and in their own on-premise DC.

3.6. Cloud Discovery

One of the concerns of using Cloud services is not aware where the resource is actually located, especially Cloud operators can move application instances from one place to another. When applications in Cloud communicate with on-premise applications, it may not be clear where the Cloud applications are located or to which VPCs they belong.

It is highly desirable to have tools to discover cloud services in much the same way as you would discover your on-premises infrastructure. A significant difference is that cloud discovery uses the cloud vendor's API to extract data on your cloud services, rather than the direct access used in scanning your on-premises infrastructure.

Standard data models, APIs or tools can alleviate concerns of enterprise utilizing Cloud Resources, e.g. having a Cloud service scan that connects to the API of the cloud provider and collects information directly.

4. Interconnecting Enterprise Sites with Cloud DCs

Considering that many enterprises already have existing VPNs (e.g. MPLS based L2VPN or L3VPN) interconnecting branch offices & on-premises data centers, connecting to Cloud services will be mixed of different types of networks. When an enterprise's existing VPN service providers do not have direct connections to the corresponding cloud DCs that the enterprise prefers to use, the enterprise has to face additional infrastructure and operational costs to utilize Cloud services.

4.1.1. Sites to Cloud DC

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

- AWS Internet gateway allows communication between instances in AWS VPC and the internet.
- AWS 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).
- AWS 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. In addition, an AWS Transit Gateway can be used to interconnect multiple VPCs in different Availability Zones. AWS Transit Gateway acts as a hub that controls how traffic is forwarded among all the connected networks which act like spokes.

Microsoft's ExpressRoute allows extension of a private network to any of the Microsoft cloud services, including Azure and Office365. ExpressRoute is configured using Layer 3 routing. Customers can opt for redundancy by provisioning dual links from their location to two Microsoft Enterprise edge routers (MSEEs) located within a third-party ExpressRoute peering location. The BGP routing protocol is then setup over WAN links to provide redundancy to the cloud. This redundancy is maintained from the peering data center into Microsoft's cloud network.

Google's Cloud Dedicated Interconnect offers similar network connectivity options as AWS and Microsoft. One distinct difference, however, is that Google's service allows customers access to the entire global cloud network by default. It does this by connecting your on-premises network with the Google Cloud using BGP and Google Cloud Routers to provide optimal paths to the different regions of the global cloud infrastructure.

Figure below shows an example of some of a tenant's workloads are accessible via a virtual router connected by AWS Internet Gateway;

some are accessible via AWS vGW, and others are accessible via AWS Direct Connect.

Different types of access require different level of security functions. Sometimes it is not visible to end customers which type of network access is used for a specific application instance. To get better visibility, separate virtual routers (e.g. vR1 & vR2) can be deployed to differentiate traffic to/from different cloud GWs. It is important for some enterprises to be able to observe the specific behaviors when connected by different connections.

Customer Gateway can be customer owned router or ports physically connected to AWS Direct Connect GW.




Figure 1: Examples of Multiple Cloud DC connections.

4.2. Inter-Cloud Interconnection

The connectivity options to Cloud DCs described in the previous section are for reaching Cloud providers' DCs, but not between cloud DCs. When applications in AWS Cloud need to communicate with applications in Azure, today's practice requires a third-party gateway (physical or virtual) to interconnect the AWS's Layer 2 DirectConnect path with Azure's Layer 3 ExpressRoute.

Enterprises can also instantiate their own virtual routers in different Cloud DCs and administer IPsec tunnels among them, which by itself is not a trivial task. Or by leveraging open source VPN software such as strongSwan, you create an IPsec connection to the Azure gateway using a shared key. The StrongSwan instance within AWS not only can connect to Azure but can also be used to facilitate traffic to other nodes within the AWS VPC by configuring forwarding and using appropriate routing rules for the VPC.

Most Cloud operators, such as AWS VPC or Azure VNET, use non-globally routable CIDR from private IPv4 address ranges as specified by [RFC1918](#). To establish IPsec tunnel between two Cloud DCs, it is necessary to exchange Public routable addresses for applications in different Cloud DCs. [[BGP-SDWAN](#)] describes one method. Other methods are worth exploring.

