

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Expires: February 17, 2004

C. Lonvick
Cisco Systems
August 19, 2003

RADIUS Attributes for soBGP Support
draft-lonvick-sobgp-radius-03.txt

Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all provisions of [Section 10 of RFC2026](#).

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/lid-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 February 17, 2004.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2003). All Rights Reserved.

Abstract

This document defines a set of RADIUS attributes designed to support the provisioning of the soBGP protocol. A router will encapsulate the components of an AuthCert or PolicyCert into TLVs and transport them to a centralized server capable of verifying the associated signature.

This draft goes along with other IDs submitted for Secure Origin BGP (soBGP) both of which are edited by James Ng and Russ White. [draft-white-sobgp-bgp-deployment-00.txt](#) [1], [draft-ng-sobgp-bgp-extensions-00.txt](#) [2] Mostly this work relates to "Extensions to BGP to Support Secure Origin BGP (soBGP)" and is explained in additional detail in "Deployment Considerations for Secure Origin BGP (soBGP)". The purpose of this draft is to explain

the concept of offloading the Authcert validation steps, and the Entitycert storage, from the router. RADIUS may not be the best way to do this but it's the best that I know of at this moment. Once the concepts of soBGP are discussed, the transport to support offload should be reviewed and a proper mechanism should be chosen.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Attributes	4
2.1	Stored-Policy	4
2.1.1	Stored-Policy-Request	4
2.1.2	Stored-Policy-End	5
2.2	Prefixes	5
2.2.1	IPv4-Prefix	5
2.2.2	IPv6-Prefix	6
2.3	Authcert Validation Request	6
2.3.1	Authcert-Header	6
2.3.2	Authcert-URL	7
2.3.3	Authcert-Signature	8
2.4	Authcert Validation Responses	8
2.4.1	Authcert-Accept	8
2.4.2	Authcert-Reject	9
3.	Table of Attributes	11
4.	Useage Notes and Examples	12
4.1	Certificate Validation	12
4.2	Username and Passwords	12
4.3	Stored Policy	12
4.4	Time	13
4.5	Authcert Verification	13
4.6	Redundancy	13
5.	Security Considerations	14
6.	IANA Considerations	15
7.	Acknowledgments	16
8.	Changes from Prior Drafts	17
	References	18
	Author's Address	18
	Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements	19

1. Introduction

A router participating in soBGP will need to validate received Authcerts. The best way to do this is by having their associated Entitycerts contained on the router and using the information stored in them to perform the necessary validation steps. Unfortunately, this would entail the storage and consistent maintenance of Entitycerts on all participating routers in the AS. One way to centralize this would be for a device to store all of the Entitycerts and then have each of the participating routers submit the pertinent information from each received Authcert to it for the computationally intensive validation steps. This centralized device, henceforth to be known as the sob-server in this document, could then transmit a pass/fail message back to the router. This would reduce the amount of administration of the Entitycert database to one device - with appropriate backup. This document defines a set of RADIUS attributes designed to support the provision of the soBGP protocol. The participating routers are expected to form and transmit a RADIUS [RFC 2865](#) [4] Access-Request message with the appropriate pieces of information from a received Authcert. This Access-Request will go to the sob-server which will perform the steps necessary to validate the Authcert information. It will then form and transmit an Access-Accept or Access-Reject response to the router.

This draft is still rather drafty. It does not discuss validation of Polycerts yet, but that's still a subject of discussion anyway.

Discussion of this draft may be directed to the author, or to the mailing list discussing soBGP. sobgp@external.cisco.com

More information about soBGP may be found on the web page. <ftp://ftp-eng.cisco.com/sobgp/index.html>

This Attribute is also used in Access-Challenge messages. In that

case, the Value is the AS number of the Authorized Originator. This is the autonomous system number of an entity authorized to advertise the associated IPv4 and IPv6 prefixes.

2.1.2 Stored-Policy-End

A summary of the Stored-Policy-End Attribute format is shown below. This format will only be used in the Access-Accept message. The fields are transmitted from left to right.

```

      0               1               2               3
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|      Type      |      Length      |      Count      |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                                     Time                                     |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

Type - [SPE] for Stored-Policy-End

Length - The length of the Attribute; 8 octets.

Count - The Count field is two octets and contains the number of policies that have been transmitted to the router. The router should verify that the value returned in this message is the same value that was most recently transmitted in the associated request message.

Time - The Time field is the number of seconds for which the downloaded policies should be considered valid. The receiver is not obligated to honor this timer. A value of 0 is not valid and MUST NOT be used.

2.2 Prefixes

Multiple instances of each of the attributes defined in this section may be included in a single RADIUS packet. In all cases, each RADIUS message may only include these Attributes pertaining to a single AS.

2.2.1 IPv4-Prefix

A summary of the IPv4-Prefix Attribute format is shown below. The fields are transmitted from left to right.

