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1. Introduction

15 years have passed since IETF recommended test methodology and terminology for firewalls initially (RFC 2647, RFC 3511). The requirements for network security element performance and effectiveness have increased tremendously since then. Security function implementations have evolved to more advanced areas and have diversified into intrusion detection and prevention, threat management, analysis of encrypted traffic, etc. In an industry of growing importance, well-defined and reproducible key performance indicators (KPIs) are increasingly needed: They enable fair and reasonable comparison of network security functions. All these reasons have led to the creation of a new next-generation firewall benchmarking document.

2. Requirements

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].

3. Scope

This document provides testing terminology and testing methodology next-generation firewalls and related security functions. It covers two main areas: Performance benchmarks and security effectiveness testing. The document focuses on advanced, realistic, and reproducible testing methods. Additionally it describes test bed environments, test tool requirements and test result formats.

4. Test Setup

Test setup defined in this document will be applicable to all of the benchmarking test cases described in Section 7.
4.1. Testbed Configuration

Testbed configuration MUST ensure that any performance implications that are discovered during the benchmark testing aren’t due to the inherent physical network limitations such as number of physical links and forwarding performance capabilities (throughput and latency) of the network devise in the testbed. For this reason, this document recommends to avoid external devices such as switch and router in the testbed as possible.

In the typical deployment, the security devices (DUT/SUT) will not have a large number of entries in MAC or ARP tables, which impact the actual DUT/SUT performance due to MAC and ARP table lookup processes. Therefore, depend on number of used IP address in client and server side, it is recommended to connect Layer 3 device(s) between test equipment and DUT/SUT as shown in Figure 1.

If the test equipment is capable to emulate layer 3 routing functionality and there is no need for test equipment ports aggregation, it is recommended to configure the test setup as shown in Figure 2.
4.2. DUT/SUT Configuration

An unique DUT/SUT configuration MUST be used for all of the benchmarking tests described in Section 7. Since each DUT/SUT will have their own unique configuration, users SHOULD configure their device with the same parameters that would be used in the actual deployment of the device or a typical deployment. Also it is mandatory to enable all the security features on the DUT/SUT in order to achieve maximum security coverage for a specific deployment scenario.

This document attempts to define the recommended security features which SHOULD be consistently enabled for all test cases. The table below describes the recommended sets of feature list which SHOULD be configured on the DUT/SUT. In order to improve repeatability, a summary of the DUT configuration including description of all enabled DUT/SUT features MUST be published with the benchmarking results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DUT Features</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Included in initial Scope</th>
<th>Added to future Scope</th>
<th>Future test standards to be developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSL Inspection</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS/IPS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Filtering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antivirus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti Spyware</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti Botnet</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDoS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate Validation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logging and Reporting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Identification</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: DUT/SUT Feature List

In addition, it is also recommended to configure a realistic number of access policy rules on the DUT/SUT. This document determines the number of access policy rules for three different classes of DUT/SUT. The classification of the DUT/SUT MAY be based on its maximum supported throughput performance number. This document classifies the DUT/SUT in three different categories; namely small, medium and maximum.

The recommended throughput values for the following classes are;
Small - supported throughput less than 5Gbit/s

Medium - supported throughput greater than 5Gbit/s and less than 10Gbit/s

Large - supported throughput greater than 10Gbit/s

The access rule defined in the table 2 MUST be configured from top to bottom in correct order. The configured access policy rule MUST NOT block the test traffic used for the benchmarking test scenario.
### Table 2: DUT/SUT Access List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules Type</th>
<th>Match Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application layer</td>
<td>Application layer</td>
<td>Any application traffic NOT included in the test traffic</td>
<td>block</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport layer</td>
<td>Src IP and TCP/UDP Dst ports</td>
<td>Any src IP use in the test AND any dst ports NOT used in the test traffic</td>
<td>block</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP layer</td>
<td>Src/Dst IP</td>
<td>Any src/dst IP NOT used in the test</td>
<td>block</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application layer</td>
<td>Application layer</td>
<td>Applications included in the test traffic</td>
<td>allow</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport layer</td>
<td>Src IP and TCP/UDP Dst ports</td>
<td>Half of the src IP used in the test AND any dst ports used in the test traffic. One rule per subnet</td>
<td>allow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP layer</td>
<td>Src IP</td>
<td>The rest of the src IP subnet range used in the test. One rule per subnet</td>
<td>allow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Test Equipment Configuration

In general, test equipment allows configuring parameters in different protocol level. These parameters thereby influencing the traffic flows which will be offered and impacting performance measurements.
This document attempts to explicitly specify which test equipment parameters SHOULD be configurable, any such parameter(s) MUST be noted in the test report.

