# Distance vector protocols 

## Distance Vector routing principles

Routing loops and countermeasures to loops
Bellman-Ford algorithm
RIP, RIP-2

## Distance Vector Routing Principles

## RIP - Routing Information Protocol is a basic protocol for interior routing

- RIP is a distance vector protocol
- Based on the Bellman-Ford algorithm
- The routing table contains information about other known nodes
- link (interface) identifier
- distance (cost) in hops

| E to | Link | Distance |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| E | - | 0 |
| $B$ | 4 | 1 |
| A | 4 | 2 |
| D | 6 | 1 |
| C | 5 | 1 |

- The nodes periodically send distance vectors based on the routing tables on all their links
- The nodes update their routing table with received distance vectors


## Let us study the principles of DV protocols

Example network with nodes A, B, C, D, E and links $1,2,3,4,5,6$.

Initial state: Nodes know their own addresses
 and interfaces, nothing more.

Node A creates its routing table:

| From node A to ... | Link | Distance |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | - (local) | 0 |

The corresponding distance vector (DV) is: $\mathrm{A}=0$

## Generation of routing tables starts when all routers send their DVs on all interfaces

Let's look at reception in Node B. First the table of B is:


| From node B to ... | Link | Distance |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| B | - | 0 |

1. B receives the distance vector $\mathrm{A}=0$
2. B increments the $\boldsymbol{D} \boldsymbol{V}$ with $+\boldsymbol{1} \Rightarrow \mathrm{A}=1$
3. B looks for the result in its routing table, no match
4. B adds the result to its RT, the result is

| From node B to ... | Link | Distance |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| B | - | 0 |
| A | 1 | 1 |

5. B generates its distance vector $\mathrm{B}=0, \mathrm{~A}=1$

## B creates its own DV and sends it to all neighbors

| A to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | - | 0 |
| B | 1 | 1 |

$A=2>A=0$


| C to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | - | 0 |
| B | 2 | 1 |
| A | 2 | 2 |


| E to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E | - | 0 |
| B | 4 | 1 |
| A | 4 | 2 |

## D sends its distance vector to all neighbors

| A to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | - | 0 |
| B | 1 | 1 |
| D | 3 | 1 |



| E to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E | - | 0 |
| B | 4 | 1 |
| A | 4 | 2 |
| D | 6 | 1 |

$\mathrm{A}=2=\mathrm{A}=2 \Rightarrow$ no change

## The nodes whose RT changed create DVs and send them to neighbors



## Again the changes are sent ...



## Processing of received distance vectors



Note: this is simplified, shows only the principle!

## A link breaks...

## A round of updates starts on link failure

A gives an infinite distance to the nodes reached through link 1

| A to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | - | 0 |
| B | 1 | Inf. |
| D | 3 | 1 |
| C | 1 | Inf. |
| E | 1 | Inf. |


| B to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | - | 0 |
| $A$ | 1 | Inf. |
| D | 1 | Inf. |
| C | 2 | 1 |
| E | 4 | 1 |



## $\mathrm{D}, \mathrm{E}$ and C update their routing tables

$$
\mathrm{B}=0, \mathrm{~A}=\mathrm{inf}, \mathrm{D}=\mathrm{inf}, \mathrm{C}=1, \mathrm{E}=1
$$

$$
\mathrm{A}=0, \mathrm{~B}=\mathrm{inf}, \mathrm{D}=1, \mathrm{C}=\mathrm{inf}, \mathrm{E}=\mathrm{inf}
$$



$$
\mathrm{A}=1, \mathrm{~B}=\mathrm{inf}, \mathrm{D}=2, \mathrm{C}=\mathrm{inf}, \mathrm{E}=\mathrm{inf}
$$



| C to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | - | 0 |
| $B$ | 2 | 1 |
| $A$ | 2 | Inf. |
| $E$ | 5 | 1 |
| $D$ | 5 | 2 |


| D to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | - | 0 |
| $A$ | 3 | 1 |
| B | 3 | Inf. |
| E | 6 | 1 |
| $C$ | 6 | 2 |


| E to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E | - | 0 |
| B | 4 | 1 |
| A | 4 | Inf. |
| D | 6 | 1 |
| C | 5 | 1 |

