Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Experimental
Expires: October 28, 2010

V. Fuller
D. Farinacci
cisco Systems
April 26, 2010

LISP Map Server
draft-ietf-lisp-ms-05.txt

Abstract

This draft describes the LISP Map-Server (LISP-MS), a computing system which provides a simple LISP protocol interface as a "front end" to the Endpoint-ID (EID) to Routing Locator (RLOC) mapping database and associated virtual network of LISP protocol elements.

The purpose of the Map-Server is to simplify the implementation and operation of LISP Ingress Tunnel Routers (ITRs) and Egress Tunnel Routers (ETRs), the devices that implement the "edge" of the LISP infrastructure and which connect directly to LISP-capable Internet end sites.

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 October 28, 2010.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2010 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 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
2. Definition of Terms 4
3. Basic Overview 5
4. Interactions With Other LISP Components 6
4.1. ITR EID-to-RLOC Mapping Resolution 6
4.2. ETR/Map-Server EID Prefix Registration 7
4.3. Map-Server Processing 8
4.4. Map-Resolver Processing 8
4.4.1. Anycast Map-Resolver Operation 9
5. Open Issues and Considerations 10
6. Security Considerations 11
7. References 12
7.1. Normative References 12
7.2. Informative References 12
Appendix A. Acknowledgments 13
Authors' Addresses 14

1. Introduction

LISP [LISP] specifies an architecture and mechanism for replacing the addresses currently used by IP with two separate name spaces: EIDs, used within sites, and RLOCs, used on the transit networks that make up the Internet infrastructure. To achieve this separation, LISP defines protocol mechanisms for mapping from EIDs to RLOCs. In addition, LISP assumes the existence of a database to store and propagate those mappings globally. Several such databases have been proposed, among them: LISP-CONS [CONS], LISP-NERD, [NERD] and LISP+ ALT [ALT].

There are two types of operation for a LISP Map-Server: as a Map-Resolver, which accepts Map-Requests from an ITR and "resolves" the EID-to-RLOC mapping using the distributed mapping database, and as a Map-Server, which learns authoritative EID-to-RLOC mappings from an ETR and publish them in the database. A single device may implement one or both types of operation.

Conceptually, LISP Map-Servers share some of the same basic configuration and maintenance properties as Domain Name System (DNS) [RFC1035] servers and caching resolvers. With this in mind, this specification borrows familiar terminology (resolver and server) from the DNS specifications.

Note that while this document assumes a LISP+ALT database mapping infrastructure to illustrate certain aspects of Map-Server and Map-Resolver operation, this is not intended to preclude the use of Map-Servers and Map-Resolvers as a a standardized interface for ITRs and ETRs to access other mapping database systems.

2. Definition of Terms

Map-Server: a network infrastructure component which learns EID-to-RLOC mapping entries from an authoritative source (typically, an ETR, through static configuration or another out-of-band mechanism may be used). A Map-Server publishes these mappings in the distributed mapping database.

Map-Resolver: a network infrastructure component which accepts LISP Encapsulated Map-Requests, typically from an ITR, quickly determines whether or not the destination IP address is part of the EID namespace; if it is not, a Negative Map-Reply is immediately returned. Otherwise, the Map-Resolver finds the appropriate EID-to-RLOC mapping by consulting the distributed mapping database system.

Encapsulated Map-Request: a LISP Map-Request with an additional LISP header prepended. Sent to UDP destination port 4342. The "outer" addresses are globally-routeable IP addresses, also known as RLOCs. Used by an ITR when sending to a Map-Resolver and by a Map-Server when forwarding a Map-Request to an ETR.

Negative Map-Reply: a LISP Map-Reply that contains an empty locator-set. Returned in response to a Map-Request if the destination EID does not exist in the mapping database. Typically, this means that the "EID" being requested is an IP address connected to a non-LISP site.

Map-Register message: a LISP message sent by an ETR to a Map-Server to register its associated EID-prefixes. In addition to the set of EID-prefixes to register, the message includes one or more RLOCs to be be used by the Map-Server when forwarding Map-Requests (re-formatted as Encapsulated Map-Requests) received through the database mapping system.

For definitions of other terms, notably Map-Request, Map-Reply, Ingress Tunnel Router (ITR), and Egress Tunnel Router (ETR), please consult the LISP specification [LISP].

3. Basic Overview

A Map-Server is a device which publishes EID-prefix information on behalf of ETRs and connects to the LISP distributed mapping database system to help answer LISP Map-Requests seeking the RLOCs for those EID-prefixes. To publish its EID-prefixes, an ETR periodically sends Map-Register messages to the Map-Server. A Map-Register message contains a list of EID-prefixes plus a set of RLOCs that can be used to reach the ETR when a Map-Server needs to forward a Map-Request to it.

