Stable Internet Route Selection

Brighten Godfrey

Matthew Caesar Ian Haken Scott Shenker Ion Stoica UC Berkeley

pbg@cs.berkeley.edu

NANOG 40 June 6, 2007

BGP instability: trouble

control plane

data plane

CPU cycles update processing uses majority of cycles on some core routers

degraded path quality
 BGP causes majority of
 packet loss bursts

Stable Route Selection: simple technique to significantly improve stability

What about Route Flap Damping?

- Introduces pathologies
- Impacts availability

"...the application of flap damping in ISP networks is NOT recommended."

--RIPE Route Working Group, May 2006

• Only helps for very unstable routes

Stable Route Selection

Given a choice between routes, select routes that are less likely to fail.

RFD philosophyshut off bad routesSRS philosophyalways pick a route if
possible, but prefer
more stable routes

Challenges

- Inferring stability of paths, locally
- Dependence: does one ISP's benefit require others' participation?
- Flexibility required



Outline

- Design
- Evaluation

Improvement in stability

Dependence

Flexibility

• Conclusion



BGP decision process

- 1. Highest local pref
- Shore-characteristic
 Lowest origin type
- 4. Lowest MED
- 5. eBGP- over iBGP-learned
- 6. Lowest IGP cost
- 7. Lowest router ID

SRS heuristic

- 2. Current route
- 3. Shortest path length
- 4. Longest uptime

Simplified processes

- Simulator has one router per AS, at most one link between AS's
- So...

Standard BGP

Highest local pref
 Shortest path length
 Lowest router ID

1. Highest local pref

SRS

- 2. Current route
- 3. Shortest path length
- 4. Longest uptime

Outline

- Design
- Evaluation

Improvement in stability

- Dependence
- Flexibility
- Conclusion

Evaluation methodology

• Event-based BGP simulator

TopologyInternet AS-levelLocal prefscust./prov./peerAS-adjacency
failuresinferred from
RouteViews

 Measuring interruptions: route changes/ withdrawals



Mean interruptions per month per src-dst pair relative to Std BGP

Availability loss



Dependence between ISPs



Dependence between ISPs



Route flexibility

Flexibility also needed for

load balancing

business relationships

path length

What is the tradeoff with these other objectives?



Tradeoffs: path length



Mean path length

Outline

- Design
- Evaluation

Improvement in stability

- Dependence
- Flexibility
- Conclusion

Summary

- Stable Route Selection: use flexibility in path selection to optimize for stability
 - Significantly more stable
 - No impact on availability
 - Very low stretch
- Ongoing work: implementation & deployment

Questions for operators





What are the barriers? (nondeterminism, traffic engineering...)



How much flexibility would be available to SRS?

Very interested in feedback and collaborations pbg@cs.berkeley.edu

Backup slides

AS adjacency mean session time distribution



Attribution of improvement



speed convergence

~8% better

avoid failures Majority of the improvement

SRS vs. flap damping

SRS: better mean improvement

RFD: better for worst ~0.5% of src-dst pairs



SRS vs. flap damping

SRS is more conservative

SRS is more aggressive

always pick a route if one is advertised

use any flexibility available for stability

SRS with less flexibility



But how much flexibility in practice?

SRS convergence

• Convergence depends on decision process



- Any stable state for Std BGP is still stable
- Gao-Rexford constraints still sufficient to guarantee convergence to stable state
- (Simulations: *slightly* faster convergence)



Dispute wheel

Acknowledgements

- This material is based upon work supported by a National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship
- Traffic sign image from Manual of Traffic Signs, by Richard C. Moeur (<u>http://www.trafficsign.us</u>)