## D, C, E generate their distance vectors...

| A to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | - | 0 |
| B | 1 | Inf. |
| D | 3 | 1 |
| C | 3 | 3 |
| E | 3 | 2 |


| B to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | - | 0 |
| A | 1 | Inf. |
| D | 4 | 2 |
| C | 2 | 1 |
| E | 4 | 1 |

$$
\mathrm{D}=0, \mathrm{~A}=1, \mathrm{~B}=\mathrm{inf}, \mathrm{E}=1, \mathrm{C}=2
$$

$$
\text { D } \leftrightarrows \underset{6}{\longleftrightarrow} \text { E } \mathrm{E}=0, \mathrm{~B}=1, \mathrm{~A}=\mathrm{inf}, \mathrm{D}=1, \mathrm{C}=1
$$

| D to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | - | 0 |
| A | 3 | 1 |
| B | 6 | 2 |
| E | 6 | 1 |
| C | 6 | 2 |


| E to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E | - | 0 |
| B | 4 | 1 |
| A | 6 | 2 |
| D | 6 | 1 |
| C | 5 | 1 |

## A, B, D, E generate their distance vectors

| A to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | - | 0 |
| B | 3 | 3 |
| D | 3 | 1 |
| C | 3 | 3 |
| E | 3 | 2 |


| B to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | - | 0 |
| A | 4 | 3 |
| D | 4 | 2 |
| C | 2 | 1 |
| E | 4 | 1 |


| C to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | - | 0 |
| $B$ | 2 | 1 |
| $A$ | 5 | 3 |
| E | 5 | 1 |
| $D$ | 5 | 2 |



The result is that all nodes are able to communicate with all other nodes again.

## Routing loops



## The DV-protocol may create a transient routing loop



Let's assume that cost of link 5 is 8 . A stable initial state for routes to C would be:

| $\mathbf{x}$ to C | Link <br> from $\mathbf{x}$ | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}$ | 1 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{~B} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}$ | 2 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}$ | - | 0 |
| $\mathrm{D} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}$ | 3 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{E} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}$ | 4 | 2 |

## Link 2 fails



## A and E send their distance vectors



Distance vectors sent by C do not change anything because of high link cost

## A sends a new distance vector



## A sends a new distance vector



## A sends a new distance vector



## E sends a new distance vector



| x to C | Link <br> from $\mathbf{x}$ | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}$ | 1 | 10 |
| $\mathrm{~B} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}$ | 4 | 9 |
| $\mathrm{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}$ | - | 0 |
| $\mathrm{D} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}$ | 6 | 9 |
| $\mathrm{E} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}$ | 5 | 8 |

## B send its DV but the tables are already OK



| $\mathbf{x}$ to C | Link <br> from $\mathbf{x}$ | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}$ | 1 | 10 |
| $\mathrm{~B} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}$ | 4 | 9 |
| $\mathrm{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}$ | - | 0 |
| $\mathrm{D} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}$ | 6 | 9 |
| $\mathrm{E} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}$ | 5 | 8 |

- Each update round increased the costs by 2
- The process progresses in a random order, because it is genuinely parallel in nature.
- During the process, the state of the network is bad. DV-packets may be lost due to the overload created by bouncing user messages


## Counting to infinity occurs when failures break the network to isolated islands (1)

- Link 1 is broken, and the network has recovered.
- All link costs = 1

| A to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | 3 | 1 |
| A | - | 0 |
| B | 3 | 3 |
| E | 3 | 2 |
| C | 3 | 3 |



| D to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | - | 0 |
| A | 3 | 1 |
| B | 6 | 2 |
| E | 6 | 1 |
| C | 6 | 2 |

## Counting to infinity occurs when failures break the network to isolated islands (2)

- Also link 6 breaks.
- D updates its routing table but has not yet sent its

| A to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | 3 | 1 |
| A | - | 0 |
| B | 3 | 3 |
| E | 3 | 2 |
| C | 3 | 3 |

 distance vector.

| D to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | - | 0 |
| $A$ | 3 | 1 |
| $B$ | 6 | Inf. |
| E | 6 | Inf. |
| $C$ | 6 | Inf. |

