IDR and SIDR
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: April 30, 2015

K. Sriram
D. Montgomery
US NIST

October 27, 2014

Methods for Detection and Mitigation of BGP Route Leaks
draft-sriram-route-leak-detection-mitigation-00

Abstract

In [I-D.ietf-sriram-route-leak-problem-definition], the authors have provided a definition of the route leak problem, and also enumerated several types of route leaks. In this document, we first examine which of those route-leak types are detected and mitigated by the existing BGPSEC protocol [I-D.ietf-sidr-bgpsec-protocol-09]. Where the current BGPSEC protocol doesn't offer a solution, this document suggests an enhancement that would extend the route-leak detection and mitigation capability of BGPSEC. The solution can be implemented in BGP without necessarily tying it to BGPSEC. Incorporating the solution in BGPSEC is one way of implementing it in a secure way. We do not claim to have provided a solution for all possible types of route leaks, but the solution covers several, especially considering some significant route-leak attacks or occurrences that have been observed in recent years. The document also includes a stopgap method for detection and mitigation of route leaks for the phase when BGPSEC (path validation) is not yet deployed but only origin validation is deployed.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

In [I-D.ietf-sriram-route-leak-problem-definition], the authors have provided a definition of the route leak problem, and also enumerated several types of route leaks. In this document, we first examine which of those route-leak types are detected and mitigated by the existing BGPSEC protocol [I-D.ietf-sidr-bgpsec-protocol]. The BGPSEC protocol provides cryptographic protection for some aspects of BGP update messages. It offers mechanisms to protect against mis-

originations and hijacks of IP prefixes as well as man-in-the-middle (MITM) AS path modifications. Route leaks (see [I-D.ietf-sriram-route-leak-problem-definition] and references cited at the back) are another type of vulnerability in the global BGP routing system against which BGPSEC so far offers only partial protection.

For the types of route leaks enumerated in [I-D.ietf-sriram-route-leak-problem-definition], where the current BGPSEC protocol doesn't offer a solution, this document suggests an enhancement that would extend the detection and mitigation capability of BGPSEC. The solution can be implemented in BGP without necessarily tying it to BGPSEC. Incorporating the solution in BGPSEC is one way of implementing it in a secure way. We do not claim to provide a solution for all possible types of route leaks, but the solution covers several relevant types, especially considering some significant route-leak occurrences that have been observed frequently in recent years. The document also includes a stopgap method for detection and mitigation of route leaks for the phase when BGPSEC (path validation) is not yet deployed but only origin validation is deployed.

2. Mechanisms for Detection and Mitigation of Route Leaks

Referring to the five types of route leaks discussed in [I-D.ietf-sriram-route-leak-problem-definition], Table 1 summarizes the route-leak detection capability offered by ROA-based origin validation (OV) and BGPSEC path validation (PV) for different types of route leaks. (Note: Route filtering is not considered here in this table. Please see Section 3.)

A detailed explanation of the contents of Table 1 is as follows. It is readily observed that Type 1 and Type 5 route leaks are not detected by origin validation or even by BGPSEC path validation. It is also easy to observe that route leaks of Types 2 and 3 can be readily detected by the BGPSEC protocol (which checks for origin-AS validation and AS path signature verification). Type 2 route leak involves changing a prefix to a subprefix (i.e. more specific); such a modified update will fail BGPSEC validation checks. In the case of Type 3 route leak, there would be no existing ROAs to validate a re-originated prefix or subprefix, and hence the update will be considered Invalid. If BGPSEC is deployed, then in the case of a Type 3 route leak, the update will be Invalid due to Invalid path signatures as well as Invalid origin AS.

Type of Route Leak	Detection Coverage and Comments
Type 1: U-Turn with Full Prefix	BGPSEC in its current form [I-D.ietf-sidr-bgpsec-protocol] does not detect Type 1.
Type 2: U-Turn with More Specific Prefix	ROA maxLength may offer detection in some cases when only origin validation is used; BGPSEC detects Type 2.
Type 3: Prefix Hijack with Data Path to Legitimate Origin	Origin validation by itself detects and also BGPSEC detects Type 3.
Type 4: Leak of Internal Prefixes and Accidental Deaggregation	For internal prefixes never meant to be seen (i.e. routed) on the Internet, origin validation helps detect their leak; they might either have no covering ROA or have a ROA-AS0 to always filter them. In the case of accidental deaggregation, ROA maxLength may offer detection. BGPSEC path validation does not catch Type 4.
Type 5: Lateral ISP to ISP Leak	BGPSEC in its current form [I-D.ietf-sidr-bgpsec-protocol] does not detect Type 5.

