

MILE Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Informational  
Expires: January 23, 2020

S. Banghart  
NIST  
J. Field  
Pivotal  
July 22, 2019

**Definition of ROLIE CSIRT Extension**  
**draft-ietf-mile-rolie-csirt-04**

Abstract

This document extends the Resource-Oriented Lightweight Information Exchange (ROLIE) core to add the information type categories and related requirements needed to support Computer Security Incident Response Team (CSIRT) use cases. The indicator and incident information types are defined as ROLIE extensions. Additional supporting requirements are also defined that describe the use of specific formats and link relations pertaining to the new information types.

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 January 23, 2020.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2019 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 (<https://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

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Terminology . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Information-type Extensions . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	The "incident" information type . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	The "indicator" information type . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Data format requirements . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	Incident Object Description Exchange Format . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.1.1.</a>	Description . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.1.2.</a>	Requirements . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
4.2.	Structured Threat Information eXpression (STIX) Format . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.2.1.</a>	Description . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.2.2.</a>	Requirements . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.3.</a>	Malware Information Sharing Platform (MISP) Format . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.3.1.</a>	Creating MISP Event Entries . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.3.2.</a>	MISP Feeds and Manifests . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	atom:link Extensions . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
5.1.	Link relations for the 'incident' information-type . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
5.2.	Link relations for the 'indicator' information-type . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">5.3.</a>	Link relations for both information-types . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	atom:category Extensions . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">6.1.</a>	Newly registered category values . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">6.2.</a>	Expectation and Impact Classes . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">7.1.</a>	information-type registrations . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">7.1.1.</a>	incident information-type . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">7.1.2.</a>	indicator information-type . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">7.2.</a>	atom:category scheme registrations . . . . .	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">7.2.1.</a>	category:csirt:iodef:purpose . . . . .	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">7.2.2.</a>	category:csirt:iodef:restriction . . . . .	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">Appendix A.</a>	Examples of Use . . . . .	<a href="#">14</a>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">15</a>

## [1.](#) Introduction

Threats to computer security are evolving ever more rapidly as time goes on. As software increases in complexity, the number of vulnerabilities in systems and networks can increase exponentially.



Threat actors looking to exploit these vulnerabilities are making more frequent and more widely distributed attacks across a large variety of systems. The adoption of liberal information sharing amongst attackers allows a discovered vulnerability to be shared and used to attack a vulnerable system within a narrow window of time. As the skills and knowledge required to identify and combat these attacks become more and more specialized, even a well established and secure system may find itself unable to quickly respond to an incident. Effective identification of and response to a sophisticated attack requires open cooperation and collaboration between defending operators, software vendors, and end-users. To improve the timeliness of responses, automation must be used to acquire, contextualize, and put to use shared computer security information.

CSIRTs share two primary forms of information: incidents and indicators. Using these forms of information, analysts are able to perform a wide range of activities both proactive and reactive to ensure the security of their systems.

Incident information describes a cyber security incident. Such information may include attack characteristics, information about the attacker, and attack vector data. Sharing this information helps analysts within the sharing community to inoculate their systems against similar attacks, providing proactive protection.

Indicator information describes the symptoms or necessary pre-conditions of an attack. Everything from system vulnerabilities to unexpected network traffic can help analysts secure systems and prepare for an attack. Making this information available for sharing aids in the proactive defense of systems both within an operating unit but also for any CSIRTs that are part of a sharing consortium.

As a means to bring automation of content discovery and dissemination into the CSIRT domain, this specification provides an extension to the Resource-Oriented Lightweight Information Exchange (ROLIE) core [[RFC8322](#)] designed to address CSIRT use cases. The primary purpose of this extension is to define two new information types: incident, and indicator, along with formats and link relations that support these information-types.

## 2. 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](#)].



Definitions for some of the common computer security-related terminology used in this document can be found in [Section 2 of \[RFC5070\]](#).

### **3. Information-type Extensions**

#### **3.1. The "incident" information type**

When an "atom:category" element has a "scheme" attribute equal to "urn:ietf:params:rolie:category:information-type", the "term" attribute defines the information type of the associated resource. A new valid "term" value for this "scheme": "incident", is described in this section, and registered in [Section 7.1.1](#).

