# Building a Fixed-Line Broadband Network in 2019 2020 Richard Patterson UKNOF - 15<sup>th</sup> Jan 2020

sky atlantic

### High-Level End-to-End Network





### Access

#### Fibre to the Home - Gigabit Passive Optical Network (GPON)



- Optical Line Terminal (OLT) @ Edge POP
- Optical Network Terminal (ONT) @ Customer Premise
  - 2 box solution with Sky Hub 4 CPE router



### Access GPON

- Single-strand single-mode fibre
  - BiDi Optics
- Point-to-Multipoint using passive splitters
  - Commonly @ 32:1 or 64:1 but up to 128:1
- Performance isn't variable like xDSL
  - 2.5Gbps down
  - 1.25Gbps up
- Optical Budget
  - Splitters
  - Splicing
  - Connectors
  - Distance
  - Etc.



4

# Access

#### **GPON - Downstream**

- ~1490nm Downstream
- Broadcast to all ONTs
- Distinguished by Port-ID in the GEM header
- AES128 Encrypted





### Access GPON - Upstream

- ~1310nm Upstream
- Time-Division Multiple Access
- OLTs "range" to find each ONT's distance from OLT
- Frames converge on the fibre without collision





### Access **Unbundled GPON**

- **Distinct Optical Distribution** Network (ODN)
- Shared ducts / fibre bundles



### Access **Unbundled GPON**

A Customer can port ISPs, by an engineer physically patching the ONT over to the other provider's splitter



### Access

### Future-proofed: XGS-PON

- Shared optical network using distinct wavelengths
- XGS-PON
  - ~1270nm Up
  - ~1577nm Down
- Wavelength Mux at the OLT head-end
- XGS-PON coloured ONT







# **Metro Network**





# Metro Aggregation

Aggregates multiple OLTs from multiple Edge POPs





### Metro Network EVPN E-LAN



- BGP-Signaled L2VPN
- Efficient MAC-learning
- Active/Active Multi-homed
- No need for MC-LAG or STP
- Efficient handling of BUM packets



### Metro Network Future: EVPN-VPWS



- Point-to-Point
  - No MAC-learning
- Single-Active multi-homing on BNG side
  - Uses the "Backup" control flag (RFC8214 § 3.1)



# **Core Network**





#### **Core Network Merchant Silicon** Cheaper per Gbps cost High Port Density ٠ Rigid Feature Set / Packet Processing • Bugs in Vendor Implementations Segment Routing (MPLS) No LDP or RSVP-TE • Virtualised Route Reflectors ECMP Everywhere To Satellite POPs



# Segment Routing (MPLS)

- Uses existing MPLS packet forwarding
- Extensions to IGP for label distribution
  - Not a distinct new "protocol"
  - No need for LDP or RSVP-TE
- No Stateful Label Switch Paths (LSPs)
  - State is kept in the packet header
  - Scalable
- Supports Traffic Engineering
  - Label Stack or "Segment List"
  - Offline Path Computation
  - Dynamic TE using Link Delay metrics signaled in ISIS (RFC8570)



# Segment Routing

#### Shortest Path





### Segment Routing Traffic Engineering





# **Subscriber Termination**





# **Subscriber Termination**

### Broadband Network Gateways (BNG)



- IPoE Less encapsulation overhead compared to PPPoE
- Port-based Authentication DHCPv6 Option 37 Remote-ID
  - Inserted by the OLT's Lightweight DHCPv6 Relay Agent (LDRA)
- Redundant BNG Proprietary vendor-magic session-state syncing, plus VRRP
- Native IPv6 /48 Prefix Delegations

Future:

- Subscriber Termination directly on EVPN-VPWS
  - Vendor-magic glues BNG backup state with EVPN state
  - "Single-Active" bit set in the ESI Label Extended Community



# **IPv6 Addressing**

- RIPE NCC allocates an LIR up to a /29 without question
- Enough for ~500K subscribers @ /48 PD
  - As recommended in RIPE-690 BCOP
  - Not enough for our projected growth
- >/29 available with questions
  - Lots of questions
  - So many questions
  - Some RIPE NCC members decide that spinning up new LIRs is more efficient

#### [members-discuss] [EXTERNAL] Re: New Charging Scheme

- Previous message (by thread): [members-discuss] [EXTERNAL] Re: New Charging Scheme
- Next message (by thread): [members-discuss] [EXTERNAL] Re: New Charging Scheme

Messages sorted by: [ date ] [ thread ] [ subject ] [ author ]

Tue Feb 19 15:52:07 CET 2019

> From: Patterson, Richard (Sky Network Services (SNS))
> Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2019 12:44 PM
[snip]

> It felt like the IPv4-conservative approach was being applied to IPv6, and > that kind of defeats the purpose IMO.