## Counting to infinity occurs when failures break the network to isolated islands (3)

- A sends its distance vector first:
$\mathrm{A}=0, \mathrm{~B}=3, \mathrm{D}=1, \mathrm{C}=3, \mathrm{E}=2$

| A to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | 3 | 1 |
| $A$ | - | 0 |
| $B$ | 3 | 3 |
| E | 3 | 2 |
| $C$ | 3 | 3 |



- D adds the information sent by A into its routing table.

| D to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | - | 0 |
| A | 3 | 1 |
| B | 3 | 4 |
| E | 3 | 3 |
| C | 3 | 4 |

## Counting to infinity occurs when failures break the network to isolated islands (4)

- The result is a loop Costs are incremented by 2 on each round.
- We need to define

| A to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | 3 | 1 |
| A | - | 0 |
| B | 3 | 5 |
| E | 3 | 4 |
| C | 3 | 5 |

 infinity as a cost greater than any normal route cost.

| D to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | - | 0 |
| A | 3 | 1 |
| B | 3 | 4 |
| E | 3 | 3 |
| C | 3 | 4 |

## The first method to avoid loops is to send less information

The split horizon rule:
If node A sends to node X through node B , it does not make sense for B to try to reach X through A
$\Rightarrow$ A should not advertise to B its short distance to X
Implementation choices:

1. Split horizon

- A does not advertise its distance to X towards B at all
$\Rightarrow$ the loop of previous example can not occur

2. Split horizon with poisonous reverse

- A advertises to B: X=inf.
$\Rightarrow$. two node loops are killed immediately


## Split horizon example

| A to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | 3 | 1 |
| A | - | 0 |
| D | 3 | 2 |
| C | 1 | 1 |



- Normally:
- A sends: $\mathrm{A}=0, \mathrm{~B}=1, \mathrm{C}=1, \mathrm{D}=2$
- Split horizon:
- A sends: $\mathrm{A}=0, \mathrm{C}=1$
- Split horizon with poisonous reverse:
- A sends: $A=0, B=i n f, C=1, D=i n f$,

Note that A sends
different DVs on link 1

## Three-node loops are still possible (1)

- Link 1 is broken, and the network has recovered.
- All link costs = 1


| $x$ to $D$ | Link <br> from $x$ | Distance |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{B} \rightarrow \mathrm{D}$ | 4 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{D}$ | 5 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{E} \rightarrow \mathrm{D}$ | 6 | 1 |

## Three-node loops are still possible (2)

- Also link 6 fails.
- E sends its distance vector to $B$ and $C$ $\mathrm{E}=0, \mathrm{~B}=1, \mathrm{~A}=\mathrm{inf}, \mathrm{D}=\mathrm{inf}, \mathrm{C}=1$


| $x$ to $D$ | Link <br> from $\mathbf{x}$ | Distance |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{B} \rightarrow \mathrm{D}$ | 4 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{D}$ | 5 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{E} \rightarrow \mathrm{D}$ | 6 | Inf. |

## Three-node loops are still possible (3)

- Also link 6 fails.
- E sends its distance vector to $B$ and $C$ $\mathrm{E}=0, \mathrm{~B}=1, \mathrm{~A}=\mathrm{inf}, \mathrm{D}=\mathrm{inf}, \mathrm{C}=1$

- ... But the DV sent to C is lost

| $x$ to $D$ | Link <br> from $\mathbf{x}$ | Distance |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{B} \rightarrow \mathrm{D}$ | 4 | Inf. |
| $\mathrm{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{D}$ | 5 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{E} \rightarrow \mathrm{D}$ | 6 | Inf. |

## Three-node loops are still possible (4)

- Now C sends its poisoned DV


| B to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | - | 0 |
| A | 2 | 4 |
| D | 2 | 3 |
| C | 2 | 1 |
| E | 4 | 1 |


| E to | Link | Distance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | 4 | 1 |
| $A$ | 6 | Inf. |
| D | 6 | Inf. |
| C | 5 | 1 |
| E | - | 0 |

## Three-node loops are still possible (5)

- B generates its poisoned distance vectors
- The three node loop is ready
- On link 5 cost=4 is advertised. C's knowledge about the distance to D grows ...
- Routes to D do not change except that the costs keep growing, nodes count to infinity.This finally breaks the loop.



