

BESS Workgroup  
Internet Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track

J. Rabadan, Ed.  
Nokia  
A. Sajassi, Ed.  
Cisco

E. Rosen  
J. Drake  
W. Lin  
Juniper

J. Uttaro  
AT&T

A. Simpson  
Nokia

Expires: April 28, 2018

October 25, 2017

EVPN Interworking with IPVPN  
draft-rabadan-sajassi-bess-evpn-ipvpn-interworking-00

Abstract

EVPN is used as a unified control plane for tenant intra and inter-subnet-forwarding. When tenant connectivity spans not only EVPN domains but also domains where IPVPN provides inter-subnet-forwarding, there is a need to specify the interworking aspects between both EVPN and IPVPN domains, so that the end to end tenant connectivity can be accomplished. This document specifies how EVPN should interwork with VPN-IPv4/VPN-IPv6 and IPv4/IPv6 BGP families for inter-subnet-forwarding.

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/lid-abstracts.txt>

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

This Internet-Draft will expire on April 28, 2018.

#### Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2017 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 And Problem Statement . . . . .	3
2. Terminology and Interworking PE components . . . . .	3
3. Domain Path Attribute (D-PATH) . . . . .	8
4. Route selection process between EVPN and other ISF SAFIs . . . . .	10
5. Loop Prevention . . . . .	12
6. BGP Path Attribute Propagation Across ISF SAFIs . . . . .	12
6.1. No-Propagation-Mode . . . . .	12
6.2. Uniform-Propagation-Mode . . . . .	13
6.3. Aggregation of Host Routes and Path Attribute Propagation . . . . .	13
7. Composite PE Procedures . . . . .	14
8. Gateway PE Procedures . . . . .	16
9. Interworking Use-Cases . . . . .	18
10. Conclusion . . . . .	19
11. Conventions used in this document . . . . .	19
12. Security Considerations . . . . .	19
13. IANA Considerations . . . . .	20
14. References . . . . .	20

14.1. Normative References . . . . .	20
14.2. Informative References . . . . .	20
15. Acknowledgments . . . . .	20
16. Contributors . . . . .	20
17. Authors' Addresses . . . . .	21

## 1. Introduction And Problem Statement

EVPN is used as a unified control plane for tenant intra and inter-subnet-forwarding. When tenant connectivity spans not only EVPN domains but also domains where IPVPN provides inter-subnet-forwarding, there is a need to specify the interworking aspects between both EVPN and IPVPN domains, so that the end to end tenant connectivity can be accomplished. This document specifies how EVPN should interwork with VPN-IPv4/VPN-IPv6 and IPv4/IPv6 BGP families for inter-subnet-forwarding.

EVPN supports the advertisement of ipv4 or ipv6 prefixes in two different route types:

- o Route Type 2 - MAC/IP route (only for /32 and /128 host routes), as described by [INTER-SUBNET].
- o Route Type 5 - IP Prefix route, as described by [IP-PREFIX].

When interworking with other BGP address families (AFIs/SAFIs) for inter-subnet-forwarding, the IP- Prefixes in those two EVPN route types must be propagated to other domains using different SAFIs. Some aspects of that propagation must be clarified. Examples of these aspects or procedures across BGP families are: route selection, loop prevention or BGP Path attribute propagation. The Interworking PE concepts are defined in section 2, and the rest of the document describes the interaction between Interworking PEs and other PEs for end-to-end inter-subnet-forwarding.

## 2. Terminology and Interworking PE components

This section summarizes the terminology related to the "Interworking PE" concept that will be used throughout the rest of the document.