In summary, here are some approaches, available now (which might change in the future), to interconnect workloads among different Cloud DCs:

- a) Utilize Cloud DC provided inter/intra-cloud connectivity services (e.g., AWS Transit Gateway) to connect workloads instantiated in multiple VPCs. Such services are provided with the cloud gateway to connect to external networks (e.g., AWS DirectConnect Gateway).
- b) Hairpin all traffic through the customer gateway, meaning all workloads are directly connected to the customer gateway, so that communications among workloads within one Cloud DC must traverse through the customer gateway.
- c) Establish direct tunnels among different VPCs (AWS' Virtual Private Clouds) and VNET (Azure's Virtual Networks) 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.

Approach a) usually does not work if Cloud DCs are owned and managed by different Cloud providers.

Approach b) creates additional transmission delay plus incurring cost when exiting Cloud DCs.

For the Approach c), DMVPN or 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 cannot be used for registering virtual routers in Cloud DCs unless an extension of such protocols is developed for that purpose, e.g. taking NAT or dynamic addresses into consideration. Therefore, DMVPN and/or DSVPN cannot be used directly for connecting workloads in hybrid Cloud DCs.

Other protocols such as BGP can be used, as described in [BGP-SDWAN].

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, because 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 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. An enterprise with a hybrid cloud deployment can use an MPLS-VPN to connect to a Cloud provider at multiple locations. The connection locations often correspond to gateways of different Cloud DC locations from the Cloud provider. The different Cloud DCs are interconnected by the Cloud provider's own internal network. At each connection location (gateway), the Cloud provider uses BGP to advertise all of the prefixes in the enterprise's VPC, regardless of which Cloud DC a given prefix is actually in. This can result in inefficient routing for the end-to-end data path.

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.

6.1. Scaling Issues with 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 have multiple sites and multiple data centers. For multiple sites to communicate with workloads and apps hosted in cloud DCs, Cloud DC gateways have to maintain many IPsec tunnels to all those locations. In addition, each of those IPsec Tunnels requires pair-wise periodic key refreshment. 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 very processing intensive. That is why 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 is key distribution and maintenance of a key server, etc.

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.

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

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. More Complexity to Edge Nodes

Augmenting transport path is not as simple as it appears. For an enterprise with multiple sites, CPE managed overlay paths among sites requires each CPE to manage all the addresses that local hosts have potential to reach, i.e., map internal VPN addresses to appropriate Overlay 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 with the 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.

In addition, overlay path for interconnecting branch offices are different from connecting to Cloud DCs:

- Overlay path interconnecting branch offices usually have two end-points (e.g. CPEs) controlled by one entity (e.g. controllers or management systems operated by the enterprise).
- Connecting to Cloud DC may consists of CPEs owned or managed by the enterprise, and the remote end-points being managed or controlled by Cloud DCs.

7.2. Edge WAN Port Management

An SDWAN edge node can have WAN ports connected to different networks or public internet managed by different operators. There is therefore a need to propagate WAN port property to remote authorized peers in third party network domains in addition to route propagation. Such an exchange cannot happen before communication between peers is properly secured.

7.3. Forwarding based on Application

Forwarding based on application IDs instead of based on destination IP addresses is often referred to as Application based Segmentation. If the Applications have unique IP addresses, then the Application Based Segmentation can be achieved by propagating different BGP UPDATE messages to different nodes, as described in [BGP-SDWAN-USAGE]. If the Application cannot be uniquely identified by the IP addresses, more work is needed.

8. End-to-End Security Concerns for Data Flows

When IPsec tunnels established from enterprise on-premises CPEs are terminated at the Cloud DC gateway where the workloads or applications are hosted, some enterprises have concerns regarding traffic to/from their workload being exposed to others behind the data center gateway (e.g., exposed to other organizations that have workloads in the same data center).

To ensure that traffic to/from workloads is not exposed to unwanted entities, IPsec tunnels may go all the way to the workload (servers, or VMs) within the DC.

9. Requirements for Dynamic Cloud Data Center VPNs

In order to address the aforementioned issues, any solution for enterprise VPNs that includes connectivity to dynamic workloads or applications in cloud data centers should satisfy a set of requirements:

- The solution should allow enterprises to take advantage of the current state-of-the-art in VPN technology, in both traditional

- 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.

11. IANA Considerations

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

12. References

12.1. Normative References

12.2. 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
- [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.

13. Acknowledgments

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

Authors' Addresses

Linda Dunbar
Futurewei
Email: Linda.Dunbar@futurewei.com

Andrew G. Malis
Independent
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