## When should a DV-protocol advertise?

Time of advertisement is a compromise:

+ immediate delivery of changed info
+ recovery from packet loss
+ need to monitor the neighbors
- sending all changes at the same time
- traffic load created by the protocol

```
+ = Faster
\(\Theta=\) Slower
```


## The second method to avoid loops is to use triggered updates

- Entries in the routing tables have refresh and obsolescence timeouts.
- RIP advertises
- when the refresh timer expires, and
- when a change occurs in an entry (=triggered update).
- Triggered updates reduce the probability of loops
- Loops are still possible, e.g. because of packet loss
- Triggered updates speed up counting to infinity


## The Bellman-Ford algorithm

## Bellman-Ford algorithm (1)

- DV-protocols are based on the Bellman-Ford algorithm
- Centralized version:
- Let $N$ be the number of nodes and $M$ the number of links.
- $L$ is the link table with $M$ rows, $L[l] \cdot m \quad$ - link cost
$L[l] . s \quad$ - link source
$L[l] . d \quad-$ link destination
- $D$ is $N \times N$ matrix, such that $D[i, j]$ is the distance from $i$ to $j$
- $H$ on $N \times N$ matrix, such that $H[i, j]$ is the link that $i$ uses to send to $j$


Both directions are presented separately in the link table!

A column $\equiv \mathrm{DV}$ of the corresponding node

## Bellman-Ford algorithm (2)

- Initialized distance and link matrices


Distance matrix D


Link matrix H

From i to $j$

## Bellman-Ford algorithm (3)

1. Initialization: (previous slide)

If $i=j$, then $\mathrm{D}[i, j]=0$, else $\mathrm{D}[i, j]=\inf$.
Initialize $\forall \mathrm{H}[i, j]=-1$.
2. $\forall$ links $l$ and $\forall$ destinations $k$ :
i. $\quad$ set $i=\mathrm{L}[l] . \mathrm{s}, j=\mathrm{L}[l] . \mathrm{d}$
ii. calculate $d=\mathrm{L}[l] . m+\mathrm{D}[j, k]$
iii. if $d<\mathrm{D}[i, k]$, set $\mathrm{D}[i, k]=d ; \mathrm{H}[i, k]=l$.
4. If at least one $\mathrm{D}[i, k]$ changed, go to step 2 , else stop.

## Bellman-Ford algorithm (4)

- First in D-matrix appear one hop link distances, then two hop link distances, etc.
- Number of steps $\leq \mathrm{N}$
- Complexity: $\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{M} \cdot \mathrm{N}^{2}\right)$
- Complexity of the distributed version: $\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{M} \cdot \mathrm{N})$


## RIP protocol

## RIP-protocol properties (1)

- Simple protocol. Used before standardization.
- RIP version 1
- RFC 1058 in 1988
- RIP is used inside an autonomous system
- Interior routing protocol
- RIP works both on shared media (Ethernet) and in point-to-point networks.
- RIP runs on top of UDP (port 520) and IP.


## RIP-protocol properties (2)

- An entry in the routing table represents a network, a subnetwork or a host:
- <netid,0,0>
represents a network
- <netid,subnetid,0>
represents a sub-network
- <netid,subnetid,host> represents a host (used only in exceptional cases)
- <0.0.0.0> represents a route out from the autonomous system
- The mask must be manually configured.
- Sub-network entries are aggregated to a network entry on interfaces belonging to another network.


## RIP-protocol properties (3)

- Distance $=$ hop count $=$ number of links on a path (route).
- No other metrics
- Distance 16 = infinite.
- RIP advertises once in 30s.
- If an entry is 180 s old $\Rightarrow$ distance is set to infinite
- Advertisements must be randomized to avoid bursts of RIP updates.
- RIP also sends 1-5 s after an update (triggered updates).
- RIP uses poisoned vectors.


## RIP message format

|  | 32 bits |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8 bits 8 bits |  | 16 bits |  |
|  | Command | Version | Must be zero |  |
|  | Address fam | fier | Must be zero |  |
|  | IP address |  |  | N |
|  | Must be zero |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\square}$ |
|  | Must be zero |  |  | 9 |
|  | Metric |  |  | E. |

## RIP routing table

A routing table entry contains

- Destination IP address (network)
- Distance to destination
- Next hop IP address
- "Recently updated" flag
- Several timers (refresh, obsolescence...)


