Routing Concepts

TCP/IP class

Jim Binkley
Routing - Concepts

- intro concepts
  - topologies
  - types/properties
  - issues
- vector-distance
- link-state
- see Radia Perlman’s *Interconnections*, for more information
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issues/properties

- **routing** - finding a path from one end to the other for a packet
- we need one or more **algorithms** that are most likely **distributed** amongst a set of hosts and router
- what are the properties of said algorithm?
- what issues affect it?
elements of a routing scheme

- **routing protocols** that allow info to be gathered and distributed - routing agents communicate with these protocols

- **routing algorithms** - may be distributed, use protocols and data to determine and disseminate paths

- **routing databases** (tables in routers) (to boardwalk, via new jersey, $100)
topology

- Tanenbaum mentions logical absurdities
- **no router** - every host wired to every other host (mesh)
  
  \[ N \times N \text{ wires, go ahead add a host...} \]

- **1 router** - for all hosts (star)
  
  - 1 heck of a routing table
one solution

- typically a flattened tree to give hierarchy
- at the top a small circle of core routers that know all the routes
- idea: default route
  - if you are not in the center AND you don’t know what to do with it, send it “UP” to smarter entity
routing hierarchy

core routers

Level 1

Level 2

default route

router
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connectionless/connected

- network-layer in TCP/IP connectionless
- OSI stack has connected + connectionless
- connectionless - each packet routed via route table, paths may change dynamically
- connected - route setup at “connect” time in circuit switch, torn down at disconnect
- routing problems still similar
ideal routing algorithm

- fair or unfair (what if we want isochronous data ?)
- correct - what if algorithms too complex?
- robust - can deal with router reboot?
- stable - do routing changes stabilize in distributed system?
- efficient - all routing and no data not good
- topologically flexible
- maintainable - admin not too complicated
- scalable to many routers, many hosts? (distributed)
- deadlock? - loops?
- secure (+ clean, cheerful, takes out the trash, etc.)
classic problem

* routing loop

path to Z?
types of routing algorithms

 преимущества статических алгоритмов

- простое, может быть самым простым в простой топологии, особенно для листового хоста с одним роутером
- вы можете быть умнее, чем роутеры (хотите путь, который они не дадут)

- не устойчиво к масштабированию

Jim Binkley
routing algorithm types

- centralized versus distributed versus end-node
  - center is necessary, can't have defaults everywhere
  - if end nodes have route info, and big net, then route tables huge - need to limit size
source-routing vs hop-by-hop

- end node has exact PATH and datagram follows that path: (first to Joe, then to Bob, then to Grandma’s)
- IP option, but rarely used
- challenge to security: what if hostile entity convinces you to route all packets through it?
  » maybe it can masquerade as you after that?
- still a possible tool - used in BGP, can communicate POLICIES, from Novell to Intel, please Skip Bellevue
- as scalable as hop by hop?
flooding - assume N interfaces
- packet comes in N(1)
- packet goes out N(2)…N(N)
be careful with flooding...
types - flooding

◆ important routing algorithm “tool” - used in many routing algorithms in some sense
◆ strong pro and con
◆ pro - perfect routing, you follow the best path
◆ con - “perfect congestion” - you use up too much bandwidth
**types: vector-distance**

- **vector-distance algorithms:**
  “tell the neighbors about the world”

- **vector** is destination (net/host)

- **distance** is metric (hopcount)

- if we called it destination-metric, other people would understand

- you flood your destination, hopcount info to your directly connected neighbor routers

- **RIP** is an example
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types: link-state

- link-state or shortest path first (SPF) “tell the world about your neighbors”
- find out who is up locally, and flood that information to the entire set of routers
- they can use the “link-state” to build a shortest path map to everybody
- LS is compute-intensive. VD is bandwidth intensive.
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issues - scalability?

- 10’s of hosts and a few routers - static routing
- what about putting all of those toasters on the Internet?
- one home/office, to business/enterprise, to state, nation, planet, solar system, galaxy...
- components affected include the network address and the router hierarchy
scalability...

- ip’s current problems
  - net/hosts via class or even subnet don’t match number of hosts really utilized
  - too many routes in core tables
  - ip address allocation from class C slice of pie means in effect majority of numbers are wasted

- scalability affects addresses and how they are sliced up; also router hierarchy

- how much low-level info (e.g., link-level details) can we afford to disseminate upwards?
general solution to problem exists

- when in doubt, add a new prefix to address and a new SMALLER center to the world
- prefix must summarize internal structure
- divide world into
  - center: (layer 1) boundary routers
  - domains: (layer 2) inside routers
- boundary routers have summary routes in them, not all.
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add a prefix...

