

Internet Engineering Task Force
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: September 26, 2019

H. Stenn
Network Time Foundation
S. Goldberg
Boston University
March 25, 2019

Network Time Protocol REFID Updates
draft-ietf-ntp-refid-updates-05

Abstract

[RFC 5905 \[RFC5905\], section 7.3](#), "Packet Header Variables", defines the value of the REFID, the system peer for the responding host. In the past, for IPv4 associations the IPv4 address is used, and for IPv6 associations the first four octets of the MD5 hash of the IPv6 are used. There are two recognized shortcomings to this approach, and this proposal addresses them. One is that knowledge of the system peer is "abusable" information and should not be generally available. The second is that the four octet hash of the IPv6 address looks very much like an IPv4 address, and this is confusing.

RFC EDITOR: PLEASE REMOVE THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPH BEFORE PUBLISHING:

The source code and issues list for this draft can be found in <https://github.com/hstenn/ietf-ntp-refid-updates>

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 September 26, 2019.

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

1.	Introduction	2
1.1.	The REFID	2
1.2.	NOT-YOU REFID	3
1.3.	IPv6 REFID	4
1.4.	Requirements Language	4
2.	The NOT-YOU REFID	4
2.1.	Proposal	5
3.	Augmenting the IPv6 REFID Hash	5
3.1.	Background	5
3.2.	Potential Problems	6
4.	Acknowledgements	6
5.	IANA Considerations	6
6.	Security Considerations	6
7.	References	7
7.1.	Normative References	7
7.2.	Informative References	7
	Authors' Addresses	7

[1.](#) Introduction[1.1.](#) The REFID

The interpretation of a REFID is based on the stratum, as documented in [RFC 5905 \[RFC5905\], section 7.3](#), "Packet Header Variables". The core reason for the REFID in the NTP Protocol is to prevent a degree-one timing loop, where server B decides to follow A as its time

source, and A then decides to follow B as its time source.

At Stratum 2+, which will be the case if two servers A and B are exchanging timing information, then if server B follows A as its time source, A's address will be B's REFID. When A uses IPv4, the default

REFID is A's IPv4 address. When A uses IPv6, the default REFID is a four-octet digest of A's IPv6 address. Now, if A queries B for its time, then A will learn that B is using A as its time source by observing A's address in the REFID field of the response packet sent by B. Thus, A will not select B as a potential time source, as this would cause a timing loop.

[1.2.](#) NOT-YOU REFID

The traditional REFID mechanism, however, also allows a third-party C to learn that A is the time source that is being used by B. When A is using IPv4, C can learn this by querying B for its time, and observing that the REFID in B's response is the IPv4 address of A. Meanwhile, when A is using IPv6, then C can again query B for its time, and then can use an offline dictionary attack to attempt to determine the IPv6 address that corresponds to the digest value in the response sent by B. C could construct the necessary dictionary by compiling a list of publicly accessible IPv6 servers. Remote attackers can use this technique to attempt to identify the time sources used by a target, and then send spoofed packets to the target or its time source in an attempt to disrupt time service, as was done e.g., in [[NDSS16](#)] or [[CVE-2015-8138](#)].

The REFID thus unnecessarily leaks information about a target's time server to remote attackers. The best way to mitigate this vulnerability is to decouple the IP address of the time source from the REFID. To do this, a system can use an otherwise-impossible value for its REFID, called the NOT-YOU REFID value, when it believes that a querying system is not its time source.

The NOT-YOU REFID proposal is backwards-compatible and provides the bare minimum diagnostic information to third parties. It can be implemented by one peer in an NTP association without any changes to the other peer. This holds as long as responding NOT-YOU system can accurately detect when it's getting a request from its system peer.

The NOT-YOU REFID proposal does have a small risk. Consider system A that returns the NOT-YOU REFID and system B that has two network interfaces B1 and B2. Suppose that system A is using system B as his time source, via network interface B1. Now suppose that system B queries system A for time via network interface B2. In this case, system A returns the NOT-YOU REFID value to system B, since system A does not realize that network interface B1 and B2 belong to the same system. In this case, system B might choose system A as its time source, and a degree-one timing loop will occur. In this case, however, the two systems will spiral into degrading stratum positions with increasing root distances, and eventually the loop will break. If any other systems are available as time servers, one of them will

become the new system peer. However, unless or until this happens the two spiraling systems will have degraded time quality.

1.3. IPv6 REFID

In an environment where all time queries made to a server can be trusted, an operator might well choose to expose the real REFID. [RFC 5905 \[RFC5905\], section 7.3](#), "Packet Header Variables", explains how a remote system peer is converted to a REFID. It says:

If using the IPv4 address family, the identifier is the four-octet IPv4 address. If using the IPv6 family, it is the first four octets of the MD5 hash of the IPv6 address. ...

However, the MD5 hash of an IPv6 address often looks like a valid IPv4 address. When this happens, an operator cannot tell if the REFID refers to an IPv6 address or and IPv4. Specifically, the NTP Project has received a report where the generated IPv6 hash decoded to the IPv4 address of a different machine on the system peer's network.

This proposal offers a way for a system to generate a REFID for a IPv6 system peer that does not conflict with an IPv4-based REFID.

This proposal is not backwards-compatible. It SHOULD be implemented by both peers in an NTP association. In the scenario where A and B are peering using IPv6, where A is the system peer and does not understand IPv6 REFID, and B is subordinate and is using IPv6 REFID, A will not be able to determine that B is using A as its system peer

and a degree-one timing loop can form.

If both peers implement the IPv6 REFID this situation cannot happen.

If at least one of the peers implements the proposed I-DO [[DRAFT-I-DO](#)] protocol this situation cannot happen.