4.3.1. Client Configuration

This section specifies which parameters SHOULD be considerable while configuring emulated clients using test equipment. Also this section specifies the recommended values for certain parameters.

4.3.1.1. TCP Stack Attributes

The TCP stack SHOULD use a TCP Reno variant, which include congestion avoidance, back off and windowing, retransmission and recovery on every TCP connection between client and server endpoints. The default IPv4 and IPv6 MSS segments size MUST be set to 1460 bytes and 1440 bytes and a TX and RX receive windows of 32768 bytes. Delayed ACKs are permitted, but it SHOULD be limited to either a 200 msec delay timeout or 3000 in bytes before a forced ACK. Up to 3 retries SHOULD be allowed before a timeout event is declared. All traffic MUST set the TCP PSH flag to high. The source port range SHOULD be in the range of 1024 - 65535. Internal timeout SHOULD be dynamically scalable per RFC 793.

4.3.1.2. Client IP Address Space

The sum of the client IP space SHOULD contain the following attributes. The traffic blocks SHOULD consist of multiple unique, continuous static address blocks. A default gateway is permitted. The IPv4 ToS byte should be set to ’00’.

The following equation can be used to determine the required total number of client IP address.

\[
\text{Desired total number of client IP} = \frac{\text{Target throughput [Mbit/s]}}{\text{Throughput per IP address [Mbit/s]}}
\]

(Idea 1) 6-7 Mbps per IP= 1,400-1,700 IPs per 10Gbit/s throughput

(Idea 2) 0.1-0.2 Mbps per IP = 50,000-100,000 IPs per 10Gbit/s throughput

Based on deployment and usecase scenario, client IP addresses SHOULD be distributed between IPv4 and IPv6 type. This document recommends using the following ratio(s) between IPv4 and IPv6:

(Idea 1) 100 % IPv4, no IPv6
(Idea 2) 80 % IPv4, 20 % IPv6
(Idea 3) 50 % IPv4, 50 % IPv6
(Idea 4) 0 % IPv4, 100 % IPv6

4.3.1.3. Emulated Web Browser Attributes

The emulated web browser contains attributes that will materially affect how traffic is loaded. The objective is to emulate a modern, typical browser attributes to improve realism of the result set.

For HTTP traffic emulation, the emulated browser must negotiate HTTP 1.1. HTTP persistency MAY be enabled depend on test scenario. The browser CAN open multiple TCP connections per Server endpoint IP at any time depending on how many sequential transactions are needed to be processed. Within the TCP connection multiple transactions can be processed if the emulated browser has available connections. The browser MUST advertise a User-Agent header. Headers will be sent uncompressed. The browser should enforce content length validation.

For encrypted traffic, the following attributes shall define the negotiated encryption parameters. The tests must use TLSv1.2 or higher with a record size of 16383, commonly used cipher suite and key strength. Session reuse or ticket resumption may be used for subsequent connections to the same Server endpoint IP. The client endpoint must send TLS Extension SNI information when opening up a security tunnel. Server certificate validation should be disabled. Server certificate validation should be disabled. Cipher suite and certificate size should be defined in the parameter session of benchmarking tests.

4.3.2. Backend Server Configuration

This document attempts to specify which parameters should be considerable while configuring emulated backend servers using test equipment.

