



Aggregation (?)

Effect of business practices on
the Internet today

Philip Smith
SANOG 6, Thimphu



BGP Report (gih)

- Data taken from:
 - bgp.potaroo.net/as4637/
- 157000 prefixes total announcements
- 108000 prefixes
 - aggregating including full AS PATH info
 - i.e. including each ASN's traffic engineering



Aggregation/Deaggregation

- 49000 prefixes have no value whatsoever in the Internet Routing Table
 - This view only!
 - They may have value in another view
 - 31% of the Internet Routing table could be discarded with no loss of information



BGP Report (gih)

- 157000 prefixes total announcements
- 108000 prefixes
 - aggregating including full AS PATH info
 - i.e. including each ASN's traffic engineering
- 93000 prefixes
 - aggregating by Origin AS
 - i.e. ignoring each ASN's traffic engineering



Aggregation/Deaggregation

- 15000 prefixes are caused by ISP traffic engineering
 - This view only!
 - They cause 10% of the Internet Routing Table



Simplistic Summary

- Deaggregation is a serious problem again
 - 33% of the Internet Routing Table caused by deaggregation
 - 10% of the Internet Routing Table caused by BGP traffic engineering



Past Solutions: CIDR Report

- CIDR Report started by Tony Bates in 1995
 - Aim was to encourage ISPs to CIDRise as the Internet moved from classful to classless routing
 - Published top 20 ISPs who could do better at aggregating
 - Weekly mailshot was held in high regard across the industry, and its influence was significant
- Growth of commercial Internet and lack of “clue” reduced the influence



Past Solutions: CIDR Police

- Group of well meaning individuals who in their spare time used my Routing Report and the CIDR Report to encourage ISPs to try and aggregate better
- Were most active in 1999-2002
 - Rampant growth of the Internet Routing Table during the boom years



Efforts Today?

- CIDR Report now maintained by Geoff Huston
 - Greatly expanded in scope and available views
 - Web site – www.cidr-report.org
 - Web interface allows any ASN to check on their aggregation effort



Efforts Today?

- And that's all
- CIDR Police have "retired"
 - Harder times, more to do, less time to do it
 - "Charity" is the first to suffer
- No one seems to care about size of Internet Routing Table
 - "Problem solved! Vendors make routers with fast CPUs and large memory"



What's going wrong?

- Internet has bigger reach
 - All countries in the world are connected
 - Has everyone been trained on the requirements of being an Internet Service Provider?
- Education system is **STILL** teaching classful routing 10 years after its obsolescence
 - New engineers are still thinking Class A, Class B and Class C...
 - ...and configure BGP as such



Now?

- RIRs request that address allocations made to ISPs are announced as such
 - Some protest that the RIRs are telling them how to run their networks! ☹️
 - Other people only understand Class As, Class Bs, and Class Cs, so announce their networks as /16s or /24s, rather than aggregates



Commercial Pressures

- ISPs deliberately deaggregating
 - To avoid “DoS attacks” from other ISPs falsely announcing their deaggregated address space
 - Oft used excuse but published evidence of these events?
- Such miscreant behaviour encourages others to do likewise with impunity
 - We should all route /32s and be done with it (!)
 - Routed address space span is 1,383,395,136 /32s
 - Even announcing /24s makes this 5.4 million prefixes



Commercial Pressures

- Network engineers:
 - Paid less (so job rotation is significant)
 - Untrained (training costs money)
 - Have less time (expected to do everything)
 - Participate less in NOGs, if at all
 - Smaller NetEng teams
- Results:
 - Cookbook “knowledge”
 - Mailing list myths and bad/wrong advice
 - Temporary hacks become permanent solutions



Multihoming

- Multihoming is a basic requirement
 - Improves redundancy and operational reliability
 - Commercial service \Rightarrow SLAs + non-stop operation
 - “BGP Traffic Engineering”
- Lack of knowledge on what to do
 - Deaggregation is common solution
- Myths of Multihoming:
 - Big router with lots of memory FALSE
 - Need the full routing table FALSE



Multihoming

- Lack of training on current multihoming solutions for IPv4
- Lack of agreement between experts on how to implement multihoming
 - One size does NOT fit all
- Lack of clear concise documentation on how to multihome
 - Elusive because solutions are often particular to specific situations



What next?

- Suggestions welcome...
- RFC4116 is a good start
- Aim: Aggregation Recommendations for ISPs
 - Spin off would be improved multihoming solutions – maybe even best practice documentation