


Route Flap Damping in the Wild?!

RIPE 80 - May 2020

**Clemens Mosig, Randy Bush, Cristel Pelsser,
Thomas C. Schmidt, Matthias Wählisch**


Motivation: Flapping routes.

Flaky network interfaces



Motivation: Flapping routes.

Flaky network interfaces




Motivation: Flapping routes.

Flaky network interfaces

Ahhhhhh!

That's it, I'm out!




RFD suppresses flapping routes

Route

10.20.30.0/24

Flap




Damping




Oh wait, what about BGP convergence process?

Flaky network interfaces




Oh wait, what about BGP convergence process?

BGP path hunting




Flaky network interfaces




Oh wait, what about BGP convergence process?

BGP path hunting




Flaky network interfaces



Oh wait, what about BGP convergence process?

BGP path hunting

Flaky network interfaces



One Withdrawal can cause several updates distant in topology and trigger Route Flap Damping.


Route Flap Damping is
controversial!

What is this talk about? Measuring RFD deployment.

1. Route Flap Damping History.
2. How we detect RFD.
3. Which ASs deploy RFD?
4. Which RFD configurations are used?

Is Route Flap Damping
recommended?

RFD originally published in RFC 2439



RFD originally published in RFC 2439

Route Flap Damping Exacerbates Internet Routing Convergence

Zhuoqing Morley Mao
UC Berkeley
zmao@cs.berkeley.edu

Ramesh Govindan
ICSI
ramesh@icsi.berkeley.edu

George Varghese
UC San Diego
varghese@cs.ucsd.edu


Randy H. Katz
UC Berkeley
randy@cs.berkeley.edu

ABSTRACT

Route flap damping is considered to be a widely deployed mechanism for stabilizing the Internet routing system.

1. INTRODUCTION

Routing mechanisms that trade-off route convergence or optimality for increased stability are often described in the routing literature.



RFD originally published in RFC 2439

RIPE-378 recommends disabling
RFD as reaction to Maos' paper.

Route Flap Damping Exacerbates Internet Routing Convergence

Zhuoqing Morley Mao
UC Berkeley
zmao@cs.berkeley.edu

Ramesh Govindan
ICSI
ramesh@icsi.berkeley.edu

George Varghese
UC San Diego
varghese@cs.ucsd.edu


Randy H. Katz
UC Berkeley
randy@cs.berkeley.edu

ABSTRACT

Route flap damping is considered to be a widely deployed mechanism for reducing the impact of route flaps on the Internet routing system.

1. INTRODUCTION

Routing mechanisms that trade-off route convergence or optimality for increased stability are often described in the routing literature.



RFD originally published in RFC 2439

RIPE-378 recommends disabling RFD as reaction to Maos' paper.

Route Flap Damping Exacerbates Internet Routing Convergence

Zhuoqing Morley Mao Ramesh Govindan George Varghese Randy H. Katz
UC Berkeley ICSI UC San Diego UC Berkeley
zmao@cs.berkeley.edu ramesh@icsi.berkeley.edu varghese@cs.ucsd.edu randy@cs.berkeley.edu


ABSTRACT

Route flap damping is considered to be a widely deployed mechanism for reducing the impact of routing changes on the network.

1. INTRODUCTION

Routing mechanisms that trade-off route convergence or optimality for increased stability are often described in the literature. These

Pelsser et al. publish how RFD can be made useful.



RFD originally published in RFC 2439

RIPE-378 recommends disabling RFD as reaction to Maos' paper.

Route Flap Damping Exacerbates Internet Routing Convergence

Zhuoqing Morley Mao Ramesh Govindan George Varghese Randy H. Katz
UC Berkeley ICSI UC San Diego UC Berkeley
zmao@cs.berkeley.edu ramesh@icsi.berkeley.edu varghese@cs.ucsd.edu randy@cs.berkeley.edu

ABSTRACT


Route flap damping is considered to be a widely deployed mechanism for reducing the impact of routing changes on the network.

1. INTRODUCTION

Routing mechanisms that trade-off route convergence or optimality for increased stability are often described in the literature. One

RIPE-580 recommends RFD with adjusted parameters.

