

CDNI
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: April 7, 2017

R. van Brandenburg
TNO
K. Leung
Cisco Systems, Inc.
P. Sorber
Comcast Cable Communications
M. Miller
Cisco Systems, Inc.
October 4, 2016

URI Signing for CDN Interconnection (CDNI)
draft-ietf-cdni-uri-signing-10

Abstract

This document describes how the concept of URI signing supports the content access control requirements of CDNI and proposes a URI signing method as a JSON Web Token (JWT) [[RFC7519](#)] profile.

The proposed URI signing method specifies the information needed to be included in the URI to transmit the signed JWT as well as the claims needed by the signed JWT to authorize a UA. The mechanism described can be used both in CDNI and single CDN scenarios.

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 <http://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 April 7, 2017.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2016 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

Internet-Draft

CDNI URI Signing

October 2016

This document is subject to [BCP 78](http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	3
1.1.	Terminology	4
1.2.	Background and overview on URI Signing	4
1.3.	CDNI URI Signing Overview	5
1.4.	URI Signing in a non-CDNI context	7
2.	JWT Format and Processing Requirements	7
2.1.	JWT Claims	8
2.1.1.	URI Container Forms	10
2.1.1.1.	URI Simple Container (uri:)	11
2.1.1.2.	URI Pattern Container (uri-pattern:)	11
2.1.1.3.	URI Regular Expression Container (uri-regex:)	12
3.	Relationship with CDNI Interfaces	12
3.1.	CDNI Control Interface	12
3.2.	CDNI Footprint & Capabilities Advertisement Interface	12
3.3.	CDNI Request Routing Redirection Interface	13
3.4.	CDNI Metadata Interface	13
3.5.	CDNI Logging Interface	14
4.	URI Signing Message Flow	15
4.1.	HTTP Redirection	16
4.2.	DNS Redirection	18
5.	HTTP Adaptive Streaming	21
6.	IANA Considerations	21
6.1.	CDNI Payload Type	21
6.1.1.	CDNI UriSigning Payload Type	21
6.2.	CDNI Logging Record Type	22
6.2.1.	CDNI Logging Record Version 2 for HTTP	22
6.3.	CDNI Logging Field Names	22
7.	Security Considerations	22
8.	Privacy	24
9.	Acknowledgements	24
10.	References	24

10.1.	Normative References	24
10.2.	Informative References	25
Appendix A.	Signed URI Package Example	26
A.1.	Simple Example	26
A.2.	Complex Example	27

Authors' Addresses	28
------------------------------	--------------------

[1.](#) Introduction

This document describes the concept of URI Signing and how it can be used to provide access authorization in the case of redirection between interconnected CDNs (CDNI) and between a Content Service Provider (CSP) and a CDN. The primary goal of URI Signing is to make sure that only authorized User Agents (UAs) are able to access the content, with a CSP being able to authorize every individual request. It should be noted that URI Signing is not a content protection scheme; if a CSP wants to protect the content itself, other mechanisms, such as DRM, are more appropriate. In addition to access control, URI Signing also has benefits in reducing the impact of denial-of-service attacks.

The overall problem space for CDN Interconnection (CDNI) is described in CDNI Problem Statement [[RFC6707](#)]. This document, along with the CDNI Requirements [[RFC7337](#)] document and the CDNI Framework [[RFC7336](#)], describes the need for interconnected CDNs to be able to implement an access control mechanism that enforces the CSP's distribution policy.

Specifically, CDNI Framework [[RFC7336](#)] states:

"The CSP may also trust the CDN operator to perform actions such as ..., and to enforce per-request authorization performed by the CSP using techniques such as URI signing."

In particular, the following requirement is listed in CDNI Requirements [[RFC7337](#)]:

"MI-16 [HIGH] The CDNI Metadata Distribution interface shall allow signaling of authorization checks and validation that are to be performed by the surrogate before delivery. For example, this could potentially include:

* need to validate URI signed information (e.g., Expiry time, Client IP address)."

This document proposes a method of signing URIs that allows Surrogates in interconnected CDNs to enforce a per-request authorization performed by the CSP. Splitting the role of performing per-request authorization by the CSP and the role of validating this authorization by the CDN allows any arbitrary distribution policy to be enforced across CDNs without the need of CDNs to have any awareness of the actual CSP distribution policy.

The representation of this method is a Signed JSON Web Token (JWT) [[RFC7519](#)].

1.1. Terminology

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 [[RFC2119](#)].

This document uses the terminology defined in CDNI Problem Statement [[RFC6707](#)].

This document also uses the terminology of JSON Web Token (JWT) [[RFC7519](#)].

In addition, the following terms are used throughout this document:


- o Signed URI: A URI that contains a signed JWT for itself.
- o Target CDN URI: URI created by the CSP to direct UA towards the Upstream CDN (uCDN). The Target CDN URI can be signed by the CSP and verified by the uCDN.
- o Redirection URI: URI created by the uCDN to redirect UA towards the Downstream CDN (dCDN). The Redirection URI can be signed by the uCDN and verified by the dCDN. In a cascaded CDNI scenario, there can be more than one Redirection URI.

1.2. Background and overview on URI Signing

A CSP and CDN are assumed to have a trust relationship that enables the CSP to authorize access to a content item by including a set of claims in the form of a signed JWT in the URI before redirecting a UA to the CDN. Using these attributes, it is possible for a CDN to check an incoming content request to see whether it was authorized by the CSP (e.g., based on the UA's IP address or a time window). To prevent the UA from altering the claims a signed JWT is REQUIRED.