Table 1: Examination of Route-Leak Detection Capability of Origin Validation and Current BGPSEC AS-path Validation

In the case of Type 4 leaks involving internal prefixes that are not meant to be routed in the Internet, they are likely to be detected by origin validation. That is because such prefixes might either have no covering ROA or have a ROA-AS0 to always filter them. In the case of Type 4 leaks that are due to accidental deaggregation, they may be detected due to violation of ROA maxLength. BGPSEC path validation does not catch Type 4. However, route leaks of Type 4 are least problematic due to the following reasons. In the case of accidental deaggregation, the offending AS is itself the legitimate destination of the leaked more-specific prefixes. Hence, in most cases of this type, the data traffic is neither misrouted not denied service.

Also, leaked announcements of Type 4 are short-lived and typically withdrawn quickly following the announcements. Further, the MaxPrefix limit may kick in in some receiving routers and that helps limit the propagation of sometimes large number of leaked routes of Type 4.

From the above, it is evident that in our proposed solution method, we need to focus primarily on Type 1 and Type 5 route leaks. In Section 2.1 and Section 2.2, we describe a simple addition to BGPSEC that facilitates cryptographically-enabled detection of route leaks of Type 1. Then in Section 2.3, we will explain how the same method as described in Section 2.1 can be utilized between ISPs to detect and mitigate lateral (ISP to ISP) route leaks (i.e. Type 5).

2.1. Route Leak Protection (RLP) Field Encoding by Sending Router

The key principle is that, in the event of a route leak, a receiving router in a provider AS (e.g. referring to Figure 1, ISP2 (AS3) router) should be able to detect from the prefix-update that its customer AS (e.g. AS1 in Figure 1) SHOULD NOT have forwarded the update (towards the provider AS). This means that at least one of the ASes in the AS path of the update has indicated that it sent the update to its customer or peer AS, but forbade any subsequent 'Up' forwarding (i.e. from a customer AS to its provider AS). For this purpose, a Route Leak Protection (RLP) field to be set by a sending router is proposed to be used for each AS hop.



Figure 1: Illustration of the basic notion of a route leak.

For the purpose of route leak detection and mitigation proposed in this document, the RLP field value SHOULD be set to one of two values as follows:

- 00: This is the default value (i.e. "nothing specified"),

- 01: This is the 'Do not Propagate Up' indication; sender indicating that the prefix-update SHOULD NOT be forwarded 'Up' towards a provider AS.

There are two different scenarios when a sending AS SHOULD set the '01' indication in a prefix-update: (1) when sending the prefix-update to a customer AS, and (2) to let a peer AS know not to forward the prefix-update 'Up' towards a provide AS. In essence, in both scenarios, the intent of '01' indication is that any receiving AS along the subsequent AS path SHOULD NOT forward the prefix-update 'Up' towards its (receiving AS's) provider AS.

One may argue for an RLP field value (e.g. '10') to be used to specify 'Up' (i.e. towards provider AS) directionality. But in the interest of keeping the methodology simple, the choice of two RLP field values as defined above (00 - default, and 01 - 'Do not Propagate Up') is all that is needed. This two-state specification in the RLP field can be shown to work for detection and mitigation of route leaks of Type 1 (and also Type 5; see Section 2.3), which are the focus here. (Please see Section 4 for further discussion about the downside using 'Up' indication.)

In general, the proposed RLP encoding can be carried in BGP-4 [RFC4271] updates in any possible way, e.g., in a transitive community attribute. We consider BGPSEC as an example, where the RLP encoding can be accommodated in the existing Flags field and thereby secured using the existing BGPSEC path signatures. The Flags field is part of the Secure_Path Segment in BPGSEC updates [I-D.ietf-sidr-bgpsec-protocol]. It is one octet long, and one Flags field is available for each AS hop, and currently only the first bit is used in BGPSEC. So there are 7 bits that are currently unused in the Flags field. Two (or more if needed) of these bits can be designated for the RLP field. Since the BGPSEC protocol specification requires a sending AS to include the Flags field in the data that are signed over, the RLP field for each hop (assuming it would be part of the Flags field) will be protected under the sending AS's signature.