```

      0               1               2
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|      Type      |      Length      | IPv4 Prefix ...
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```


A summary of the Authcert-Header Attribute format is given below. The fields are transmitted left to right.


```

      0               1               2               3
      0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|   Type   |   Length   | Authorizing Autonomous System
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                                     | Options |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                                     | Authorized Originator |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                                     | Serial Number |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                                     | ..Continued |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

Type - [HDR] for Authcert-Header

Length - The entire length of this message in octets; 20.

Authorizing Autonomous System - The autonomous system authorizing other entities to advertise prefixes within this block.

Options - The Options associated with this Authcert.

Authorized Originator - The autonomous system number of an entity authorized to advertise the associated IPv4 and IPv6 prefixes.

Serial Number - A eight octet unsigned integer indicating the serial number of this Authorization certificate.

[2.3.2 Authcert-URL](#)

A summary of the Authcert-URL Attribute format is given below. The fields are transmitted left to right.

```

      0               1               2               3
      0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|   Type   |   Length   | URL ...
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

Type - [URL] for Authcert-URL

Length - The entire length of this message in octets.

URL - A uniform resource locator indicating a location where the public key of the entity which signed this certificate can be found along with any certificate revocation information.

2.3.3 Authcert-Signature

A summary of the Authcert-Signature Attribute format is given below. The fields are transmitted left to right.

```

      0                               1                               2                               3
      0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|      Type      |      Length      |      Signature Type      |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|
|                               Signature ...
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

Type - [Sig] for Authcert-Signature

Length - The entire length of this message in octets.

Signature Type - A two byte unsigned integer denoting the type of signature (the algorithm used to build this signature). Each possible signing algorithm is assigned an integer from this field.

Signature - The signature will be as taken from [draft-ng-sobgp-extensions-01.txt](#) [2]

2.4 Authcert Validation Responses

The following Attributes will be sent in response to a group of Authcert Validation Request Attributes. The Authcert-Accept Attribute will be sent in an Access-Accept message while the Authcert-Reject Attribute will be sent in an Access-Reject message.

2.4.1 Authcert-Accept

A summary of the Authcert-Accept Attribute format is shown below. This format will only be used in the Access-Accept message. The fields are transmitted from left to right.

```

      0                               1                               2                               3
      0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|      Type      |      Length      |      Authorized Originator
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                               Continued.. |      Time
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                               Continued.. |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

Type - [ACA] for Authcert-Accept

Reason Code - The reason for the rejection. It may be a local policy decision on the router to accept the information contained in the received Authcert even if it is rejected by the sob-server. As an example of that, if the URL is not found but the Authcert is validated otherwise, the router may choose to accept the information in the Authcert but at a lower trust level than if the signature is valid and the URL is found and properly processed. The table below gives the Reason Codes and their explanations.

Reason Code	Explanation
0-filled	Invalid Code - This value MUST NOT be used.
0b10000000	No Entitycert found matching this Authorized Originator.
0b01000000	Entitycert found for this Authorized Originator but the Serial Number in the Authcert is out of range.
0b00100000	The Signature in the Authcert doesn't match the calculated signature.
0b00010000	The Entitycert found on the sob-server has expired.
0b00001000	The URL could not be found.
0b00000nnnn	Reserved for future use.
0x00nn and beyond	are also reserved for future use.

3. Table of Attributes

The following table provides a guide to which of the above attributes may be found in which kinds of packets, and in what quantity.

Request	Accept	Reject	Challenge	Acct-Request	#	Attribute
0-1	0	0	0-1	0		SPR Stored-Policy-Request
0	0-1	0	0	0		SPE Stored-Policy-End
0+	0+	0	0	0		IP4 IPv4-Prefix
0+	0+	0	0	0		IP6 IPv6-Prefix
0-1	0	0	0	0		HDR AC-Header
0-1	0	0	0	0		URL
0-1	0	0	0	0		SIG AC-Signature
0-1	0	0	0	0		ACA AC-Accept
0	0	0-1	0	0		ACR AC-Reject

The following table defines the meaning of the above table entries.

0	This attribute MUST NOT be present in packet.
0+	Zero or more instances of this attribute MAY be present in packet.
0-1	Zero or one instance of this attribute MAY be present in packet.

4. Useage Notes and Examples

This section describes the expected implementation of the ideas presented in this document.

4.1 Certificate Validation

Any device receiving an Entitycert can verify it by separating its components into appropriate segments and sending them to the sob-server. The sob-server will return either an accept or reject message.

Likewise a router may submit a signed AuthCert or PolicyCert so an sob-server for validation.

Note: I need to review Brian's work to ensure that the components of each of these certificates or signed information has an associated RADIUS attribute in this document.

4.2 Usernames and Passwords

Some latitude is given in this area so that different policies may be enforced on different routers. In the most expected case, all routers will be configured with identical Usernames and Passwords which will be sent in the Access-Request Attributes as described in [\[1\]](#).