4.3.2.1. TCP Stack Attributes

The TCP stack SHOULD use a TCP Reno variant, which include congestion avoidance, back off and windowing, retransmission and recovery on every TCP connection between client and server endpoints. The default IPv4 MSS segment size MUST be set to 1460 bytes and a TX and RX receive windows of at least 32768 bytes. Delayed ACKs are permitted but SHOULD be limited to either a 200 msec delay timeout or 3000 in bytes before a forced ACK. Up to 3 retries SHOULD be allowed before a timeout event is declared. All traffic MUST set the TCP PSH
flag to high. The source port range SHOULD be in the range of 1024 - 65535. Internal timeout should be dynamically scalable per RFC 793.

4.3.2.2. Server Endpoint IP Addressing

The server IP blocks should consist of unique, continuous static address blocks with one IP per Server FQDN endpoint per test port. The IPv4 ToS byte should be set to ‘00’. The source mac address of the server endpoints shall be the same emulating routed behavior. Each Server FQDN should have it’s own unique IP address. The Server IP addressing should be fixed to the same number of FQDN entries.

4.3.2.3. HTTP / HTTPS Server Pool Endpoint Attributes

The emulated server pool for HTTP should listen on TCP port 80 and emulated HTTP version 1.1 with persistence. For HTTPS server, the pool must have the same basic attributes of an HTTP server pool plus attributes for SSL/TLS. The server must advertise a server type. For HTTPS server, TLS 1.2 or higher must be used with a record size of 16383 bytes and ticket resumption or Session ID reuse enabled. The server must listen on port TCP 443. The server shall serve a certificate to the client. It is required that the HTTPS server also check Host SNI information with the Fully Qualified Domain Name (FQDN). Client certificate validation should be disabled. Cipher suite and certificate size should be defined in the parameter session of benchmarking tests.

4.3.3. Traffic Flow Definition

The section describes the traffic pattern between the client and server endpoints. At the beginning of the test, the server endpoint initializes and will be in a ready to accept connection state including initialization of the TCP stack as well as bound HTTP and HTTPS servers. When a client endpoint is needed, it will initialize and be given attributes such as the MAC and IP address. The behavior of the client is to sweep though the given server IP space, sequentially generating a recognizable service by the DUT. Thus, a balanced, mesh between client endpoints and server endpoints will be generated in a client port server port combination. Each client endpoint performs the same actions as other endpoints, with the difference being the source IP of the client endpoint and the target server IP pool. The client shall use Fully Qualified Domain Names in Host Headers and for TLS 1.2 Server Name Indication (SNI).
4.3.3.1. Description of Intra-Client Behavior

Client endpoints are independent of other clients that are concurrently executing. When a client endpoint initiate traffic, this section will describe how the steps though different services. Once initialized, the user should randomly hold (perform no operation) for a few milliseconds to allow for better randomization of start of client traffic. The client will then either open up a new TCP connection or connect to a TCP persistence stack still open to that specific server. At any point that the service profile may require encryption, a TLS 1.2 encryption tunnel will form presenting the URL request to the server. The server will then perform an SNI name check with the proposed FQDN compared to the domain embedded in the certificate. Only when correct, will the server process the object. The initial object to the server may not have a fixed size; its size is based on benchmarking tests described in Section 7. Multiple additional sub-URLs (Objects on the service page) may be requested simultaneously. This may or may not be to the same server IP as the initial URL. Each sub-object will also use a conical FQDN and URL path, as observed in the traffic mix used.

4.3.4. Traffic Load Profile

The loading of traffic will be described in this section. The loading of an traffic load profile has five distinct phases: Init, ramp up, sustain, ramp down/close, and collection.

Within the Init phase, test bed devices including the client and server endpoints should negotiate layer 2-3 connectivity such as MAC learning and ARP. Only after successful MAC learning or ARP resolution shall the test iteration move to the next phase. No measurements are made in this phase. The minimum recommended time for init phase is 5 seconds. During this phase the emulated clients SHOULD NOT initiate any sessions with the DUT/SUT, in contrast, the emulated servers should be ready to accept requests from DUT/SUT or from emulated clients.

In the ramp up phase, the test equipment should start to generate the test traffic. It should use a set approximate number of unique client IP addresses actively to generate traffic. The traffic should ramp from zero to desired target objective. The target objective will be defined for each benchmarking test. The duration for the ramp up phase must be configured long enough, so that the test equipment do not overwhelm DUT/SUT’s supported performance metrics namely; connection setup rate, concurrent connection and application transaction. The recommended time duration for the ramp up phase is 180-300 seconds. No measurements are made in this phase.
In the sustain phase, the test equipment should keep to generate traffic at a constant target value for a constant number of active client IPs. The recommended time duration for sustain phase is 600 seconds. This is the phase where measurements occur.