Figure 1, shown below, presents an overview of the URI Signing mechanism in the case of a CSP with a single CDN. When the UA browses for content on CSP's website (#1), it receives HTML web pages with embedded content URIs. Upon requesting these URIs, the CSP redirects to a CDN, creating a Target CDN URI (#2) (alternatively, the Target CDN URI itself is embedded in the HTML). The Target CDN URI is the Signed URI which may include the IP address of the UA and/or a time window and always contains the signed JWT which is generated by the CSP using a shared secret or private key. Once the UA receives the response with the Signed URI, it sends a new HTTP

request using the Signed URI to the CDN (#3). Upon receiving the request, the CDN checks to see if the Signed URI is authentic by verifying the signed JWT. If applicable, it checks whether the IP address of the HTTP request matches that in the Signed URI and if the time window is still valid. After these claims are confirmed to be valid, the CDN delivers the content (#4).






Figure 2: URI Signing in a CDNI Environment

The trust relationships between CSP, uCDN, and dCDN have direct implications for URI Signing. In the case shown in Figure 2, the CDN that the CSP has a trust relationship with is the uCDN. The delivery of the content may be delegated to the dCDN, which has a relationship with the uCDN but may have no relationship with the CSP.

In CDNI, there are two methods for request routing: DNS-based and HTTP-based. For DNS-based request routing, the Signed URI (i.e., Target CDN URI) provided by the CSP reaches the dCDN directly. In the case where the dCDN does not have a trust relationship with the CSP, this means that either an asymmetric public/private key method needs to be used for computing the signed JWT (because the CSP and dCDN are not able to exchange symmetric shared secret keys), or the CSP needs to allow the uCDN to redistribute shared keys to a subset

of their dCDNs .

For HTTP-based request routing, the Signed URI (i.e., Target CDN URI) provided by the CSP reaches the uCDN. After this URI has been verified to be correct by the uCDN, the uCDN creates and signs a new Redirection URI to redirect the UA to the dCDN. Since this new URI also has a new signed JWT, this new signature can be based around the trust relationship between the uCDN and dCDN, and the relationship between the dCDN and CSP is not relevant. Given the fact that such a relationship between uCDN and dCDN always exists, both asymmetric public/private keys and symmetric shared secret keys can be used for URI Signing with HTTP-based request routing. Note that the signed Redirection URI MUST maintain the same, or higher, level of security as the original Signed URI.

1.4. URI Signing in a non-CDNI context

While the URI signing method defined in this document was primarily created for the purpose of allowing URI Signing in CDNI scenarios, e.g., between a uCDN and a dCDN or between a CSP and a dCDN, there is nothing in the defined URI Signing method that precludes it from being used in a non-CDNI context. As such, the described mechanism could be used in a single-CDN scenario such as shown in Figure 1 in [Section 1.2](#), for example to allow a CSP that uses different CDNs to only have to implement a single URI Signing mechanism.

2. JWT Format and Processing Requirements

The concept behind URI Signing is based on embedding a signed JSON Web Token (JWT) [[RFC7519](#)] in the Target CDN URI/Redirection URI. The signed JWT contains a number of claims that can be validated to ensure the UA has legitimate access to the content.

In addition, this document specifies the following URI attribute:

- o URI Signing Package (URISigningPackage): The URI attribute that encapsulates all the URI Signing claims in a signed JWT encoded format. This attribute is exposed in the Signed URI as a URI query parameter or as a URL path parameter.

The parameter name of the URI Signing Package Attribute is defined in

the CDNI Metadata. If the CDNI Metadata interface is not used, or does not include a parameter name for the URI Signing Package Attribute, the parameter name can be set by configuration (out of scope of this document).

2.1. JWT Claims

This section identifies the set of claims that can be used to enforce the CSP distribution policy. New claims can be introduced in the future to extend the distribution policy capabilities.

In order to provide distribution policy flexibility, the exact subset of claims used in a given signed JWT is a runtime decision. Claim requirements are defined in the CDNI Metadata. If the CDNI Metadata interface is not used, or does not include claim requirements, the claim requirements can be set by configuration (out of scope of this document).

The following claims (where the "JSON Web Token Claims" registry claim name is specified in parenthesis below) are used to enforce the distribution policies. All of the listed claims are mandatory to implement in a URI Signing implementation, but are not mandatory to use in a given signed JWT. (The "optional" and "mandatory" identifiers in square brackets refer to whether or not a given claim MUST be present in a URI Signing JWT.) A CDN MUST be able to parse and process all of the claims listed below. If the signed JWT contains any claims which the CDN does not understand (i.e., is unable to parse and process), the CDN MUST reject the request.

