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Signpost Routing, Version 1

## Routing Information Protocol

- Interior Gateway Protocol (IGP)
- Distance-Vector Routing Protocol
- Bellman Ford Algorithm
- RFC 1058 released in 1988
- Classful
- No subnet masks carried
- Distributed through BSD UNIX 4.2 in 1982 (routed)


## RIP Basics

- Signpost principle
- Own routing table is sent periodically (every 30 seconds)
- Receiver of update extracts new information
- Known routes with worse metric are ignored
- What is a signpost made of ?
- Destination network
- Hop Count (metric, "distance")
- Next Hop ("vector", given implicitly by sender's address! )


## "Routing By Rumour"

- Good news propagate quickly
- 30 seconds per network
- Bad news are ignored
- Except when sent by routers from which these routes had been learned initially
- But better news from ANY router will be preferred
- Unreachable messages propagate slowly
- 180 seconds per network
- RIP is a Distance Vector Protocol
- after booting the non-volatile configurationmemory tells a RIP router to which networks it is directly connected
- this information is loaded into the routing table
- basically the routing table contains
- the net-ID of the directly connected networks
- and the associated distance (in hops) to them directly connected networks have hop-count $=0$
- then, this routing table is distributed periodically (every 30 seconds) to all connected networks = routing update
- using a broadcast MAC-frame containing
- an IP-broadcast datagram containing
- an UDP-datagram with port number 520
- metric entries of the routing table will be risen by the distance of the interface where transmitted-> in case of RIP -> distance is one -> hop count
- directly reachable routers
- receive this message, update their own routing tables,
- and hence generate their own routing updates reflecting any corresponding modifications
- after a specific time
- all routers know about all network addresses of the whole network
- if different routing updates (from different routers) contain the same net-ID
- then there are redundant paths to this network
- only the path with the lowest hop-count is stored in the routing-table
- on receiving equal hop counts, the net-ID of the earlier one will be selected (and all other associated data)
- hence, between each two networks exists exactly one active path
- all routing table's net-IDs are periodically refreshed by routing-update messages
- if a routing update tells a better metric than that one currently stored in the table
- the routing table must be updated with this new information
- this update does not take care about if the sender of this routing-update is also the router which is currently selected as next hop
- "good news" are quickly adapted
- RIP trusts good news from any source ("trusted news")
- if a routing update tells a worse metric than that one currently stored in the table
- the routing table must be updated with this new information if the sender of this routing-update is the nexthop router for this network
that is: the actual VECTOR in the table is identical with the source address of the routing-update
- routing-updates from other routers than that one currently registered in the table are ignored
- summary: routing-updates with worse metric is only relevant if it comes from that router mentioned in the actual table entry
- when a routing table entry is not refreshed within 180sec
- this entry is considered to be obsolete
- possible reasons: router-failure, network not reachable
- without special mechanism
- we have to wait for 180 sec at least in order that all routers have consistent routing tables again
- slow adaptation of "bad news"
- during these 180sec, forwarding of IP datagram's is done according to the routing table !!


## Without Split Horizon (1)



| NET | Hops | IF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.0.0.0 | direct | e0 |
| 12.0 .0 .0 | direct | s0 |
| 1.0 .0 .0 | 1 | s 0 |


2.0.0.0

Router A just powered on;
First routing update contains directly connected networks;
Router B learns new network 1.0.0.0 (good news);
Router B ignores network 12.0.0.0 in the received update (bad news).

## Without Split Horizon (2)

| NET | Hops | IF |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.0.0.0 | direct | e0 |
| 12.0 .0 .0 | direct | s0 |
| 2.0 .0 .0 | 1 | s 0 |


| NET | Hops | IF |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.0 .0 .0 | direct | e0 |
| 12.0 .0 .0 | direct | $s 0$ |
| 1.0 .0 .0 | 1 | $s 0$ |



Router B sends first routing update containing directly connected networks and already learned network 1.0.0.0;
Router A learns new network 2.0.0.0 (good news);
Router B ignores network 12.0.0.0 and 1.0.0.0 in the received update (bad news).

## Without Split Horizon (3)



Now the peridiodical updates refreshes the learned networks

## Without Split Horizon (4)

| NET | Hops | IF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.0 .0 .0 | direct | e0 |
| 12.0 .0 .0 | direct | s0 |
| 2.0 .0 .0 | 1 | s0 |


| NET | Hops | IF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.0 .0 .0 | ??? | $? ?$ |
| 12.0 .0 .0 | direct | s0 |
| 1.0 .0 .0 | 1 | s0 |





## Without Split Horizon (5)



## Without Split Horizon (6)


...Count to Infinity...
During count to infinity packets to network 2.0.0.0 are caught in a routing loop

## Split Horizon

- A router will not send information about routes through an interface over which the router has learned about those routes
- Exactly THIS is split horizon
- Idea: "Don't tell neighbor of routes that you learned from this neighbor"
- That's what humans (almost) always do:

Don't tell me what l've told you !

- Cannot 100\% avoid routing loops!