In the ramp down/close phase, no new connection is established and no measurements are made. The recommend duration of this phase is between 180 to 300 seconds.

The last phase is administrative and will be when the tester merges and collates the report data.

5. Test Bed Considerations

This section recommends steps to control the test environment and test equipment, specifically focusing on virtualized environments and virtualized test equipment.

1. Ensure that any ancillary switching or routing functions between the system under test and the test equipment do not limit the performance of the traffic generator. This is specifically important for virtualized components (vSwitches, vRouters).

2. Verify that the performance of the test equipment matches and reasonably exceeds the expected maximum performance of the system under test.

3. Assert that the test bed characteristics are stable during the whole test session. A number of factors might influence stability specifically for virtualized test beds, for example additional work loads in a virtualized system, load balancing and movement of virtual machines during the test, or simple issues such as additional heat created by high workloads leading to an emergency CPU performance reduction.

Test bed reference pre-tests help to ensure that the desired traffic generator aspects such as maximum throughput and the network performance metrics such as maximum latency and maximum packet loss are met.

Once the desired maximum performance goals for the system under test have been identified, a safety margin of 10 % SHOULD be added for throughput and subtracted for maximum latency and maximum packet loss.

Test bed preparation may be performed either by configuring the DUT in the most trivial setup (fast forwarding) or without presence of DUT.
6. Reporting

This section describes how the final report should be formatted and presented. The final test report may have two major sections; Introduction and result sections. The following attributes should be present in the introduction section of the test report.

1. The name of the NetSecOPEN traffic mix must be prominent.
2. The time and date of the execution of the test must be prominent.
3. Summary of testbed software and Hardware details
   A. DUT Hardware/Virtual Configuration
      + This section should clearly identify the make and model of the DUT
      + The port interfaces, including speed and link information must be documented.
      + If the DUT is a virtual VNF, interface acceleration such as DPDK and SR-IOV must be documented as well as cores used, RAM used, and the pinning / resource sharing configuration. The Hypervisor and version must be documented.
      + Any additional hardware relevant to the DUT such as controllers must be documented
   B. DUT Software
      + The operating system name must be documented
      + The version must be documented
      + The specific configuration must be documented
   C. DUT Enabled Features
      + Specific features, such as logging, NGFW, DPI must be documented
      + Attributes of those featured must be documented
      + Any additional relevant information about features must be documented
D. Test equipment hardware and software
   + Test equipment vendor name
   + Hardware details including model number, interface type
   + Test equipment firmware and test application software version

4. Results Summary / Executive Summary
   1. Results should resemble a pyramid in how it is reported, with the introduction section documenting the summary of results in a prominent, easy to read block.
   2. In the result section of the test report, the following attributes should be present for each test scenario.
      a. KPIs must be documented separately for each test scenario. The format of the KPI metrics should be presented as described in Section 6.1.
      b. The next level of details should be graphs showing each of these metrics over the duration (sustain phase) of the test. This allows the user to see the measured performance stability changes over time.

6.1. Key Performance Indicators

This section lists KPIs for overall benchmarking test scenarios. All KPIs MUST be measured in whole period of sustain phase as described in Section 4.3.4. All KPIs MUST be measured from test equipment’s result output.

   o TCP Concurrent Connection
      This key performance indicator will measure the average concurrent open TCP connections in the sustaining period.

   o TCP Connection Setup Rate
      This key performance indicator will measure the average established TCP connections per second in the sustaining period. For Session setup rate benchmarking test scenario, the KPI will measure average established and terminated TCP connections per second simultaneously.

   o Application Transaction Rate
      This key performance indicator will measure the average successful transactions per seconds in the sustaining period.
• TLS Handshake Rate
  This key performance indicator will measure the average TLS 1.2 or higher session formation rate within the sustaining period.