I have experienced this as well. For technical reasons (not convenience), I needed another /29 (or rather 6 /32's). This turned out to take too long and too much of my time, so I gave up and opened another LIR simply for the /29 IPv6.

Of course that meant I had to buy one less /22 IPv4 on the free market, so the tight IPv6 policies directly caused faster depletion of IPv4. Though I don't know whether this happens often enough to be significant, it's still ass-backwards.

Regards,



# **IPv6 Addressing**

- IPv6-only Recursive DNS
- OTT Voice delivered over IPv6



#### IPv6 is no longer an optional feature



#### MOST RECENT TRANSFERS COMPLETED

# **IPv4 Addressing**

- Started with zero IPv4 addresses
- Join RIPE as a Local Internet Registry (LIR)
  - €2000 joining fee + €1400pa
  - Gets you a /22 or 1024 IPv4 addresses
    - Last of RIPE's IPv4 allocated on 25<sup>th</sup> November 2019
    - Maybe this will be enough for infrastructure?
- Buy off the open market @ >\$20USD / IP
- Still need some form of IPv4 address sharing
  - We've chosen MAP-T (RFC7599)

Individual buyers and sellers will agree to a specific nominated currency such as USD, EUR, GBP, etc. in the following table, prices per IP are illustrated in USD for comparative regional purposes.

Block Size*	/24	/23	/22	/21	/20	/19	/18	/17	/16
Price/IP (USD)	26.00	23.00	20.00	20.00	19.50	19.50	19.00	19.50	19.00+ depending on quality

Source: https://ipv4marketgroup.com/broker-services/buy/

Block Size*	/24	/23	/22	/21	/20	/19	/18	/17	/16
Price/IP (USD)	30.00	26.00	22.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	21.00

\*Prices in this table are based on the most recent transfer agreed upon by a previous seller and buyer. Each price by block size is indicative of current seller expectation, and buyers can reference these prices to support internal planning and budgeting.

> Source: https://ipv4marketgroup.com/broker-services/buy/ 23rd Dec 2019



# Mapping of Address and Port (MAP)

- IPv4aaS
  - IPv4 delivered via IPv6 transport
  - IPv6-only Access Layer
  - Reduced operational overhead
- Allows IPv4 address sharing, or 1:1
- No DNS synthesizing required
- Doesn't require an agent on end-hosts.
- Can operate in either encapsulation or translation modes
- Stateless



# Mapping of Address and Port (MAP)



- 5-tuple hashing. (E.g., with ECMP or over LAGs)
- Border relay-bypass
- Loses IPv4-only header attributes

RFC6052 IPv4-embedded IPv6 addresses used for external **Packet Flow (MAP-T)** host destination address. 151.230.60.51 2001:db8:c:2:97:e63c:3300:0000 NAT64 Native IPv6 NAT44 NAT46 IPv4 IPv4 LAN Internet  $s|_{\mathcal{N}}$ IPv6 Access IPv6 Core IPv6 LAN MAP BR Native IPv6 IPv6 Internet 27

# Life of a Packet (MAP-T)



Note: Source address translation is BMR-dependent, it would not use RFC6052 as shown in this example.

### Mapping of Address and Port (MAP) Stateless

Algorithmically translated/encapsulated based on predefined rules

- No need to keep track of every flow
- Efficient packet processing
- Cheaper, more scalable hardware
- Already supported on existing linecards by some vendors

- IPv4 and DHCPv6 pool management becomes complicated
- Some jurisdictions regulate 5-tuple logging for compliance reasons, which stateless IPv4aaS methods don't provide



# **MAP Border Relay Anycasting**

- DMR IPv6 prefixes can be anycasted internally
- Public IPv4 prefixes can be anycasted externally.
- Stateless translation/encapsulation allows for asymmetric packet flows.





# **MAP Forward Mapping Rules**

• Allows direct CPE <-> CPE communication, bypassing Border Relays.





# MAP Border Relay Bypass for CDN

- On-net content servers could be numbered from within the IPv6 DMR prefix, allowing for Border Relay-bypass, using more specific destination-based routing.
- Allows for serving of IPv4-only clients from IPv6-capable CDNs.

