Internet Engineering Task Force
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Proposed Standard
Expires: 3 December 2021

N. Elkins
Inside Products, Inc.
M. Ackermann
BCBS Michigan
A. Deshpande
NITK, Surathkal
T. Pecorella
A. Rashid
University of Florence

1 June 2021

Encrypted IPv6 Performance and Diagnostic Metrics Version 2 (EPDMv2) Destination Option

draft-elkins-ippm-encrypted-pdmv2-00.txt

Abstract

RFC8250 describes an optional Destination Option (DO) header embedded in each packet to provide sequence numbers and timing information as a basis for measurements. As this data is sent in clear- text, this may create an opportunity for malicious actors to get information for subsequent attacks. This document defines PDMv2 which has a lightweight handshake (registration procedure) and encryption to secure this data. Additional performance metrics which may be of use are also defined.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/.

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."

This Internet-Draft will expire on 3 December 2021.

Copyright Notice

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

1.1. Current Performance and Diagnostic Metrics (PDM)

The current PDM is an IPv6 Destination Options header which provides information based on the metrics like Round-trip delay and Server delay. This information helps to measure the Quality of Service (QoS) and to assist in diagnostics. However, there are potential risks involved transmitting PDM data during a diagnostics session.

PDM metrics can help an attacker understand about the type of machine and its processing capabilities. Inferring from the PDM data, the attack can launch a timing attack. For example, if a cryptographic protocol is used, a timing attack may be launched against the keying material to obtain the secret.

Along with this, PDM does not provide integrity. It is possible for a Man-In-The-Middle (MITM) node to modify PDM headers leading to incorrect conclusions. For example, during the debugging process using PDM header, it can mislead the person showing there are no unusual server delays.

1.2. PDMv2 Introduction

PDMv2 introduces confidential, integrity and authentication.

TBD

2. Conventions used in this document

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14, RFC 2119 [RFC2119] .

In this document, these words will appear with that interpretation only when in ALL CAPS. Lower case uses of these words are not to be interpreted as carrying significance described in RFC 2119.

3. Terminology

* Primary (Writer) Client (WC): An authoritative node that creates cryptographic keys for multiple reader clients.

* Primary (Writer) Server (WS): An authoritative node that creates cryptographic keys for multiple reader servers.

* Secondary (Reader) Client (RC): An endpoint node which initiates a session with a listening port and sends PDM data. Connects to the Primary (Writer) Client to get cryptographic key material.

* Secondary (Reader) Server (RS): An endpoint node which has a listening port and sends PDM data. Connects to the Primary (Writer) Server to get cryptographic key material.

Note: a client may act as a server (have listening ports).

* Symmetric Key (K): A uniformly random bitstring as an input to the encryption algorithm, known only to Secondary (Reader) Clients and Secondary (Reader) Servers, to establish a secure communication.

* Public and Private Keys: A pair of keys that is used in asymmetric cryptography. If one is used for encryption, the other is used for decryption. Private Keys are kept hidden by the source of the key pair generator, but Public Key is known to everyone. pkX (Public Key) and skX (Private Key). Where X can be, any client or any server.

* Pre-shared Key (PSK): A symmetric key. Uniformly random bitstring, shared between any client or any server or a key shared between an entity that forms client-server relationship. This could happen through an out-of band mechanism: e.g., a physical meeting or use of another protocol.

* Session Key: A temporary key which acts as a symmetric key for the whole session.

4. Protocol Flow

The protocol will proceed in 3 steps.

Step 1: Negotiation between Primary (Writer) Server and Primary (Writer) Client.

Step 2: Registration between Primary (Writer) Server / Client and Secondary (Reader) Server / Client

Step 3: PDM data flow between Secondary (Reader) Server and Secondary (Reader) Server

After-the-fact (or real-time) data analysis of PDM flow may occur by network diagnosticians or network devices. The definition of how this is done is out of scope for this document.

4.1. Registration Phase

4.1.1. Rationale of Primary (Writer) and Secondary (Reader) Roles

Enterprises have many servers and many clients. These clients and servers may be in multiple locations. It may be less overhead to have a secure location (ex. Shared database) for servers and clients to share keys. Otherwise, each client needs to keep track of the keys for each server.