- o Issuer (iss) [optional] - The semantics in [\[RFC7519\] Section 4.1.1](#) MUST be followed. This claim MAY be used to validate authorization of the issuer of a signed JWT and also MAY be used to confirm that the indicated key was provided by said issuer. If the CDN validating the signed JWT does not support Issuer validation, or if the Issuer in the signed JWT does not match the list of known acceptable Issuers, the CDN MUST reject the request. If the received signed JWT contains an Issuer claim, then any JWT subsequently generated for CDNI redirection MUST also contain an Issuer claim, and the Issuer value MUST be updated to identify the redirecting CDN. If the received signed JWT does not contain an Issuer claim, an Issuer claim MAY be added to a signed JWT generated for CDNI redirection.
- o URI Container (sub) [mandatory] - The semantics in [\[RFC7519\] Section 4.1.2](#) MUST be followed. Container for holding the URI representation before the URI Signing Package is added. This representation can take one of several forms detailed in

[Section 2.1.1](#). If the URI pattern/regex in the signed JWT does not match the URI of the content request, the CDN validating the signed JWT MUST reject the request. When redirecting a URI, the CDN generating the new signed JWT MAY change the URI Container to comport with the URI being used in the redirection.

- o Client IP (aud) [optional] - The semantics in [\[RFC7519\]](#) [Section 4.1.3](#) MUST be followed. IP address, or IP prefix, for which the Signed URI is valid. This is represented in CIDR notation, with dotted decimal format for IPv4 or canonical text representation for IPv6 addresses [\[RFC5952\]](#). The request is rejected if sourced from a client outside of the specified IP range. Since the client IP is considered personally identifiable information this field MUST be a JSON Web Encryption (JWE [\[RFC7516\]](#)) Object in compact serialization form. If the CDN validating the signed JWT does not support Client IP validation, or if the Client IP in the signed JWT does not match the source IP address in the content request request, the CDN MUST reject the request. If the received signed JWT contains a Client IP claim, then any JWT subsequently generated for CDNI redirection MUST also contain a Client IP claim, and the Client IP value MUST be the same as in the received signed JWT. A signed JWT generated for CDNI redirection MUST NOT add a Client IP claim if no Client IP claim existed in the received signed JWT.
- o Expiry Time (exp) [optional] - The semantics in [\[RFC7519\]](#) [Section 4.1.4](#) MUST be followed, though URI Signing implementations MUST not allow for any time synchronization "leeway". Note: The time on the entities that generate and validate the signed URI SHOULD be in sync. In the CDNI case, this means that CSP, uCDN and dCDN servers need to be time-synchronized. It is RECOMMENDED to use NTP for time synchronization. If the CDN validating the signed JWT does not support Expiry Time validation, or if the Expiry Time in the signed JWT corresponds to a time earlier than the time of the content request request, the CDN MUST reject the request. If the received signed JWT contains a Expiry Time claim, then any JWT subsequently generated for CDNI redirection MUST also contain an Expiry Time claim, and the Expiry Time value MUST be the same as in the received signed JWT. A signed JWT generated for CDNI redirection MUST NOT add an Expiry Time claim if no Expiry Time claim existed in the received signed JWT.
- o Not Before (nbf) [optional] - The semantics in [\[RFC7519\]](#) [Section 4.1.5](#) MUST be followed, though URI Signing implementations MUST not allow for any time synchronization "leeway". Note: The time on the entities that generate and validate the signed URI

SHOULD be in sync. In the CDNI case, this means that the CSP, uCDN, and dCDN servers need to be time-synchronized. It is

RECOMMENDED to use NTP for time synchronization. If the CDN validating the signed JWT does not support Not Before time validation, or if the Not Before time in the signed JWT corresponds to a time later than the time of the content request request, the CDN MUST reject the request. If the received signed JWT contains a Not Before time claim, then any JWT subsequently generated for CDNI redirection MUST also contain a Not Before time claim, and the Not Before time value MUST be the same as in the received signed JWT. A signed JWT generated for CDNI redirection MUST NOT add a Not Before time claim if no Not Before time claim existed in the received signed JWT.

- o Issued At (iat) [optional] - The semantics in [\[RFC7519\]](#) [Section 4.1.6](#) MUST be followed. Note: The time on the entities that generate and validate the signed URI SHOULD be in sync. In the CDNI case, this means that CSP, uCDN, and dCDN servers need to be time-synchronized. It is RECOMMENDED to use NTP for time synchronization. If the received signed JWT contains an Issued At claim, then any JWT subsequently generated for CDNI redirection MUST also contain an Issued At claim, and the Issuer value MUST be updated to identify the time the new JWT was generated. If the received signed JWT does not contain an Issued At claim, an Issued At claim MAY be added to a signed JWT generated for CDNI redirection.
- o Nonce (jti) [optional] - The semantics in [\[RFC7519\]](#) [Section 4.1.7](#) MUST be followed. Can be used to prevent replay attacks if the CDN stores a list of all previously used Nonce values, and validates that the Nonce in the current JWT has never been used before. If the signed JWT contains a Nonce claim and the CDN validating the signed JWT does not support Nonce storage, then the CDN MUST reject the request. If the received signed JWT contains a Nonce claim, then any JWT subsequently generated for CDNI redirection MUST also contain a Nonce claim, and the Nonce value MUST be the same as in the received signed JWT. If the received signed JWT does not contain a Nonce claim, a Nonce claim MAY be added to a signed JWT generated for CDNI redirection.

Note: See the Security Considerations ([Section 7](#)) section on the

limitations of using an expiration time and client IP address for distribution policy enforcement.

[2.1.1.1.](#) URI Container Forms

The URI Container (sub) claim takes one of the following forms. More forms may be added in the future to extend the capabilities.

[2.1.1.1.1.](#) URI Simple Container (uri:)

When prefixed with 'uri:', the string following 'uri:' is the URI that MUST be matched with a simple string match to the requested URI.

