Internet routing

V. Arun
CS491G: Computer Networking Lab
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Slide material copyright 1996-2013
J.F Kurose and K.W. Ross, All Rights Reserved

Graph abstraction



graph: G = (N,E)

N = set of routers = { u, v, w, x, y, z }

E = set of links ={ (u,v), (u,x), (v,x), (v,w), (x,w), (x,y), (w,y), (w,z), (y,z) }

Graph abstraction: costs



$c(x,x')$ = cost of link (x,x')
e.g., $c(w,z) = 5$

cost could always be 1, or inversely related to bandwidth, or related to congestion

cost of path $(x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_p) = c(x_1,x_2) + c(x_2,x_3) + \ldots + c(x_{p-1},x_p)$

key question: what is the least-cost path between u and z ?
routing algorithm: algorithm that finds that least cost path

Routing algorithm classification

Q: global or decentralized information?

global:

- all routers have complete topology, link cost info
- "link state" algorithms

decentralized:

- router knows physically-connected neighbors, link costs to neighbors
- iterative process of computation, exchange of info with neighbors
- "distance vector" algorithms

Q: static or dynamic?

static:

- routes change slowly over time

dynamic:

- routes change more quickly
  - periodic update
  - in response to link cost changes

4. Internet Routing: Outline

4.5 routing algorithms
- link state
- distance vector
- hierarchical routing

4.6 routing in the Internet
- RIP
- OSPF
- BGP

A Link-State Routing Algorithm

Dijkstra's algorithm

- net topology, link costs known to all nodes
  - accomplished via "link state broadcast"
  - all nodes have same info
- computes least cost paths from one node ('source") to all other nodes
  - gives *forwarding table* for that node
- iterative: after k iterations, know least cost path to k dest.'s

notation:

- c(x,y): link cost from node x to y; $= \infty$ if not direct neighbors
- D(v): current value of cost of path from source to dest. v
- p(v): predecessor node along path from source to v
- N': set of nodes whose least cost path definitively known

Dijsktra's Algorithm



Initialization:

N' = {u}
for all nodes v
  if v adjacent to u
    then D(v) = c(u,v)
  else D(v) = ∞

Loop

???

until all nodes in N'

Dijsktra's Algorithm



Initialization:

```
  N' = {u}
  for all nodes v
    if v adjacent to u
        then D(v) = c(u,v)
    else D(v) = ∞
```

Loop

```
  find w not in N' such that D(w) is a minimum
  add w to N'
  update D(v) for all v adjacent to w and not in N' :
     D(v) = min( D(v), D(w) + c(w,v) )
  /* new cost to v is either old cost to v or known
   shortest path cost to w plus cost from w to v */
```

until all nodes in N'

Dijkstra's algorithm: example

Step	N'	D(v) p(v)	D(w) p(w)	D(x) p(x)	D(y) p(y)	D(z) p(z)
0	u	7,u	3,u	5,u	∞	∞
1	uw	6,w		5,u	11,w	∞
2	uwx	6,w			11,w	14,x
3	uwxv				10,v	14,x
4	uwxvy					12,y
5	uwxvyz					



notes:

- construct shortest path tree by tracing predecessor nodes
- ties can exist (can be broken arbitrarily)

Dijkstra's algorithm: another example

Step	N'	D(v),p(v)	D(w),p(w)	D(x),p(x)	D(y),p(y)	D(z),p(z)
0	u	2,u	5,u	1,u	∞	∞
1	ux	2,u	4,x		2,x	∞
2	uxy	2,u	3,y			4,y
3	uxyv		3,y			4,y
4	uxyvw					4,y
5	uxyvwz					



Dijkstra's algorithm: example (2)

resulting shortest-path tree from u:



resulting forwarding table in u:

destination	link
v	(u,v)
x	(u,x)
y	(u,x)
w	(u,x)
z	(u,x)

Dijkstra's algorithm, discussion

algorithm complexity: n nodes

- each iteration: need to check all nodes, w, not in N
- n(n+1)/2 comparisons: $O(n^2)$
- more efficient implementations possible: O(nlogn)

oscillations possible:

- e.g., support link cost equals amount of carried traffic:



4. Internet Routing: Outline

4.5 routing algorithms
- link state
- distance vector
- hierarchical routing

4.6 routing in the Internet
- RIP
- OSPF
- BGP

Distance vector algorithm

Bellman-Ford equation (dynamic programming)

let

$d_x(y)$:= cost of least-cost path from x to y

then

$$d_x(y) = \min_v \{c(x,v) + d_v(y)\}$$

- $d_v(y)$: cost from neighbor v to destination y
- $c(x,v)$: cost to neighbor v
- $\min_v$: *min* taken over all neighbors v of x

