

Homenet	E. Vyncke
Internet-Draft	A. Yourtchenko
Intended status: Informational	M. Townsley
Expires: May 03, 2012	Cisco Systems
	October 31, 2011

Advanced Security for IPv6 CPE
draft-vyncke-advanced-ipv6-security-03.txt

Abstract

This document describes how an IPv6 residential Customer Premise Equipment (CPE) can leverage modern security techniques to have strong security, while retaining as much of the end-to-end reachability of IPv6 as possible.

It is a re-submission in the framework of the HOMENET working group. The reputation part of this document should leverage the work done in the REPUTE working group of the Application are.

The IETF has been notified of intellectual property rights claimed in regard to some or all of the specification contained in this document. For more information consult the online list of claimed rights.

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 <http://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 May 03, 2012.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2011 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 (<http://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. [Threats](#)
- *3. [Overview](#)
 - *3.1. [Rules for Security Policy](#)
 - *3.2. [Security Analysis](#)
- *4. [IANA Considerations](#)
- *5. [Security Considerations](#)
- *6. [Acknowledgements](#)
- *7. [References](#)
 - *7.1. [Normative References](#)
 - *7.2. [Informative References](#)
- *[Authors' Addresses](#)

[1. Introduction](#)

Internet access in residential IPv4 deployments generally consist of a single IPv4 address provided by the service provider for each home. Residential CPE then translates the single address into multiple private addresses allowing more than one device in the home, but at the cost of losing end-to-end reachability. IPv6 allows all devices to have a unique, global, IP address, restoring end-to-end reachability directly between any device. Such reachability is very powerful for ubiquitous global connectivity, and is often heralded as one of the significant advantages to IPv6 over IPv4. Despite this, concern about exposure to inbound packets from the IPv6 Internet (which would otherwise be dropped by the address translation function if they had been sent from the IPv4 Internet) remain. This document describes firewall functionality for an IPv6 CPE which departs from the "simple security" model described in [\[RFC6092\]](#) . The intention is to provide an example of a security model which allows most traffic, including incoming unsolicited packets and connections, to traverse the CPE unless the CPE identifies the traffic as potentially harmful based on a set of signatures (and other correlation data and heuristics) that are kept up to date on a regular basis. The computational resources necessary to support some, not all, functionalities of this model are likely more intensive than those described in [\[RFC6092\]](#), but are easily within the realm of what is commonly available in 2011 on medium to

high-end network based firewall systems for small and medium businesses, or host-based commercial firewalls that run on laptop and desktop PCs. This set of techniques is also known as Universal Threat Mitigation (UTM).

2. Threats

For a typical residential network connected to the Internet over a broadband connection, the threats can be classified into:

*denial of service by packet flooding: overwhelming either the access bandwidth or the bandwidth of a slower link in the residential network (like a slow home automation network) or the CPU power of a slow IPV6 host (like networked thermostat or any other sensor type nodes)

*denial of service by service requests: like sending print jobs from the Internet to an ink jet printer until the ink cartridge is empty or like filing some file server with junk data

*unauthorized use of services: like accessing a webcam or a file server which are open to anonymous access within the residential network but should not be accessed freely and anonymously from outside of the home network

*exploiting a vulnerability in the host in order to get access to data or to execute some arbitrary code in the attacked host. Exploitation can be further divided in two classes:

1. day-0 attack when this attack has never been seen before (hence nothing can really detect it) and
2. day+n attack where this attack is known and can be detected by the use of an attack signature

*trojanized host (belonging to a Botnet) can communicate via a covert channel to its master and launch attacks to Internet targets.

3. Overview

The basic goal is to provide an adaptive security policy which aims to block known harmful traffic and allow the rest, restoring as much of end-to-end communication as possible. In addition, new protocols may evolve and be deployed over time; only if they become a threat vector does the CPE firewall receive a signature update (including dynamic correlation data) to classify and block them. This is in direct contrast to [\[RFC6092\]](#), which requires built-in knowledge of a number of protocols, or requires Internet communication to be limited to a handful of protocols that the CPE understands how to process.