When LISP+ALT is used as the mapping database, a Map-Server connects to ALT network and acts as a "last-hop" ALT router. Intermediate ALT routers forward Map-Requests to the Map-Server that advertises a particular EID-prefix and the Map-Server forwards them to the owning ETR, which responds with Map-Reply messages.

The LISP Map-Server design also includes the operation of a Map-Resolver, which receives Encapsulated Map-Requests from its client ITRs and uses the distributed mapping database system to find the appropriate ETR to answer those requests. On a LISP+ALT network, a Map-Resolver acts as a "first-hop" ALT router. It has GRE tunnels configured to other ALT routers and uses BGP to learn paths to ETRs for different prefixes in the LISP+ALT database. The Map-Resolver uses this path information to forward Map-Requests over the ALT to the correct ETRs. A Map-Resolver may operate in a non-caching mode, where it simply de-capsulates and forwards the Encapsulated Map-Requests that it receives from ITRs.

Alternatively, a Map-Resolver may operate in a caching mode, where it saves information about outsanding Map-Reqeusts, originates new Map-Requests to the correct ETR(s), accepts and caches the Map-Replies, and finally forwards the Map-Replies to the original ITRs. One significant issue with use of caching in a Map-Resolver is that it hides the original ITR source of a Map-Request, which prevents an ETR from tailoring its responses to that source; this reduces the inbound traffic- engineering capability for the site owning the ETR. In addition, caching in a Map-Resolver exacerbates problems associated with old mappings being cached; an outdated, cached mapping in an ITR affects only that ITR and traffic originated by its site while an outdate, cached mapping in a Map-Resolver could cause a problem with a wider scope. More experience with caching Map-Resolvers on the LISP pilot network will be needed to determine whether their use can be recommended.

While a single device can implement the functions of both a Map-Server and a Map-Resolver. As is the case with the DNS, however, operational simplicity argues for keeping those functions separate.

4. Interactions With Other LISP Components

4.1. ITR EID-to-RLOC Mapping Resolution

An ITR is configured with the address of a Map-Resolver. This address is a "locator" or RLOC in that it must be routeable on the underlying core network; it must not need to be resolved through LISP EID-to-RLOC mapping as that would introduce a circular dependency. When using a Map-Resolver, an ITR does not need to connect to any other database mapping system. In particular, the ITR need not connect to the LISP+ALT infrastructure or implement the BGP and GRE protocols that it uses.

An ITR sends an Encapsulated Map-Request to a configured Map-Resolver when it needs an EID-to-RLOC mapping that is not found in its local map-cache. Using the Map-Resolver greatly reduces both the complexity of the ITR implementation the costs associated with its operation.

In response to an Encapsulated Map-Request, the ITR can expect one of the following:

- A negative LISP Map-Reply if the Map-Resolver can determine that the requested EID does not exist. The ITR saves EID-prefix returned in the Map-Reply in its cache, marking it as non-LISP-capable and knows not to attempt LISP encapsulation for destinations matching it.

- A LISP Map-Reply from the ETR that owns the EID-to-RLOC mapping or possibly from a Map-Server answering on behalf of the ETR. Note that the stateless nature of non-caching Map-Resolver forwarding means that the Map-Reply may not be from the Map-Resolver to which the Encapsulated Map-Request was sent unless the target Map-Resolver offers caching (Section 4.4).

Note that an ITR may use a Map-Resolver while also participating in another mapping database mechanism. For example, an ITR that runs LISP+ALT can also send Encapsulated Map-Requests to a Map-Resolver. When doing this, an ITR should prefer querying an ETR learned through the ALT network as LISP+ALT provides better information about the set of defined EID-prefixes. Such a configuration is expected to be very rare, since there is little benefit to using a Map-Resolver if an ITR is already using a mapping database system. There would be, for example, no need for such an ITR to send a Map-Request to a possibly non-existent EID (and rely on Negative Map-Replies) if it can consult the ALT database to verify that an EID-prefix is present before sending that Map-Request.

4.2. ETR/Map-Server EID Prefix Registration

An ETR publishes its EID-prefixes on a Map-Server by sending LISP Map-Register messages. A Map-Register message includes authentication data, so prior to sending a Map-Register message, the ETR and Map-Server must be configured with a secret shared-key. A Map-Server's configuration should also include list of the EID-prefixes for which each ETR is authoratative and should verify that a Map-Register received from an ETR only contain EID-prefixes that are associated with that ETR. While this check is not mandatory, it is strongly encouraged as a failure to so leaves the mapping system vulnerable to simple EID-prefix hijacking attacks. As developers and users gain experience with the mapping system, additional, stronger security measures may be added to the registration process.