• Throughput
  This key performance indicator will measure the average Layer 1 throughput within the sustaining period as well as average packets per seconds within the same period. The value of throughput should be presented in Gbps rounded to two places of precision with a more specific kbps in parenthesis. Optionally, goodput may also be logged as an average goodput rate measured over the same period. Goodput result shall also be presented in the same format as throughput.

• URL Response time / Time to Last Byte (TTLB)
  This key performance indicator will measure the minimum, average and maximum per URL response time in the sustaining period as well as the average variance in the same period.

• Application Transaction Time
  This key performance indicator will measure the minimum, average and maximum the amount of time to receive all objects from the server.

• Time to First Byte (TTFB)
  This key performance indicator will measure minimum, average and maximum the time to first byte. TTFB is the elapsed time between sending the SYN packet from the client and receiving the first byte of application date from the DUT/SUT. TTFB SHOULD be expressed in millisecond.

• TCP Connect Time
  This key performance indicator will measure minimum, average and maximum TCP connect time. It is elapsed between the time the client sends a SYN packet and the time it receives the SYN/ACK. TCP connect time SHOULD be expressed in millisecond.

7. Benchmarking Tests

7.1. Throughput Performance With NetSecOPEN Traffic Mix

7.1.1. Objective

To determine the average throughput performance of the DUT/SUT when using application traffic mix defined in Section 7.1.3.3.
7.1.2. Test Setup

Test bed setup MUST be configured as defined in Section 4. Any test scenario specific test bed configuration changes must be documented.

7.1.3. Test Parameters

In this section, test scenario specific parameters SHOULD be defined.

7.1.3.1. DUT/SUT Configuration Parameters

DUT/SUT parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in Section 4.2. Any configuration changes for this specific test scenario MUST be documented.

7.1.3.2. Test Equipment Configuration Parameters

Test equipment configuration parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in Section 4.3. Following parameters MUST be noted for this test scenario:

- Client IP address range
- Server IP address range
- Traffic distribution ratio between IPv4 and IPv6
- Traffic load objective or specification type (e.g. Throughput, SimUsers and etc.)
- Target throughput: It MAY be defined based on requirements. Otherwise it represents aggregated line rate of interface(s) used in the DUT/SUT
- Initial throughput: Initial throughput MAY be up to 10% of the "Target throughput"

7.1.3.3. Traffic Profile

Test scenario MUST be run with a single application traffic mix profile. The name of the NetSecOpen traffic mix MUST be documented.

7.1.3.4. Test Results Acceptance Criteria

The following test Criteria is defined as test results acceptance criteria

a. Number of failed Application transaction MUST be 0.01%.
b. Number of Terminated TCP connection due to unexpected TCP RST sent by DUT/SUT MUST be less than 0.01%

c. Maximum deviation (max. dev) of application transaction time / TTLB (Time To Last Byte) MUST be less than X (The value for "X" will be finalized and updated in future draft release)

The following equation MUST be used to calculate the deviation of application transaction time or TTLB.

\[
\text{max. dev} = \max\left(\left(\text{avg\_latency} - \text{min\_latency}\right),\left(\text{max\_latency} - \text{avg\_latency}\right)\right) / \left(\text{Initial latency}\right)
\]

Where, the initial latency is calculated using the following equation. For this calculation, the latency values (min’, avg’ and max’) MUST be measured during test procedure step 1 as defined in Section 7.1.4.1. The variable latency represents application transaction time or TTLB.

\[
\text{Initial latency} = \min\left(\left(\text{avg’ latency} - \text{min’ latency}\right) | \left(\text{max’ latency} - \text{avg’ latency}\right)\right)
\]

d. Maximum value of TCP connect time must be less than Xms (The value for "X" will be finalized and updated in future draft release). The definition for TCP connect time is found in Section 6.1.

e. Maximum value of Time to First Byte must be less than 2* TCP connect time.

Test Acceptance criteria for this test scenario MUST be monitored during the sustain phase of the traffic load profile only.

7.1.3.5. Measurement

Following KPI metrics MUST be reported for this test scenario.