Figure 1 EVPN-IPVPN Interworking PE

- o ISF SAFI: Inter-Subnet-Forwarding (ISF) SAFI is a MP-BGP Sub-Address Family that advertises reachability for IP-Prefixes and can be used for inter-subnet-forwarding within a given tenant Domain. The ISF SAFIs are 1 (including IPv4 and IPv6 AFIs), 128 (including IPv4 and IPv6 AFIs) and 70 (EVPN, including only AFI 25).
- o IP-VRF: an IP Virtual Routing and Forwarding table, as defined in [RFC4364]. It is the instantiation of an IPVPN in a PE. Route-distinguisher and route-target(s) are required properties of an IP-VRF.
- o MAC-VRF: a MAC Virtual Routing and Forwarding table, as defined in [RFC7432]. The instantiation of an EVI (EVPN Instance) in a PE. Route-distinguisher and route-target(s) are required properties and they are normally different than the ones defined in the associated IP-VRF.
- o BT: a Bridge Table, as defined in [RFC7432]. A BT is the instantiation of a Broadcast Domain in a PE. When there is a single

Broadcast Domain in a given EVI, the MAC-VRF in each PE will contain a single BT. When there are multiple BTs within the same MAC-VRF, each BT is associated to a different Ethernet Tag. The EVPN routes specific to a BT, will indicate which Ethernet Tag the route corresponds to.

Example: In Figure 1, MAC-VRF1 has two BTs: BT1 and BT2. Ethernet Tag x is defined in BT1 and Ethernet Tag y in BT2.

- o AC: Attachment Circuit or logical interface associated to a given BT or IP-VRF. To determine the AC on which a packet arrived, the PE will examine the combination of a physical port and VLAN tags (where the VLAN tags can be individual c-tags, s-tags or ranges of both).

Example: In Figure 1, AC1 is associated to BT1, AC2 to BT2 and AC3 to IP-VRF1.

- o IRB: Integrated Routing and Bridging interface. It refers to the logical interface that connects a BT to an IP-VRF and allows to forward packets with destination in a different subnet.
- o MPLS/NVO tnl: It refers to a tunnel that can be MPLS or NVO-based (Network Virtualization Overlays) and it is used by MAC-VRFs and IP-VRFs. Irrespective of the type, the tunnel may carry an Ethernet or an IP payload. MAC-VRFs can only use tunnels with Ethernet payloads (setup by EVPN), whereas IP-VRFs can use tunnels with Ethernet (setup by EVPN) or IP payloads (setup by EVPN or IPVPN). IPVPN-only PEs have IP-VRFs but they cannot send or receive traffic on tunnels with Ethernet payloads.

Example: Figure 1 shows an MPLS/NVO tunnel that is used to transport Ethernet frames to/from MAC-VRF1. The PE determines the MAC-VRF and BT the packets belong to based on the EVPN label (MPLS or VNI). Figure 1 also shows two MPLS/NVO tunnels being used by IP-VRF1, one carrying Ethernet frames and the other one carrying IP packets.

- o RT-2: Route Type 2 or MAC/IP route, as per [RFC7432].
- o RT-5: Route Type 5 or IP-Prefix route, as per [IP-PREFIX].
- o Interworking PE: a PE that may advertise a given prefix in both an EVPN route (RT-2 or RT-5) and in a route of another ISF SAFI. An Interworking PE has one IP-VRF per tenant, and one or multiple MAC-VRFs per tenant. Each MAC-VRF may contain one or more BTs, where each BT may be attached to that IP-VRF via IRB. There are two types of Interworking PEs: Composite PEs and Gateway PEs. Both PE

functions can be independently implemented per tenant and they may both be implemented for the same tenant.

Example: Figure 1 shows an Interworking PE, where ISF SAFIs 1, 128 and 70 are enabled. IP-VRF1 and MAC-VRF1 are instantiated on the PE, and together provide inter-subnet-forwarding for the tenant.

- o Composite PE: an Interworking PE that advertises a given IP Prefix multiple times to the same BGP peer, but using a different ISF SAFI each time, and being EVPN one of them.

Example: Figure 2 shows an example where PE1 is a Composite PE since PE1 has EVPN and another ISF SAFI enabled to the same route-reflector, and PE1 advertises a given IP Prefix IPn/x twice, one using EVPN and another one using ISF SAFI 128. PE2 and PE3 are not Composite PEs.