Map-Register messages are sent periodically from an ETR to a Map-Server with a suggested interval between messages of one minute. A Map-Server should time-out and remove an ETR's registration if it has not received a valid Map-Register message within the past three minutes. When first contacting a Map-Server after restart or changes to its EID-to-RLOC database mappings, an ETR may initially send Map-Register messages at an increased frequency, up to one every 20 seconds. This "quick registration" period is limited to five minutes in duration.

Note that a one-minute minimum registration interval during steady state maintenance of an association between an ITR and a Map-Server does set a lower-bound on how quickly and how frequently a mapping database entry can be updated. This may have implications for what sorts of mobility can supported directly by the mapping system. For a discussion on one way that faster mobility may be implemented for individual devices, please see [LISP-MN].

An ETR which uses a Map-Server to publish its EID-to-RLOC mappings does not need to participate further in the mapping database protocol(s). When using a LISP+ALT mapping database, for example, this means that the ETR does not need to implement GRE or BGP, which greatly simplifies its configuration and reduces its cost of operation.

Note that use of a Map-Server does not preclude an ETR from also connecting to the mapping database (i.e. it could also connect to the LISP+ALT network) but doing so doesn't seem particularly useful as the whole purpose of using a Map-Server is to avoid the complexity of the mapping database protocols.

4.3. Map-Server Processing

The operation of a Map-Server, once it has EID-prefixes registered by its client ETRs, is quite simple. In response to a Map-Request (received over the ALT if LISP+ALT is in use), the Map-Server verifies that the destination EID matches an EID-prefix for which it has one or more registered ETRs, then re-encapsulates and forwards the now-Encapsulated Map-Request to a matching ETR. It does not otherwise alter the Map-Request so any Map-Reply sent by the ETR is returned to the RLOC in the Map-Request, not to the Map-Server. Unless also acting as a Map-Resolver, a Map-Server should never receive Map-Replies; any such messages should be discarded without response, perhaps accompanied by logging of a diagnostic message if the rate of Map-Replies is suggestive of malicious traffic.

4.4. Map-Resolver Processing

In response to an Encapsulated Map-Request, a Map-Resolver de-capsulates the message then checks its local database of mapping entries (statically configured, cached, or learned from associated ETRs). If it finds a matching entry, it returns a non-authoritative LISP Map-Reply with the known mapping.

If the Map-Resolver does not have the mapping entry and if it can determine that the requested IP address does not match an EID-prefix in the mapping database, it immediately returns a negative LISP Map-Reply, one which contains an EID-prefix and an empty locator-set. To minimize the number of negative cache entries needed by an ITR, the Map-Resolver should return the least-specific prefix which both matches the original query and does not match any EID-prefix known to exist in the LISP-capable infrastructure.

If the Map-Resolver does not have sufficient information to know whether the EID exists, it needs to forward the Map-Request to another device which has more information about the EID being requested. This is done in one of two ways:

1. A non-caching Map-Resolver simply forwards the unencapsulated Map-Request, with the original ITR RLOC as the source, on to the distributed mapping database. Using a LISP+ALT mapaping database, the Map-Resolver is connected to the ALT network and sends the Map-Request to the next ALT hop learned from its ALT BGP neighbors. The Map-Resolver does not send any response to the ITR; since the source RLOC is that of the ITR, the ETR or Map-Server which receives the Map-Request over the ALT and responds will do so directly to the ITR.

2. A caching Map-Resolver queues information from the Encapsulated Map-Request, including the ITR RLOC and the original nonce. It then modifies the Map-Request to use its own RLOC, generates a "local nonce" (which is also saved in the request queue entry), and forwards the Map-Request as above. When the Map-Resolver receives a Map-Reply, it looks in its request queue to match the reply nonce to a "local nonce" entry then de-queues the entry and uses the saved original nonce and ITR RLOC to re-write those fields in the Map-Reply before sending to the ITR. The request queue entry is also deleted and the mapping entries from the Map-Reply are saved in the Map-Resolver's cache.

4.4.1. Anycast Map-Resolver Operation

A Map-Resolver can be set up to use "anycast", where where the same address is assigned to multiple Map-Resolvers and is propagated through IGP routing, to facilitate the use of a topologically-close Map-Resolver each ITR.

Note that Map-Server associations with ETRs should not use anycast addresses as registrations need to be established between an ETR and a specific set of Map-Servers, each identified by a specific registation association.

