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What is this document about

Main Concepts

A VPN may span **multiple domains** where different Inter-Subnet-Forwarding SAFIs (ISF SAFIs) may provide inter-subnet connectivity.

Interworking PEs / Gateways receive and advertise IP Prefixes in different ISF SAFIs and therefore there is a need to specify certain functions across ISF SAFIs, such as:

- BGP path selection
- Loop Prevention
- Path Attribute Propagation
- Route Aggregation

The document defines D-PATH as a path attribute with value 36 (IANA allocated) as optional transitive:

- A sequence of domain segments (segment length, value)
- Where value is a sequence of domains with format `<DOMAIN-ID:ISF_SAIFI_TYPE>`
What is this document about
Domains and D-PATH

Domains and Domain-IDs
A GW is always configured with multiple Domain-IDs
Two PEs are in the same Domain if there are no (tenant) IP lookups done in intermediate routers

D-PATH and Loop Prevention
D-PATH provides visibility of the domains and SAFIs through which the IP Prefix has gone
Modifies best path selection for IPVPN and EVPN routes (shortest D-PATH wins) and prevent loops. E.g.,:
• GW PE21 receives EVPN 10.0.0.0/24 from PE2 with D-PATH=0 and VPN-IPv4 from GW PE22 with D-PATH=(6500:1:EVPN)
• GW PE21 selects the EVPN route based on shortest D-PATH
• GWs MUST NOT re-export a route that contains a local domain-id
Document History
draft-ietf-bess-evpn-ipvpn-interworking

- Initial document draft-rabadan-sajassi-bess-evpn-ipvpn-interworking originated based on the consensus among a few vendors and operators to merge of draft-rs-bess-evpn-attr-prop and draft-sajassi-bess-evpn-ipvpn-interop
- Presented multiple times at IETF
- Adopted by the BESS Working Group in March 2019, early allocation by IANA
- BESS Working Group Last Call in November 2020, sent to IDR chairs and IDR WG for review
- Document reviewed by IDR chairs (big thanks to Sue and Jeff), with several issues raised and addressed by authors
- Main outstanding concerns related to D-PATH and best path selection (quoting IDR chairs):
  1. D-PATH changes fundamental route selection behavior for BGP
  2. Can result in inconsistent route selection
  3. Accidentally applicable to Internet-scoped BGP routes (attribute escape)
Changes in rev 08
Addressing concerns and other comments

1. Remove complete support for D-PATH on SAFI 1 routes, including proper normative language
   1. D-PATH MUST NOT be advertised along with routes different from IPVPN and EVPN routes, and only changes best path selection for IPVPN and EVPN routes.
   2. By default, the BGP D-PATH attribute is not advertised and MUST be explicitly enabled by configuration on the Gateway PEs.
   3. If D-PATH is received along with routes of AFI/SAFI different from the IPVPN and EVPN families, the behavior treat-as-withdraw is applied.
   4. The use of D-PATH is restricted to “walled garden” Virtual Private Networks, and the operator MUST NOT turn on the generation of D-PATH along with IPVPN and/or EVPN routes if there are CEs attached to a PE (of any domain in the Virtual Private Network) that are connected to the Internet.
   5. In addition, a Gateway PE MUST support the removal of the D-PATH attribute on import and on export, based on configuration.

2. New discussion on the Security Considerations section about “walled garden” VPNs and what happens in case of D-PATH escape

3. Addressed John Scudder’s comment on mailing list
Next Steps

1. Request Feedback from WG, BESS and IDR chairs about rev 08
2. Make progress and publish ASAP
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