[1.4.](#) Requirements Language

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 [RFC 2119](#) [[RFC2119](#)].

[2.](#) The NOT-YOU REFID

[2.1.](#) Proposal

When enabled, this proposal allows the one-degree loop detection to work and useful diagnostic information to be provided to trusted partners while keeping potentially abusable information from being disclosed to ostensibly uninterested parties. It does this by returning the normal REFID to queries that come from trusted addresses or from an address that the current system believes is its time source (aka its "system peer"), and otherwise returning one of two special IP addresses that is interpreted to mean "not you". The "not you" IP addresses are 127.127.127.127 and 127.127.127.128. If an IPv6 query is received from an address whose four-octet hash equals one of these two addresses and we believe the querying host is not our system peer, the other NOT-YOU address is returned as the REFID.

This mechanism is correct and transparent when the system responding with a NOT-YOU can accurately detect when it's getting a timing query from its system peer. A querying system that uses IPv4 continues to check that its IPv4 address does not appear in the REFID before deciding whether to take time from the current system. A querying system that uses IPv6 continues to check that the four-octet hash of

its IPv6 address does not appear in the REFID before deciding whether to take time from the current system.

[3.](#) Augmenting the IPv6 REFID Hash

[3.1.](#) Background

In a trusted network, the S2+ REFID is generated based on the network system peer. [RFC 5905](#) [[RFC5905](#)] says:

If using the IPv4 address family, the identifier is the four-octet IPv4 address. If using the IPv6 family, it is the first four octets of the MD5 hash of the IPv6 address.

This means that the IPv4 representation of the IPv6 hash would be: b1.b2.b3.b4 . This proposal is that the system MAY also use 255.b2.b3.b4 as its REFID. This reduces the risk of ambiguity, since addresses beginning with 255 are "reserved", and thus will not collide with valid IPv4 on the network.

When using the REFID to check for a timing loop for an IPv6 association, if the code that checks the first four-octets of the hash fails to match then the code must check again, using 0xFF as the first octet of the hash.

[3.2.](#) Potential Problems

There is a 1 in 16,777,216 chance that the REFID hashes of two IPv6 addresses will be identical, producing a false-positive loop detection. With a sufficient number of servers, the risk of this problem becomes a non-issue. The use of the NOT-YOU REFID and/or the proposed REFID-SUGGESTION [[DRAFT-REFID-SUGGESTION](#)] or I-DO [[DRAFT-I-DO](#)] extension fields are ways to mitigate this potential situation.

Unrealistically, if only two instances of NTP are communicating via IPv6 and system A implements this new IPv6 REFID hash and system B does not, system B will not be able to detect this loop condition. In this case, the two machines will slowly increase their stratum until they become unsynchronized. This situation is considered to be

unrealistic because, for this to happen, each system would have to have only the other system available as a time source, for example, in a misconfigured "orphan mode" setup. There is no risk of this happening in an NTP network with 3 or more time sources, or in a properly-configured "time island" setup.

4. Acknowledgements

For the "not-you" REFID, we acknowledge useful discussions with Aanchal Malhotra and Matthew Van Gundy.

For the IPv6 REFID, we acknowledge Dan Mahoney (and perhaps others) for suggesting the idea of using an "impossible" first-octet value to indicate an IPv6 refid hash.

5. IANA Considerations

This memo requests IANA to allocate a pseudo Extension Field Type of 0xFFFF so the proposed "I-Do" exchange can report whether or not the "IPv6 REFID Hash" is supported.

6. Security Considerations

Many systems running NTP are configured to return responses to timing queries by default. These responses contain a REFID field, which generally reveals the address of the system's time source if that source is an IPv4 address. This behavior can be exploited by remote attackers who wish to first learn the address of a target's time source, and then attack the target and/or its time source. As such, the NOT-YOU REFID proposal is designed to harden NTP against these attacks by limiting the amount of information leaked in the REFID field.

Systems running NTP should reveal the identity of their system in peer in their REFID only when they are on a trusted network. The IPv6 REFID proposal provides one way to do this, when the system peer uses addresses in the IPv6 family.

7. References

7.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC5905] Mills, D., Martin, J., Ed., Burbank, J., and W. Kasch, "Network Time Protocol Version 4: Protocol and Algorithms Specification", [RFC 5905](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5905, June 2010, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5905>>.

7.2. Informative References

- [CVE-2015-8138]
Van Gundy, M. and J. Gardner, "Network Time Protocol Origin Timestamp Check Impersonation Vulnerability (CVE-2015-8138)", in TALOS VULNERABILITY REPORT (TALOS-2016-0077), 2016.
- [DRAFT-I-DO]
Stenn, H., "[draft-stenn-ntp-i-do](#)", 2018.
- [DRAFT-REFID-SUGGESTION]
Stenn, H., "[draft-stenn-ntp-suggest-refid](#)", 2018.
- [NDSS16] Malhotra, A., Cohen, I., Brakke, E., and S. Goldberg, "Attacking the Network Time Protocol", in ISOC Network and Distributed System Security Symposium 2016 (NDSS'16), 2016.
- [NTP-EXTENSION-FIELD]
Stenn, H., "[draft-stenn-ntp-extension-fields](#)", 2018.

Authors' Addresses

Stenn & Goldberg

Expires September 26, 2019

[Page 7]

Internet-Draft

Network Time Protocol REFID Updates

March 2019

Harlan Stenn

Network Time Foundation
P.O. Box 918
Talent, OR 97540
US

Email: stenn@nwttime.org

Sharon Goldberg
Boston University
111 Cummington St
Boston, MA 02215
US

Email: goldbe@cs.bu.edu