5. Open Issues and Considerations

There are a number of issues with the Map-Server and Map-Resolver design that are not yet completely understood. Among these are:

- Feasibility, performance, and complexity trade-offs of implementing caching in Map-Resolvers
- Convergence time when an EID-to-RLOC mapping changes and mechanisms for detecting and refreshing or removing stale, cached information
- Deployability and complexity trade-offs of implementing stronger security measures in both EID-prefix registration and Map-Request/ Map-Reply processing
- Requirements for additional state in the registration process between Map-Servers and ETRs
- Possible need for security associations between a Map-Resolver and its client ITRs

The authors expect that experimentation on the LISP pilot network will help answer open questions surrounding these and other issues.

6. Security Considerations

The 2-way nonce exchange documented in [LISP] can be used to avoid ITR spoofing attacks.

To publish an authoritative EID-to-RLOC mapping with a Map-Server, an ETR includes authentication data that is a hash of the message using pair-wise shared key. An implementation must support use of HMAC-SHA-1-96 [RFC2404] and should support use of HMAC-SHA-128-256 [RFC4634]. Key changes are initially expected to be manual though a key-chaining scheme may be developed as a future extension of this specification.

As noted in Section 4.2, a Map-Server should verify that all EID-prefixes registered by an ETR match configuration stored on the Map-Server.

The current LISP and LISP-MS protocol exchange, where an ITR sends a Map-Request through a Map-Resolver, mapping database infrastructure, and Map-Server while an ETR returns a Map-Reply directly to the ITR makes it difficult for the ITR to verify that the returned EID-prefix length matches that registered by the ETR with, and therefore checked by, a Map-Server.

While beyond the scope of securing an individual Map-Server or Map-Resolver, it should be noted that a BGP-based LISP+ALT network (if ALT is used as the mapping database infrastructure) can take advantage of technology being developed by the IETF SIDR working group or either S-BGP [I-D.murphy-bgp-secr] or soBGP [I-D.white-sobgparchitecture] should they be developed and widely deployed.

7. References

7.1. Normative References

[ALT] Farinacci, D., Fuller, V., Meyer, D., and D. Lewis, "LISP Alternative Topology (LISP-ALT)", draft-ietf-lisp-alt-04.txt (work in progress), April 2010.

[LISP] Farinacci, D., Fuller, V., Meyer, D., and D. Lewis, "Locator/ID Separation Protocol (LISP)", draft-ietf-lisp-07.txt (work in progress), April 2010.

[RFC1035] Mockapetris, P., "Domain names - implementation and specification", STD 13, RFC 1035, November 1987.

[RFC2404] Madson, C. and R. Glenn, "The Use of HMAC-SHA-1-96 within ESP and AH", RFC 2404, November 1998.

[RFC4634] Eastlake, D. and T. Hansen, "US Secure Hash Algorithms (SHA and HMAC-SHA)", RFC 4634, July 2006.

7.2. Informative References

[CONS] Farinacci, D., Fuller, V., and D. Meyer, "LISP-CONS: A Content distribution Overlay Network Service for LISP", draft-meyer-lisp-cons-03.txt (work in progress), November 2007.

[I-D.murphy-bgp-secr] Murphy, S., "BGP Security Analysis", draft-murphy-bgp-secr-04 (work in progress), November 2001.

[I-D.white-sobgparchitecture] White, R., "Architecture and Deployment Considerations for Secure Origin BGP (soBGP)", draft-white-sobgparchitecture-00 (work in progress), May 2004.

[LISP-MN] Farinacci, D., Fuller, V., Meyer, D., and D. Lewis, "LISP Mobile Node Architecture", draft-meyer-lisp-mn-01.txt (work in progress), February 2010.

[NERD] Lear, E., "NERD: A Not-so-novel EID to RLOC Database", draft-lear-lisp-nerd-08.txt (work in progress), March 2010.

Appendix A. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Greg Schudel, Darrel Lewis, John Zwiebel, Andrew Partan, Dave Meyer, Isidor Kouvelas, Jesper Skriver, and members of the lisp@ietf.org mailing list for their feedback and helpful suggestions.

Special thanks are due to Noel Chiappa for his extensive work on caching with LISP-CONS, some of which will be used by Map-Resolvers.

Authors' Addresses

Vince Fuller
cisco Systems
Tasman Drive
San Jose, CA 95134
USA

Email: vaf@cisco.com

Dino Farinacci
cisco Systems
Tasman Drive
San Jose, CA 95134
USA

Email: dino@cisco.com