Mandatory KPIs: average Throughput, maximum Concurrent TCP connection, TTLB/application transaction time (minimum, average and maximum) and average application transaction rate

Optional KPIs: average TCP connection setup rate, average TLS handshake rate, TCP connect time and TTFB
7.1.4. Test Procedures and expected Results

The test procedure is designed to measure the throughput performance of the DUT/SUT at the sustaining period of traffic load profile. The test procedure consists of three major steps.

7.1.4.1. Step 1: Test Initialization and Qualification

Verify the link status of all connected physical interfaces. All interfaces are expected to be "UP" status.

Configure traffic load profile of the test equipment to generate test traffic at "initial throughput" rate as described in the parameters section. The DUT/SUT SHOULD reach the "initial throughput" during the sustain phase. Measure all KPI as defined in Section 7.1.3.5. The measured KPIs during the sustain phase MUST meet acceptance criteria "a" and "b" defined in Section 7.1.3.4.

If the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria, the test procedure MUST NOT be continued to step 2.

7.1.4.2. Step 2: Test Run with Target Objective

Configure test equipment to generate traffic at "Target throughput" rate defined in the parameter table. The test equipment SHOULD follow the traffic load profile definition as described in Section 4.3.4. The test equipment SHOULD start to measure and record all specified KPIs. The frequency of KPI metrics measurement MUST be less than 5 seconds. Continue the test until all traffic profile phases are completed.

The DUT/SUT is expected to reach the desired target throughput during the sustain phase. In addition, the measured KPIs must meet all acceptance criteria. Follow the step 3, if the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria.

7.1.4.3. Step 3: Test Iteration with Binary Search

Use binary search algorithm to configure the desired traffic load profile for each test iteration. Binary search algorithm can be implemented using the parameter; Resolution =0.01* Target throughput and Backoff= 50%.

Determine the maximum and average achievable throughput within the acceptance criteria.
7.2. Concurrent TCP Connection Capacity With HTTP Traffic

7.2.1. Objective

Determine the maximum number of concurrent TCP connection that DUT/SUT sustains when using HTTP traffic.

7.2.2. Test Setup

Test bed setup SHOULD be configured as defined in Section 4. Any specific test bed configuration changes such as number of interfaces and interface type, etc. must be documented.

7.2.3. Test Parameters

In this section, test scenario specific parameters SHOULD be defined.

7.2.3.1. DUT/SUT Configuration Parameters

DUT/SUT parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in Section 4.2. Any configuration changes for this specific test scenario MUST be documented.

7.2.3.2. Test Equipment Configuration Parameters

Test equipment configuration parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in Section 4.3. Following parameters MUST be noted for this test scenario:

- Client IP address range
- Server IP address range
- Traffic distribution ratio between IPv4 and IPv6
- Traffic load objective or specification type (e.g. Throughput, SimUsers and etc.)
- Target concurrent connection: It can be defined based on requirements
- Initial concurrent connection: 10% of "Target concurrent connection"
7.2.3.2.1. Client Configuration Parameters

The client must negotiate HTTP 1.1 with persistence and each client can open multiple concurrent TCP connections per server endpoint IP.

Test scenario SHOULD be run with a single traffic profile with following attributes:

HTTP 1.1 with GET command requesting 10 Kbyte objects with random MIME type.

The test equipment SHOULD perform HTTP transactions within each TCP connection subsequently. The frequency of transactions MUST be defined to achieve X% of total throughput that DUT can support. The suggested value of X is 25. It will be finalized and updated in the next draft version.

During the sustain state of concurrent connection and traffic load, a minimal % of TCP connection SHOULD be closed and re-opened.

7.2.3.3. Test Results Acceptance Criteria

The following test Criteria is defined as test results acceptance criteria

a. Number of failed Application transaction MUST be less than 0.01% of attempt transaction.

b. Number of Terminated TCP connection due to unexpected TCP RST sent by DUT/SUT MUST be less than 0.01% of total initiated TCP sessions.

c. During the sustain phase, traffic should be forwarded constantly at the rate defined in the parameter Section 7.2.3.

d. Maximum deviation (max. dev) of application transaction time / TTLB (Time To Last Byte) MUST be less than Xms (The value for "X" will be finalized and updated in future draft release).