Bellman-Ford example



clearly, $d_v(z) = 5$, $d_x(z) = 3$, $d_w(z) = 3$

B-F equation says:

$$
\begin{aligned}
d_u(z) = \min \{ & c(u,v) + d_v(z), \\
& c(u,x) + d_x(z), \\
& c(u,w) + d_w(z) \} \\
= \min \{ & 2 + 5, \\
& 1 + 3, \\
& 5 + 3 \} = 4
\end{aligned}
$$

node achieving minimum is next hop in shortest path, used in forwarding table

Distance vector algorithm

- $D_x(y)$ = estimate of least cost from x to y
  - x maintains distance vector $\mathbf{D}_x = [D_x(y): y \in N]$
- node x:
  - knows cost to each neighbor v: $c(x,v)$
  - maintains its neighbors' distance vectors. For each neighbor v, x maintains $\mathbf{D}_v = [D_v(y): y \in N]$

Distance vector algorithm

key idea:

- from time-to-time, each node sends its own distance vector estimate to neighbors
- when x receives new DV estimate from neighbor, it updates its own DV using B-F equation:

$$D_x(y) \leftarrow \min_v\{c(x,v) + D_v(y)\} \quad \text{for each node } y \in N$$

- under minor, natural conditions, the estimate $D_x(y)$ *converge to the actual least cost* $d_x(y)$

Distance vector algorithm

iteritive, asynchronous:

each local iteration caused by:

- local link cost change
- DV update message from neighbor

distributed:

- each node notifies neighbors *only* when its DV changes
  - neighbors then notify their neighbors if necessary

each node:



$$D_x(y) = \min\{c(x,y) + D_y(y),\ c(x,z) + D_z(y)\} = \min\{2+0\ ,\ 7+1\} = 2$$

$$D_x(z) = \min\{c(x,y) + D_y(z),\ c(x,z) + D_z(z)\} = \min\{2+1\ ,\ 7+0\} = 3$$

node x table

from \ cost to	x	y	z
x	0	2	7
y	∞	∞	∞
z	∞	∞	∞

node y table

from \ cost to	x	y	z
x	∞	∞	∞
y	2	0	1
z	∞	∞	∞

node z table

from \ cost to	x	y	z
x	∞	∞	∞
y	∞	∞	∞
z	7	1	0

node x table (updated)

from \ cost to	x	y	z
x	0	2	3
y	2	0	1
z	7	1	0

time →



$D_x(y) = \min\{c(x,y) + D_y(y), c(x,z) + D_z(y)\}$
$= \min\{2+0 , 7+1\} = 2$

$D_x(z) = \min\{c(x,y) + D_y(z), c(x,z) + D_z(z)\}$
$= \min\{2+1 , 7+0\} = 3$

node x table

from \ cost to	x	y	z
x	0	2	7
y	∞	∞	∞
z	∞	∞	∞

from \ cost to	x	y	z
x	0	2	3
y	2	0	1
z	7	1	0

from \ cost to	x	y	z
x	0	2	3
y	2	0	1
z	3	1	0

node y table

from \ cost to	x	y	z
x	∞	∞	∞
y	2	0	1
z	∞	∞	∞

from \ cost to	x	y	z
x	0	2	7
y	2	0	1
z	7	1	0

from \ cost to	x	y	z
x	0	2	3
y	2	0	1
z	3	1	0

node z table

from \ cost to	x	y	z
x	∞	∞	∞
y	∞	∞	∞
z	7	1	0

from \ cost to	x	y	z
x	0	2	7
y	2	0	1
z	3	1	0

from \ cost to	x	y	z
x	0	2	3
y	2	0	1
z	3	1	0

time



Distance vector: link cost changes

link cost changes:

- node detects local link cost change
- updates routing info, recalculates distance vector
- if DV changes, notify neighbors



"good news travels fast"

t_0 : *y* detects link-cost change, updates its DV, informs its neighbors.

t_1 : *z* receives update from *y*, updates its table, computes new least cost to *x* , sends its neighbors its DV.

t_2 : *y* receives *z*'s update, updates its distance table. *y*'s least costs do *not* change, so *y* does *not* send a message to *z*.

Distance vector: link cost changes

link cost changes:

- node detects local link cost change
- *bad news travels slow* - "count to infinity" problem!
- 44 iterations before algorithm stabilizes!



poisoned reverse:

- If Z routes through Y to get to X :
  - Z tells Y its (Z's) distance to X is infinite (so Y won't route to X via Z)
- will this completely solve count to infinity problem?