Figure 2 Interworking Composite PE example

- o Gateway PE: an Interworking PE that advertises IP Prefixes to different BGP peers, using EVPN to one BGP peer and another ISF SAFI to another BGP peer.

Example: Figure 3 illustrates an example where PE1 is a Gateway PE since the EVPN and IPVPN SAFIs are enabled on different BGP peers, and a given local IP Prefix IPn/x is sent to both BGP peers for the same tenant.




Figure 3 Interworking Gateway PE example

- o Domain: a set of IP-VRFs for the same tenant that have been configured with the same Domain-ID. Two PEs are in the same Domain if they are attached to the same tenant and the packets between them do not require a data path IP lookup (in the tenant space) in any intermediate router. A Gateway PE is always configured with multiple Domain-IDs.

Example 1: Figure 4 depicts an example where TS1 and TS2 belong to the same tenant, and they are located in different Data Centers that are connected by Gateway PEs. These Gateway PEs speak IPVPN in the WAN. When TS1 sends traffic to TS2, the intermediate routers between PE1 and PE2 require a tenant IP lookup in their IP-VRFs so that the packets can be forwarded. In this example there are three different Domains. The Gateway PEs connect the EVPN Domain to the IPVPN Domain.




Figure 4 Multiple Domain DCI example

Example 2: Figure 5 illustrates a similar example, but PE1 and PE2 are now connected by a BGP-LU (BGP Labeled Unicast) tunnel, and they have a BGP peer relationship for EVPN. Contrary to Example 1,

there is no need for tenant IP lookups on the intermediate routers in order to forward packets between PE1 and PE2. Therefore, there is only one Domain in the network and PE1/PE2 belong to it.




Figure 5 Single Domain DCI example

The Domain-ID is encoded in the Domain Path Attribute (D-PATH), and advertised along with EVPN and other ISF SAFI routes. Section 3 describes the D-PATH attribute.

### 3. Domain Path Attribute (D-PATH)

The BGP Domain Path (D-PATH) attribute is an optional and transitive BGP path attribute.

Similar to AS\_PATH, D-PATH is composed of a length field followed by a sequence of Domain segments, where each Domain segment is represented by <DOMAIN-ID:ISF\_SAFI\_TYPE>.

- o The length field is a 1-octet field, containing the number of Domain segments. Each Domain segment value field contains one or more Domain segments, each encoded as a 7-octet length field.
- o DOMAIN-ID is a 6-octet field that represents a Domain. It is composed of a 4-octet Global Administrator sub-field and a 2-octet Local Administrator sub-field. The Global Administrator sub-field



MAY be filled with an Autonomous System Number (ASN), an IPv4 address, or any value that guarantees the uniqueness of the DOMAIN-ID when the tenant expands across multiple Operators.

- o ISF\_SAFI\_TYPE is a 1-octet field that indicates the Inter-Subnet-Forwarding SAFI type of the DOMAIN. The following types are valid in this document:

Value	Type
1	SAFI 1
70	EVPN
128	SAFI 128

About the BGP D-PATH attribute:

- a) Identifies the sequence of <DOMAIN-ID:ISF\_SAFI\_TYPE> segments through which the update message has passed.
  - This attribute list may contain zero, one or more entries.
  - The leftmost entry in the list is the <DOMAIN-ID:ISF\_SAFI\_TYPE> that the Gateway PE added when sending the prefix into the local DOMAIN. The rightmost entry in the list is the originating <DOMAIN-ID:ISF\_SAFI\_TYPE> for the prefix, that was added by the first Gateway PE propagating the update between Domains. Intermediate entries are transit <DOMAIN-ID:ISF\_SAFI\_TYPE> that the update has passed through on its way.
  - As an example, an EVPN Prefix route received with D-PATH {<6500:2:IPVPN>,<6500:1:EVPN>} indicates that the Prefix was originally advertised in EVPN within Domain 6500:1, re-advertised by a first Gateway PE using an IPVPN route in Domain 6500:2 and re-advertised by a second Gateway PE into the local Domain.
- b) It is added/modified by a Gateway PE when propagating an update to a different Domain:
  - A Gateway PE's IP-VRF, that connects two Domains, belongs to two DOMAIN-IDs, e.g. 6500:1 for EVPN and 6500:2 for IPVPN.
  - Whenever a Prefix arrives at a Gateway PE in a particular ISF SAFI route, if the Gateway PE needs to export that Prefix to a BGP peer using a different ISF SAFI, the Gateway PE will prepend a <DOMAIN-ID:ISF\_SAFI\_TYPE> segment to the list of segments in