[2.1.1.1.2.](#) URI Pattern Container (uri-pattern:)

Prefixed with 'uri-pattern:', this string contains one or more URI Patterns that describes for which content the Signed URI is valid. Each URI Pattern contains an expression to match against the requested URI, to check whether the requested content is allowed to be served. Multiple URI Patterns may be concatenated in a single URI Pattern by separating them with a semi-colon(';') character. Each URI Pattern follows the [\[RFC3986\]](#) URI format, including the '://' that delimits the URI scheme from the hierarchy part. The pattern may include the special literals:

';' - separates individual patterns when the string contains multiple URI patterns.

'*' - matches any sequence of characters, including the empty string.

'?' - matches exactly one character.

'\$' - used to escape the special literals; MUST be followed by exactly one of ';', '*', '?', or '\$'.

The following is an example of a valid URI Pattern:

```
*://*/folder/content-83112371/quality_*/segment?????.mp4
```

An example of two concatenated URI Patterns is the following (whitespace is inserted after the ';' for readability and should not be present in the actual representation):

```
http://*/folder/content-83112371/manifest/*.xml;  
http://*/folder/content-83112371/quality_*/segment????.mp4
```

In order to increase the performance of string parsing the URI Pattern, implementations can check often-used URI Pattern prefixes to quickly check whether certain URI components can be ignored. For example, URI Pattern prefixes '*://*/' or '*://*:*' will be used in case the scheme and authority components of the URI are ignored for purposes of pattern enforcement.

[2.1.1.3](#). URI Regular Expression Container (uri-regex:)

Prefixed with 'uri-regex:', this string is any PCRE [[PCRE839](#)] compatible regular expression used to match against the requested URI.

Note: Because '\\' has special meaning in JSON [[RFC7159](#)] as the escape character within JSON strings, the regular expression character '\\' MUST be escaped as '\\\\'.

An example of a 'uri-regex:' is the following:

```
.*\\:\\.*/folder/content-83112371/quality_*/segment.{3}\\.mp4
```

Note: Due to computational complexity of executing arbitrary regular expressions, it is RECOMMENDED to only execute after validating the JWT to ensure its authenticity.

[3](#). Relationship with CDNI Interfaces

Some of the CDNI Interfaces need enhancements to support URI Signing. As an example: A dCDN that supports URI Signing needs to be able to advertise this capability to the uCDN. The uCDN needs to select a dCDN based on such capability when the CSP requires access control to enforce its distribution policy via URI Signing. Also, the uCDN

needs to be able to distribute via the CDNI Metadata interface the information necessary to allow the dCDN to validate a Signed URI. Events that pertain to URI Signing (e.g., request denial or delivery after access authorization) need to be included in the logs communicated through the CDNI Logging interface (Editor's Note: Is this within the scope of the CDNI Logging interface?).

[3.1.](#) CDNI Control Interface

URI Signing has no impact on this interface.

[3.2.](#) CDNI Footprint & Capabilities Advertisement Interface

The CDNI Request Routing: Footprint and Capabilities Semantics document [[I-D.ietf-cdni-footprint-capabilities-semantics](#)] defines support for advertising CDNI Metadata capabilities, via CDNI Payload Type. The CDNI Payload Type registered in [Section 6.1](#) can be used for capability advertisement.

[3.3.](#) CDNI Request Routing Redirection Interface

The CDNI Request Routing Redirection Interface [[I-D.ietf-cdni-redirection](#)] describes the recursive request redirection method. For URI Signing, the uCDN signs the URI provided by the dCDN. URI Signing therefore has no impact on this interface.

[3.4.](#) CDNI Metadata Interface

The CDNI Metadata Interface [[I-D.ietf-cdni-metadata](#)] describes the CDNI metadata distribution in order to enable content acquisition and delivery. For URI Signing, a new CDNI metadata object is specified.

The UriSigning Metadata object contains information to enable URI signing and validation by a dCDN. The UriSigning properties are defined below.

Property: enforce

Description: URI Signing enforcement flag. Specifically, this flag indicates if the access to content is subject to URI Signing. URI Signing requires the dCDN to ensure that the URI must be signed and validated before delivering content. Otherwise, the dCDN does not perform validation, regardless of whether or not the URI is signed.

Type: Boolean

Mandatory-to-Specify: No. The default is true.

Property: issuers

Description: A list of valid Issuers against which the Issuer claim in the signed JWT may be validated.

Type: Array of Strings

Mandatory-to-Specify: No. The default is an empty list. An empty list means that any Issuer is acceptable.

Property: package-attribute

Description: The name to use for the URI Signing Package.

Type: String

Mandatory-to-Specify: No. Default is "URISigningPackage".

The following is an example of a URI Signing metadata payload with all default values:

```
{
  "generic-metadata-type": "MI.UriSigning"
  "generic-metadata-value": {}
}
```

The following is an example of a URI Signing metadata payload with

explicit values:

```
{
  "generic-metadata-type": "MI.UriSigning"
  "generic-metadata-value":
    {
      "enforce": true,
      "issuers": ["csp", "ucdn1", "ucdn2"],
      "package-attribute": "usp"
    }
}
```

[3.5.](#) CDNI Logging Interface

For URI Signing, the dCDN reports that enforcement of the access control was applied to the request for content delivery. When the request is denied due to enforcement of URI Signing, the reason is logged.

