

# Implementing MPLS VPN in Provider's IP Backbone

Luyuan Fang luyuanfang@att.com AT&T

49th IETF, San Diego, CA, December 2000



#### Outline

- BGP/MPLS VPN (RFC 2547bis)
- Setting up LSP for VPN Design Alternative Studies
  - Interworking of LDP / RSVP / VPN protocols
  - Interoperability in heterogeneous IP network
- MPLS VPN Deployment Issues
  - Scalability
  - VPN security
  - Load sharing between PE-CE links
- MPLS VPN network management
  - Provisioning
  - Performance
  - Fault Management

# BGP/MPLS VPN (RFC 2547bis)

- MPLS VPN: Deliver network based VPN services over shared IP network.
- Security: Controlled access. VRF "VPN Routing and Forwarding" tables, contains customer VPN routes. VPNs are isolated.
- Scalability: Provider backbone (P) routers are not VPN aware; Provider Edge (PE) router only holds the routing information of VPN directly connected.
- Customer addresses can overlap. Support non-unique, private (RFC1918) addressing in customer networks.
- Easy configuration for customers, no special changes required on customer side (for Enterprise VPN).

#### **BGP/MPLS VPN**



#### **Configuration:**

- IGP (e.g. OSPF, or ISIS) routing in the core
- MPLS (e.g. LDP) enabled for all P and PE
- MP-iBGP fully meshed between PEs
- PE-CE can be e-BGP, OSPF, RIP or Static

#### Two level Labels:

- Top label 
   : LDP label forwarding through the core, PE-PE
- Inner label ■: VPN label identify the destination VPN, forwarding to CE



49th IETF, San Diego, CA, December 2000

### Setting up LSP for VPN

- Design Alternatives Study



- Example 1: VPN / LDP
  - MPLS (LDP) enabled in the entire backbone network, including all P and PE routers for setting up the Label Switched Path (LSP)
  - VPN enabled on VPN PE routers



LSP = IGP path (e.g. OSPF shortest path), in this case

- Advantage: simplicity
- Consider: availability of LDP

#### Setting up LSP for VPN

- Design Alternatives Study



- Example 2: VPN / RSVP
  - Using RSVP TE Tunnel through Multi OSPF areas (PE-PE) for setting up the LSP, with back-up tunnel for failure protection
  - RSVP tunnels are unidirectional, alternative path can be taken for each direction
  - VPN enabled on VPN PE routers



- *Advantage:* Better TE control, including fast reroute when available
- Consider: Availability of RSVP across multi-OSPF area; many long tunnels required throughout the network may or may not be desirable.

#### Setting up LSP for VPN

#### - Design Alternatives Study



- Example 3: VPN / LDP / RSVP
  - Config LDP for PE1 and P1, P4 and PE2.
  - Build short RSVP TE Tunnel in OSPF area 0 (P1-P3-P5-P4), note P1 and P4 may be from one vendor, acting as the head-end, P3 and P5 may be from another vendor. P3 and P5 does not need to enable LDP.
  - Interoperability on RSVP is required, not LDP in this example.
  - VPN enabled on VPN PE routers.



- LDP path
- *Advantage:* LDP does not need to be available everywhere. Short tunnel.
- Consider: There are no end-to-end TE control. 49<sup>th</sup> IETF, San Diego, CA, December 2000



### **MPLS VPN Deployment Issues**

- MPLS Feature availability
  - VPN, LDP, RSVP, CR-LDP: individually, and Interworking
  - Design largely based on feature availability Vs. optimal
- Multi-vendor inter-operability
  - Required in an heterogeneous IP network
- Incremental deployment plans
  - Fully enable MPLS in the entire IP backbone Vs. partially enable MPLS.
  - TE tunnels, use only as needed Vs. fully meshed
  - Incrementally deploy BGP/MPLS VPN on PE routers



## MPLS VPN Deployment Issues

- Scalability
  - The use of Route Reflector
  - Performance impact on PEs needs to be measured
- Load sharing between PE-CE links
  - Assign different RDs to different sites Vs. single RD for each VPN.
- Security
  - One VPN's route does not exist in other non-connected VPN's VRF or the global routing table
  - FR/ATM equivalent security more study needed
- Multi-AS inter-working
  - Feature needed today for building VPN to traverse multi-AS / multi-provider's network

#### MPLS VPN network management



- Available MIBs today
  - LSR MIB, VPN MIB, MBGP MIB, RSVP TE MIB, TDP MIB, FTN MIB,...
- Configuration and Provisioning
  - Auto-provisioning tools needed for large scale VPN deployment
- Performance
  - All MPLS features impact on performance, including basic VPN on PE routers, need to be studied
  - More study needed for VPN supporting QoS
  - Network performance: delay, jitter, loss, throughput, availability
  - Element performance: utilization
- Security

#### **MPLS VPN network management**



#### Traffic Management / Engineering

- Characterize traffic for VPNs
- Profiling, correlation, and optimization
- Fault management
  - Monitoring and troubleshooting
  - VPN failure detection and recovery



**Config:** LDP in the core for all P and PE router; IGP: OSPF; iBGP full mesh between PEs

LSP: OSPF shortest path: PE1-P1-P3-P4-PE2; no TE tunnels.

**Problem:** All links and nodes are up, but P3 label switching fails. LSP failure results in VPN failure. **Solution required:** PE1 and PE2 to to be notified of the LSP failure

LSP needs to be re-established through recovery mechanism, force LSP <> OSPF path



- Implementing BGP/MPLS VPN in large IP backbone can be feasible
  - Illustrations of alternatives and examples presented here have been experimented through lab testing and inter-lab trial
- Deployment Challenges

Summary

- Feature availability
- Interoperability
- Manageability
- Requirements on BGP/MPLS VPN implementation, service deployment and management