2.2. Recommended Actions at a Receiving Router

We provide here an example set of receiver actions that work to detect and mitigate route leaks of Type 1 (in particular). This example algorithm serves as a proof of concept. However, other receiver algorithms or procedures can be designed (based on the same sender specification as in Section 2.1) and may perform with greater efficacy, and are by no means excluded.

A recommended receiver algorithm for detecting a route leak is as follows:

A receiving BGPSEC router SHOULD mark an update as a Route-Leak if ALL of the following conditions hold true:

1. The update is received from a customer AS.

2. It is Valid in accordance with the BGPSEC protocol.

3. The update has the RLP field set to '01' (i.e. 'Do not Propagate Up') indication for one or more hops (excluding the most recent) in the AS path.

The reason for stating "excluding the most recent" in the above algorithm is as follows. The provider AS already knows that most recent hop in the update is from its customer AS to itself, and hence it does not need to rely on the RLP field value set by the customer for detection of route leaks. (See further discussion in Section 4.1.)

After applying the above detection algorithm, a receiving router may use any policy-based algorithm of its own choosing to mitigate any detected route leaks. An example receiver algorithm for mitigating a route leak is as follows:

- If an update from a customer AS is marked as a Route-Leak, then the receiving router SHOULD prefer a Valid signed update from a peer or an upstream provider over the customer's update.

The basic principle here is that the presence of '01' value in the RLP field corresponding to one or more AS hops in the AS path of an update coming from a customer AS informs a receiving router in a provider AS that a route leak is likely occurring. The provider AS then overrides the "prefer customer route" policy, and instead prefers a route learned from a peer or another upstream provider over the customer's route.

A receiving router expects the RLP field value for any hop in the AS path to be either 00 or 01. However, if a different value (say, 10 or 11) is found in the RLP field, then an error condition will get flagged, and any further action is TBD.

2.3. Detection and Mitigation of Type 5 (Lateral ISP to ISP) Route Leaks

The sender and receiver actions described in Section 2.1 and Section 2.2 clearly help detect and mitigate Type 1 route leaks. With a slightly modified interpretation of the RLP encoding on the receiver side, they can be extended to detect lateral ISP-to-ISP route leaks (Type 5) also. A sending ISP router would set RLP field value to '01' indication towards another ISP peer, following the same sender principles as described in Section 2.1.

A recommended receiver algorithm for an ISP to detect a route leak of Type 5 is as follows:

A receiving BGPSEC router SHOULD mark an update as a Route-Leak if ALL of the following conditions hold true:

1. The update is received from a lateral ISP peer or a customer AS.

2. It is Valid in accordance with the BGPSEC protocol.

3. The update has the RLP field set to '01' indication for one or more hops (excluding the most recent) in the AS path.

In the above algorithm, the receiving AS interprets the '01' indication slightly strongly (i.e. stronger than in Section 2.2) to mean "the update SHOULD NOT have been propagated laterally to a peer ISP like me either". This is strictly the case between settlement-free large ISP peers.

The receiver algorithm for mitigation is up to the discretion of the ISP. It may simply prefer another unmarked (i.e. not route-leak) update from a different peer or an upstream ISP over a marked update.

3. Stopgap Solution when Only Origin Validation is Deployed

During a phase when BGPSEC has not yet been deployed but only origin validation has been deployed, it would be good have a stopgap solution for route leaks. The stopgap solution can be in the form of construction of a prefix filter list from ROAs. A suggested procedure for constructing such a list comprises of the following steps:

- ISP makes a list of all the ASes (Cust_AS_List) that are in its customer cone (ISP's own AS is also included in the list). (Some of the ASes in Cust_AS_List may be multi-homed to another ISP and that is OK.)

- ISP downloads from the RPKI repositories a complete list (Cust_ROA_List) of valid ROAs that contain any of the ASes in Cust_AS_List.