The "incident" information type represents any information describing or pertaining to a computer security incident. This document uses the definition of incident provided by [\[RFC4949\]](#). Provided below is a non-exhaustive list of information that may be considered to be an incident information type.

- o Timing information: start and end times for the incident and/or the response.
- o Descriptive information: plain text or machine readable data that provides some degree of description of the incident itself.
- o Response information: the methods and results of a response to the incident.
- o Meta and contact information: data about the CSIRT that recorded the information, or the operator that enacted the response.
- o Effect and result information: data that describes the effects of an incident, or what the final results of the incident are.

Note again that this list is not exhaustive, any information that in is the abstract realm of an incident should be classified under this information-type.

#### **3.2. The "indicator" information type**

When an "atom:category" element has a "scheme" attribute equal to "urn:ietf:params:rolie:category:information-type", the "term" attribute defines the information type of the associated resource. A new valid "term" value for this "scheme": "indicator", is described in this section, and registered in [Section 7.1.2](#).



The "indicator" information type represents computer security indicators or any information surrounding them. This document uses the definition of indicator provided by [\[RFC4949\]](#). Some examples of indicator information is provided below, but note that indicator is defined in an abstract sense, to be understood as a flexible and widely-applicable definition.

- o Specific vulnerabilities that indicate a vector for attack.
- o Signs of malicious reconnaissance.
- o Definitions of patterns of other indicators.
- o Events that may indicate an attack and information regarding those events.
- o Meta information about the collecting agent.

This list is intended to provide examples of the indicator information-type, not to define it.

#### **[4.](#) Data format requirements**

This section defines usage guidance and additional requirements related to data formats above and beyond those specified in [\[RFC8322\]](#). The following formats are expected to be commonly used to express software descriptor information. For this reason, this document specifies additional requirements to ensure interoperability.

##### **[4.1.](#) Incident Object Description Exchange Format**

###### **[4.1.1.](#) Description**

The Incident Object Description Exchange Format (IODEF) is a format for representing computer security information commonly exchanged between Computer Security Incident Response Teams (CSIRTs) or other operational security teams.

IODEF conveys indicators, incident reports, response activities, and related meta-data in an XML serialization. This information is formally structured in order to support and encourage automated machine-to-machine security communication, as well as enhanced processing at the endpoint.

The full IODEF specification [\[RFC7970\]](#) provides further high-level discussion and technical details.



#### **4.1.2. Requirements**

For an Entry to be considered as a "IODEF Entry", it MUST fulfill the following conditions:

- o The information-type of the Entry is "indicator" or "incident". For a typical Entry, this is derived from the information type of the Feed it is contained in. For a standalone Entry, this is provided by an "atom:category" element.
- o The document linked to by the "href" attribute of the "atom:content" element is an IODEF document as per [[RFC7970](#)]

A "IODEF Entry" MUST conform to the following requirements:

- o The value of the "type" attribute of the "atom:content" element MUST be "application/xml".
- o There MUST be at least one "rolie:property" with the "name" attribute equal to "urn:ietf:params:rolie:property:content-id" and the "value" attribute exactly equal to the "<Indicator-ID>" or the "<Incident-ID>" element in the attached IODEF document. This allows for ROLIE consumers to more easily search for IODEF documents without needing to download the document itself.

### **4.2. Structured Threat Information eXpression (STIX) Format**

#### **4.2.1. Description**

STIX is a structured language for describing a wide range of security resources. STIX approaches the problem with a focus on flexibility, automation, readability, and extensibility.

The full STIX specification [[stix2](#)] provides further high-level discussion and technical details.

#### **4.2.2. Requirements**

For an Entry to be considered as a "STIX Entry", it MUST fulfill the following conditions:

- o The information-type of the Entry is "indicator" or "incident". For a typical Entry, this is derived from the information type of the Feed it is contained in. For a standalone Entry, this is provided by an "atom:category" element.
- o The document linked to by the "href" attribute of the "atom:content" element is a STIX object as per [[stix2](#)]



A "STIX Entry" MUST conform to the following requirements:

- o The value of the "type" attribute of the "atom:content" element MUST be "application/xml" or "application/json".
- o There MUST be at least one "rolie:property" with the "name" attribute equal to "urn:ietf:params:rolie:property:content-id" and the "value" attribute exactly equal to the "<id>" element in the attached STIX object . This allows for ROLIE consumers to more easily search for STIX objects without needing to download the document itself.