## Routing table example

- Example Kernel routing table

```
# netstat -nr
Kernel routing table
```

| Destination | Gateway | Genmask | Flags Metric Ref Use | Iface |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 127.0 .0 .1 | $*$ | 255.255 .255 .255 | UH | 1 | 0 | 2130 | lo0 |
| 191.72 .1 .0 | $*$ | 255.255 .255 .0 | U | 1 | 0 | 3070 | eth0 |
| 191.72 .2 .0 | 191.72 .1 .1 | 255.255 .255 .0 | UG | 2 | 0 | 1236 | eth0 |
| 191.72 .3 .0 | 191.72 .1 .2 | 255.255 .255 .0 | UG | 2 | 0 | 3212 | eth0 |

## Processing of Received Distance Vectors



Note: this is simplified, shows only the principle!

## RIP response messages

- Distance vectors are sent in response messages
- Periodic updates (30 seconds period)
- All routing table entries
- Different DV on different links because of poisoned vectors
- More than 25 entries $\Rightarrow$ several messages
- Triggered updates after changes
- Contains changed entries
- 1-5 seconds delay, so that the message contains all updates that are related to the same change
- Destinations with infinite distance can be omitted if the next hop is same as before.


## RIP request messages

- The router can request routing tables from its neighbors at startup
- Complete list
- Response similar to normal update (+ poisoned vectors)
- Partial routing table
- For debugging
- No poisoned vectors


## Silent nodes

- When only RIP was used, hosts could listen to routing traffic and maintain their own routing tables
- Which router is closest to the destination?
- Which link, if several available?
- These where "silent nodes", that only listened to routing traffic without sending
- Nowadays there are too many routing protocols
- RIP-2, OSPF, IGRP, ...


## RIP version 2

## RIP version 2

- RFC-1388 $(1387,1389)$
- Why?
- Simple and lightweight alternative to OSPF and IS-IS
- RIP-2 is an update that is partially interoperable with RIP-1
- A RIP-1 router understands some of what a RIP-2 router is saying.
- Improvements
- Authentication
- Support for CIDR
- Next hop -field
- Subnet mask
- Support for external routes
- Updates with multicast


## RIP version 2 - messages



## Routing from one sub-net to another (1)

- In RIP-1 the subnet mask is not known outside the subnet, only network-id is sent in an advertisement out from a subnet
$\Rightarrow$ A host and a subnet can not be distinguished
$\Rightarrow$ All subnets must be interconnected with all other subnets and exterior traffic is received in the nearest router independent of the final destination inside our network
- RIP-2 corrects the situation by advertising both the subnet and the subnet mask
- Masks of different length within a network
- CIDR
- RIP-1 does not understand


## Routing from one sub-net to another (2)



## Routing domain and next hop



Next hop $\Rightarrow \mathrm{D}$ advertises in X : the distance to F is f and the next hop is E !

## Support for local multicast

- RIP-1 broadcasts advertisements to all addresses on the wire
- Hosts must examine all broadcast packets
- RIP-2 uses a multicast address for advertisements
- 224.0.0.9 (all RIP-2 routers)
- No real multicast support needed, since packets are only sent on the local network
- Compatibility problems between RIP-1 and RIP-2


## Acknowledged updates (extension)

- When RIP is used on ISDN links a new call is established per 30s
$\Rightarrow$ Expensive.
- Slow network $\Rightarrow$ queue length are restricted.
- RIP sends its DVs 25 entries/message in a row $\Rightarrow$ RIP messages may be lost.
- A correction proposal: ack all DVs: no periodic updates
$\Rightarrow$ If there are no RIP message: assume that neighbor is alive and reachable
$\Rightarrow$ Info on all alternative routes is stored.


## The synchronization problem

- Routers have a spontaneous tendency to synchronize their send times. This increases the probability of losses in the net.
- Reason: send interval = constant + time of message packing + processing time of messages that are in the queue.
- Therefore, send instants are randomized between 15 s ... 45s.