*Intrusion Prevention System (IPS) is a signature-based technology which inspects a pre-defined set of protocols at all layers (from layer-3 to layer-7) and uses a vast set of heuristics to detect attacks within one or several flow. Upon detection, the flow is terminated and an event is logged for further optional auditing. As exploits are added every day, the signature database must be updated daily and is usually quite large (more than 100 MB). This requires both large local storage (large flash or even a hard disk) and a subscription to an update service.

*Reputation database is a centralized database which gives a reputation score to any IPv6 address (or prefix). The score varies from untrusted to trusted. Untrusted IPv6 addresses are typically addresses of a well-known attacker or from a Botnet member or from an ISP with a poor track of security... Protocols exist to dynamically request a reputation (based on DNS or HTTP). This usually requires a subscription. Note: in IPv6 the reputation database concept is still in its infancy, for example, little experience exists on the scope of the reputation: a host / 128, a LAN prefix /64 or a delegated prefix size of /56 or /48...

*Local correlation uses another set of heuristics (like TCP distribution of Initial Sequence Number or used TCP ports or protocol handshake banners) to assert the variety of local hosts (namely operating system (OS) version and set of application) and raise or decrease the importance of a specific attack signature. For example, if the OS of host A is OS-A, then there is no point to inspect traffic to or from host A for attacks which are only relevant to OS-B.

*Global correlation leverage all IPS distributed on the Internet to build the reputation database as well as changing the relevance of an IPS signature (for example, a propagating worm will trigger a lot of identical signatures on several IPS, this should raise the relevance of a specific signature up to the point of blocking all inbound/outbound connections on a specific layer-4 port).

The above techniques are common in the large network where budget is enough to buy firewalls, IPS and subscribe to signature or reputation source. The authors of this document believes that competition and Moore's law will make the set of those techniques (commonly referred to as 'Universal Threat Mitigation') affordable for consumer space.

[3.1. Rules for Security Policy](#)

These are an example set of rules to be applied. Each would normally be configurable, either by the user directly or on behalf of the user by a

subscription service. The default preferred state hasn't been listed, though it is expected that all rules would be on by default.

If we named all hosts on the residential side of the CPE as 'inside' and all hosts on the Internet as 'outside', then the behavior of the CPE is described by a small set of rules:

1. Rule RejectBogon: apply unicast reverse path forwarding (RPF) checks (anti-spoofing) for all inbound and outbound traffic (implicitly blocking link-local and ULA in the same shot)
2. Rule BlockBadReputation: block all inbound and outbound packets whose outside IPv6 address has a bad reputation score
3. Rule AllowReturn: inspect all outbound traffic and allow the return traffic matching the states (5-tuple + TCP sequence number or any layer-4 state), apply IPS on the outbound (to block Botnet) and inbound (to block malicious/cracked servers which could inject malware) with IPS. If the protocol is not supported/recognized by the IPS, accept it anyway.
4. Rule AllowToPublicDnsHost: allow all inbound traffic to any inside address which is listed in the public DNS with a AAAA record (this requires that the CPE/RG can do a zone transfer, i.e., that the CPE/RG appears like a secondary name server), all inbound traffic is also inspected with IPS. If the protocol is not supported/recognized by the IPS, accept it anyway.
5. Rule ProtectLocalOnly: block all inbound traffic to any inside address as long as the inside address has never sent a packet to the outside. The intent is to protect local-only devices like thermostat or printers. Most (if not all) hosts expecting inbound connections have to send a couple of outbound packets to the outside (registration, DNS request, ...). This is the usual IPv4 firewall behavior augmented with IPS and reputation
6. Rule CryptoIntercept: at the exception of IPsec, all inbound connections that are encrypted (notably TLS [\[RFC5246\]](#)) must be intercepted (this is terminated by the CPE that will present its own self-signed certificate to the remote party which should have installed the CPE self-signed certificate in a secure way in its trust anchors store) in order to allow for further inspection. The decrypted flow is then passed again through those rules and encrypted again before being forwarded to the local host. This is actually a Man-in-the-Middle attack done for a good reason: protect the naive residential user. Of course, documentation and GUI MUST be provided to educate the user and help him/her to understand how to do it in a secure way. Note: this technique is also used nowadays by large

enterprise web proxies with the self-signed certificate being securely distributed to all clients.