The following CDNI Logging field for URI Signing SHOULD be supported in the HTTP Request Logging Record as specified in CDNI Logging Interface [[I-D.ietf-cdni-logging](#)], using the new "cdni_http_request_v2" record-type registered in [Section 6.2.1](#).

- o s-uri-signing (mandatory):
 - * format: 3DIGIT
 - * field value: this characterises the URI signing validation performed by the Surrogate on the request. The allowed values are:
 - + "000" : no signed JWT validation performed
 - + "200" : signed JWT validation performed and validated

- + "400" : signed JWT validation performed and rejected because of incorrect signature
- + "401" : signed JWT validation performed and rejected because

- of Expiration Time enforcement
- + "402" : signed JWT validation performed and rejected because of Client IP enforcement
- + "403" : signed JWT validation performed and rejected because of URI Pattern enforcement
- + "404" : signed JWT validation performed and rejected because of Issuer enforcement
- + "405" : signed JWT validation performed and rejected because of Not Before enforcement
- + "500" : unable to perform signed JWT validation because of malformed URI
- * occurrence: there MUST be zero or exactly one instance of this field.
- o s-uri-signing-deny-reason (optional):
 - * format: QSTRING
 - * field value: a string for providing further information in case the signed JWT was rejected, e.g., for debugging purposes.
 - * occurrence: there MUST be zero or exactly one instance of this field.


4. URI Signing Message Flow

URI Signing supports both HTTP-based and DNS-based request routing. JSON Web Token (JWT) [[RFC7519](#)] defines a compact, URL-safe means of representing claims to be transferred between two parties. The claims in a signed JWT are encoded as a JSON object that is used as the payload of a JSON Web Signature (JWS) structure or as the plaintext of a JSON Web Encryption (JWE) structure, enabling the claims to be digitally signed or integrity protected with a Message Authentication Code (MAC) and/or encrypted.

4.1. HTTP Redirection

For HTTP-based request routing, a set of information that is unique to a given end user content request is included in a signed JWT, using key information that is specific to a pair of adjacent CDNI hops (e.g. between the CSP and the uCDN, between the uCDN and a dCDN). This allows a CDNI hop to ascertain the authenticity of a given request received from a previous CDNI hop.

The URI signing method described below is based on the following steps (assuming HTTP redirection, iterative request routing, and a CDN path with two CDNs). Note that uCDN and uCDN are used exchangeably.



Internet-Draft

CDNI URI Signing

October 2016




Figure 3: HTTP-based Request Routing with URI Signing

1. Using the CDNI Footprint & Capabilities Advertisement interface, the dCDN advertises its capabilities including URI Signing support to the uCDN.
2. CSP provides to the uCDN the information needed to validate signed JWTs from that CSP. For example, this information may include a key value.
3. Using the CDNI Metadata interface, the uCDN communicates to a dCDN the information needed to validate signed JWTs from the uCDN for the given CSP. For example, this information may include the URI query string parameter name for the URI Signing Package Attribute.
4. When a UA requests a piece of protected content from the CSP, the CSP makes a specific authorization decision for this unique request based on its arbitrary distribution policy.
5. If the authorization decision is negative, the CSP rejects the request.

6. If the authorization decision is positive, the CSP computes a Signed URI that is based on unique parameters of that request and conveys it to the end user as the URI to use to request the content.
7. On receipt of the corresponding content request, the uCDN validates the signed JWT in the URI using the information provided by the CSP.

8. If the validation is negative, the uCDN rejects the request.
9. If the validation is positive, the uCDN computes a Signed URI that is based on unique parameters of that request and provides to the end user as the URI to use to further request the content from the dCDN.
10. On receipt of the corresponding content request, the dCDN validates the signed JWT in the Signed URI using the information provided by the uCDN in the CDNI Metadata.
11. If the validation is negative, the dCDN rejects the request and sends an error code (e.g., 403 Forbidden) in the HTTP response.
12. If the validation is positive, the dCDN serves the request and delivers the content.
13. At a later time, dCDN reports logging events that includes URI signing information.



With HTTP-based request routing, URI Signing matches well the general chain of trust model of CDNI both with symmetric and asymmetric keys because the key information only needs to be specific to a pair of adjacent CDNI hops.

[4.2.](#) DNS Redirection

For DNS-based request routing, the CSP and uCDN must agree on a trust model appropriate to the security requirements of the CSP's particular content. Use of asymmetric public/private keys allows for unlimited distribution of the public key to dCDNs. However, if a shared secret key is preferred, then the CSP may want to restrict the distribution of the key to a (possibly empty) subset of trusted

dCDNs. Authorized Delivery CDNs need to obtain the key information to validate the Signed URI.

The URI signing method described below is based on the following steps (assuming iterative DNS request routing and a CDN path with two CDNs).






Figure 4: DNS-based Request Routing with URI Signing

1. Using the CDNI Footprint & Capabilities Advertisement interface, the dCDN advertises its capabilities including URI Signing support to the uCDN.

2. CSP provides to the uCDN the information needed to validate cryptographic signatures from that CSP. For example, this information may include a key.
3. Using the CDNI Metadata interface, the uCDN communicates to a dCDN the information needed to validate cryptographic signatures from the CSP (e.g., the URI query string parameter name for the URI Signing Package Attribute). In the case of symmetric key, the uCDN checks if the dCDN is allowed by CSP to obtain the shared secret key.
4. When a UA requests a piece of protected content from the CSP, the CSP makes a specific authorization decision for this unique request based on its arbitrary distribution policy.
5. If the authorization decision is negative, the CSP rejects the request.
6. If the authorization decision is positive, the CSP computes a

cryptographic signature that is based on unique parameters of that request and includes it in the URI provided to the end user to request the content.

