

**A note about 3rd party bombing in Mobile IPv6  
draft-dupont-mipv6-3bombing-05.txt**

Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, each author represents that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which he or she is aware have been or will be disclosed, and any of which he or she becomes aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [Section 6 of BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt>.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

This Internet-Draft will expire on July 26, 2007.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2007).

Abstract

Mobile IPv6 introduces some new kinds of reflection attacks, as known as 3rd party bombing. This memo analyses these attacks and makes some recommendations: the goal is to avoid anything, including in new optimized mechanisms, which can make the life of bad guys easier.

**1. Introduction**

The standard reflection attack is based on the "bombing" of a 3rd

party, the victim, by a reflector:

- the attacker A sends requests to the reflector R using the address of the victim V as the source address of requests
- the reflector R sends (large) answers to V.

In the mobile IPv6 [\[RFC3775\]](#) context, the attacker is a mobile node, the reflector a correspondent node (a common one or the home agent).

There are two basic defenses against the reflection attack:

- ingress filtering [\[BCP38\]](#) (improved in [\[BCP84\]](#)), i.e., checking that source addresses are topologically correct
- all protocols which needs some kind of positive feedback from peers, as TCP or RTP/RTCP.

As a correspondent node sees two addresses (a transient care-of address and the home address) per mobile node, it is clear that mobile IPv6 can add new opportunities to reflection attacks...

## **2. Analysis**

There are three different kinds of reflection attacks using mobile IPv6 mechanisms, one for each mode of operation: triangular routing, bidirectional tunneling and routing optimization.

Note that the attack is always from the mobile node itself, i.e., no intermediate node can successfully modify packets in transit to launch an attack as in the transient pseudo-nat attack [\[ID.transient-pseudonat\]](#).

At the opposite, a local / visited network access control with an AAA architecture [\[ID.aaa-mipv6-requirements\]](#) or an equivalent can give some real guarantees about a care-of address, i.e., something better than just trusting mobile nodes.

The basic argument of this document is the ingress filtering is the right defense against reflection attacks and similar threats like address stealing and network bombing.

### **2.1. Triangular routing**

In this case the mobile node sends packets carrying in the home address option a fake home address. The correspondent node sends back traffic to this home address. In order to avoid a very dangerous attack (bombing traffic with no trace of the attacker) the mobile IPv6 specifications [\[RFC3775\]](#) mandates the verification of home address options:

- when a packet with a home address option matches a binding cache entry it is accepted, but routing optimization is active: this case will be analyzed further.

Dupont

Expires July 26, 2007

[Page 2]

- when a proper IPsec security association exists, but in this case the home address is proven.
- So there is no reflection attack issue with triangular routing.

## **2.2. Bidirectional tunneling**

This mode is the basic one: all traffic from or to the mobile node goes through a bidirectional tunnel between the mobile node and its home agent.

In order to launch a reflection attack the mobile node has to put a fake care-of address in binding updates sent to its home agent (home registrations). The home agent does not perform a routing routability check, i.e., it does not check if the mobile node is really reachable at its current care-of address. This point was discussed (issue 34 [[ISSUE34](#)]) by the mobileip working group which decided:

"The above mechanisms do not show that the care-of address given in the Binding Update is correct. This opens the possibility for Denial-of-Service attacks against third parties. However, since the mobile node and home agent have a security association, the home agent can always identify an ill-behaving mobile node. This allows the home agent operator to discontinue the mobile node's service, and possibly take further actions based on the business relationship with the mobile node's owner."

Note that the registration of a fake care-of address diverts all the traffic to the mobile node via the home agent and at least 40 octets is added to each packet, so for an attacker this attack is more effective than the next one.

## **2.3. Routing optimization**

The last mode is the routing optimization: binding updates sent by the mobile node create or update binding cache entries on the correspondent node. A routing header of type 2 is added to each packet to the mobile node with its home address, so the extra information uses 24 octets and reveals the home address.

The reflection attack in the routing optimization case uses fake care-of addresses in binding updates sent from the mobile node to the correspondent node. Usually the care-of address is in the source address field of the IPv6 header but it can be, with a different value, in an alternate care-of address option too. So the only security issue can come from this option because a fake care-of address in the IPv6 header is not a different case than a fake source address, i.e., the routing optimization does not modify the basic



reflection attack.

When the return routability procedure is used with an alternate care-of address, it is applied to the right address (issue 5 [[ISSUE5](#)]). When some other mechanism is used, usually a longer term one, either a return routability check must be performed, using a third packet (aka a hand-shake) repeating a cookie from the binding acknowledgment [[ID.mipv6-rrcookie](#)] or binding updates with different care-of addresses in the IPv6 header and in the alternate care-of address option must be refused.

#### **[2.4.](#) Home network bombing**

The last attack uses a fake home address and simulates a "return to the home". Pending traffic is redirected to the the home address and can flood the home network. Further traffic has to be sent from the fake home address so this is the standard reflection attack.