Pelsser et al. publish how RFD can be made useful.



RFD originally published in RFC 2439

RIPE-378 recommends disabling RFD as reaction to Maos' paper.

IETF publishes BCP 194 with RFD recommendations

Route Flap Damping Exacerbates Internet Routing Convergence

Zhuoqing Morley Mao
UC Berkeley
zmao@cs.berkeley.edu

Ramesh Govindan
ICSI
ramesh@icsi.berkeley.edu

George Varghese
UC San Diego
varghese@cs.ucsd.edu

Randy H. Katz
UC Berkeley
randy@cs.berkeley.edu

ABSTRACT


Route flap damping is considered to be a widely deployed mechanism for reducing the impact of routing changes on the network.

1. INTRODUCTION

Routing mechanisms that trade-off route convergence or optimality for increased stability are often described in the literature. One

RIPE-580 recommends RFD with adjusted parameters.

Pelsser et al. publish how RFD can be made useful.



RFD originally published in RFC 2439

RIPE-378 recommends disabling RFD as reaction to Maos' paper.

IETF publishes BCP 194 with RFD recommendations

We are measuring deployment of Route Flap Damping.

Route Flap Damping Exacerbates Internet Routing Convergence

Zhuoqing Morley Mao
UC Berkeley
zmao@cs.berkeley.edu

Ramesh Govindan
ICSI
ramesh@icsi.berkeley.edu

George Varghese
UC San Diego
varghese@cs.ucsd.edu

Randy H. Katz
UC Berkeley
randy@cs.berkeley.edu

ABSTRACT


Route flap damping is considered to be a widely deployed mechanism for reducing the impact of route flaps on the Internet routing system.

1. INTRODUCTION

Routing mechanisms that trade-off route convergence or optimality for increased stability are often described in the literature. One

with adjusted parameters.

Pelsser et al. publish how RFD can be made useful.



Why should you care about RFD deployment?

Many **different recommendations** in the past.

Different configurations may lead to conflicting goals.

Deprecated default **parameters affect Internet reachability.**


Especially in today's rich topology.

RFD **impacts** passive and active BGP **measurements.**


Current results on BGP Update noise may be an underestimation.

Let us measure deployment of RFD.

How does Route Flap Damping work?




How does Route Flap Damping work? AIMD Principle.




How does Route Flap Damping work? Start.


Damping starts




How does Route Flap Damping work? Wait.



How does Route Flap Damping work? Release.




BGP Beacons with different frequencies



Details see <https://rfd.rg.net/beacons.html>

Sending Burst and Breaks



BGP Update Bursts TRIGGER RFD somewhere on the Internet

Breaks RESET the PENALTY for our prefixes in routers to 0.

RFD causes a very recognizable pattern.


View from a Vantage Point

Our prefixes are damped during the Burst (Blue) and re-advertised during the Break (White).

Japan/AS58361
147.28.32.0/24 : 5 min, burst lasting 2h

VP: 137.39.3.55
ASN: 701
VP upstream: 701<2497<58361


147.28.32.0/24



Seattle/AS3130
147.28.36.0/24 : 5 min, burst lasting 2h



VP: 137.39.3.55
ASN: 701
VP upstream: 701<2914<3130

147.28.36.0/24



View from a Vantage Point

Our prefixes are damped during the Burst (Blue) and re-advertised during the Break (White).




View from a Vantage Point

Our prefixes are damped during the Burst (Blue) and re-advertised during the Break (White).

Japan/AS58361
147.28.32.0/24 : 5 min, burst lasting 2h


VP: 137.39.3.55
ASN: 701
VP upstream: 701<2497<58361



NO Route Flap Damping

Seattle/AS3130
147.28.36.0/24 : 5 min, burst lasting 2h

VP: 137.39.3.55
ASN: 701
VP upstream: 701<2914<3130




View from a Vantage Point

Our prefixes are damped during the Burst (Blue) and re-advertised during the Break (White).