7. End user sends DNS request to the uCDN.
8. On receipt of the DNS request, the uCDN redirects the request to the dCDN.
9. End user sends DNS request to the dCDN.
10. On receipt of the DNS request, the dCDN responds with IP address of one of its Surrogates.
11. On receipt of the corresponding content request, the dCDN validates the cryptographic signature in the URI using the information provided by the uCDN in the CDNI Metadata.
12. If the validation is negative, the dCDN rejects the request and sends an error code (e.g., 403) in the HTTP response.
13. If the validation is positive, the dCDN serves the request and delivers the content.
14. At a later time, dCDN reports logging events that includes URI signing information.

With DNS-based request routing, URI Signing matches well the general chain of trust model of CDNI when used with asymmetric keys because

the only key information that needs to be distributed across multiple, possibly non-adjacent, CDNI hops is the public key, which is generally not confidential.

With DNS-based request routing, URI Signing does not match well the general chain of trust model of CDNI when used with symmetric keys because the symmetric key information needs to be distributed across multiple CDNI hops, including non-adjacent hops. This raises a security concern for applicability of URI Signing with symmetric keys in case of DNS-based inter-CDN request routing.

The authors note that in order to perform URI signing for individual content segments of HTTP Adaptive Bitrate content, specific URI signing mechanisms are needed. Such mechanisms are currently out-of-scope of this document. More details on this topic is covered in Models for HTTP-Adaptive-Streaming-Aware CDNI [[RFC6983](#)]. In addition, [[I-D.brandenburg-cdni-uri-signing-for-has](#)] provides an extension to the algorithm defined in this document that deals specifically with URI signing of segmented content.

[6.](#) IANA Considerations

[6.1.](#) CDNI Payload Type

This document requests the registration of the following CDNI Payload Type under the IANA "CDNI Payload Type" registry:

Payload Type	Specification
MI.UriSigning	RFCthis

[RFC Editor: Please replace RFCthis with the published RFC number for this document.]

[6.1.1.](#) CDNI UriSigning Payload Type

Purpose: The purpose of this payload type is to distinguish UriSigning MI objects (and any associated capability advertisement).

Interface: MI/FCI

Encoding: see [Section 3.4](#)

[6.2.](#) CDNI Logging Record Type

This document requests the registration of the following CDNI Logging record-type under the IANA "CDNI Logging record-types" registry:

record-types	Reference	Description
cdni_http_request_v2	RFCthis	Extension to CDNI Logging Record version 1 for content delivery using HTTP, to include URI Signing logging fields

[RFC Editor: Please replace RFCthis with the published RFC number for this document.]

6.2.1. CDNI Logging Record Version 2 for HTTP

The "cdni_http_request_v2" record-type supports all of the fields supported by the "cdni_http_request_v1" record-type [[I-D.ietf-cdni-logging](#)] plus the two additional fields "s-uri-signing" and "s-uri-signing-deny-reason", registered by this document in [Section 6.3](#). The name, format, field value, and occurrence information for the two new fields can be found in [Section 3.5](#) of this document.

6.3. CDNI Logging Field Names

This document requests the registration of the following CDNI Logging fields under the IANA "CDNI Logging Field Names" registry:

Field Name	Reference
s-uri-signing	RFCthis
s-uri-signing-deny-reason	RFCthis

[RFC Editor: Please replace RFCthis with the published RFC number for this document.]

7. Security Considerations

This document describes the concept of URI Signing and how it can be used to provide access authorization in the case of CDNI. The primary goal of URI Signing is to make sure that only authorized UAs

are able to access the content, with a CSP being able to authorize every individual request. It should be noted that URI Signing is not a content protection scheme; if a CSP wants to protect the content itself, other mechanisms, such as DRM, are more appropriate.

In general, it holds that the level of protection against illegitimate access can be increased by including more claims in the signed JWT. The current version of this document includes claims for enforcing Issuer, Client IP Address, Not Before time, and Expiration Time, however this list can be extended with other, more complex, attributes that are able to provide some form of protection against some of the vulnerabilities highlighted below.

That said, there are a number of aspects that limit the level of security offered by URI Signing and that anybody implementing URI Signing should be aware of.

Replay attacks: A (valid) Signed URI may be used to perform replay attacks. The vulnerability to replay attacks can be reduced by picking a relatively short window between the Not Before time and Expiration Time attributes, although this is limited by the fact that any HTTP-based request needs a window of at least a couple of seconds to prevent a sudden network issues from preventing legitimate UAs access to the content. One may also reduce exposure to replay attacks by including a unique one-time access ID via the Nonce attribute (jti claim). Whenever the dCDN receives a request with a given unique ID, it adds that ID to the list of 'used' IDs. In the case an illegitimate UA tries to use the same URI through a replay attack, the dCDN can deny the request based on the already-used access ID.

Illegitimate clients behind a NAT: In cases where there are multiple users behind the same NAT, all users will have the same IP address from the point of view of the dCDN. This results in the dCDN not being able to distinguish between the different users based on Client IP Address and illegitimate users being able to access the content. One way to reduce exposure to this kind of attack is to not only check for Client IP but also for other attributes, e.g., attributes that can be found in HTTP headers.

