

Internet Draft [draft-stokes-ppvnp-vpls-discover-00.txt](#)

June 2002

Internet Draft Document  
[draft-stokes-ppvnp-vpls-discover-00.txt](#)

Olen Stokes  
Kevin Frick  
Extreme Networks

Giles Heron  
PacketExchange Ltd.

Vach Kompella  
TiMetra Networks

Expires December 2002

June 2002

## Discovering Nodes and Services in a VPLS Network

### Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all provisions of [Section 10 of RFC2026](#).

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

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

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

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

### Abstract

This document describes a methodology for allowing the nodes in a Virtual Private LAN Service (VPLS) network as described in [\[VPLS\]](#) to discover each other via MPLS signaling. It also defines a

methodology whereby the individual VPLS services are discovered via MPLS signaling. The goal is to allow a VPLS network to be created using MPLS signaling and a minimal amount of configuration.

Stokes, et al.

[Page 1]

Internet Draft [draft-stokes-ppvnp-vpls-discover-00.txt](#)

June 2002

#### Conventions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC 2119](#).

Placement of this Memo in Sub-IP Area

#### RELATED DOCUMENTS

<http://search.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-lasserre-vkompella-ppvnp-vpls-01.txt>

<http://search.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-martini-l2circuit-trans-mpls-08.txt>

<http://search.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-martini-ethernet-encap-mpls-00.txt>

<http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc3036.txt>

<http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc3209.txt>

WHERE DOES THIS FIT IN THE PICTURE OF THE SUB-IP WORK

PPVPN

WHY IS IT TARGETTED AT THIS WG

The charter of the PPVPN WG includes L2 VPN services and this draft specifies a method for establishing Ethernet VPLS services over MPLS.

## JUSTIFICATION

There is no Internet document that provides a method for establishing a VPLS network using signaling and a minimal amount of configuration through the use of MPLS protocols.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1</a>	Overview.....	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">1.1</a>	Terminology.....	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">2</a>	Node discovery signaling.....	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">2.1</a>	Service Capabilities TLV procedures.....	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">3</a>	VPLS Core node procedures.....	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4</a>	VPLS Spoke node procedures.....	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">5</a>	Service discovery signaling.....	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6</a>	Security Considerations.....	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">7</a>	Scalability Issues.....	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">8</a>	Intellectual Property Considerations.....	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">9</a>	References.....	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">10</a>	Authors' Addresses.....	<a href="#">10</a>



Service providers are being requested to provide L2 VPN services for their customers. Virtual Private LAN Services (VPLS) networks as described in [[VPLS](#)] are being deployed to provide these services. [[VPLS](#)] describes the operation of a VPLS network but does not specify how the network is configured.

A provider's network is normally organized with groups of one or more edge nodes connecting to a group of core nodes. This corresponds to the spoke and core nodes of the "HVPLS" model described in [[VPLS](#)]. This document describes a methodology for allowing the core nodes in a VPLS network to discover each other via MPLS signaling. It also describes how core nodes can discover the spoke nodes attaching to it via MPLS signaling.

Once the underlying VPLS network is established as described above, customer sites for individual VPLS services are added to the nodes. This document also defines a methodology whereby the individual VPLS services are discovered by the core nodes via MPLS signaling.

## [1.1](#) Terminology

The phrase "VPLS network" is used when referring collectively to a service provider's core and spoke nodes and the targeted LDP sessions between them.

The phrase "VPLS service" is used when referring to a single VPLS service emulating a LAN segment.

The phrase "VPLS core node" is used when referring to a core node in an HVPLS service, or a node in a VPLS service with no HVPLS "spoke" nodes. Note that all VPLS core nodes for a given VPLS are meshed.


The phrase "/32 LSP" is used when referring to a LDP-signaled LSP whose FEC specifies a 32-bit IP address prefix [[MPLS-LDP](#)].