## RIP At Work (A)



## RIP At Work (B)



## RIP At Work (C)

| NET | Hops | IF |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.0.0.0 | direct | e0 |
| 12.0 .0 .0 | direct | s0 |
| 31.0 .0 .0 | direct | s1 |
| 2.0 .0 .0 | 1 | s0 |
| 23.0 .0 .0 | 1 | $\mathbf{s 0}$ |
| 3.0 .0 .0 | 1 | s1 |


| NET | Hops | IF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.0 .0 .0 | direct | e0 |
| 12.0 .0 .0 | direct | s0 |
| 23.0 .0 .0 | direct | s1 |
| 1.0 .0 .0 | 1 | s0 |
| 31.0 .0 .0 | 1 | s0 |
| 3.0 .0 .0 | 1 | s1 |




## Count To Infinity

昷

- Main problem with distance vector protocols
- Unforeseeable situations can lead to count to infinity
- Access lists
- Disconnection and connections
- Router malfunctions
- During that time, routing loops occur!


## Count To Infinity (1)

会


## Count To Infinity (2)

今


## Count To Infinity (3)



## Count To Infinity (4)

Count to Infinity situations cannot be avoided in any situation (drawback of signpost principle)
Basic solution: Maximum Hop Count = 16

| NET | Hops | IF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.0 .0 .0 | 6 | s2 |
| $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | . |



## Maximum Hop Count $=16$

Upon network failure, the route is marked as INVALID (hop count 16) and propagated.


## Maximum Hop Count

- Defining a maximum hop count of 16 provides a basic safety factor
- But restricts the maximum network diameter
- Routing loops might still exist during 480 seconds ( $16 \times 30$ s)
- Therefore several other measures necessary


## Additional Measures

- Split Horizon
- Suppressing information that the other side should know better
- Used during normal operation but cannot prevent routing loops !!!
- Split Horizon with Poison Reverse
- Declare learned routes as unreachable
* "Bad news is better than no news at all"
- Stops potential loops due to corrupted routing updates


## Split Horizon With Poison Reverse



Note: poison reverse overrides split horizon when a network is lost

## Additional Measures

- Remember: good news overwrite bad news
- Unreachable information could be overwritten by uninformed routers (which are beyond scope of split horizon)
- Hold Down
- Guarantees propagation of bad news throughout the network
- Routers in hold down state ignore good news for 180 seconds


## Hold Down (1)

- Router C receives unreachable message (4.0.0.0, 16) from router D
- Router C declares 4.0.0.0 as invalid (16) and enters hold-down state



## Hold Down (2)

- Information about network 4.0.0.0 with better metric is ignored for 180 seconds



## Hold Down (3)

全

- Time enough to propagate the unreachabilty of network 4.0.0.0



## Triggered Update

- To reduce convergence time, routing updates are sent immediately upon events (changes)
- On receiving a different routing update a router should also send immediately an update
- Called triggered update


## RIP Timers Summary

- UPDATE (30 seconds)
- Period to send routing update
- INVALID (180 seconds)
- Aging time before declaring a route invalid ("16") in the routing table
- HOLDDOWN (180 seconds)
- After a route has been invalided, how long a router will wait before accepting an update with better metric
- FLUSH (240 seconds)
- Time before a non-refreshed routing table entry is removed


## Message Format

| Command | Version | Must be zero |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Address Family Identifier | Must be zero |  |
| IP Address |  |  |
| Must be zero |  |  |
| Must be zero |  |  |
| Metric |  |  |
| Address Family Identifier |  |  |
| IP Address |  |  |
| Must be zero |  |  |
| Must be zero |  |  |
| Metric |  |  |
| $\ldots . .$. |  |  |

Up to 25 route entries

## RIP Messages

- Request (command = 1)
- Ask neighbor to send response containing all or part of the routing table
- Typically used at startup only
- Response (command = 2)
- THE Routing Update
- Typically sent every 30 seconds without explicit request


## Details

- RIP message is sent within UDP payload
- UDP Port 520, both source and destination port
- Maximum message size is 512 bytes
- L2 Broadcast + IP Broadcast
- Because we do not know neighbor router addresses
- On shared media one update is sufficient
- Version = 1
- Address family for IP is 2


## Timer Synchronization

- In case of many routers on a single network
- Processing load might affect update timer
- Routers might get synchronized
- Collisions occur more often
- Therefore either use
- External timer
- Or add a small random time to the update timer ( 30 seconds + RIP_JITTER = 25... 35 seconds)


## RIP Disadvantages

- Big routing traffic overhead
- Contains nearly entire routing table

WAN links (!)

- Slow convergence
- Small network diameter
- No discontiguos subnetting
- Only equal-cost load balancing supported
- (if you are lucky)


## Summary

- First important distance vector implementation (not only for IP)
- Main problem: Count to infinity
- Maximum Hop Count
- Split Horizon
- Poison Reverse
- Hold Down
- Classless, Slow, Simple


## Quiz

- How could slower gateways/links be considered for route calculation
- Wouldn't TCP be more reliable than UDP?
- Does maximum hop-count mean that I can only have 15 net-IDs ?