The following equation MUST be used to calculate the deviation of application transaction time or TTLB.

\[
\text{max. dev} = \max((\text{avg}_{\text{latency}} - \text{min}_{\text{latency}}), (\text{max}_{\text{latency}} - \text{avg}_{\text{latency}})) / (\text{Initial latency})
\]

Where, the initial latency is calculated using the following equation. For this calculation, the latency values (min’, avg’ and max’) MUST be measured during test procedure step 1 as defined in section 7.1.4.1.
The variable latency represents application transaction time or TTLB.

Initial latency:= min((avg’ latency - min’ latency) | (max’ latency - avg’ latency))

e. Maximum value of TCP connect time must be less than Xms (The value for "X" will be finalized and updated in future draft release). The definition for TCP connect time is found in Section 6.1.

f. Maximum value of Time to First Byte must be less than 2* TCP connect time.

Test Acceptance criteria for this test scenario MUST be monitored during the sustain phase of the traffic load profile only.

7.2.3.4. Measurement

Following KPI metrics MUST be reported for this test scenario;

average Throughput, max. Min. Avg. Concurrent TCP connection, TTLB/application transaction time (minimum, average and maximum) and average application transaction rate.

7.2.4. Test Procedures and expected Results

The test procedure is designed to measure the concurrent TCP connection capacity of the DUT/SUT at the sustaining period of traffic load profile. The test procedure consists of three major steps. This test procedure MAY be repeated multiple times with different IPv4 and IPv6 traffic distribution.

7.2.4.1. Step 1: Test Initialization and Qualification

Verify the link status of the all connected physical interfaces. All interfaces are expected to be "UP" status.

Configure traffic load profile of the test equipment to establish "initial concurrent connection" as defined in the parameters section. The traffic load profile should be defined as described in Section 4.3.4.

The DUT/SUT SHOULD reach the "initial concurrent connection" during the sustain phase. The measured KPIs during the sustain phase MUST meet the acceptance criteria "a" and "b" defined in Section 7.2.3.3.
If the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria, the test procedure MUST NOT be continued to "Step 2".

### 7.2.4.2. Step 2: Test Run with Target Objective

Configure test equipment to establish "Target concurrent connection" defined in the parameters table. The test equipment SHOULD follow the traffic load profile definition as described in Section 4.3.4.

During the ramp up and sustain phase, the other KPIs such as throughput, TCP connection rate and application transaction MUST NOT reach to the maximum value that the DUT/SUT can support. Throughput, TCP connection rate and application transaction should not be reached more than X% of maximum value that DUT can support. The suggested value of X is 25. It will be finalized and updated in the next draft version.

The test equipment SHOULD start to measure and record all specified KPIs. The frequency of measurement MUST be less than 5 seconds. Continue the test until all traffic profile phases are completed.

The DUT/SUT is expected to reach the desired target concurrent connection at the sustain phase. In addition, the measured KPIs must meet all acceptance criteria.

Follow the step 3, if the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria.

### 7.2.4.3. Step 3: Test Iteration with Binary Search

Use binary search algorithm to configure the desired traffic load profile for each test iteration. Binary search algorithm can be implemented using the parameter: Resolution =0.01* "Target concurrent connection" and Backoff= 50%.

Determine the maximum and average achievable throughput within the acceptance criteria.

### 7.3. TCP/HTTP Connections Per Second

#### 7.3.1. Objective

Using HTTP traffic, determine the maximum and average value of TCP session establishment rate supported by the DUT/SUT.

Test parameters and test test procedures will be added in the future release.
7.4. HTTP Transactions Per Second

7.4.1. Objective

Determine maximum and average HTTP transaction rate supported by the DUT/SUT.

Test parameters and test test procedures will be added in the future release.

7.5. HTTP Throughput

7.5.1. Objective

Determine the average throughput performance of the DUT/SUT when using HTTP traffic.

Test parameters and test test procedures will be added in the future release.

7.6. HTTP Transaction Latency

7.6.1. Objective

Determine the minimum, average and maximum values of HTTP transaction latency at 80% throughput rate measured in "HTTP Throughput" test scenario.

Test parameters and test test procedures will be added in the future release.

