Operational Security Capabilities
for IP Network
Infrastructure
Internet-Draft
Intended status: BCP
Expires: September 2, 2010

J. Kristoff
Team Cymru
M. O'Reirdan
Comcast
F. Gont
UTN/FRH
March 1, 2010

Port Filtering Considerations
draft-kristoff-opsec-port-filtering-00.txt

Abstract

This document provides advice and technical guidance for ISP port filtering.

Status of this Memo

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

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html.

This Internet-Draft will expire on September 2, 2010.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Many networks have implemented a variety of mechanisms to prevent or limit certain types of network traffic from traversing their networks or reaching certain classes of systems. This activity, which we generically refer to simply as "filtering" can take many forms and be instituted for a number of purposes. "Port filtering" is a specific class of stateless Internet packet filtering based on the port number fields found the protocols that provide an interface between the Internet Protocol (IP) below and application layers above. Common protocols that implement these port identifiers include the transmission control protocol (TCP), user datagram protocol (UDP), stream control transmission protocol (SCTP) and the datagram congestion control protocol (DCCP). We aim to offer high-level guidance to networks who are currently or are considering utilizing port filters.

Filtering policies are often a contentious issue and can spark lengthy debates. We avoid rehashing those discussions. We do highlight architectural and technical issues where particular filtering policies have shown noteworthy side effects from practical experience. Others have published extensively on architectural principles that are worthy of the reader's attention [TODO: ref to Salzer, Clark and Reed paper, IETF RFC 1958, IETF RFC 2775, IETF RFC 3439, what credible anti-transparency or pro-filtering references are there?].

The rest of this document is organized as follows. The first section outlines problems that can arise from port filtering, and where appropriate discusses how to mitigate them. The remainder of the document outlines from a high-level, common port filtering scenarios are being widely implemented.

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].

2. Perimeter-based Security

The point in the network where port filtering is applied results in a defined perimeter, or delineation of a good "inside" and bad "outside" [ref RFC 3631 3.11]. Systems common to a particular area or "side" share an implicit trust relationship. As the number of systems in an area grows, the number of implicit trust relationships in that area may grow expotentially. With port filtering, in practice this only occurs if all systems are sharing a common set of applications and ports. Likewise, as the number of systems in an area or side decreases, implicit trust relationships in shared applications and ports decline. For large networks, filters may need to be applied throughout the infrastructure to be effective, yet may become an increasingly difficult distributed management challenge.

3. Filter Placement

Mechanisms exist in current Internet systems that perform filtering at almost any point in communications path. In ISP networks, port filters are most often set in router configurations. These routers also perform the route selection and packet formwarding duties of transit traffic. In some cases, ISPs use specialized devices generically referred to as firewalls that inspect or intercept packets as they traverse the path. Firewalls often reside next to or in some cases may be integrated into routing devices. These devices are dedicated to filtering and related duties, but do not generally perform the routing and forwarding functions of the traditional routering system.

4. Ingress Edge Host Shielding

Edge networks consisting of only end hosts and are used primarily for client-based applications have been successfully put behind &shielding& filters and rate limits. If it is known that these hosts will require limited stable server processes, the goal is to limit their exposure to server processes and minimize their ability to generate abusive traffic. A balance between protection, support and transparency is a delicate balance. Care must be taken to avoid preventing access to current or future client-based services through the use of filters.

5. Ingress Shielding Rate Limits

Rate limits artificially constrain the amount, optionally by type, of traffic that may be sourced by an edge host. It is common for typical client-based hosts on the Internet to use TCP for the bulk of the source traffic, particularly for high-speed transfers and where a congestion-avoidance friendly protocol is desired. Therefore, rate limits for other protocol types to an acceptable rate that leave the bulk of the available capacity to the TCP or TCP-like packets have been used.

6. Performance Considerations

7. Support Considerations

TODO: troubleshooting and diagnosis issues, documentation

8. Filter Rule Design

TODO: order and anomalies with rules

9. Future Considerations

TODO: future app support, flexiblity, new protocols

10. Opt In / Opt Out

11. Email filtering

12. Security Considerations

None.

