Suppressing BGP Zombies with Route Status Transparency

Yosef Edery Anahory¹, Justin Furuness², Jie Kong², Nicholas Scaglione², Hemi Leibowitz³, Amir Herzberg², Bing Wang², Yossi Gilad¹

> ¹Hebrew University of Jerusalem ²University of Connecticut ³College of Management Academic Studies

Border Gateway Protocol (BGP)



Border Gateway Protocol (BGP)

costumer -



Border Gateway Protocol (BGP)

costumer _



4

Explicit BGP Withdrawals

costumer -



Withdrawal Suppression: BGP zombies/stuck routes

costumer



BGP Withdrawal Suppression with Implicit Withdrawal

costumer -



Zombie Routes - Impact on the Internet

> Suboptimal routing decisions

> Network instability

> Packet loss due to routing loops

Zombie Routes - Impact on the Internet

> Suboptimal routing decisions

> Network instability

> Packet loss due to routing loops

Zombie Routes - Impact on the Internet (Suboptimal Routing)



costumer _

Zombie Routes - Impact on the Internet (Suboptimal Routes)



Route Status Transparency (RoST) - This work

- 1. Periodically send to a *repository* status of routes announced
- 2. Validate own active routes by retrieving routes status of other ASes from the *repository*



Information exchanged with the repository can be authenticated using RPKI certificates.

RoST Synchronization

> Determine whether repository data or BGP update is more recent



RoST uses a *counter* in the BGP message indicating at what "time" the message was sent

Dealing with Frequent Route Changes

An IP route can change ~2M times/day (e.g route flapping)

> Periodically send <u>batch</u> of delta <u>path</u> changes to the repository



costumer ____















RoST Security - Dealing with malicious faults

- Malicious repository: RoST uses RPKI certificates (~55% of ASes have one)
- \succ RoST uses this certificate to:
 - Sign route status updates uploads using it's private key
 - Repository and AS's validate data using the public key
- Malicious ASes: To prevent path manipulation and withdrawal suppressions use RoST with BGP-iSec (recently proposed)





RoST Security - Selective Route Distribution

An AS does not need all routes (potentially millions for each interface; ~4 TB)

RoST approach:

- > Publisher generates a Merkle root for all its exported routes at each batch
- Repository provides Merkle proofs for required subsets ensuring integrity with minimal data transfer



RoST Benefits Under Partial Adoption



RoST Benefits Under Partial Adoption

Simulated BGP route selection over CAIDA's AS internet topology.

Scenario:

- 1. The origin AS announces a prefix and later withdraws it
- 2. A Tier-1 AS fails to propagate the withdrawal (*zombie route*)



Partial RoST Adoption (%)

Metric	Overhead
Storage (per AS)	Up to 100 MiB
Storage (repository total)	Up to 8 TiB
Bandwidth (per AS, 5 min updates)	Less than 100 Kbps

RoST Compatibility with Existing Routers

- > Upgrading all BGP routers (hardware/software) is expensive
- > External agent implements RoST and communicates with routers via API





- *Problem*: BGP withdrawal suppression creates zombie routes (suboptimal routing, instability, possible loops)
- Solution (RoST): ASes upload and retrieve routes status from/to a repository
- > *Security*: Information can be signed using RPKI certificates
- > *Benefits*: Works well in partial adoption and it can be easily deployed

Zombie Routes - Impact on the Internet (Routing Loops)



Zombie Routes - Impact on the Internet (Routing Loops)



Zombie Routes - Impact on the Internet (Routing Loops)