Please view Appendix 1 for some sample topologies and further explanation.

4.1.2. Diagram of Registration Flow



4.2. Primary (Writer) Client - Primary (Writer) Server Negotiation Phase

The two entities exchange a set of data to ensure the respective identities.

They use HPKE KEM to negotiate a "SharedSecret".

4.3. Primary (Writer) Server / Client - Secondary (Reader) Server / Client Registration Phase

The "SharedSecret" is shared securely:

* By the Primary (Writer) Client to all the Secondary (Reader) Clients under its control. How this is achieved is beyond the scope of the present specification.

* By the Primary (Writer)Server to all the Secondary (Reader) Servers under its control. How this is achieved is beyond the scope of the present specification.

4.4. Secondary (Reader) Client - Secondary (Reader) Server communication

Each Client and Server derive a "SessionTemporaryKey" by using HPKE KDF, using the following inputs:

* The "SharedSecret".

* The 5-tuple (SrcIP, SrcPort, DstIP, DstPort, Protocol) of the communication.

* A Key Rotation Index (Kri).

The Kri is initialized to zero.

The server and client initialize (separately) a pseudo-random non-repeating sequence between 1 and 2^15-1. How to generate this sequence is beyond the scope of this document, and does not affect the rest of the specification. When the sequence is used fully, or earlier if appropriate, the sender signals the other party that a key change is necessary. This is achieved by flipping the "F bit" and resetting the PRSEQ. The receiver increments the Kri of the sender, and derives another SessionTemporaryKey to be used for decryption.

It shall be stressed that the two SessionTemporaryKeys used in the communication are never the same, as the 5-tuple is reversed for the Server and Client. Moreover, the time evolution of the respective Kri can be different. As a consequence, each entity must maintain a table with (at least) the following informations:

* Flow 5-tuple, Own Kri, Other Kri

An implementation might optimize this further by caching the OwnSessionTemporaryKey (used in Encryption) and OtherSessionTemporaryKey (used in Decryption).

5. Security Goals

As discussed in the introduction, PDM data can represent a serious data leakage in presence of a malicious actor.

In particular, the sequence numbers included in the PDM header allows correlating the traffic flows, and the timing data can highlight the operational limits of a server to a malicious actor. Moreover, forging PDM headers can lead to unnecessary, unwanted, or dangerous operational choices, e.g., to restore an apparently degraded Quality of Service (QoS).

Due to this, it is important that the confidentiality and integrity of the PDM headers is maintained. PDM headers can be encrypted and authenticated using the methods discussed in section [x], thus ensuring confidentiality and integrity. However, if PDM is used in a scenario where the integrity and confidentiality is already ensured by other means, they can be transmitted without encryption or authentication. This includes, but is not limited to, the following cases:

a) PDM is used over an already encrypted medium (For example VPN tunnels).

b) PDM is used in a link-local scenario.

c) PDM is used in a corporate network where there are security measures strong enough to consider the presence of a malicious actor a negligible risk.

5.1. Security Goals for Confidentiality

PDM data must be kept confidential between the intended parties, which includes (but is not limited to) the two entities exchanging PDM data, and any legitimate party with the proper rights to access such data.

5.2. Security Goals for Integrity

PDM data must not be forged or modified by a malicious entity. In other terms, a malicious entity must not be able to generate a valid PDM header impersonating an endpoint, and must not be able to modify a valid PDM header.

5.3. Security Goals for Authentication

TBD

5.4. Cryptographic Algorithm

Symmetric key cryptography has performance benefits over asymmetric cryptography; asymmetric cryptography is better for key management. Encryption schemes that unite both have been specified in [RFC1421], and have been participating practically since the early days of public-key cryptography. The basic mechanism is to encrypt the symmetric key with the public key by joining both yields. Hybrid public-key encryption schemes (HPKE) [Draft-09] used a different approach that generates the symmetric key and its encapsulation with the public key of the receiver.