The shared key between CSP and uCDN may be distributed to dCDNs - including cascaded CDNs. Since this key can be used to legitimately sign a URL for content access authorization, it is important to know the implications of a compromised shared key.

In the case where asymmetric keys are used, the KID information element might contain the URL to the public key. To prevent malicious clients from signing their own URIs and inserting the

associated public key URL in the KID field, thereby passing URI validation, it is important that CDNs check whether the URI conveyed in the KID field is in the allowable set of KIDs as listed in the CDNI metadata or set via configuration.

8. Privacy

The privacy protection concerns described in CDNI Logging Interface [[I-D.ietf-cdni-logging](#)] apply when the client's IP address (aud) is embedded in the Signed URI. For this reason, the mechanism described in [Section 2](#) encrypts the Client IP before including it in the URI Signing Package (and thus the URL itself).

9. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the following people for their contributions in reviewing this document and providing feedback: Scott Leibrand, Kevin Ma, Ben Niven-Jenkins, Thierry Magnien, Dan York, Bhaskar Bhupalam, Matt Caulfield, Samuel Rajakumar, Iuniana Oprescu, Leif Hedstrom and Gancho Tenev. In addition, Matt Caulfield provided content for the CDNI Metadata Interface section.

10. References

10.1. Normative References

- [I-D.ietf-cdni-logging]
Fauceur, F., Bertrand, G., Oprescu, I., and R. Peterkofsky, "CDNI Logging Interface", [draft-ietf-cdni-logging-27](#) (work in progress), June 2016.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC6707] Niven-Jenkins, B., Le Faucheur, F., and N. Bitar, "Content Distribution Network Interconnection (CDNI) Problem Statement", [RFC 6707](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6707, September 2012, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6707>>.
- [RFC7159] Bray, T., Ed., "The JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) Data

Interchange Format", [RFC 7159](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7159, March 2014, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7159>>.

[RFC7516] Jones, M. and J. Hildebrand, "JSON Web Encryption (JWE)", [RFC 7516](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7516, May 2015, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7516>>.

van Brandenburg, et al. Expires April 7, 2017

[Page 24]

Internet-Draft

CDNI URI Signing

October 2016

[RFC7519] Jones, M., Bradley, J., and N. Sakimura, "JSON Web Token (JWT)", [RFC 7519](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7519, May 2015, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7519>>.

10.2. Informative References

[I-D.brandenburg-cdni-uri-signing-for-has]
Brandenburg, R., "URI Signing for HTTP Adaptive Streaming (HAS)", [draft-brandenburg-cdni-uri-signing-for-has-03](#) (work in progress), June 2016.

[I-D.ietf-cdni-footprint-capabilities-semantic]
Seedorf, J., Peterson, J., Previdi, S., Brandenburg, R., and K. Ma, "CDNI Request Routing: Footprint and Capabilities Semantics", [draft-ietf-cdni-footprint-capabilities-semantic-20](#) (work in progress), May 2016.

[I-D.ietf-cdni-metadata]
Niven-Jenkins, B., Murray, R., Caulfield, M., and K. Ma, "CDN Interconnection Metadata", [draft-ietf-cdni-metadata-21](#) (work in progress), August 2016.

[I-D.ietf-cdni-redirection]
Niven-Jenkins, B. and R. Brandenburg, "Request Routing Redirection interface for CDN Interconnection", [draft-ietf-cdni-redirection-20](#) (work in progress), August 2016.

[PCRE839] Hazel, P., "Perl Compatible Regular Expressions", Version 8.39, June 2016, <<http://www.pcre.org/>>.

[RFC3986] Berners-Lee, T., Fielding, R., and L. Masinter, "Uniform Resource Identifier (URI): Generic Syntax", STD 66, [RFC 3986](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3986, January 2005, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3986>>.

- [RFC5952] Kawamura, S. and M. Kawashima, "A Recommendation for IPv6 Address Text Representation", [RFC 5952](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5952, August 2010, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5952>>.
- [RFC6983] van Brandenburg, R., van Deventer, O., Le Faucheur, F., and K. Leung, "Models for HTTP-Adaptive-Streaming-Aware Content Distribution Network Interconnection (CDNI)", [RFC 6983](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6983, July 2013, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6983>>.

van Brandenburg, et al. Expires April 7, 2017

[Page 25]

Internet-Draft

CDNI URI Signing

October 2016

- [RFC7336] Peterson, L., Davie, B., and R. van Brandenburg, Ed., "Framework for Content Distribution Network Interconnection (CDNI)", [RFC 7336](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7336, August 2014, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7336>>.
- [RFC7337] Leung, K., Ed. and Y. Lee, Ed., "Content Distribution Network Interconnection (CDNI) Requirements", [RFC 7337](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7337, August 2014, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7337>>.

[Appendix A](#). Signed URI Package Example

This section contains two examples of token usage: a simple example with only the required claims present, and a complex example which demonstrates the full JWT claims set, including an encrypted Client IP (aud).

Note: All of the examples have whitespace added to improve formatting and readability, but are not present in the generated content.