Japan/AS58361
147.28.32.0/24 : 5 min, burst lasting 2h

VP: 137.39.3.55
ASN: 701
VP upstream: 701<2497<58361


147.28.32.0/24



Seattle/AS3130
147.28.36.0/24 : 5 min, burst lasting 2h

VP: 137.39.3.55
ASN: 701
VP upstream: 701<2914<3130

147.28.36.0/24



Signal Stops


View from a Vantage Point

Our prefixes are damped during the Burst (Blue) and re-advertised during the Break (White).

Japan/AS58361
147.28.32.0/24 : 5 min, burst lasting 2h

VP: 137.39.3.55
ASN: 701
VP upstream: 701<2497<58361



147.28.32.0/24



Seattle/AS3130
147.28.36.0/24 : 5 min, burst lasting 2h

VP: 137.39.3.55
ASN: 701
VP upstream: 701<2914<3130


147.28.36.0/24




Re-advertisement

View from a Vantage Point

Our prefixes are damped during the Burst (Blue) and re-advertised during the Break (White).




NO Route Flap Damping



Route Flap Damping


Utopian Solution

With this setup we are able to tell whether this border router uses RFD.



Utopian Solution

With this setup we are able to tell whether this border router uses RFD.



There are 60,000 ASs on the Internet.
We cannot setup this many Beacons and VPs! :(

We sent Beacons from 7 different locations.

Locations of our BGP Beacons

Bangkok, TH

Johannesburg, ZA

København, DK

München, DE

São Paulo, BR

Seattle, US

Tokyo, JP



Locations of our BGP Beacons

Bangkok, TH

Johannesburg, ZA



Many thanks to the operators who host our Beacons :)!

São Paulo, BR

Seattle, US

Tokyo, JP

We analyze updates from route collectors by Isolario, RIPE RIS, and Routeviews.



Challenges

- 1) If we find the Route Flap Damping pattern at some vantage points, **the damper could be anywhere on the AS path** between the vantage point and the Beacon.
- 2) Some ASs use **Route Flap Damping selectively** on a subset of neighbors.
- 3) BGP is an excellent **information hiding protocol**.

We have developed a **heuristic** to determine which AS is using Route Flap Damping on the Internet.

Our heuristic is based on three principles

1: Signal Ratio

Relative occurrences of an AS on a path showing Route Flap Damping signal.

2: Alternative Paths

Damped routes are withdrawn.
Neighboring AS may announce alternative paths to vantage point.


3: Update Distribution

On average, damping ASs should send fewer updates towards the end of the burst.

How many ASs are damping?

Small ISPs as well as **Tier 1 providers** such as Telia utilize Route Flap Damping.

At least **8% of 610 measured ASs** are using Route Flap Damping.



Which RFD parameters are deployed?

Most ASs use **deprecated** vendor
default configurations.

This could be you!

Some ASs report usage of RFD in whois records.

Most ASs are referencing RIPE-229, which is the
(outdated) recommendation from 2001.

```
$ whois AS...
```

```
-----  
remarks:
```

```
remarks:    Applied Route Flap Damping Policy conformant to RIPE-229
```

```
remarks:
```

```
remarks:  
-----
```

Validating Results

To validate our findings we contacted all identified RFD ASs.

We have **received replies from 27 ASs** and we have 1 false positive. Most ASs are using vendor default parameters!

Expectation

vs.

Reality

- The networking community thinks **RFD is rarely used**
- **IETF + RIPE recommendation** are used in practise

- **RFD is not uncommon** - multiple Tier 1 providers use RFD
- Most ASs use deprecated default **values from 2001**

Lessons learned

RFD is used on the Internet.

Tier1 provider as well as small ISPs
deploy RFD.

Most vendors provide deprecated,
harmful default configurations. Most
ASs use them.

Recommendations to you!

Thank you!

1. Check the **configurations of your routers** whether you have unpurposely enabled RFD.
2. Check whether your **whois entries** are up to date.
3. Consider using **recommended parameters** (adjusting suppress-threshold) or disabling RFD.

See <https://www.ripe.net/publications/docs/ripe-580>

You do want to help improving our results?

Give feedback on our results!

Confirm our observations, send us your RFD configuration ;) ...

<https://rfd.rg.net> | **clemens.mosig@fu-berlin.de**