the received D-PATH.

- For instance, in an IP-VRF configured with DOMAIN-IDs 6500:1 for EVPN and 6500:2 for IPVPN, if an EVPN route for Prefix P is received and P installed in the IP-VRF, the IPVPN route for P that is exported to an IPVPN peer will prepend the segment <6500:1:EVPN> to the previously received D-PATH attribute. Likewise, IP-VRF prefixes that are received from IP-VPN, will be exported to EVPN peers with the additional segment <6500:2:IPVPN>.
  - In the above example, if the EVPN route is received without D-PATH, the Gateway PE will add the D-PATH attribute with segment <6500:1:EVPN> when re-advertising to Domain 6500:2.
  - Within the originating Domain, the update does not contain a D-PATH attribute because the update has not passed through a Gateway PE yet.
- c) The Gateway PE MUST NOT add the D-PATH attribute to routes generated for IP-VRF Prefixes that are not learned via any ISF SAFI, for instance, local prefixes.
- d) A route received with a D-PATH that contains at least one of the locally configured Domains for the IP-VRF MUST be flagged as a looped update.
- e) The number of <DOMAIN-ID:ISF\_SAFI\_TYPE> segments in the D-PATH list reflects the number of Gateway PEs the update has gone through, irrespective of the actual number of BGP speakers along the way.

#### 4. Route selection process between EVPN and other ISF SAFIs

A PE may receive an IP Prefix simultaneously from EVPN and another ISF SAFI, e.g. SAFI 128 or 1, from the same or different BGP neighbor. In addition, a router may receive the same IP Prefix (host route) simultaneously from an EVPN RT-5 and a RT-2. A route selection algorithm across EVPN and other ISF SAFIs is needed so that:

- o Different Gateway and Composite PEs have a consistent and deterministic view on how to reach a given Prefix.
- o Prefixes advertised in EVPN and other ISF SAFIs can be compared based on path attributes commonly used by operators across networks.

- o Equal Cost Multi-Path (ECMP) is allowed across EVPN and other ISF SAFI routes.

For a given prefix advertised in one or more non-EVPN ISF SAFIs, the BGP best path selection procedure will produce a set of "non-EVPN best paths". For a given prefix advertised in the EVPN ISF SAFI, the BGP best path selection procedure will produce a set of "EVPN best paths". To support IP/EVPN interworking, it is then necessary to run a tie-breaking selection algorithm on the union of these two sets. This tie-breaking algorithm begins by considering all EVPN and other ISF SAFI routes, equally preferable routes to the same destination, and then selects routes to be removed from consideration. The process terminates as soon as only one route remains in consideration.

The route selection algorithm must remove from consideration the routes following the rules and the order defined in [RFC4271], with the following exceptions and in the following order:

- 1- Immediately after removing from consideration all routes that are not tied for having the highest Local Preference, any routes that do not have the shortest D-PATH are also removed from consideration. Routes with no D-PATH are considered to have a zero-length D-PATH.
- 2- Then regular [RFC4271] selection criteria is followed.
- 3- At the end of the selection algorithm, if at least one route still under consideration is an RT-2 route, remove from consideration any RT-5 routes.
- 4- Steps 1-3 could possibly leave Equal Cost Multi-Path (ECMP) between IP and EVPN paths. By default, the EVPN path is considered (and the IP path removed from consideration). However, if ECMP across ISF SAFIs is enabled by policy, and an "IP path" and an "EVPN path" remain at the end of step 3, both path types will be used.

