

# Troubleshooting Flapping BGP Routes (Recursive Routing Failure)

Document ID: 19167

---

## **Introduction**

### **Prerequisites**

Requirements

Components Used

Background Theory

Conventions

### **Problem**

Symptoms

Recursive Routing Failure

What Causes Recursive Routing Failure?

### **Solution**

#### **Route Dampening**

#### **Related Information**

---

## **Introduction**

This document describes how to troubleshoot flapping Border Gateway Protocol (BGP) routes caused by recursive routing failure.

Common symptoms of recursive routing failure in BGP are:

- Constant deletion and reinsertion of BGP routes into the routing table.
- Loss of connectivity towards destinations learned through BGP.

## **Prerequisites**

### **Requirements**


There are no specific requirements for this document.

### **Components Used**

This document is not restricted to specific software and hardware versions.

### **Background Theory**

Refer to this network diagram as you use this document:



Refer to these configurations as you use this document:

| Rtr-A   |
|---|
| <pre> hostname RTR-A ! interface Loopback0  ip address 10.10.10.10 255.255.255.255 ! interface Serial8/0  ip address 192.168.16.1 255.255.255.252 ! router bgp 1   bgp log-neighbor-changes   neighbor 20.20.20.20 remote-as 2   neighbor 20.20.20.20 ebgp-multihop 2   neighbor 20.20.20.20 update-source Loopback0 ! <b>ip route 20.20.20.0 255.255.255.0 192.168.16.2</b> </pre> |

| Rtr-B  |
|--|
| <pre> hostname RTR-B ! interface Loopback0  ip address 20.20.20.20 255.255.255.255 ! interface Ethernet0/0  ip address 172.16.1.1 255.255.255.0 !  interface Serial8/0  ip address 192.168.16.2 255.255.255.252 ! router bgp 2   no synchronization   bgp log-neighbor-changes   network 20.20.20.20 mask 255.255.255.255   network 172.16.1.0 mask 255.255.255.0   neighbor 10.10.10.10 remote-as 1   neighbor 10.10.10.10 ebgp-multihop 2   neighbor 10.10.10.10 update-source Loopback0   no auto-summary ! ip route 10.10.10.0 255.255.255.0 192.168.16.1 ! </pre> |

## Conventions

Refer to Cisco Technical Tips Conventions for more information on document conventions.

## Problem

## Symptoms

These two symptoms are observed with recursive routing failure:

- The continuous flapping of BGP-learned routes in the IP routing table.

Observe the routing table continuously for couple of minutes in order to see the flapping.

```
RTR-A#show ip route
Codes: C - connected, S - static, I - IGRP, R - RIP, M - mobile, B - BGP
       D - EIGRP, EX - EIGRP external, O - OSPF, IA - OSPF inter area
       N1 - OSPF NSSA external type 1, N2 - OSPF NSSA external type 2
       E1 - OSPF external type 1, E2 - OSPF external type 2, E - EGP
       i - IS-IS, L1 - ISIS level-1, L2 - ISIS level-2, ia - ISIS inter are
       * - candidate default, U - per-user static route, o - ODR
       P - periodic downloaded static route

Gateway of last resort is not set

      20.0.0.0/8 is variably subnetted, 2 subnets, 2 masks
B       20.20.20.20/32 [20/0] via 20.20.20.20, 00:00:35
S       20.20.20.0/24 [1/0] via 192.168.16.2
      172.16.0.0/24 is subnetted, 1 subnets
B       172.16.1.0 [20/0] via 20.20.20.20, 00:00:35
      10.0.0.0/32 is subnetted, 1 subnets
C       10.10.10.10 is directly connected, Loopback0
      192.168.16.0/30 is subnetted, 1 subnets
C       192.168.16.0 is directly connected, Serial8/0
```

**Note:** It is helpful to use the **show ip route | include , 00:00** command in order to observe flapping routes when you deal with large routing tables.

After you wait for approximately one minute, the **show ip route** command results change to this:

```
RTR-A#show ip route
[...]

Gateway of last resort is not set

      20.0.0.0/24 is subnetted, 1 subnets
S       20.20.20.0 [1/0] via 192.168.16.2
      10.0.0.0/32 is subnetted, 1 subnets
C       10.10.10.10 is directly connected, Loopback0
      192.168.16.0/30 is subnetted, 1 subnets
C       192.168.16.0 is directly connected, Serial8/0
```

**Note:** The BGP routes are missing in the previous routing table.

- When the BGP routes are present in the routing table, connectivity to those networks fails.

