

Routing Security: an Oversimplification APNIC / Perth 2006.03.01

Randy Bush <randy@psg.com> Steve Bellovin <smb@cs.columbia.edu>

http://rip.psg.com/~randy/060201.apnic-routesec.pdf

What is Routing Security?

- Defending routers against attacks that are similar to attacks on hosts
- But the unique threat is attackers using routing protocols
 - To divert traffic
 - To alter traffic
- We have some ability to lessen the danger, but not enough!

History of Routing Security

- Radia Perlman dissertation: Network Layer Protocols with Byzantine Robustness, 1988
- Bellovin: Security Problems in the TCP/IP Protocol Suite, 1989
- Work accelerates 1996
- Kent et alia two papers in 2000
- Endless jawing in the IVTF

Why so Little Progress

- The problems are technically very difficult
- Simple routing is already a very complex operational issue
- It is not traditional communications security
- Installed base & transition problem
- Unmotivated vendor\$

Normal Ops Security


- Go to any Routing Ops Security Tutorial
- TCP/MD5 session protection
- ACLs on everything
- ssh, not telnet. no http, ...
- Route filtering (based on IRR),

Want to Ensure

- An ISP/site owns the IP address space it is announcing
- If a router announces a path to X it can really deliver to X
- If X tells me it can get to Y, did Y authorize X to carry its packets?

What is Different Here?


- Well-studied communication and host security issues are buggy code and/or bad protocol design
- Routing is vulnerable with good code and good protocols
- The problem is a dishonest peer
- Hop-by-hop authentication is not sufficient




Expected Path - A->X->Y->B Diverted Path - A->X->Z->Y->B


How does Attacker Do It?

- Routers select lowest cost path toward destination on a hop by hop basis
- Attacker 'owned' router lies about cost
- And we must assume that random routers can be owned






- X does not really know Z's links
- X does not really know Y's links
- They trust each other re costs!



- Validating IP prefix ownership does not help, as Z is not lying about B's owning it
- Using IRR-like peering map does not help, as Z is not lying about who connects to whom



- •B cryptographically signs the message to Y Sb(Y->B=5)
- Y signs messages to X and Z encapsulating B's message Sy(X->Y=10 Sb(Y->B=5)) and Sy(Z->Y=10 Sb(Y->B=5))
- •Z can only sign Sz(X->Z=10 Sy(Z->Y=10 Sb(Y->B=5)))
- •Now X can verify paths and costs
- •Forward path signing solves the 'simple' case

2006.03.02 APNIC RouteSec



- Very crypto-CPU-intensive
 - Use caching
 - Use delayed validation
 - Moore's 'Law' is your friend
- Expense is highest when routing is changing, just when we need validation the most ⁽³⁾

Trust Issues

- How does X know the identity of ISP Y, i.e. trusted relationships?
- How does anyone know B owns the address space it is announcing?
- So there are two classes of trust,
 IP address ownership
 ISP identity

Address Space Ownership

- Luckily, IP space delegation is a natural hierarchy
- IANA signs address allocations to RIRs using IANA certificate
- RIR signs address allocations to ISPs/LIRs using RIR certificate
- ISP/LIR signs allocations to sites using its ISP/LIR certificate

Who Issues the Certs?

- IANA can certify itself
- Who certifies an RIR, IANA?
- Who certifies an ISP/LIR, an RIR or other ISPs in a web of trust?
- Issuing a certificate can be separated from signing that you attest that IP prefix P belongs to ISP A

Public Key Infrastructure

- How are certs distributed?
- Administratively: ftp ...?
- Out-of-band protocol: new cert distribution protocol?
- In-band protocol: yet another extension to BGP?
- Someone will think of how to do it with DNS!

Thanks

 Steve Bellovin, whose ideas and work I liberally stole

NSF via award ANI-0221435

Internet Initiative Japan