### **4.3. Malware Information Sharing Platform (MISP) Format**

MISP involves documentation, utilities, and formats designed to facilitate the day-to-day duties of security operators. MISP includes it's own data format that is used to share between MISP features. While MISP has Feed features that can share and distribute events, it has support for linking to other sharing methods like ROLIE.

MISP is defined by a family of internet drafts and are actively being worked on. With that in mind, this extension will provide non-normative guidance on using MISP format data in ROLIE. In the future, when the MISP format is formally published, this document will be updated to normative requirements around MISP content.

#### **4.3.1. Creating MISP Event Entries**

MISP content should be syndicated in ROLIE using the following guidance:

- o The information-type of the Entry is "indicator". For a typical Entry, this is derived from the information type of the Feed it is contained in. For a standalone Entry, this is provided by an "atom:category" element.
- o The document linked to by the "href" attribute of the "atom:content" element is a MISP Event object as per [[I-D.dulaunoy-misp-core-format](#)]
- o The value of the "type" attribute of the "atom:content" element should be "application/xml".
- o There should be at least one "rolie:property" with the "name" attribute equal to "urn:ietf:params:rolie:property:content-id" and the "value" attribute exactly equal to the "<uuid>" element in the attached MISP Event . This allows for ROLIE consumers to more



easily search for MISP Events without needing to download the document itself.

- o It is also recommended to expose information in the ROLIE Entry that is required and recommended to expose in the MISP Manifest format. This ensures better compatibility between a ROLIE Feed and a MISP Manifest
- \* The following fields are required by the MISP draft: info, Orgc, timestamp, date
- \* The following fields are recommended by the MISP draft: analysis, threat\_level\_id

#### **4.3.2. MISP Feeds and Manifests**

MISP Feeds are hosted lists of MISP events, each event represented by its UUID. Users request Events on a one-by-one basis and are served the full Event on each request.

MISP Manifest files list MISP events by their UUIDs as well, but provide a variety of metadata for each Event inline. After examining the minimized and stripped Event in the manifest, a user could search for the Event UUID of interest in a locally located folder of Event files where the file name is the UUID of the Event.

ROLIE hosting MISP data would operate as a combination of these approaches. Each ROLIE Feed would contain a list of Event Entries, each with metadata and identifying information about a given Event. Should the user be interested in the Event, the Event Entry provides a direct link to download the full Event. In short, a ROLIE MISP Feed is minimally mappable to a MISP Manifest file where a resolvable link to the MISP Event was injected into each Event described in the Manifest.

With that in mind, a MISP Feed as well as a MISP Manifest with attached local file list could be fully converted and hosted as a ROLIE repository. As a lower overhead alternative, a ROLIE server could simply provide a view into MISP data.

## **5. atom:link Extensions**

This section defines additional link relationships that implementations MUST support. These relationships are not registered in the Link Relation IANA table as their use case is too narrow. Each relationship is named and described.



These relations come in related pairs. The first of each pair is expected to be more common, as they can be determined at the time that the Entry is created. The second of each pair will often need to be added retroactively to an Entry.

### **5.1. Link relations for the 'incident' information-type**

If a ROLIE server supports either the incident information-types, then these link relations MUST be support

Name	Description
indicators	Provides a link to a collection of zero or more instances of cyber security indicators that are associated with the resource.
evidence	Provides a link to a collection of zero or more resources that provides some proof of attribution for an incident. The evidence may or may not have any identified chain of custody.
attacker	Provides a link to a collection of zero or more resources that provides a representation of the attacker.
vector	Provides a link to a collection of zero or more resources that provides a representation of the method used by the attacker.

Table 1: Link Relations for Resource-Oriented Lightweight Indicator Exchange

### **5.2. Link relations for the 'indicator' information-type**

If a ROLIE server supports the indicator information-types, then these link relations MUST be supported.

Name	Description
incidents	Provides a link to a collection of zero or more instances of incident representations associated with the resource.