In order to observe this, when the routing table of the Rtr-A has BGP-learned route 172.16.1.0/24 in its routing table, a ping to valid host 172.16.1.1 fails.

```
RTR-A#show ip route 172.16.1.0
```

```
Routing entry for 172.16.1.0/24
  Known via "bgp 1", distance 20, metric 0
  Tag 2, type external
  Last update from 20.20.20.20 00:00:16 ago
  Routing Descriptor Blocks:
  * 20.20.20.20, from 20.20.20.20, 00:00:16 ago
    Route metric is 0, traffic share count is 1
    AS Hops 1
```

```
RTR-A#ping 172.16.1.1
```

```
Type escape sequence to abort.
Sending 5, 100-byte ICMP Echos to 172.16.1.1, timeout is 2 seconds:
.....
Success rate is 0 percent (0/5)
RTR-A#
```

## Recursive Routing Failure

On Rtr-A, observe the route towards the BGP peer 20.20.20.20. The route flaps between the two next hops consistently every minute or so.

```
RTR-A#show ip route 20.20.20.20
Routing entry for 20.20.20.20/32
  Known via "bgp 1", distance 20, metric 0
  Tag 2, type external
  Last update from 20.20.20.20 00:00:35 ago
  Routing Descriptor Blocks:
  * 20.20.20.20, from 20.20.20.20, 00:00:35 ago
    Route metric is 0, traffic share count is 1
    AS Hops 1
```

The route towards the BGP peer IP address is learned through BGP itself; thus it creates a recursive routing failure.

After approximately a minute, the route changes to:

```
RTR-A#show ip route 20.20.20.20
Routing entry for 20.20.20.0/24
  Known via "static", distance 1, metric 0
  Routing Descriptor Blocks:
  * 192.168.16.2
    Route metric is 0, traffic share count is 1
```

## What Causes Recursive Routing Failure?

These steps describe the cause of recursive routing failures:

1. Refer to the configuration of Rtr-A. In this configuration, a static route 20.20.20.0/24 is configured pointing to the directly connected next-hop 192.168.16.2. With this static route, a BGP session with peer Rtr-B 20.20.20.20 is established.
2. Rtr-B announces BGP routes 172.16.1.0/24 and 20.20.20.20/32 to Rtr-A with its loopback IP address 20.20.20.20 as the next-hop.
3. Rtr-A receives BGP routes announced by Rtr-B and tries to install the 20.20.20.20/32. This is more specific than 20.20.20.0/24 which is already configured in Rtr-A as a static route. Because the longest matching route is preferred, 20.20.20.20/32 is preferred over 20.20.20.0/24. Refer to Route Selection in Cisco Routers for more information. The installed route 20.20.20.20/32 has next-hop of 20.20.20.20 (Rtr-B's peering IP address) in the routing table. This leads to recursive routing failure since the route towards 20.20.20.20/32 has a next-hop of itself.

In order to understand the reason behind why recursive routing fails in this particular situation, you need to understand how the routing algorithm works. For any nondirectly-connected route in the routing table whose next hop IP address is not a directly-connected interface of the router, the algorithm looks recursively into the routing table until it finds a directly-connected interface to which it can forward the packets.

In this particular situation, Rtr-A learns a route to the nondirectly-connected network 20.20.20.20/32 with a nondirectly-connected next hop of 20.20.20.20 (itself). The routing algorithm runs into a recursive routing loop failure because it is unable to find any directly-connected interface to which to send packets destined for 20.20.20.20/32.

4. The router detects that this nondirectly-connected route 20.20.20.20/32 has a recursive routing failure and withdraws 20.20.20.20/32 from the routing table. Consequently, all BGP-learned routes with the next hop IP address 20.20.20.20 are also withdrawn from routing table.
5. The whole process repeats from step 1. You can confirm this if you issue the **debug ip routing** command.