## [2](#) Node discovery signaling

Each spoke and core node in a VPLS network uses targeted LDP sessions as defined in [[MARTINI-SIG](#)] and [[VPLS](#)]. If the underlying tunnel LSPs are to be created via downstream unsolicited LDP [[MPLS-LDP](#)], then each node is configured to advertise a label mapping for a /32 LSP to its IP address. Normally, this is the only LSP that is advertised by the node.

These label advertisements are propagated throughout the VPLS network until all nodes have received one or more label mappings for a /32 LSP to all other nodes. These label mappings can be used to signal whether the LSP's egress node is a core node in the VPLS network.

To signal this Service Capabilities, a new optional TLV is proposed for use with a LDP Label Mapping message. In fact this TLV may be used for other services with similar requirements for node discovery. The new Service Capabilities TLV is shown below.



**U bit**

Unknown bit. This bit MUST be set to 1. If the Node Type format is not understood, the remaining Label Mapping should be processed, and the Service Capabilities TLV MUST be ignored.

**F bit**

Forward bit. This bit MUST be set to 1. Since the network topology is unknown and there may be non-VPLS nodes receiving the label message, the Service Capabilities TLV MUST be forwarded.

**Type**

Type field. This field MUST be set to 0x0105 (subject to IANA approval). This will identify the TLV type as a Service Capabilities TLV.

**Length**

Length field. This field specifies the total length of the Value fields in octets.

**Service Type**

Service Type field. This has the following values:

Value	Node Type
-----	-----

- 0 Undefined
- 1 VPLS core node

Note that a node may support multiple service types, in which case it will advertise multiple Service Capabilities TLVs.

#### Service Instance

Service Instance field. This field contains a 16-bit index used as an instance identifier for the service. This enables, for example, one Service Provider to create multiple sets of VPLS nodes providing different grades of service. Note that a node may have multiple service instances, in which case it will advertise multiple Service Capabilities TLVs. Note also that in the case of VPLS, one service instance may contain multiple VPLS services.

#### Service Parameters

Stokes, et al.

[Page 5]

Internet Draft [draft-stokes-ppvpn-vpls-discover-00.txt](#)

June 2002

Optional Service Parameters. Some service types may have additional parameters that must be discovered for correct operation of the service. This field is not required for VPLS. Note that for a given service type and instance a node will only advertise one Service Capabilities TLV, with one set of Service Parameters.

If RSVP-TE [[MPLS-RSVP](#)] is being used to create the underlying tunnel LSPs, then LDP MUST be enabled to advertise a /32 LSP for each node. Note also that these additional LSPs do not need to be used as part of the underlying tunnel LSPs used to carry the customer traffic.

### [2.1](#) Service Capabilities TLV procedures

Each time that a label mapping for a /32 LSP is received from a valid next hop, a check is made for the presence of a Service Capabilities TLV.

If no Service Capabilities TLV is present and there were Service Capabilities TLVs received previously for the IP address specified in the Label Mapping's FEC then any local configuration relating to these TLVs MUST be removed. The label mapping MUST be propagated upstream.

If one or more Service Capabilities TLVs are present, but there were Service Capabilities TLVs received previously for the IP address specified in the Label Mapping's FEC with a (Service Type,

Service Instance) which is not seen in this message, then any configuration relating to these TLVs MUST be removed. The label mapping MUST be propagated upstream.

If one or more Service Capabilities TLVs are present with a (Service Type, Service Instance) which has not been received previously for the IP address specified in the Label Mapping's FEC, then these TLVs will be used locally. The label mapping MUST be propagated upstream.

If one or more Service Capabilities TLVs are present with a (Service Type, Service Instance) which has been received previously for the IP address specified in the Label Mapping's FEC, but with different Service Parameters to those in the received TLVs, then these new parameters will be used locally. The label mapping MUST be propagated upstream.

If one or more Service Capabilities TLVs are present, there are previously received Service Capabilities TLVs from this same downstream peer, and any of those match exactly the content of a Service Capabilities TLV received on the new label mapping, then no further action is required on behalf of those newly received Service Capabilities TLVs. Note that there may be other actions required due to other TLVs in the Label Mapping message.

