Network Layer V

Dmitri Loguinov
Texas A&M University

April 19, 2022
Chapter 4: Roadmap

4.1 Introduction
4.2 Virtual circuit and datagram networks
4.3 What’s inside a router
4.4 IP: Internet Protocol
4.5 Routing algorithms
4.6 Routing in the Internet
   - RIP
   - OSPF
   - BGP
4.7 Broadcast and multicast routing
Inter-AS Routing: BGP

- BGP (Border Gateway Protocol): de facto standard for inter-AS (exterior) routing
- BGP provides each AS a means to:
  - Obtain subnet reachability information from neighboring ASes
  - Propagate the reachability information to all routers internal to the AS
  - Determine “good” routes to subnets based on reachability information and policy
- Allows a subnet to advertise its existence to the rest of the Internet: “I am here”
BGP Basics

- Pairs of routers (BGP peers) exchange routing info over TCP connections: BGP sessions
  - Note that BGP sessions do not correspond to physical links
- When AS2 advertises a prefix 128.194/16 to AS1, AS2 is promising it will forward any datagrams destined to that prefix towards the prefix
  - AS2 can aggregate prefixes in its advertisement
Distributing Reachability Info

• With eBGP session between 2a and 1b, AS2 sends prefix reachability info to AS1
  - 1b can then use iBGP do distribute this to all routers in AS1
  - 1c may (if beneficial to AS1) re-advertise these subnets to AS2 over the 1c-3a eBGP session

• Internal AS routers combine intra-AS data with iBGP broadcasts to set up actual forwarding tables
Path Attributes & BGP Routes

- When advertising an IP prefix (i.e., subnet), message includes BGP attributes
  - Notation: combination (IP prefix, attributes) = route
- Two important attributes:
  - AS-PATH: contains ASes through which the advert for the prefix passed (latest AS first)
  - NEXT-HOP: indicates the router that should receive traffic (usually border router of the AS that advertised prefix; multiple values possible)
BGP Route Selection

- When gateway router receives route advert, it uses an import policy to accept/decline
  - Filters and rules decide allowed/prohibited routes
- Router may learn about more than one route to some prefix, how does it decide which one is better?
  - Multi-exit discriminator (MED) attribute: policy of foreign AS that assigns different weight to different incoming points
  - Shortest AS-PATH
  - Closest NEXT-HOP router: hot potato routing
  - Local preference attribute: policy decision of accepting AS that assigns different weight to various exit points (only used in iBGP)
**BGP Examples**

**Example 1**: different MED (lower # means higher priority) for paths into AS1

- 7.2.3/24: NEXT-HOP = blue, MED = 10
- 7.2.3/24: NEXT-HOP = red, MED = 50
- 192.10.3/25: NEXT-HOP = blue, MED = 50
- 192.10.3/25: NEXT-HOP = red, MED = 10

**Example 2**: hot-potato routing in AS2 (orange routers exit right, yellow left)
Customer BGP Policies

- BGP messages exchanged using TCP on port 179
  - Application-layer protocol

- A, B, C are provider networks
- X, W, Y are customer networks
- X is dual-homed: attached to two networks
  - X does not want to route from B via itself to C
  - .. so X will not advertise to B any routes picked up from C
Provider BGP Policies

- A advertises to B and C the path AW
- B advertises to X the path BAW
- Should B advertise to C the path BAW?
- Not unless B has agreed to route C’s traffic!
  - B gets no “revenue” for routing CBAW since W, A, C are not B’s customers
  - B may want to force C to route to W via A
- ISPs want to route mainly to/from their customers!
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Multicast and Broadcast

- **Broadcast**: send a packet to all hosts in the network
- **Multicast**: send to a certain subset of nodes
- **Unicast**: one sender - one receiver

**Example**: video distribution to 1M receivers via unicast
- First link R1-R2 carries each packet 1M times
- 5 Mbps stream requires a 5-Tbps link!
Implementing Broadcast

- **(A) Controlled flooding**: routers re-broadcast each received packet only once
  - Must keep a table of all previously received pkts to avoid re-sending of the same data (not scalable)

- **(B) Reverse-path forwarding (RPF)**: routers re-broadcast only packets received on the interface leading towards the source along their own shortest path

- **Drawbacks of RPF**: redundant packets are still transmitted (e.g., C→B, B→C) and routing must be symmetric
**Implementing Broadcast 2**