Example 1 - PE1 receives the following routes for IP1/32, that are candidate to be imported in IP-VRF-1:

```
{SAFI=EVPN, RT-2, Local-Pref=100, AS-Path=(100,200)}  
{SAFI=EVPN, RT-5, Local-Pref=100, AS-Path=(100,200)}  
{SAFI=128, Local-Pref=100, AS-Path=(100,200)}
```

Selected route: {SAFI=EVPN, RT-2, Local-Pref=100, AS-Path=100,200}  
(due to step 3, and no ECMP)

Example 2 - PE1 receives the following routes for IP2/24, that are candidate to be imported in IP-VRF-1:

```
{SAFI=EVPN, RT-5, D-PATH=(6500:3:IPVPN), AS-Path=(100,200),  
MED=10}  
{SAFI=128, D-PATH=(6500:1:EVPN,6500:2:IPVPN), AS-Path=(200),  
MED=200}
```

Selected route: {SAFI=EVPN, RT-5, D-PATH=(6500:3:IPVPN), AS-Path=(100,200), MED=10} (due to step 1)

## 5. Loop Prevention

The D-PATH attribute (see section 3) is used to prevent loops in interworking PE networks. For instance, in the example of Figure 4, Gateway GW1 receives TS1 Prefix in two different updates:

- o In an EVPN RT-5 with next-hop PE1 and no D-PATH attribute.
- o In a SAFI 128 route with next-hop GW2 and D-PATH = (6500:1:EVPN), assuming that DOMAIN-ID for Domain 1 is 6500:1.

Gateway GW1 flags the SAFI 128 route as a loop, and does not re-advertise it to the EVPN neighbors since the route includes the GW1's local Domain.

In general, any Interworking PE that imports a Prefix route MUST flag the route as "looped" if its D-PATH contains a <DOMAIN-ID:ISF\_SAFI\_TYPE> segment, where DOMAIN-ID matches a local DOMAIN-ID in the tenant IP-VRF.

## 6. BGP Path Attribute Propagation Across ISF SAFIs

The following modes of operation are defined on the Gateway PEs.

### 6.1. No-Propagation-Mode

This is the default mode of operation. In this mode, the Gateway PE will simply re-initialize the Path Attributes when re-advertising a route to a different SAFI, as though it would for direct or local IP-Prefixes. This model may be enough in those use-cases where the EVPN Domain is considered an "abstracted" CE and remote IPVPN/IP PEs don't need to consider the original EVPN Attributes for path calculations.

However, since this mode of operation does not propagate the D-PATH attribute either, redundant Gateway PEs are exposed to routing loops. Those loops may be resolved by policies and the use of other

attributes, such as the Route Origin extended community [RFC4360], however not all the loop situations may be solved.

## 6.2. Uniform-Propagation-Mode

In this mode, the Gateway PE simply keeps accumulating or mapping certain key commonly used Path Attributes when re-advertising routes to a different ISF SAFI. This mode is typically used in networks where EVPN and IPVPN SAFIs are used seamlessly to distribute IP Prefixes.

The following rules MUST be observed by the Gateway PE when propagating Path Attributes:

- o The Gateway PE imports the routes in the IP-VRF and stores the original Path Attributes. The following set of Path Attributes SHOULD be propagated by the Gateway PE to other ISF SAFIs (other Path Attributes SHOULD NOT be propagated):
  - AS\_PATH
  - D-PATH
  - IBGP-only Path Attributes: LOCAL\_PREF, ORIGINATOR\_ID, CLUSTER\_ID
  - MED
  - AIGP
  - Communities, (non-EVPN) Extended Communities and Large Communities
- o When re-advertising a route to a different ISF SAFI and IBGP peer, the Gateway PE SHOULD copy the AS\_PATH of the originating family and add it to the destination family without any modification. When re-advertising to a different ISF SAFI and EBGp peer, the Gateway PE SHOULD copy the AS\_PATH of the originating family and prepend the IP-VRF's AS before sending the route.
- o When re-advertising a route to IBGP peers, the Gateway PE SHOULD copy the IBGP-only Path Attributes from the originating SAFI to the re-advertised route.
- o Communities, non-EVPN Extended Communities and Large Communities SHOULD be copied by the Gateway PE from the originating SAFI route.