Comparison of LS and DV algorithms

message complexity

- ***LS:*** with n nodes, E links, O(nE) msgs sent
- ***DV:*** exchange between neighbors only
  - convergence time varies

speed of convergence

- ***LS:*** $O(n^2)$ algorithm requires O(nE) msgs
  - may have oscillations
- ***DV:*** convergence time varies
  - may be routing loops
  - count-to-infinity problem

robustness: what happens if router malfunctions?

LS:

- node can advertise incorrect *link* cost
- each node computes only its *own* table

DV:

- DV node can advertise incorrect *path* cost
- each node's table used by others
  - *error propagate thru network*

4. Internet Routing: Outline

4.5 routing algorithms

- link state
- distance vector
- hierarchical routing

4.6 routing in the Internet

- RIP
- OSPF
- BGP

Hierarchical routing

our routing study thus far - idealization
- all routers identical
- network "flat"

… *not* true in practice

scale: with 600 million destinations:
- can't store all dest's in routing tables!
- routing table exchange would swamp links!

administrative autonomy
- internet = network of networks
- each network admin may want to control routing in its own network

Hierarchical routing

- aggregate routers into regions, "autonomous systems" (AS)
- routers in same AS run same routing protocol
  - "intra-AS" routing protocol
  - routers in different AS can run different intra-AS routing protocol

gateway router:

- at "edge" of its own AS
- has link to router in another AS

Interconnected ASes



- forwarding table configured by both intra- and inter-AS routing algorithm
  - intra-AS sets entries for internal dests
  - inter-AS & intra-AS sets entries for external dests

Inter-AS tasks

- suppose router in AS1 receives datagram destined outside of AS1:
  - router should forward packet to gateway router, but which one?

AS1 must:

1. learn which dests are reachable through AS2, which through AS3
2. propagate this reachability info to all routers in AS1

job of inter-AS routing!



Example: setting forwarding table in router 1d

- suppose AS1 learns (via inter-AS protocol) that subnet *x* reachable via AS3 (gateway 1c), but not via AS2
  - inter-AS protocol propagates reachability info to all internal routers
- router 1d determines from intra-AS routing info that its interface *I* is on the least cost path to 1c
  - installs forwarding table entry *(x,I)*



Example: choosing among multiple ASes

- now suppose AS1 learns from inter-AS protocol that subnet *x* is reachable from AS3 *and* from AS2.
- to configure forwarding table, router 1d must determine which gateway it should forward packets towards for dest x
  - this is also job of inter-AS routing protocol!



Example: choosing among multiple ASes

- now suppose AS1 learns from inter-AS protocol that subnet *x* is reachable from AS3 *and* from AS2.
- to configure forwarding table, router 1d must determine towards which gateway it should forward packets for dest x
  - this is also job of inter-AS routing protocol!
- *hot potato routing: send* packet towards closest of two routers.



4. Internet Routing: Outline

4.5 routing algorithms
- link state
- distance vector
- hierarchical routing

4.6 routing in the Internet
- RIP
- OSPF
- BGP

Intra-AS Routing

- also known as *interior gateway protocols (IGP)*
- most common intra-AS routing protocols:
  - RIP: Routing Information Protocol
  - OSPF: Open Shortest Path First
  - IGRP: Interior Gateway Routing Protocol (Cisco proprietary)

RIP (Routing Information Protocol)

- included in BSD-UNIX distribution in 1982
- distance vector algorithm
  - distance metric: # hops (max = 15 hops), each link has cost 1
  - DVs exchanged with neighbors every 30 sec in response message (aka advertisement)
  - each advertisement: list of up to 25 destination *subnets* *(in IP addressing sense)*



from router A to destination *subnets:*

subnet	hops
u	1
v	2
w	2
x	3
y	3
z	2

RIP: example



routing table in router D

destination subnet	next router	# hops to dest
w	A	2
y	B	2
z	B	7
x	--	1
….	….	….

RIP: example

A-to-D advertisement

dest	next	hops
w	-	1
x	-	1
z	C	4
….	…	...



routing table in router D

destination subnet	next router	# hops to dest
w	A	2
y	B	2
z	~~B~~ A	~~7~~ 5
x	--	1
….	….	....