13. Normative References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.

Appendix A. Shielding Filter Example, Cisco IOS

These examples assume BCP 38/84 are in effect, but are not shown for brevity.

```
interface FastEthernet0/0
  ip address 192.0.2.0 255.255.255
  ip access-group shield-filter-in in
  ip access-group shield-filter-out out
  ! 2 Mb/s source ICMP limit for entire edge net
  rate-limit input access-group 2000 2000000 375000 750000
  conform-action transmit exceed-action drop
  ! 10 Mb/s source UDP (non-multicast) limit for entire edge net
  rate limit input access-group 2001 10000000 1875000 3750000
  conform-action transmit exceed-action drop
  ! 10 Mb/s source IP/UDP multicast limit for entire edge net
  rate limit source access-group 2002 1000000 1875000 3750000
  conform-action transmit exceed-action drop
  ! 2 Mb/s source IGMP limit for entire edge net
  rate limit input access-group 2003 2000000 375000 750000
  conform-action transmit exceed-action drop
  ! 10 Mb/s source IPsec limit for entire edge net
  rate-limit input access-group 2004 10000000 1875000 3750000
  conform-action transmit exceed-action drop
  ! 10 Mb/s source GRE limit for entire edge net
  rate-limit input access-group 2005 10000000 1875000 3750000
  conform-action transmit exceed-action drop
  ! 10 Mb/s source limit for all other non-TCP-friendly protocols
  rate-limit input access-group 2500 10000000 1875000 3750000
  conform-action transmit exceed-action drop

access-list 2000 remark ICMP - for edge ingress rate limit
access-list 2000 permit icmp any any
access-list 2000 deny ip any any

access-list 2001 remark UDP (non-multicast) - for edge ingress
rate limit

access-list 2001 deny udp any 224.0.0.0 15.255.255.255
access-list 2001 permit udp any any
access-list 2001 deny ip any any

access-list 2002 remark IP/UDP multicast - for edge ingress
rate limit

access-list 2002 permit udp any 224.0.0.0 15.255.255.255
access-list 2002 deny ip any any
```

```
   access-list 2003 remark IGMP - for edge ingress rate limit
   access-list 2003 permit igmp any 224.0.0.0 15.255.255.255
   access-list 2003 deny ip any any

   access-list 2004 remark IPsec - for edge ingress rate limit
   access-list 2004 permit ahp any any
   access-list 2004 permit esp any any
   access-list 2004 deny ip any any

   access-list 2005 remark GRE - for edge ingress rate limit
   access-list 2005 permit gre any any
   access-list 2005 deny ip any any

   access-list 2500 remark default - for edge ingress rate limit
   access-list 2500 deny icmp any any
   access-list 2500 deny igmp any any
   access-list 2500 deny udp any any
   access-list 2500 deny tcp any any
   access-list 2500 deny ahp any any
   access-list 2500 deny esp any any
   access-list 2500 deny gre any any
   access-list 2500 permit ip any any

   ip access-list extended shield-filter-in
    remark [subnet description] (full shielding) - inbound
    !
    ! allow high numbered TCP source ports
    permit tcp any gt 1023 any
    !
    ! allow high numbered UDP source ports
    permit udp any gt 1023 any
    !
    ! allow GRE (required for PPTP)
    permit gre any any
    !
    ! allow IPSec (next 3 lines)
    permit esp any any
    permit udp any eq isakmp any
    permit ahp any any
    !
    ! allow UDP limited broadcasts
    permit udp any host 255.255.255.255
    !
    ! allow UDP multicast
    permit udp any 224.0.0.0 15.255.255.255
    !
    ! allow DHCP clients
    permit udp host 0.0.0.0 host 255.255.255.255 eq bootps
```

```
    !
    ! allow NTP (some clients use 123 for both src and dst port)
    permit udp any eq ntp any eq ntp
    !
    ! allow TCP source port 113 (IDENT)
    permit tcp any eq ident any
    !
    ! allow IGMP
    permit igmp any 224.0.0.0 15.255.255.255
    !
    ! allow ICMP echo messages (PING)
    permit icmp any any echo
    !
    ! allow ICMP echo response messages (PONG)
    permit icmp any any echo-reply
    !
    ! allow ICMP parameter problem messages
    permit icmp any any parameter-problem
    !
    ! allow ICMP TTL exceeded messages
    permit icmp any any time-exceeded
    !
    ! allow ICMP unreachable messages
    permit icmp any any unreachable
    !
    ! deny everything else by default and log it
    deny ip any any log-input

   ip access-list shield-filter-out
    remark [subnet description] (full shielding) - outbound
    !
    ! allow high numbered TCP destination ports
    permit tcp any any gt 1023
    !
    ! allow high numbered UDP destination ports
    permit udp any any gt 1023
    !
    ! allow GRE (required for PPTP)
    permit gre any any
    !
    ! allow IPSec (next 3 lines)
    permit esp any any
    permit udp any any eq isakmp
    permit ahp any any
    !
    ! allow UDP multicast
    permit udp any 224.0.0.0 15.255.255.255
    !
```

```
! allow NTP (some clients use 123 for both src and dst port)
permit udp any eq ntp any eq ntp
!
! allow TCP destination port 113 (IDENT)
permit tcp any any eq ident
!
! allow IGMP
permit igmp any 224.0.0.0 15.255.255.255
!
! allow ICMP echo messages
permit icmp any any echo
!
! allow ICMP echo response messages
permit icmp any any echo-reply
!
! allow ICMP parameter problem messages
permit icmp any any parameter-problem
!
! allow ICMP TTL exceed messages
permit icmp any any time-exceeded
!
! allow ICMP unreachable messages
permit icmp any any unreachable
!
! deny everything else by default and log it
deny ip any any log-input
```

Figure 1

Authors' Addresses

John Kristoff
Team Cymru
16W361 S. Frontage Road
Suite 100
Burr Ridge, IL 60527
US

Phone: +1 630 230-5400
Email: jtk@cymru.com
URI: http://www.team-cymru.org

Michael O'Reirdan
Comcast

Fernando Gont
Universidad Tecnologica Nacional / Facultad Regional Haedo
Evaristo Carriego 2644
Haedo, Provincia de Buenos Aires 1706
Argentina

Phone: +54 11 4650 8472
Email: fernando@gont.com.ar
URI: http://www.gont.com.ar