## 6.3. Aggregation of Host Routes and Path Attribute Propagation

This section will be addressed in future revisions of the document.

## 7. Composite PE Procedures

As described in Section 2, a Composite PE is defined as an Interworking PE where the same IP Prefix is advertised multiple times to the same BGP peer, but using EVPN and another ISF SAFI. Composite PEs are typically used in tenant networks where EVPN and IPVPN are both used to provide inter-subnet-forwarding within the same tenant Domain.

Figure 6 depicts an example of a tenant Domain. As defined in section 2, two PEs are in the same Domain if they are attached to the same tenant and the traffic forwarding between them does not require any data path IP lookup (in the tenant space) in any intermediate router. PE1/PE2/PE4 are Composite PEs (they support EVPN and IPVPN ISFs on their peering to the Route Reflector), and PE3 is a regular IPVPN PE. The four PEs belong to the same Domain.




Figure 6 Composite PE example

In a Domain with Composite and regular PEs:

- o The Composite PEs advertise the same IP Prefixes in each ISF SAFI to the RR. For example, the prefix IP1/24 is advertised by PE1 and PE2 to the RR in two separate NLRIs, one for AFI/SAFI 1/128 and another one for EVPN.
- o The RR does not forward EVPN routes to PE3 (since the RR does not have the EVPN SAFI enabled on its BGP session to PE3), whereas the IPVPN routes are forwarded to all the PEs.
- o PE3 receives only the IPVPN route for IP1/24 and resolves the BGP next-hop to an MPLS tunnel (with IP payload) to PE1 and/or PE2.
- o Composite PE4 receives IP1/24 encoded in EVPN and another ISF SAFI route (EVPN RT-5 and IPVPN). The route selection follows the procedures in section 4. Assuming an EVPN route is selected, PE4 resolves the BGP next-hop to an MPLS tunnel (with Ethernet or IP payload) to PE1 and/or PE2. As described in section 2, two EVPN PEs may use tunnels with Ethernet or IP payloads to connect their IP-VRFs, depending on the [IP-PREFIX] model implemented. If some attributes are modified so that the route selection process (section 4) results in PE4 selecting the IPVPN path instead of the EVPN path, the operator should be aware that the EVPN advanced forwarding features, e.g. recursive resolution to overlay indexes, will be lost for PE4.
- o The other Composite PEs (PE1 and PE2) receive also the same IP Prefix via EVPN and IPVPN SAFIs and they also follow the route selection in section 4.
- o When a given route has been selected as the route for a particular packet, the transmission of the packet is done according to the rules for that route's AFI/SAFI.
- o It is important to note that in mixed networks, such as the one in Figure 6, the EVPN advanced forwarding features will only be available to Composite and EVPN PEs (assuming they select an RT-5 to forward packets for a given IP Prefix), and not to IPVPN PEs. For example, assuming PE1 sends IP1/24 in an EVPN and an IPVPN route and the EVPN route is the best one in the selection, the recursive resolution of the EVPN RT-5s can only be used in PE2 and PE4 (Composite PEs), and not in PE3 (IPVPN PE). As a consequence of this, the indirection provided by the RT5's recursive resolution and its benefits in a scaled network, will not be available in all the PEs in the network.