Table 2: Link Relations for Resource-Oriented Lightweight Indicator Exchange



### 5.3. Link relations for both information-types

If a ROLIE server supports either the incident or the indicator information-types, then these link relations MUST be supported.

Name	Description
assessments	Provides a link to a collection of zero or more resources that represent the results of executing a benchmark.
reports	Provides a link to a collection of zero or more resources that represent RID reports.
traceRequests	Provides a link to a collection of zero or more resources that represent RID traceRequests.
investigationRequests	Provides a link to a collection of zero or more resources that represent RID investigationRequests.

Table 3: Link Relations for Resource-Oriented Lightweight Indicator Exchange

## 6. atom:category Extensions

### 6.1. Newly registered category values

This document registers two additional registered atom:category names: 'urn:ietf:params:rolie:category:csirt:iodef:purpose' and 'urn:ietf:params:rolie:category:csirt:iodef:restriction'. These categories expose important information from inside the attached IODEF document. The Purpose and Restriction elements are often used to sort or cateogrizie IODEF documents, and in some use cases, determine the security and access permissions of the document.

When the name attribute of the category is 'urn:ietf:params:rolie:category:csirt:iodef:purpose', the value attribute SHOULD be constrained as per [section 3.2](#) of IODEF [\[RFC7970\]](#), e.g. traceback, mitigation, reporting, or other.

When the name attribute of the category is 'urn:ietf:params:rolie:category:csirt:iodef:restriction', the value attribute SHOULD be constrained as per [section 3.2](#) of IODEF [\[RFC7970\]](#), e.g. public, need-to-know, private, default.



## **6.2. Expectation and Impact Classes**

It is frequently the case that an organization will need to triage their investigation and response activities based upon, e.g., the state of the current threat environment, or simply as a result of having limited resources.

In order to enable operators to effectively prioritize their response activity, it is RECOMMENDED that feed implementers provide Atom categories that correspond to the IODEF Expectation and Impact classes. The availability of these feed categories will enable clients to more easily retrieve and prioritize cyber security information that has already been identified as having a specific potential impact, or having a specific expectation.

Support for these categories may also enable efficiencies for organizations that already have established (or plan to establish) operational processes and workflows that are based on these IODEF classes.

## **7. IANA Considerations**

### **7.1. information-type registrations**

IANA has added the following entries to the "ROLIE Security Resource Information Type Sub-Registry" registry located at <https://www.iana.org/assignments/rolie/category/information-type> .

#### **7.1.1. incident information-type**

The entry is as follows:

name: incident

index: TBD

reference: This document, [Section 3.1](#)

#### **7.1.2. indicator information-type**

The entry is as follows:

name: indicator

index: TBD

reference: This document, [Section 3.2](#)



## **7.2. atom:category scheme registrations**

IANA has added the following entries to the "ROLIE URN Parameters" registry located in <<https://www.iana.org/assignments/rolie/>>.

### **7.2.1. category:csirt:iodef:purpose**

The entry is as follows:

name: category:csirt:iodef:purpose

Extension IRI: urn:ietf:params:rolie:category:csirt:iodef:purpose

Reference: This document, [Section 6.1](#)

Subregistry: None

### **7.2.2. category:csirt:iodef:restriction**

The entry is as follows:

name: category:csirt:iodef:restriction

Extension IRI:

urn:ietf:params:rolie:category:csirt:iodef:restriction

Reference: This document, [Section 6.1](#)

Subregistry: None

## **8. Security Considerations**

This document implies the use of ROLIE in high-security use cases, as such, added care should be taken to fortify and secure ROLIE repositories and clients using this extension. The guidance in the ROLIE core specification is strongly recommended, and implementers should consider adding additional security measures as they see fit.

When providing a private workspace for closed sharing, it is recommended that the ROLIE repository checks user authorization when the user sends a GET request to the service document. If the user is not authorized to send any requests to a given workspace or collection, that workspace or collection should be truncated from the service document in the response. In this way the existence of unauthorized content remains unknown to potential attackers, hopefully reducing attack surface.