While it is not currently expected to be needed, a differentiated policy may be applied through the use of different Usernames on different routers when they initiate the policy download in the Access-Request Attribute. For example, southern-facing routers could be configured with a Username of "South" and northern-facing routers could be given a Username of "North". When the sob-server receives a policy download request from a router using a Username of "North", it will deliver a policy for the northern-facing routers. Similarly for "South" and southern-facing routers.

4.3 Stored Policy

A router SHOULD attempt to gather the stored policy from the sob-server when it first awakes. It should be a local policy decision of how to proceed if the router cannot obtain the stored policy.

If the router can gather policies, then these MAY be enforced above information received in the Authcerts since this will be locally defined and administered policy. If the sob-server replies that it has no policies to deliver then the router should accept routing

updates in the manner described in [draft-white-sobgp-bgp-deployment-01.txt](#) [1].

4.4 Time

Policies - The router should associate a countdown timer with a received policy. Before the timer has reached 0, the router should request a new set of policies. (Note: It may be a problem to associate all of the downloaded policies with a single timer.)

Authcert - The router should associate a countdown timer with a validated Authcert. Before that timer reaches 0, the router should reaffirm the validity of the Authcert but only if the associated AS is still advertising routes.

4.5 Authcert Verification

An Authcert will contain all of the policies which must be sent to the sob-server in the order they are placed within the Authcert. It is very important that the elements be kept in order as the signature is calculated over them in that order. (Note: Perhaps XML signing would be better?)

4.6 Redundancy

As with all RADIUS solutions, it is usually important that the client devices be able to access an authoritative RADIUS server at all times. For this reason, it should be stressed that soBGP devices utilizing the procedure described in this document should have redundant sob-servers in their network with consistent databases of stored policies and certificates.

5. Security Considerations

The security concerns of the mechanisms described in this document may be separated into two parts: concerns with the transport, and concerns with the content.

The security concerns dealing with the transport of this mechanism are described in RFCs 2865 [[4](#)] and 2865 [[6](#)]. No further discussion is warranted in this document.

The security concerns with the contents are identical to the security concerns of the contents of the Authcerts, Entitycerts and Policycerts in the other soBGP IDs.

6. IANA Considerations

Need stuff here.

7. Acknowledgments

Glen Zorn suggested using Access-Challenge to convey Stored Policy. This seems to be much better than trying to use a stream of Access-Requests and a finale of an Access-Reject.

8. Changes from Prior Drafts

- 00 : Contained the basics but had poor formatting.
- 01 : The content was transferred to XML to be used with [RFC 2629](#) formatting using "xml2rfc". (Thanks Marshall Rose.)
- 02 : Restructured the Stored Policy section to utilize Access-Challenges. Added things to the tail-end sections.
- 03 : tried to harmonize with [draft-weis-sobgp-certificates-00.txt](#) This includes a change to the length of the Serial Number. And I fixed some spelling errors. Not many of course.

References

- [1] White, R., "Deployment Considerations for Secure Origin BGP (soBGP)", [draft-white-sobgp-bgp-extensions-01.txt](#) (work in progress), October 2002.
- [2] Ng, J., "Extensions to BGP to Support Secure Origin BGP (soBGP)", [draft-ng-sobgp-bgp-extensions-01.txt](#) (work in progress), October 2002.
- [3] Weis, J., "Extensions to BGP to Support Secure Origin BGP (soBGP)", [draft-weis-sobgp-certificates-00.txt](#) (work in progress), June 2003.
- [4] Rigney, C., Willens, S., Rubens, A. and W. Simpson, "Remote Authentication Dial in User Service (RADIUS)", [RFC 2865](#), June 2000.
- [5] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [RFC 2119](#), STD 14, March 1997.
- [6] Rigney, C., Willats, W. and P. Calhoun, "RADIUS Extensions", [RFC 2869](#), June 2000.
- [7] Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [RFC 2869](#), [BCP 26](#), October 1998.
- [8] Hinden, R. and S. Deering, "IP Version 6 Addressing Architecture", [RFC 2373](#), July 1998.

Author's Address

Chris Lonvick
Cisco Systems
12515 Research Blvd.
Austin, TX 78759
US

Phone: +1 512 378 1182
EMail: clonvick@cisco.com

Intellectual Property Statement

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any intellectual property or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; neither does it represent that it has made any effort to identify any such rights. Information on the IETF's procedures with respect to rights in standards-track and standards-related documentation can be found in [BCP-11](#). Copies of claims of rights made available for publication and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementors or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF Secretariat.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights which may cover technology that may be required to practice this standard. Please address the information to the IETF Executive Director.

Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2003). All Rights Reserved.

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to the Internet Society or other Internet organizations, except as needed for the purpose of developing Internet standards in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the Internet Standards process must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by the Internet Society or its successors or assignees.

This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION

HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF
MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Acknowledgement

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the
Internet Society.