### 3 VPLS Core node procedures

Stokes, et al.

[Page 6]

Internet Draft [draft-stokes-ppvnp-vpls-discover-00.txt](#)

June 2002

Each time a VPLS core node receives information about the presence of another core node with a shared service instance to one configured locally, it adds the IP address from the /32 LSP's FEC field to its list of core nodes. It then establishes a targeted LDP session to this new core for use in the VPLS network - if one is not already present. When the node propagates the label mapping upstream, it leaves the Service Capabilities TLV unchanged. If there was previously a targeted LDP session to this node (as a spoke) for this VPLS instance then any VC FECs for this VPLS instance are first withdrawn on that session to ensure that no forwarding loops are created at the VPLS level.

If the decision process in [Section 2.1](#) indicates that a remote node



is no longer a core node, then the receiving core node removes the IP address from the /32 LSP's FEC field from its list of core nodes. Any VC FECs for this VPLS instance will be withdrawn, and the targeted LDP session to this node will be dropped if there are no other VPLS instances or other entities using that session.

#### 4 HVPLS spoke node procedures

If the decision process in [Section 2.1](#) indicates the presence of a new core node in the network, then a receiving spoke node adds the IP address from the /32 LSP's FEC field to its list of core nodes. If the new core node is topologically closer than any other core node then the spoke node establishes a targeted LDP session to the new core node (if one is not already present). It also withdraws any VC FECs from any targeted LDP session to another core node and drops that session if there are no other VPLS instances or other entities using it.

If the decision process in [Section 2.1](#) indicates that a node is no longer a core node then the spoke node removes the IP address from the /32 LSP's FEC field from its list of core node. Any VC FECs advertised to that node are withdrawn, and the targeted LDP session is dropped if there are no more FECs advertised over it. A new session established to the topologically closest core node.

#### 5 Service discovery signaling

The procedures in [Section 2](#) create a VPLS network with targeted LDP sessions as required between nodes. Once this is accomplished, VPLS services can be signaled. When a provider adds a site to a VPLS service, it requires configuring the node to which the customer site is added. Using the procedures defined below, no additional provider configuration is necessary to establish the VPLS service.

When a customer site is added to a spoke node, it sends a VC FEC label to its core node as defined in [[MARTINI-SIG](#)] and [[VPLS](#)]. The core node stores the VC FEC label mapping in its liberally retained label database and associates the mapping with the spoke from which it was received. Note that the VC ID field in the VC FEC identifies the VPLS service.

The core node propagates the VC FEC label mapping to all of its core peer nodes. These core nodes add the VC FEC label mapping in their liberally retained label database and associate the mapping with the core node from which it was received.

At this point, if this was the first customer site in the VPLS, the original spoke node has not received a VC FEC label mapping from the core node and therefore considers the VPLS service to be non-operational.

When a customer site is added to a core node, it sends a VC FEC label to all of its peer core nodes as described above. However as above this node may not have received a VC FEC label mapping from any other core node, in which case it will consider the VPLS service to be non-operational.

When a second customer site is added at a spoke, this node advertises a VC FEC label to its upstream core node as above.

This core node (whether the second site is attached locally or via a spoke) recognizes that it has already received a VC FEC label mapping for this VPLS service by detecting a liberally retained mapping for this same VC ID. The core node moves both label mappings to its active label database and, if the second site is attached at a spoke node, sends a corresponding VC FEC label mapping to the spoke from which it received the VC FEC label mapping.

This core node also propagates a VC FEC label mapping to all of its core peers as normal. The original core node (if the first site was attached to a different core node) also recognizes that it has already received a VC FEC label mapping for this VPLS service by detecting a liberally retained mapping for this same VC ID. The original core node moves both label mappings to its active label database and, if the first customer site was attached at a spoke node, sends a corresponding VC FEC label mapping to its spoke from which it received the VC FEC label mapping.