RIP: link failure, recovery

if no advertisement heard after 180 sec --> neighbor/ link declared dead

- routes via neighbor invalidated
- new advertisements sent to neighbors
- neighbors in turn send out new advertisements (if tables changed)
- link failure info quickly (?) propagates to entire net
- *poison reverse* used to prevent ping-pong loops (infinite distance = 16 hops)

RIP table processing

- RIP routing tables managed by *application-level* process called route-d (daemon)
- advertisements sent in UDP packets, periodically repeated



EIGRP enhancements to the DV algorithm

- **Split-horizon**
  - In routing updates sent out interface X, do not include routing information about routes that refer to interface X as the outgoing interface
- **Route poisoning**
  - Advertize a failed route with a metric value of "infinity". (16 in the case of RIP)
- **Poison reverse**
  - When learning of a failed route, suspend split-horizon rule for that route, and advertise a poisoned route.
- **Triggered update**
  - When a route fails, send an update immediately.
- **Holddown Process & Timer**:

Example: Stable Network

R1 IP Routing Table

Source	Subnet	Out Int.	Next-Hop	Metric
RIP	172.30.21.0/24	S0/0	172.30.1.2	1
RIP	**172.30.22.0/24**	**S0/0**	**172.30.1.2**	**1**
Conn.	172.30.1.0/24	S0/0	N/A	0
Conn.	172.30.11.0/24	Fa0/0	N/A	0

R2 IP Routing Table

Source	Subnet	Out Int.	Next-Hop	Metric
Conn.	172.30.21.0/24	Fa0/0	N/A	0
Conn.	**172.30.22.0/24**	**Fa0/1**	**N/A**	**0**
Conn.	172.30.1.0/24	S0/1/0	N/A	0
RIP	172.30.11.0/24	S0/1/0	172.30.1.1	1



Example: Route Poisoning

R1 IP Routing Table

Source	Subnet	Out Int.	Next-Hop	Metric
RIP	172.30.21.0/24	S0/0	172.30.1.2	1
RIP	**172.30.22.0/24**	**S0/0**	**172.30.1.2**	**16**
Conn.	172.30.1.0/24	S0/0	N/A	0
Conn.	172.30.11.0/24	Fa0/0	N/A	0

R2 IP Routing Table

Source	Subnet	Out Int.	Next-Hop	Metric
Conn.	172.30.21.0/24	Fa0/0	N/A	0
~~Conn.~~	~~172.30.22.0/24~~	~~Fa0/1~~	~~N/A~~	~~0~~
Conn.	172.30.1.0/24	S0/1/0	N/A	0
RIP	172.30.11.0/24	S0/1/0	172.30.1.1	1



Advertize a failed route with a metric value of "infinity". (16 in the case of RIP)

Example: Count-to-infinity

R1 IP Routing Table (After Step 4)

Source	Subnet	Out Int.	Next-Hop	Metric
RIP	172.30.21.0/24	S0/0	172.30.1.2	1
RIP	**172.30.22.0/24**	**S0/0**	**172.30.1.2**	**16**
Conn.	172.30.1.0/24	S0/0	N/A	0
Conn.	172.30.11.0/24	Fa0/0	N/A	0

R2 IP Routing Table (After Step 3)

Source	Subnet	Out Int.	Next-Hop	Metric
Conn.	172.30.21.0/24	Fa0/0	N/A	0
RIP	**172.30.22.0/24**	**S0/1/0**	**172.30.1.1**	**2**
Conn.	172.30.1.0/24	S0/1/0	N/A	0
RIP	172.30.11.0/24	S0/1/0	172.30.1.1	1



Continues until the advertised metric reach 16

R1 IP Routing Table

Source	Subnet	Out Int.	Next-Hop	Metric
RIP	172.30.21.0/24	S0/0	172.30.1.2	1
RIP	**172.30.22.0/24**	**S0/0**	**172.30.1.2**	**3**
Conn.	172.30.1.0/24	S0/0	N/A	0
Conn.	172.30.11.0/24	Fa0/0	N/A	0

R2 IP Routing Table

Source	Subnet	Out Int.	Next-Hop	Metric
Conn.	172.30.21.0/24	Fa0/0	N/A	0
RIP	**172.30.22.0/24**	**S0/1/0**	**172.30.1.1**	**16**
Conn.	172.30.1.0/24	S0/1/0	N/A	0
RIP	172.30.11.0/24	S0/1/0	172.30.1.1	1



Example: Split Horizon

In routing updates sent out interface X, do not include routing information about routes that refer to interface X as the outgoing interface



Example: Poison Reverse & Triggered Update

Poison Reverse: When learning of a failed route, suspend split-horizon rule for that route, and advertise a poisoned route.

Triggered Updates: When a route fails, send an update immediately.