### **[3.](#) Current attacks using fake source addresses**

Reflection attacks are only one kind of attacks based on the use of fake source addresses. Current distributed denials of service (DDoS) use a large number of compromised nodes (BOTs [[Botnets](#)]) and do not take advantage of possible amplification by reflection, and this fact should not change in the future.

### **[4.](#) Conclusion**

We recommend that alternative ways to build security associations to protect signaling between mobile and correspondent nodes do not blindly accept "hidden" care-of addresses. As the goal of these ways is to be more efficient than the return routability procedure, IMHO their specifications must either forbid alternate care-of address options which carry different addresses than source addresses of IPv6 headers or must provide an explicit counter-measure (like [[ID.mipv6-rrcookie](#)]).

We recommend to avoid unnecessary return routability checks because:

- return routability does not give better assurance than ingress filtering: both check if the source is on the returning path.
- return routability is an active device which has a cost in extra messages and delays, ingress filtering is a passive device which can be done at any line speed with hardware support.
- if ingress filtering is not applied, the network is open to any attacks based on fake source addresses, including current DDoS which are (as we get the proof everyday) far more than enough to



kill a target attached as any speed to the network.

## 5. Security Considerations

This goal of this document is to verify that mobile IPv6 mechanisms cannot be misused to make reflection attacks easier. As the return routability procedure [[ID.ro-sec](#)] is not considered by many people as very safe or efficient, some new ways to build security associations to protect mobile IPv6 signaling are likely to appear [[ID.ro-enhance](#)], so they should be carefully designed...

## 6. Acknowledgments

Some persons stressed Wassim Haddad to add some defense against reflection attacks to his optimized mobile IPv6 [[ID.mipv6-omipv6](#)] when this is both unnecessary and of course against the idea of optimization.

Pekka Savola raised our attention about [[BCP84](#)] which improved ingress filtering in multi-homed environments.

## 7. References

### 7.1. Normative References

[RFC3775] Johnson, D., Perkins, C., and J. Arkko, "Mobility Support in IPv6", [RFC 3775](#), June 2004.

### 7.2. Informative References

[BCP38] Ferguson, P. and D. Senie, "Network Ingress Filtering: Defeating Denial of Service Attacks which employ IP Source Address Spoofing", [RFC 2827](#), [BCP 38](#), May 2000.

[BCP84] Baker, F. and P. Savola, "Ingress Filtering for Multihomed Networks", [RFC 3704](#), [BCP 84](#), March 2004.

[Botnets] Kristoff, J., "Presentation at NANOG 32 on botnets", October 2004,  
<<http://www.nanog.org/mtg-0410/kristoff.html>>.

[ID.aaa-mipv6-requirements]

Faccin, S., Le, F., Patil, B., Perkins, C., Dupont, F., Laurent-Maknavicius, M., and J. Bournelle, "Mobile IPv6 Authentication, Authorization, and Accounting





Requirements", [draft-le-aaa-mipv6-requirements-03.txt](#) (work in progress), February 2004.

[ID.mipv6-omipv6]

Haddad, W., Dupont, F., Madour, L., Krishnan, S., and S. Park, "Optimizing Mobile IPv6 (OMIPv6)", [draft-haddad-mipv6-omipv6-01.txt](#) (work in progress), February 2004.

[ID.mipv6-rrcookie]

Dupont, F. and J-M. Combes, "Care-of Address Test for MIPv6 using a State Cookie", [draft-dupont-mipv6-rrcookie-04.txt](#) (work in progress), January 2007.

[ID.ro-enhance]

Arkko, J. and C. Vogt, "A Taxonomy and Analysis of Enhancements to Mobile IPv6 Route Optimization", [draft-irtf-mobopts-ro-enhancements-08.txt](#) (work in progress), May 2006.

[ID.ro-sec]

Nikander, P., Arkko, J., Aura, T., Montenegro, G., and E. Nordmark, "Mobile IP version 6 Route Optimization Security Design Background", [RFC 4225](#), December 2005.

[ID.transient-pseudonat]

Dupont, F. and J-J. Bernard, "Transient pseudo-NAT attacks or how NATs are even more evil than you believed", [draft-dupont-transient-pseudonat-04.txt](#) (work in progress), June 2004.

[ISSUE34] Yegin, A., Arkko, J., and F. Dupont, "MIPv6 issue 34: CoA test also for home registrations? (Rejected, included in draft 18)", May 2004, <<http://users.piuha.net/jarkko/publications/mipv6/issues/issue34.txt>>.

[ISSUE5] Arkko, J., Ed., "MIPv6 issue 5: Alternative-CoA usage rules (Adopted, included in draft 17)", May 2004, <<http://users.piuha.net/jarkko/publications/mipv6/issues/issue5.txt>>.

Dupont

Expires July 26, 2007

[Page 6]

Author's Address

Francis Dupont  
CELAR

Email: Francis.Dupont@fdupont.fr

## Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2007).

This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in [BCP 78](#), and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY, THE IETF TRUST AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

## Intellectual Property

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at <http://www.ietf.org/ipr>.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at [ietf-ipr@ietf.org](mailto:ietf-ipr@ietf.org).

## Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is provided by the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA).