Following this, both edge nodes have received VC FEC label mappings for the VPLS service and consider the VPLS service to be operational. If either of these nodes are spokes, their upstream core nodes also consider the service to be operational and have added their peer core node and their spoke node to the flood list for this VPLS service.

The process above can be generalized for adding the nth customer site to the network.

Note that the core nodes that are not participating in this VPLS

service have liberally retained labels but have not dedicated any operational resources to this VPLS service.

When a customer site attached at a spoke node is removed from an existing VPLS service, the spoke node sends a label withdrawal to its core node for the VC FEC. The core node responds with a label release and removes the label from its active label database. It

also sends a label withdrawal for the VC FEC label mapping that it had sent to the spoke when the VPLS service became operational.

When the last customer site in a VPLS is removed from a core node (either directly or by withdrawal of a label from a spoke node) it sends a label withdrawal for this VC FEC label to all of its peer core nodes. If this is the only core node from which these remote core nodes have received a label mapping for this VPLS service, then they in turn must send a label withdrawal to any spoke nodes participating in the VPLS. They also move the label mapping to the liberally retained database.

Note that when a core node has two or more VC FEC label mappings for the same VPLS service from multiple spoke nodes, or has a locally attached site in the VPLS plus one VC FEC label mapping from a spoke node, the VPLS service remains operational even if no other core nodes have advertised label mappings for this VPLS service.

## 6 Security Considerations

Security issues resulting from this draft will be discussed in greater depth at a later point. It is recommended in [[MPLS-LDP](#)] that LDP security (authentication) methods be applied. This would prevent unauthorized participation by a spoke or core node in a VPLS.

## 7 Scalability Issues

In [[VPLS](#)], targeted LDP sessions are used to distribute VPLS labels. Between core nodes, a complete mesh of targeted LDP sessions is required.

The HVPLS model, where spoke nodes attach to core nodes, and core nodes are meshed, enables the service to scale to a greater number of PE devices.

## 8 Intellectual Property Considerations

Extreme Networks, Inc. is seeking patent protection on technology described in this Internet-Draft. If technology in this Internet-Draft is adopted as a standard, Extreme Networks agrees to license, on reasonable and non-discriminatory terms, any patent rights it obtains covering such technology to the extent necessary to comply with the standard. This document is being submitted for use in IETF standards discussions.

## 9 References

[VPLS] "Virtual Private LAN services over MPLS", [draft-lasserre-vkoppella-ppvnp-vpls-01.txt](#) (Work In Progress)

Stokes, et al.

[Page 9]

Internet Draft [draft-stokes-ppvnp-vpls-discover-00.txt](#)

June 2002

[MARTINI-SIG] "Transport of Layer 2 Frames Over MPLS", [draft-martini-l2circuit-trans-mpls-09.txt](#), April 2002 (Work In Progress)

[MARTINI-ENC] "Encapsulation Methods for Transport of Ethernet Frames Over IP and MPLS Networks", [draft-martini-ethernet-encap-mpls-00.txt](#), April 2002 (Work In Progress)

[MPLS-LDP] Andersson, et al., "LDP Specification", [RFC 3036](#), January 2001

[MPLS-RSVP] Awduche, et al., "RSVP-TE: Extensions to RSVP for LSP Tunnels", [RFC 3209](#), December 2001

## 10 Authors' Addresses

Olen Stokes  
Extreme Networks  
630 Davis Drive, Suite 250  
Morrisville, NC 27560

Email: ostokes@extremenetworks.com

Kevin Frick  
Extreme Networks  
630 Davis Drive, Suite 250  
Morrisville, NC 27560  
Email: kfrick@extremenetworks.com

Giles Heron  
PacketExchange Ltd.  
The Truman Brewery  
91 Brick Lane  
LONDON E1 6QL  
United Kingdom  
Email: giles@packetexchange.net

Vach Kompella  
TiMetra Networks  
274 Ferguson Dr.  
Mountain View, CA 94043  
Email: vkompella@timetra.com