## 8. Gateway PE Procedures

Section 2 defines a Gateway PE as an Interworking PE that advertises IP Prefixes to different BGP peers, using EVPN to one BGP peer and another ISF SAFI to another BGP peer. Examples of Gateway PEs are Data Center Gateways connecting Domains that make use of EVPN and other ISF SAFIs for a given tenant. Figure 7 illustrates this use-case, in which PE1 and PE2 (and PE3/PE4) are Gateway PEs interconnecting Domains for the same tenant.




Figure 7 Gateway PE example

The Gateway PE procedures are described as follows:

- o A Gateway PE that imports an ISF SAFI-x route to prefix P in an IP-VRF, MUST export P in ISF SAFI-y if:
  1. P is installed in the IP-VRF (hence the SAFI-x route is the best one for P) and
  2. PE has a BGP peer for SAFI-y (enabled for the same IP-VRF) and
  3. Either x or y is EVPN.



In the example of Figure 7, Gateway PE1 and PE2 receive an EVPN RT-5 with IP1/24, install the prefix in the IP-VRF and re-advertise it using SAFI 128.

- o ISF SAFI routes advertised by a Gateway PE MUST include a D-PATH attribute, so that loops can be detected in remote Gateway PEs. When a Gateway PE re-advertises an IP Prefix between EVPN and another ISF SAFI, it MUST prepend a <DOMAIN-ID:ISF\_SAFI\_TYPE> to the received D-PATH attribute. The DOMAIN-ID and ISF\_SAFI\_TYPE fields refer to the Domain over which the Gateway PE received the IP Prefix. If the received IP Prefix route did not include any D-PATH attribute, the Gateway IP MUST add the D-PATH when re-advertising. The D-PATH in this case will have only one segment on the list, the <DOMAIN-ID:ISF\_SAFI\_TYPE> of the received route.

In the example of Figure 7, Gateway PE1/PE2 receive the EVPN RT-5 with no D-PATH attribute since the route is originated at PE5. Therefore PE1 and PE2 will add the D-PATH attribute including <DOMAIN-ID:ISF\_SAFI\_TYPE> = <6500:1:EVPN>. Gateways PE3/PE4 will re-advertise the route again, now prepending their <DOMAIN-ID:ISF\_SAFI\_TYPE> = <6500:2:IPVPN>. PE6 receives the EVPN RT-5 routes with D-PATH = {<6500:2:IPVPN>, <6500:1:EVPN>} and can use that information to make BGP path decisions.

- o The Gateway PE MAY use the route-distinguisher of the IP-VRF to re-advertise IP Prefixes in EVPN or the other ISF SAFI.
- o The label allocation used by each Gateway PE is a local implementation matter. The IP-VRF advertising IP Prefixes for EVPN and another ISF SAFI may use a label per-VRF, per-prefix, etc.
- o The Gateway PE MUST be able to use the same or different set of route-targets per ISF SAFI on the same IP-VRF. In particular, if different Domains use different set of route-targets for the same tenant, the Gateway PE MUST be able to import and export routes with the different sets.
- o Even though Figure 7 only shows two Domains per Gateway PE, the Gateway PEs may be connected to more than two Domains.
- o There is no limitation of Gateway PEs that a given IP Prefix can pass through until it reaches a given PE.
- o It is worth noting that an IP-Prefix that was originated in an EVPN Domain but traversed a different ISF SAFI Domain, will lose EVPN-specific attributes that are used in advanced EVPN procedures. For example, even if PE1 advertises IP1/24 along with a given non-zero ESI (for recursive resolution to that ESI), when PE6 receives the

IP-Prefix in an EVPN route, the ESI value will be zero. This is because the route traverses an ISF SAFI Domain that is different than EVPN.

## 9. Interworking Use-Cases

While Interworking PE networks may well be similar to the examples described in sections 7 and 8, in some cases a combination of both functions may be required. Figure 8 illustrates an example where the Gateway PEs are also Composite PEs, since not only they need to re-advertise IP Prefixes from EVPN routes to another ISF SAFI routes, but they also need to interwork with IPVPN-only PEs in a Domain with a mix of Composite and IPVPN-only PEs.