- (C) **Minimum Spanning Tree**: a tree subgraph of G that spans all network nodes and has the minimum cost of all such trees
  - Once the tree is built, all data travels along the tree, regardless of the source
  - Kruskal’s and Prim’s algorithms build MST in $O(E \log E)$ time
Construction of Spanning Trees

- MST is often impractical due to lack of global knowledge
  - Other spanning trees that approximate MST are used instead
- (D) Center-Based Spanning Tree: a “center” node is selected first (various methods exist)
  - All other nodes asynchronously send join requests using unicast routing towards the center until intersection with tree

![Diagram of spanning tree construction](image)
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Multicast Routing: Problem Statement

- Broadcast floods the entire Internet and is expensive; in contrast, multicast involves a subset of routers
- Applications
  - Video/audio conferencing: participants form a multicast group to generate and consume content (many-to-many)
  - Video-on-demand or pay-per-view: multicast group is formed by one server and many receivers that consume pre-recorded content (one-to-many)
  - Patch distribution: OS provider distributes updates to hosts running its kernel (one-to-many)
  - Live TV: content received from video provider via multiple servers and fed to many receivers (many-to-many)
- **Goal:** create a tree between routers to which multicast group members are attached
Approaches to Building Mcast Trees

- **(A) Source-based mcast forwarding tree:** tree of shortest path routes from source $S$ to all receivers
  - Dijkstra’s algorithm when $S$ knows entire topology from some link-state routing algorithm (e.g., MOSPF)
- **(B) Source-specific RPF (default opt-in)**
  - Initially flood every router (even if R2, R5, R7 don’t want it)

**LEGEND**
- router with attached group member
- router with no attached group member
- datagram will be forwarded
- datagram will not be forwarded
Approaches to Building Mcast Trees

- Forwarding tree may contain subtrees with no mcast group members
  - No need to forward datagrams down subtree
  - “Prune” msgs sent upstream by router with no downstream group members
**Approaches to Building Mcast Trees**

- **(C) Steiner Tree**: minimum cost tree connecting all routers with attached group members
  - Problem is NP-complete
- Even though heuristics exists, not used in practice:
  - Global information about entire network needed
  - Computational complexity
  - Monolithic: rerun whenever a router needs to join/leave
- **(D) Center-Based Tree (CBT) (default opt-out)**
  - Single delivery tree shared by all
  - One router identified as “center” of tree
  - Join messages sent towards center until existing tree is met
Internet Multicast Routing: DVMRP

• **DVMRP**: Distance Vector Multicast Routing Protocol, RFC 1075 (1988)
• **Flood and prune (default opt-in)**: reverse path forwarding (RPF), tree rooted at source
  - RPF tree based on DVMRP’s own routing tables constructed by communicating DVMRP routers
  - No assumptions about underlying unicast
  - Initial datagram to mcast group flooded everywhere via RPF
• IGMP broadcasts proceed between neighbor routers
• Multicast IP addresses are in 224.0.0.0/4
  - To join a particular group, use setsockopt with IP_ADD_MEMBERSHIP
**Tunneling**

**Q:** How to connect “islands” of multicast routers in a “sea” of unicast routers?

- Mcast datagram encapsulated inside “normal” (non-multicast-addressed) datagram
  - Unicast IP datagram sent thru “tunnel” via regular IP unicast to receiving mcast router
  - Receiving mcast router decapsulates mcast datagrams
PIM: Protocol Independent Multicast

Dense (default opt-in):
• Group membership by routers assumed until routers explicitly prune
• Data-driven construction of mcast tree (e.g., RPF)
• Bandwidth and non-group-router processing assumed sufficient

Sparse (default opt-out):
• No membership until routers explicitly join
• Receiver-driven construction of mcast tree (e.g., center-based)
• Bandwidth and non-group-router processing is conservative
Multicast Future

- Wide-area multicast deployment has been traditionally slow, now practically dead
  - Mbone was one such endeavor, worked via tunnels
- One issue is scalability
  - Flooding all Internet receivers is dangerous/expensive
  - Opens loopholes for DoS attacks
- Another is ISP unwillingness to accept multicast traffic
  - Who pays for a single packet being replicated 1M times?
- Finally, multicast congestion control is hard
  - Mbone had 30-40% loss, which is much more than most applications can tolerate (typically below 1%)