- ISP creates a list of all the prefixes (Cust_Prfx_List) that are contained in any of the ROAs in Cust_ROA_List.

- Cust_Prfx_List is the allowed list of prefixes that is permitted by the ISP's AS, and will be forwarded by the ISP to upstream ISPs, customers, and peers.

- Any prefix not in Cust_Prfx_List but announced by any of the ISP's customers is marked as a potential route leak. Then the ISP's router SHOULD prefer an Valid (i.e. valid according to origin validation) and 'not marked' update from a peer or an upstream provider over the customer's marked update for that prefix.

Special considerations with regard to the above procedure may be needed for DDoS mitigation service providers. They typically originate or announce a DDoS victim's prefix to their own ISP on a short notice during a DDoS emergency. Some provisions would need to be made for such cases, and they can be determined with the help of inputs from DDoS mitigation service providers.

4. Design Rationale and Discussion

In this section, we will try to provide design justifications for the methodology specified in Section 2, and also answer some anticipated questions.

4.1. Downside of 'Up (Towards Provider AS)' Indication in the RLP Field

As we have shown in Section 2, route leak detection and mitigation can be performed without the use of 'Up' (i.e. from customer AS to provider AS) indication in the RLP field. The detection and mitigation action should primarily occur at a provider AS's router just as soon as a leaked update is received from a customer AS. At that point, a provider AS can be fooled if it merely looks to see if an offending customer AS has set an 'Up' indication in the RLP field. This is so since a customer AS intent on leaking a route can deliberately set "Not Specified (00)" indication in order to misguide its provider AS. So it seems better that a provider AS figures out that the update is moving in the 'Up' direction based only on its own

(configuration-based) knowledge that the update is coming from one of its customer ASes. An 'Up' indication (if it were allowed) can be also potentially misused. For example, an AS in the middle can determine that a '01' (i.e. 'Do not Propagate Up') value already exists on one of the preceding AS hops in a received update's AS path. Then, said AS in the middle can deliberately set its own RLP field to signal 'Up', in which case the update may be erroneously marked as a route leak by a subsequent AS if it concludes that there was a valley in the AS path of the update. So there appears to be some possibility of misuse of 'Up' indication, and hence we proposed not including it in the RLP specification in Section 2. However, other proposals, if any, that aim to beneficially use an 'Up' indication in the RLP field would be worth discussing.

4.2. Possibility of Abuse of '01' (i.e. 'Do not Propagate Up') Indication in the RLP Field

In reality, there appears to be no gain or incentive for an AS to falsely set its own RLP field to '01' (i.e. 'Do not Propagate Up') indication in an update that it originates or forwards. The purpose of a deliberate route leak by an AS is to attract traffic towards itself, but if the AS were to falsely set its own RLP field to '01' value, it would be effectively repelling traffic away from itself for the prefix in question (see receiver algorithms in Section 2.2 and Section 2.3).

5. Summary

It should be emphasized once again that the proposed route-leak detection method using the RLP encoding is not intended to cover all forms of route leaks. However, we feel that the solution covers several important types of route leaks, especially considering some significant route-leak attacks or occurrences that have been frequently observed in recent years. The solution can be implemented in BGP without necessarily tying it to BGPSEC. Carrying the proposed RLP encoding in a transitive community attribute in BGP is another way, but in order to prevent abuse, the community attribute would require cryptographic protection. Incorporating the RLP encoding in the BGPSEC Flags field is one way of implementing it securely using an already existing protection mechanism provided in BGPSEC path signatures.

6. Security Considerations

The proposed Route Leak Protection (RLP) field requires cryptographic protection. Since it is proposed that the RLP field be included in the Flags field in the Secure_Path Segment in BPGSEC updates, the cryptographic security mechanisms in BGPSEC are expected to also

apply to the RLP field. The reader is therefore directed to the security considerations provided in [I-D.ietf-sidr-bgpsec-protocol].

7. IANA Considerations

No updates to the registries are suggested by this document.

8. Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Danny McPherson and Eric Osterweil for discussions related to this work. Also, thanks are due to Jared Mauch, Jeff Haas, Warren Kumari, Jakob Heitz, Geoff Huston, Randy Bush, Ruediger Volk, Andrei Robachevsky, Chris Morrow, and Sandy Murphy for comments, suggestions, critique at the IETF-90 in the hall-ways and/or during the GROW WG meeting and/or on the GROW mailing list. The authors are also thankful to Padma Krishnaswami, Oliver Borchert, and Okhee Kim for their comments and review.

9. References

9.1. Normative References

[I-D.ietf-sidr-bgpsec-protocol]
Lepinski, M., "BGPSEC Protocol Specification", draft-ietf-sidr-bgpsec-protocol-09 (work in progress), July 2014.

[RFC4271] Rekhter, Y., Li, T., and S. Hares, "A Border Gateway Protocol 4 (BGP-4)", RFC 4271, January 2006.

9.2. Informative References

[Cowie2010]
Cowie, J., "China's 18 Minute Mystery", Dyn Research/ Renesys Blog, November 2010, <http://research.dyn.com/2010/11/chinas-18-minute-mystery/>.

[Cowie2013]
Cowie, J., "The New Threat: Targeted Internet Traffic Misdirection", Dyn Research/Renesys Blog, November 2013, <http://research.dyn.com/2013/11/mitm-internet-hijacking/>.

[Hiran] Hiran, R., Carlsson, N., and P. Gill, "Characterizing Large-scale Routing Anomalies: A Case Study of the China Telecom Incident", PAM 2013, March 2013, <http://www3.cs.stonybrook.edu/~phillipa/papers/CTelecom.html>.

[Huston2012]
Huston, G., "Leaking Routes", March 2012, <http://labs.apnic.net/blabs/?p=139/>.

[Huston2014]
Huston, G., "What's so special about 512?", September 2014, <http://labs.apnic.net/blabs/?p=520/>.

[Kapela-Pilosov]
Pilosov, A. and T. Kapela, "Stealing the Internet: An Internet-Scale Man in the Middle Attack", DEFCON-16 Las Vegas, NV, USA, August 2008, <https://www.defcon.org/images/defcon-16/dc16-presentations/defcon-16-pilosov-kapela.pdf/>.

[Khare]
Khare, V., Ju, Q., and B. Zhang, "Concurrent Prefix Hijacks: Occurrence and Impacts", IMC 2012, Boston, MA, November 2012, <http://www.cs.arizona.edu/~bzhang/paper/12-imc-hijack.pdf/>.

[LRL]
Khare, V., Ju, Q., and B. Zhang, "Large Route Leaks", Project web page, 2012, <http://nrl.cs.arizona.edu/projects/lsrl-events-from-2003-to-2009/>.

[Labovitz]
Labovitz, C., "Additional Discussion of the April China BGP Hijack Inciden", Arbor Networks IT Security Blog, November 2010, <http://www.arbornetworks.com/asert/2010/11/additional-discussion-of-the-april-china-bgp-hijack-incident/>.

[Madory]
Madory, D., "Why Far-Flung Parts of the Internet Broke Today", Dyn Research/Renesys Blog, September 2014, <http://research.dyn.com/2014/09/why-the-internet-broke-today/>.

[Mauch]
Mauch, J., "BGP Routing Leak Detection System", Project web page, 2014, <http://puck.nether.net/bgp/leakinfo.cgi/>.

[Mauch-nanog]
Mauch, J., "Detecting Routing Leaks by Counting", NANOG-41 Albuquerque, NM, USA, October 2007, <https://www.nanog.org/meetings/nanog41/presentations/mauch-lightning.pdf/>.

[Paseka] Paseka, T., "Why Google Went Offline Today and a Bit about How the Internet Works", CloudFare Blog, November 2012, <http://blog.cloudflare.com/why-google-went-offline-today-and-a-bit-about/>.

[Toonk] Toonk, A., "What Caused Today's Internet Hiccup", August 2014, <http://www.bgpmon.net/what-caused-todays-internet-hiccup/>.

[Zmijewski] Zmijewski, E., "Indonesia Hijacks the World", Dyn Research/Renesys Blog, April 2014, <http://research.dyn.com/2014/04/indonesia-hijacks-world/>.

Authors' Addresses

Kotikalapudi Sriram
US NIST

Email: ksriram@nist.gov

Doug Montgomery
US NIST

Email: dougm@nist.gov