- domain routers as 1st assumption - assume they know all the routes.
- if that isn’t scalable, then add new hierarchy and introduce new layer of structure
- IP is moving towards this (CIDR)
- phone companies have prefixes (not enough... nobody is perfect)
To 3.x.y, via 4.1.1

boundary router

[ net region = 1..4, subnet in region, host ]
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issues - congestion

- does not refer to bronchial condition
- connectionless routers have only so many buffers, too many packets, they drop them
- things get worse at the “freeway exchanges”
- does routing protocol add congestion burden?
- how do we prevent/detect congestion?
- obviously circuit-switches don’t have this problem once circuit is set, but they waste bandwidth
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congestion?

- prevent congestion:
  - add carrying capacity
  - shut up, especially if high-volume src

- how do we notify network about it?
  - TCP detects congestion when sender notes that ACKS are missing, slow, or duplicated, sender slows rate of sending
  - some schemes have routers forward or pass back congestion bits
congestion

- IP sends back ICMP source quench message to sender
  - pro: you sent it the right way
  - con: you poured gas on the fire
- ISO CNLP sets flag in network header
  - pro: doesn’t add data to net
  - con: congestion notification is sent to the DESTINATION (oh, goody)
congestion cont.

- TCP solution is not bad BUT
  - what about protocols that use Internet that don’t implement or can’t sensibly implement it?
    - NFS or Novell could but don’t, drive TCP out
    - audio/video transmission is steady-state data flow

- congestion detection is an open question
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issues - link costs

we need a metric, which one?

- cost? not appropriate within enterprise but between; e.g., which long-distance company?
- hop count - how many routers do we traverse
- available bandwidth - go least congested route
- speed of underlying network, use ATM as opposed to 1200 baud modem?
- time: shortest path in terms of time
issues - link costs

- if link costs change, that information must converge of course
- answer now is that link cost is usually hop count only (1 metric)
- question: would more complex algorithms (if possible) that dynamically account for link costs do qualitative better job than current simple algorithms or just use bandwidth?
type of service

◆ my packets before your packets!
◆ might want to prioritize certain traffic classes
◆ might want to optimize on multiple metrics
◆ policy-based routing (pb constrains) - outlaw certain links or routers
  – source and static routing can be useful here
issues - some misc. ones

- load-splitting - if we have two same-level routers, can we split the load between them
- address matching - router needs to do this fast or may run out of buffer space
- migrating routing algorithms - you have RIP and now you want to switch to OSPF
  - can you run both? switching one by one is disruptive
- partition repair - if two paths to one net, and one goes down, can routers fix it?
vector-distance algorithm

- examples: RIP, BGP
- algorithmic elements:
  - send: every N seconds out all connected interfaces
    broadcast 2-tuples:
    (to network X, hop count Y) ... 
  - recv: if new tuple, add to routing table
    if better tuple, change existing 
    if “dead” tuple, remove
  - timeout: if no refresh, timeout entry in N * Y seconds
    » broadcast may be lost, therefore timeout is slower

Jim Binkley
vector-distance

Assume 3 routers, and that directly connected nets are in routing tables to start with. How does the following converge?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>r1 table:</th>
<th>(n1, 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n2, 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
slow convergence/count to infinity

- vector-distance like this has defects
- changes can be sent when they occur, but must recompute a bit so convergence takes time (made worse by possible loops)
- count to infinity problem can occur too - routing loop until hopcount reaches impossible value
C crashes, B knows C crashed but hasn’t told A, but unfortunately A talks to B first. B is told by A: I can get to C in two hops (and note it doesn’t mention to B that the path is thru B). B says AHA!, that means I can get to C in three hops and reports that to A. A says AHA!, it’s now four hops to B and tells B etc...

RIP max hop count (infinity) is 16
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split-horizon fixup (vector-distance)

- A tells B that its distance to C is infinity
  - (because B is the direction A gets the info from)
- when link goes away, B will know that there is no path to C, and tell A
- doesn’t work in all cases
link-state algorithm

- “tell the world about your neighbors”
- link-state requires each participating router to keep map of complete topology
- in 3 parts
  - 1. determine neighbor connectivity
  - 2. send (“flood”) link-state packet that states which link neighbors are up
  - 3. use Dijkstra shortest-path first to compute best path to that network
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link-state#determine link-state

- “ping” neighbors to determine if they are up or they may broadcast (multicast) their existence

```
A                        B
  v   <---------------------

C
  "i multicast, therefore i am..."
```
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link-state#send LSP

- each participating router “floods” (very carefully) routing domain with LSP
each participating router takes LSPs, stores them, and computes shortest path to sender.
link-state: pros/cons

◆ pros
  – converges faster, no count to infinity problem + router can forward LSP immediately, must recompute DV
  – more functionality; e.g., each router has map of net, can make network debugging easier

◆ cons
  – more compute than vd (does this matter?)

◆ tossups
  – bandwidth? vd broadcasts summary version of route table, ls routers send LSP around net