7. Rule ParanoidOpeness: allow all unsolicited inbound connections rate limited to protect against port and address scanning attacks or overloading devices or slow links within the home. The connection MUST be inspected by the IPS engine. If the connection is anonymous or using a default password (like connecting to a webcam as a guest), then the flow SHOULD be dropped. If the IPS detects an attack, then the flow MUST be closed. If the protocol is not recognized as supported by the IPS, the flow MAY be allowed.

3.2. Security Analysis

This proposal of 'paranoid openness' stops the following attacks:

- *unauthorized use of services/denial of service: because all anonymous access to inside servers are blocked.
- *Denial of services on low bandwidth or low CPU inside hosts IFF those hosts never access the Internet
- *Exploiting of a day+1 attack, those attacks are blocked with the IPS signature and address reputation database

The CryptoIntercept part can also be leveraged as a small Certification Authority (CA) that could generate RSA key pairs and X.509 certificates at the CPE/RG owner's request. Those key pairs and certificates can then be given to trusted devices or users (like the owner's laptop so that he/she could easily and safely connect from the outside).

This proposal cannot help with the following attacks:

- *flooding the access link to the Internet, this is exactly the same as with the old layers-3/4 firewall approach as only the ISP can effectively stop the flooding of the CE-PE link;
- *weak password on inside services, of course the IPS component will detect multiple failed attempts (dictionary attack) and report the offender to the Global Correlation system;
- *exploiting of day-0 attack: until now, these day-0 attacks are caused either by rapidly propagating worms (then the global correlation of unusual traffic pattern will raise an alert and block the traffic after a couple of hundred's of successful attacks) or by targeted attacks against high-profile targets (like Government or banks or ;..) which should be protected by conventional less open security policies;

*exploiting a vulnerability in a rare or new protocol (not yet supported by the IPS), this case will probably never occur on a wide scale in a residential use of Internet.

4. IANA Considerations

There are no extra IANA consideration for this document.

5. Security Considerations

All security considerations have been done in the Security Analysis [Section 3.2](#).

It is also advisable that the inbound rate limiter system could be added to the [\[RFC6092\]](#) as it is light and does not depend on a centralized policy server.

6. Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Ole Troan, Stuart Cheshire, Dave Oran and Eliot Lear for the review of the -00 version and to Ron Bonica, Sam Hartmans, Lee Howard, Greg Lebovitz, Jordi Palet, Tina Tsou and others for their comments during and after the first presentation at the Hiroshima IETF meeting in November 2009.

A previous IETF work has similar ideas [\[I-D.palet-v6ops-ipv6security\]](#).

7. References

7.1. Normative References

[RFC5246]	Dierks, T. and E. Rescorla, " The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.2 ", RFC 5246, August 2008.
------------------	---

7.2. Informative References

[RFC2993]	Hain, T., " Architectural Implications of NAT ", RFC 2993, November 2000.
[RFC6092]	Woodyatt, J., " Recommended Simple Security Capabilities in Customer Premises Equipment (CPE) for Providing Residential IPv6 Internet Service ", RFC 6092, January 2011.
[I-D.palet-v6ops-ipv6security]	Palet, J, Vives, A, Martinez, G and A Gomez, " IPv6 distributed security requirements ", Internet-Draft draft-palet-v6ops-ipv6security-02, February 2005.

Authors' Addresses

Eric Vyncke Vyncke Cisco Systems De Kleetlaan 6a Diegem, 1831
Belgium Phone: +32 2 778 4677 EMail: evyncke@cisco.com

Andrew Yourtchenko Yourtchenko Cisco Systems De Kleetlaan 6a
Diegem, 1831 Belgium Phone: +32 2 704 5494 EMail: ayourtch@cisco.com

Mark Townsley Townsley Cisco Systems 11, Rue Camille Desmoulins Issy
Les Moulineaux, 92782 France Phone: +33 15 804 3483 EMail:
townsley@cisco.com