Both examples use the following signing key to generate the Signed URI Package:

```
{
  "kty": "EC",
  "kid": "P5Up0v0eMq1wcxLf7WxIg09JdSYGYFDOWkldueaImf0",
  "use": "sig",
  "crv": "P-256",
```

```
"x": "be807S407dzB6I4hTiCUvmxCI6FuxWba1xYBLLSSsZ8",
"y": "r0GC4vI69g-WF9AGEVI37sNNwbjIzBxSjLvIL7f3RBA",
"d": "yaoweizrCLTU6yIwUL5RQw67cHgvZeMTLVZXjUGb1A1M"
}
```

[A.1.](#) Simple Example

This example is the simplest possible example containing the only required field (sub).

The JWT Claim Set before signing:

```
{
  "sub": "uri:http://cdni.example/foo/bar/baz"
}
```

The Signed JWT:

```
eyJhbGciOiJIJFUiIjIiOiIsImtpZCI6Ii1A1VXBpdjBltXExd2N4TGy3V3hJZzA5SmRTWU
dZRkRPV2tsZHVlYUltZjAifQ.eyJzdWIiOiJ1cmk6aHR0cDovL2NkbmkuZXhhbXBsZ
S9mb28vYmFyL2JhejJ9LmC4yKwUchowx4KhMsI8MQ-Sq_1s3fC8NCi-IWcmNEE9MQz
EEQfurJ1su20p_dtYuc_fG8NixSVubz3HWKM4Rsw
```

[A.2.](#) Complex Example

This example uses all optional fields, including Client IP (aud) which is encrypted. This significantly increases the size of the signed JWT token.

Shared key used for encrypting the Client IP (aud):

```
{
  "kty": "oct",
  "kid": "f-WbjxBC3dPuI3d24kP2hfvos7Qz688UTi6aB0hN998",
  "use": "enc",
  "alg": "A128GCM",
  "k": "4uFxxV7fhNmrtiah2d1fFg"
}
```

JWE for client IP (aud) of [2001:db8::1/32]:

```
eyJhbGciOiJkaXIiLCJraWQiOiJmLVdianhCQzNkUHVJM2QyNGtQMmhm dm9zN1F6Njg4VVRpNmFCMGh00Tk4IiwiaWF0IjoiQTEyOEdDTSJ9..Ewl05cq3jmUe1Bv1.CHif9OMPmsMPgJ8tZgvD0A.R3I2C8nfppY2wBfc4xEPPQ
```

The JWT Claim Set before signing:

```
{
  "aud": "eyJhbGciOiJkaXIiLCJraWQiOiJmLVdianhCQzNkUHVJM2QyNGtQMmhm dm9zN1F6Njg4VVRpNmFCMGh00Tk4IiwiaWF0IjoiQTEyOEdDTSJ9..Ewl05cq3jmUe1Bv1.CHif9OMPmsMPgJ8tZgvD0A.R3I2C8nfppY2wBfc4xEPPQ",
  "exp": 1474243500,
  "iat": 1474243200,
  "iss": "Upstream CDN Inc",
  "jti": "5DAafLhZAFhsbe",
  "nbf": 1474243200,
  "sub": "uri-regex:http://cdni\\.example/foo/bar/baz/[0-9]{3}\\..png"
}
```

The Signed JWT:

```
eyJhbGciOiJFbUzI1NiIsImtpZCI6IiLA1VXBPDjBlTXExd2N4TGy3V3hJZzA5SmRTWU dZRkRPV2tsZHVlYUltZjAifQ.eyJhdWQiOiJleUpoYkdjaU9pSmthWElpTENKcmFXU WlPaUptTFZkaWFuaENRek5rVUhwSk0yUXlOR3RRTW1obWRtOXPOMUY2TmFnNFZWUnB ObUZDTUdoT09UazRJaXdPwlc1aklqb2lRVEV5T0VkrFRfTSjkuLkV3bDA1Y3Ezam1VZ TFCdjEuQ0hpZjlpTVBtc01QZ0o4dFpndkQwQS5SM0kyQzhuZnBwWTJ3QmZjNHhFUFB RIiwiZXhwIjoxNDc0MjQzNTAwLCJpYXQiOiJl0NzQyNDMyMDAsImZcyI6IiVvc3RyZ WftIENETiBjbmMiLCJqdGkiOiI1REFhZkxoWkFmaHNIzSIIm5iZiI6MTQ3NDI0MzI wMCwic3ViIjoIdXJpLXJlZ2V4Omh0dHA6Ly9jZG5pXWwZxhXbXBsZS9mb28vYmFyL 2JheI9bMC05XXszfVxcLnBuZyJ9.AtDNW7mwFIJpqsWAn9ojzj4imE-vTowR-FRzil vnSQuQMz_u4sIspxe6RoXo_Ti8rVMgJ0j0dSvVnQUJZdfRUQ
```

Authors' Addresses

Ray van Brandenburg

TNO
Anna van Buurenplein 1
Den Haag 2595DC
the Netherlands

Phone: +31 88 866 7000
Email: ray.vanbrandenburg@tno.nl

Kent Leung
Cisco Systems, Inc.
3625 Cisco Way
San Jose, CA 95134
United States

Phone: +1 408 526 5030
Email: kleung@cisco.com

Phil Sorber
Comcast Cable Communications
1401 Wynkoop Street, Suite 300
Denver, CO 80202
United States

Phone: +1 720 502 3785
Email: phillip_sorber@comcast.com

Matthew Miller
Cisco Systems, Inc.
1899 Wynkoop Street, Suite 600
Denver, CO 80202
United States

Email: mamille2@cisco.com