**Note:** Before you run any **debug** command, run the **debug** command against an access control list (ACL) for a specific network in order to limit the output of debug. In this example, configure an ACL in order to limit the debug output.

```
RTR-A(config)#access-list 1 permit 20.20.20.20
RTR-A(config)#access-list 1 permit 172.16.1.0
RTR-A(config)#end
```

```
RTR-A#debug ip routing 1
```

```
IP routing debugging is on for access list 1
```

```
00:29:50: RT: add 20.20.20.20/32 via 20.20.20.20, bgp metric [20/0]
00:29:50: RT: add 172.16.1.0/24 via 20.20.20.20, bgp metric [20/0]
00:30:45: RT: recursion error routing 20.20.20.20 - probable routing loop
00:30:45: RT: recursion error routing 20.20.20.20 - probable routing loop
00:30:45: RT: recursion error routing 20.20.20.20 - probable routing loop
00:30:46: RT: recursion error routing 20.20.20.20 - probable routing loop
00:30:46: RT: recursion error routing 20.20.20.20 - probable routing loop
00:30:48: RT: recursion error routing 20.20.20.20 - probable routing loop
00:30:48: RT: recursion error routing 20.20.20.20 - probable routing loop
00:30:50: RT: del 20.20.20.20/32 via 20.20.20.20, bgp metric [20/0]
00:30:50: RT: delete subnet route to 20.20.20.20/32
00:30:50: RT: del 172.16.1.0/24 via 20.20.20.20, bgp metric [20/0]
00:30:50: RT: delete subnet route to 172.16.1.0/24
```

6. If the route recursion fails continuously, then this error message appears:

```
%COMMON_FIB-SP-6-FIB_RECURSION: 10.71.124.25/32 has too many (8) levels of
recursion during setting up switching info
%COMMON_FIB-SP-STDBY-6-FIB_RECURSION: 10.71.124.25/32 has too many (8)
levels of recursion during setting up switching info
```

This is due to the TCP retransmissions occur on MPLS enabled network. If a BGP keepalive message is once failed to be sent to BGP Peer because the transport link is down, the neighbor BGP Peer does not accept any further keepalive packets even though TCP retransmits the failed message through the backup path, and it eventually leads to BGP peer down with holdtime expiration. This issue is seen only when MPLS is configured on Catalyst6500 or Cisco7600. This is discussed in Cisco bug ID CSCsj89544 ( registered customers only) .

## Solution

The solution(s) to this problem are explained in these detail.

Add a specific static route in Rtr-A for the BGP peer IP address (20.20.20.20 in this case).

```
RTR-A#configure terminal
Enter configuration commands, one per line. End with CNTL/Z.
RTR-A(config)#ip route 20.20.20.20 255.255.255.255 192.168.16.2
```

The configuration of a static route for prefix 20.20.20.20/32 ensures that a dynamically-learned BGP route 20.20.20.20/32 does not get installed in the routing table and thus avoids the recursive routing loop situation. Refer to Route Selection in Cisco Routers for more information.

**Note:** When EBGP peers are configured to reach each other with default routes, the BGP neighborhood does not appear. This is done in order to avoid route flapping and routing loops.

A ping to 172.16.1.1 confirms the solution.

```
RTR-A#ping 172.16.1.1

Type escape sequence to abort.
Sending 5, 100-byte ICMP Echos to 172.16.1.1, timeout is 2 seconds:
!!!!
Success rate is 100 percent (5/5), round-trip min/avg/max = 20/24/40 ms
```

## Route Dampening

Route dampening is a BGP feature designed to minimize the propagation of flapping routes across an internetwork. The values the ISP recommended are the defaults on Cisco IOS<sup>®</sup> and you only need to configure this command in order to enable it.

```
router bgp <AS number>
  bgp dampening
```

The **bgp dampening** command sets default values for the dampening parameters such as Halftime= 15 minutes, reuse = 750, Suppress = 2000 and Max Suppress Time= 60. These values are user configurable but Cisco recommends that it remains unchanged.

---

## Related Information

- [What Does the "#%BGP-3-INSUFCHUNKS: Insufficient chunk pools for aspath" Error Message Mean?](#)
- [Why Do BGP Neighbors Toggle Between Idle, Connect, and Active States?](#)
- [BGP Support Page](#)
- [Technical Support & Documentation – Cisco Systems](#)

---

[Contacts & Feedback](#) | [Help](#) | [Site Map](#)

© 2009 – 2010 Cisco Systems, Inc. All rights reserved. [Terms & Conditions](#) | [Privacy Statement](#) | [Cookie Policy](#) | [Trademarks of Cisco Systems, Inc.](#)

---

Updated: Aug 10, 2005

Document ID: 19167

---