Our choice is to use the HPKE framework that incorporates key encapsulation mechanism (KEM), key derivation function (KDF) and authenticated encryption with associated data (AEAD). These multiple schemes are more robust and significantly efficient than the traditional schemes and thus lead to our choice of this framework.

6. PDMv2 Destination Options

6.1. Destinations Option Header

The IPv6 Destination Options extension header [RFC8200] is used to carry optional information that needs to be examined only by a packet's destination node(s). The Destination Options header is identified by a Next Header value of 60 in the immediately preceding header and is defined in RFC 8200 [RFC8200]. The IPv6 PDMv2 destination option is implemented as an IPv6 Option carried in the Destination Options header.

6.2. Metrics information in PDMv2

The IPv6 PDMv2 destination option contains the following base fields:

SCALEDTLR: Scale for Delta Time Last Received
SCALEDTLS: Scale for Delta Time Last Sent
GLOBALPTR: Global Pointer
PSNTP: Packet Sequence Number This Packet
PSNLR: Packet Sequence Number Last Received
DELTATLR: Delta Time Last Received
DELTATLS: Delta Time Last Sent

PDMv2 adds a new metric to the existing PDM [RFC8250] called the Global Pointer. The existing PDM fields are identified with respect to the identifying information called a "5-tuple".

The 5-tuple consists of:

SADDR: IP address of the sender
SPORT: Port for the sender
DADDR: IP address of the destination
DPORT: Port for the destination
PROTC: Upper-layer protocol (TCP, UDP, ICMP, etc.)

Unlike PDM fields, Global Pointer (GLOBALPTR) field in PDMv2 is defined for the SADDR type. Following are the SADDR address types considered:

a) Link Local

b) Global Unicast

c) Multicast

The Global Pointer is treated as a common entity over all the 5-tuples with the same SADDR type. It is initialised to the value 1 and increments for every packet sent. Global Pointer provides a measure of the amount of traffic being processed by the PDMv2 node.

6.3. PDMv2 Layout

PDMv2 has two different header formats corresponding to whether the metric contents are encrypted or unencrypted. The difference between the two types of headers is determined from the Options Length value.

Following is the representation of the unencrypted PDMv2 header:



Following is the representation of the encrypted PDMv2 header:



Option Type

0x0F

8-bit unsigned integer. The Option Type is adopted from RFC 8200 [RFC8200].

Option Length

0x12: Unencrypted PDM

0x22: Encrypted PDM

8-bit unsigned integer. Length of the option, in octets, excluding the Option Type and Option Length fields. The options length is used for differentiating PDM [RFC8250], unencrypted PDMv2 and encrypted PDMv2.

Version Number

0x2

4-bit unsigned number.

Reserved Bits

12-bits.

Reserved bits for future use. They are initialised to 0 for PDMv2.

Random Number

15-bit unsigned number.

TBD

Flag Bit

1-bit field.

TBD

Scale Delta Time Last Received (SCALEDTLR)

8-bit unsigned number.

This is the scaling value for the Delta Time Last Sent (DELTATLS) field.

Scale Delta Time Last Sent (SCALEDTLS)

8-bit unsigned number.

This is the scaling value for the Delta Time Last Sent (DELTATLS) field.

Global Pointer

32-bit unsigned number.

Global Pointer is initialized to 1 for the different source address types and incremented monotonically for each packet with the corresponding source address type.

Packet Sequence Number This Packet (PSNTP)

16-bit unsigned number.

This field is initialized at a random number and is incremented monotonically for each packet of the 5-tuple.

Packet Sequence Number Last Recieved (PSNLR)

16-bit unsigned number.

This field is the PSNTP of the last received packet on the 5-tuple.

Delta Time Last Received (DELTATLR)

16-bit unsigned integer.

The value is set according to the scale in SCALEDTLR.

Delta Time Last Received =
(send time packet n - receive time packet (n - 1))

Delta Time Last Sent (DELTATLS)

16-bit unsigned integer.

The value is set according to the scale in SCALEDTLS.