OSPF (Open Shortest Path First)

- "open": publicly available
- uses link state algorithm
  - LS packet dissemination
  - topology map at each node
  - route computation using Dijkstra's algorithm
- OSPF advertisement carries one entry per neighbor
- advertisements flooded to *entire* AS
  - carried in OSPF messages directly over IP (rather than TCP or UDP
- *IS-IS routing* protocol: nearly identical to OSPF

OSPF "advanced" features (not in RIP)

- *security:* all OSPF messages authenticated (to prevent malicious intrusion)
- multiple same-cost paths allowed (only one path in RIP)
- for each link, multiple cost metrics for different TOS (e.g., satellite link cost set "low" for best effort ToS; high for real time ToS)
- integrated uni- and multicast support:
  - Multicast OSPF (MOSPF) uses same topology data base as OSPF
- hierarchical OSPF in large domains.

Hierarchical OSPF



Hierarchical OSPF

- *two-level hierarchy:* local area, backbone.
  - link-state advertisements only in area
  - each nodes has detailed area topology; only know direction (shortest path) to nets in other areas.
- *area border routers:* "summarize" distances to nets in own area, advertise to other Area Border routers.
- *backbone routers:* run OSPF routing limited to backbone.
- *boundary routers:* connect to other AS's.

Internet inter-AS routing: BGP

- BGP (Border Gateway Protocol): *the* de facto inter-domain routing protocol
  - "glue that holds the Internet together"
- BGP provides each AS a means to:
  - eBGP: obtain subnet reachability information from neighboring ASs.
  - iBGP: propagate reachability information to all AS-internal routers.
  - determine "good" routes to other networks based on reachability information and policy.
- allows subnet to advertise its existence to rest of Internet: *"I am here"*

BGP basics

- BGP session: two BGP routers ("peers") exchange BGP messages:
  - advertising *paths* to destination prefixes ("path vector" protocol)
  - exchanged over semi-permanent TCP connections

- when AS3 advertises a prefix to AS1:
  - AS3 *promises* it will forward datagrams towards that prefix
  - AS3 can aggregate prefixes in its advertisement



BGP basics: distributing path information

- using eBGP session between 3a and 1c, AS3 sends prefix reachability info to AS1.
  - 1c can then use iBGP do distribute new prefix info to all routers in AS1
  - 1b can then re-advertise new reachability info to AS2 over 1b-to-2a eBGP session
- when router learns of new prefix, it creates entry for prefix in its forwarding table.



Path attributes and BGP routes

- advertised prefix includes BGP attributes
  - prefix + attributes = “route”
- two important attributes:
  - AS-PATH: contains ASs through which prefix advertisement has passed: e.g., AS 67, AS 17
  - NEXT-HOP: indicates specific internal-AS router to next-hop AS. (may be multiple links from current AS to next-hop-AS)
- gateway router receiving route advertisement uses import policy to accept/decline
  - e.g., never route through AS x
  - *policy-based* routing

BGP route selection (import policy)

- router may learn about more than 1 route to destination AS, selects route based on:
  1. local preference value attribute: policy decision
  2. shortest AS-PATH
  3. closest NEXT-HOP router: hot potato routing
  4. additional criteria

BGP re-announce (export policy)

- Routers commonly use "valley-free" routing export policy
  - Never advertise peer or provider routes to another peer or provider.
- Examples (arrows indicate $ flow or customer → provider relationship, else peering):



Q: Which of the above routes are permitted by "valley free" export policy?

BGP messages

- BGP messages exchanged between peers over TCP connection
- BGP messages:
  - OPEN: opens TCP connection to peer and authenticates sender
  - UPDATE: advertises new path (or withdraws old)
  - KEEPALIVE: keeps connection alive in absence of UPDATES; also ACKs OPEN request
  - NOTIFICATION: reports errors in previous msg; also used to close connection

BGP routing policy



- A,B,C are *provider networks*
- X,W,Y are customer (of provider networks)
- X is *dual-homed:* attached to two networks
  - X does not want to route from B via X to C
  - .. so X will not advertise to B a route to C

BGP routing policy (2)



- A advertises path AW to B
- B advertises path BAW to X
- Should B advertise path BAW to C?
  - No way! B gets no "revenue" for routing CBAW since neither W nor C are B's customers
  - B wants to force C to route to w via A
  - B wants to route *only* to/from its customers!

Why different Intra-, Inter-AS routing ?

policy:

- inter-AS: admin wants control over how its traffic routed, who routes through its net.
- intra-AS: single admin, so no policy decisions needed

scale:

- hierarchical routing saves table size, reduced update traffic

performance:

- intra-AS: can focus on performance
- inter-AS: policy may dominate over performance