Figure 8 Gateway and Composite combined functions - example

In the example above, PE1 and PE2 MUST follow the procedures

described in sections 7 and 8. Compared to section 8, PE1 and PE2 now need to also re-advertise prefixes from EVPN to EVPN, in addition to re-advertising prefixes from EVPN to IPVPN.

## 10. Conclusion

This document describes the procedures required in PEs that use EVPN and another Inter-Subnet-Forwarding SAFI to import and export IP Prefixes for a given tenant. In particular, this document defines:

- o A route selection algorithm so that a PE can determine what path to choose between EVPN paths and other ISF SAFI paths.
- o A new BGP Path attribute called D-PATH that provides loop protection and visibility on the Domains a particular route has traversed.
- o The way Path attributes should be propagated between EVPN and another ISF SAFI.
- o The procedures that must be followed on Interworking PEs that behave as Composite PEs, Gateway PEs or a combination of both.

The above procedures provide an operator with the required tools to build large tenant networks that may span multiple domains, use different ISF SAFIs to handle IP Prefixes, in a deterministic way and with routing loop protection.

## 11. Conventions used in this document

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 [RFC2119].

In this document, these words will appear with that interpretation only when in ALL CAPS. Lower case uses of these words are not to be interpreted as carrying RFC-2119 significance.

In this document, the characters ">>" preceding an indented line(s) indicates a compliance requirement statement using the key words listed above. This convention aids reviewers in quickly identifying or finding the explicit compliance requirements of this RFC.

## 12. Security Considerations

This section will be added in future versions.

### 13. IANA Considerations

This document defines a new BGP path attribute known as the BGP Domain Path (D-PATH) attribute and requests IANA to assign a new attribute code type from the BGP Path Attributes registry.

### 14. References

#### 14.1. Normative References

[RFC7432] Sajassi, A., Ed., Aggarwal, R., Bitar, N., Isaac, A., Uttaro, J., Drake, J., and W. Henderickx, "BGP MPLS-Based Ethernet VPN", RFC 7432, DOI 10.17487/RFC7432, February 2015, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7432>>.

[RFC4271] Rekhter, Y., Ed., Li, T., Ed., and S. Hares, Ed., "A Border Gateway Protocol 4 (BGP-4)", RFC 4271, DOI 10.17487/RFC4271, January 2006, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4271>>.

#### 14.2. Informative References

[RFC4360] Sangli, S., Tappan, D., and Y. Rekhter, "BGP Extended Communities Attribute", RFC 4360, DOI 10.17487/RFC4360, February 2006, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4360>>.

[IP-PREFIX] Rabadan et al., "IP Prefix Advertisement in EVPN", draft-ietf-bess-evpn-prefix-advertisement-04, February, 2017.

[INTER-SUBNET] Sajassi et al., "IP Inter-Subnet Forwarding in EVPN", draft-ietf-bess-evpn-inter-subnet-forwarding-03.txt, work in progress, February, 2017

[ENCAP-ATT] Rosen et al., "The BGP Tunnel Encapsulation Attribute", draft-ietf-idr-tunnel-encaps-03.txt, work in progress, November, 2016.

### 15. Acknowledgments

### 16. Contributors

## 17. Authors' Addresses

Jorge Rabadan (editor)  
Nokia  
777 E. Middlefield Road  
Mountain View, CA 94043 USA  
Email: jorge.rabadan@nokia.com

Ali Sajassi (editor)  
Cisco  
170 West Tasman Drive  
San Jose, CA 95134, US  
EMail: sajassi@cisco.com

Eric C. Rosen  
Juniper Networks, Inc.  
EMail: erosen@juniper.net

John Drake  
Juniper Networks, Inc.  
EMail: jdrake@juniper.net

Wen Lin  
Juniper Networks, Inc.  
EMail: wlin@juniper.net

Jim Uttaro  
AT&T  
Email: jul738@att.com

Adam Simpson  
Nokia  
Email: adam.1.simpson@nokia.com