Delta Time Last Sent =
(receive time packet n - send time packet (n - 1))

7. Security Considerations

TBD

8. Privacy Considerations

TBD

9. IANA Considerations

This memo includes no request to IANA.

10. Contributors

TBD

11. References

11.1. References

11.2. Normative References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>.

[RFC8250] Elkins, N., Hamilton, R., and M. Ackermann, "IPv6 Performance and Diagnostic Metrics (PDM) Destination Option", RFC 8250, DOI 10.17487/RFC8250, September 2017, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8250>.

[RFC8200] Deering, S. and R. Hinden, "Internet Protocol, Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", STD 86, RFC 8200, DOI 10.17487/RFC8200, July 2017, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8200>.

11.3. Informative References

[Draft-09] Barnes, R. (et al), "Hybrid Public Key Encryption", draft-irtf-cfrg-hpke-09, May, 2021, Work In Progress, draft-irtf-cfrg-hpke-09 - Hybrid Public Key Encryption.

[RFC1421] Linn, J., "Privacy Enhancement for Internet Electronic Mail: Part I: Message Encryption and Authentication Procedures", RFC 1421, DOI 10.17487/RFC1421, February 1993, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1421>.

Appendix A. Rationale for Primary (Writer) Server / Primary (Writer) Client

A.1. One Client / One Server

Let's start with one client and one server.

The Client and Server create public / private keys and derive a shared secret. Let's not consider Authentication or Certificates at this point.

What is stored at the Client and Server to be able to encrypt and decrypt packets? The shared secret or private key.

Since we only have one Server and one Client, then we don't need to have any kind of identifier for which private key to use for which Server or Client because there is only one of each.

Of course, this is a ludicrous scenario since no real organization of interest has only one server and one client.

A.2. Multiple Clients / One Server

So, let's try with multiple clients and one Primary (Writer) server



The Clients and Server create public / private keys and derive a shared secret. Each Client has a unique private key.

What is stored at the Client and Server to be able to encrypt and decrypt packets?

Clients each store a private key. Server stores: Client Identifier and Private Key.

Since we only have one Server and multiple Clients, then the Clients don't need to have any kind of identifier for which private key to use for which Server but the Server needs to know which private key to use for which Client. So, the Server has to store an identifier as well as the Key.

But, this also is a ludicrous scenario since no real organization of interest has only one server.

A.3. Multiple Clients / Multiple Servers

When we have multiple clients and multiple servers, then each not only does the Server need to know which key to use for which Client, but the Client needs to know which private key to use for which Server.

A.4. Primary (Writer) Client / Primary (Writer) Server

Based on this rationale, we have chosen a Primary (Writer) Server / Primary (Writer) Client topology.

Appendix B. Change Log

Note to RFC Editor: if this document does not obsolete an existing RFC, please remove this appendix before publication as an RFC.

Appendix C. Open Issues

Note to RFC Editor: please remove this appendix before publication as an RFC.

Authors' Addresses

Nalini Elkins
Inside Products, Inc.
36A Upper Circle
Carmel Valley, CA, 93924
United States of America

Phone: +1 831 234 4232
Email: nalini.elkins@insidethestack.com

Michael Ackermann
BCBS Michigan
P.O. Box 2888
Detroit, Michigan, 48231
United States of America

Phone: +1 248 703 3600
Email: mackermann@bcbsm.com
URI: http://www.bcbsm.com

Tommaso Pecorella
University of Florence
Dept. of Information Engineering, Via di Santa Marta, 3, 50139
Firenze
Italy

Phone: +39 055 2758540
Email: tommaso.pecorella@unifi.it
URI: https://www.unifi.it/

Adnan Rashid
University of Florence
Dept. of Information Engineering, Via di Santa Marta, 3, 50139
Firenze
Italy

Phone: +39 347 9821 467
Email: adnan.rashid@unifi.it
URI: https://www.unifi.it/

Ameya Deshpande
NITK, Surathkal
Pashan-Baner Link Road
Pune, Maharashtra
India

Phone: +91 96893 26060
Email: ameyanrd@gmail.com
URI: https://www.nitk.ac.in/