When sharing IODEF 2 documents using a ROLIE server, care should be taken to separate IODEF Entries into different workspaces based on the "restriction" attribute of the IODEF Document (and therefore the restriction property in ROLIE). Security and access controls are most effectively deployed at the workspace level, as such, keeping private and need-to-know IODEF documents in their own workspace helps prevent unintended information leakage.

## 9. Normative References

- [I-D.dulaunoy-misp-core-format]  
Dulaunoy, A. and A. Iklody, "MISP core format", [draft-dulaunoy-misp-core-format-07](#) (work in progress), February 2019.
- [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>>.
- [RFC4287] Nottingham, M., Ed. and R. Sayre, Ed., "The Atom Syndication Format", [RFC 4287](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4287, December 2005, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4287>>.
- [RFC4949] Shirey, R., "Internet Security Glossary, Version 2", FYI 36, [RFC 4949](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4949, August 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4949>>.
- [RFC5023] Gregorio, J., Ed. and B. de hOra, Ed., "The Atom Publishing Protocol", [RFC 5023](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5023, October 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5023>>.
- [RFC5070] Danyliw, R., Meijer, J., and Y. Demchenko, "The Incident Object Description Exchange Format", [RFC 5070](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5070, December 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5070>>.
- [RFC7970] Danyliw, R., "The Incident Object Description Exchange Format Version 2", [RFC 7970](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7970, November 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7970>>.
- [RFC8322] Field, J., Banghart, S., and D. Waltermire, "Resource-Oriented Lightweight Information Exchange (ROLIE)", [RFC 8322](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8322, February 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8322>>.
- [stix2] "Structured Threat Information Expression 2.0", July 2017.



## [Appendix A](#). Examples of Use

Use of this extension in a ROLIE repository will not typically change that repository's operation. As such, the general examples provided by the ROLIE core document would serve as examples. Provided below is a sample incident ROLIE entry containing an IODEF document:

```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>
<entry xmlns="http://www.w3.org/2005/Atom"
  xmlns:rolie="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:rolie-1.0">
  <id>f762c77c-057d-45c9-b805-677ab89aaf7c</id>
  <title>Sample Incident</title>
  <published>2018-09-04T18:13:51.0Z</published>
  <updated>2019-08-05T18:13:51.0Z</updated>
  <summary>A document containing an indicator of compromise. </summary>
  <link rel="self" href="http://www.example.org/rolie/CSIRT/123456"/>
  <link rel="feed" href="http://www.example.org/rolie/CSIRT/">
  <rolie:property name="urn:ietf:params:rolie:property:content-id"
    value="id847201"/>
  <category
    scheme="urn:ietf:params:rolie:category:information-type"
    term="incident"/>
  <rolie:format
    ns="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:iodef-2.0"/>
  <content type="application/xml"
    src="http://www.example.org/rolie/csirt/123456/data"/>
</entry>
```

Below is a sample indicator ROLIE entry containing a STIX document:



```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>
<entry xmlns="http://www.w3.org/2005/Atom"
  xmlns:rolie="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:rolie-1.0">
  <id>0c99df51-767f-4940-8a09-c4b607b6fe21</id>
  <title>Sample Indicator</title>
  <published>2018-09-04T18:13:51.0Z</published>
  <updated>2019-08-05T18:13:51.0Z</updated>
  <summary>A document containing an incident report. </summary>
  <link rel="self" href="http://www.example.org/rolie/CSIRT/654321"/>
  <link rel="feed" href="http://www.example.org/rolie/CSIRT/">
  <rolie:property name="urn:ietf:params:rolie:property:content-id
    value="exmaple:indicator:654321"/>
  <category
    scheme="urn:ietf:params:rolie:category:information-type"
    term="indicator"/>
  <rolie:format
    ns="http://stix.mitre.org/XMLSchema/core/1.2/stix_core.xsd"/>
  <content type="application/xml"
    src="http://www.example.org/rolie/csirt/654321/data"/>
</entry>
```

#### Authors' Addresses

Stephen A. Banghart  
National Institute of Standards and Technology  
100 Bureau Drive  
Gaithersburg, Maryland  
USA

Phone: (301)975-4288  
Email: sab3@nist.gov

John P. Field  
Pivotal Software, Inc.  
625 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York  
USA

Phone: (646)792-5770  
Email: jfield@pivotal.io