7.7. Concurrent SSL/TLS Connection Capacity

7.7.1. Objective

Using encrypted traffic (HTTPS), determine the maximum number of concurrent TCP connection that DUT/SUT sustains.

Test parameters and test test procedures will be added in the future release.

7.8. SSL/TLS Handshake Rate

7.8.1. Objective

Determine the maximum and average SSL/TLS handshake rate supported by the DUT/SUT.
Test parameters and test test procedures will be added in the future release.

7.9. HTTPS Transaction Per Second

7.9.1. Objective

Determine maximum and average HTTPS transaction rate supported by the DUT/SUT.

Test parameters and test test procedures will be added in the future release.

7.10. HTTPS Throughput

7.10.1. Objective

Determine the average throughput performance of the DUT/SUT when using HTTPS traffic.

Test parameters and test test procedures will be added in the future release.

7.11. HTTPS Transaction Latency

7.11.1. Objective

Determine the minimum, average and maximum values of HTTPS transaction latency at 80% throughput rate measured in "HTTPS Throughput" test scenario.

Test parameters and test test procedures will be added in the future release.

8. Formal Syntax

9. IANA Considerations

This document makes no request of IANA.

Note to RFC Editor: this section may be removed on publication as an RFC.

10. Security Considerations

Security consideration will be added in the future release.
11. Acknowledgements

Acknowledgements will be added in the future release.
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Details about NetSecOPEN traffic mix will be added in next draft release.
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Abstract
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15 years have passed since IETF recommended test methodology and terminology for firewalls initially ([RFC2647], [RFC3511]). The requirements for network security element performance and effectiveness have increased tremendously since then. Security function implementations have evolved to more advanced areas and have diversified into intrusion detection and prevention, threat management, analysis of encrypted traffic, etc. In an industry of
growing importance, well-defined and reproducible key performance indicators (KPIs) are increasingly needed: They enable fair and reasonable comparison of network security functions. All these reasons have led to the creation of a new next-generation firewall benchmarking document.

2. Requirements

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].

3. Scope

This document provides testing terminology and testing methodology for next-generation firewalls and related security functions. It covers two main areas: Performance benchmarks and security effectiveness testing. The document focuses on advanced, realistic, and reproducible testing methods. Additionally, it describes test bed environments, test tool requirements and test result formats.

4. Test Setup

Test setup defined in this document is applicable to all benchmarking test scenarios described in Section 7.

4.1. Testbed Configuration

Testbed configuration MUST ensure that any performance implications that are discovered during the benchmark testing aren’t due to the inherent physical network limitations such as number of physical links and forwarding performance capabilities (throughput and latency) of the network devise in the testbed. For this reason, this document recommends avoiding external devices such as switch and router in the testbed as possible.

However, in the typical deployment, the security devices (DUT/SUT) are connected to routers and switches which will reduce the number of entries in MAC or ARP tables of the DUT/SUT. If MAC or ARP tables have many entries, this may impact the actual DUT/SUT performance due to MAC and ARP/ND table lookup processes. Therefore, it is RECOMMENDED to connect Layer 3 device(s) between test equipment and DUT/SUT as shown in Figure 1.

If the test equipment is capable to emulate layer 3 routing functionality and there is no need for test equipment ports aggregation, it is RECOMMENDED to configure the test setup as shown in Figure 2.
4.2. DUT/SUT Configuration

A unique DUT/SUT configuration MUST be used for all benchmarking tests described in Section 7. Since each DUT/SUT will have their own unique configuration, testers SHOULD configure their device with the same parameters that would be used in the actual deployment of the device or a typical deployment. Users MUST enable security features on the DUT/SUT to achieve maximum security coverage for a specific deployment scenario.

This document attempts to define the recommended security features which SHOULD be consistently enabled for all the benchmarking tests.
described in Section 7. The table 1 below describes the RECOMMENDED sets of feature list which SHOULD be configured on the DUT/SUT.

Based on customer use case, user can take a decision to enable or disable SSL inspection feature for "Throughput Performance with NetSecOPEN Traffic Mix" test scenario described in Section 7.1.

To improve repeatability, a summary of the DUT configuration including description of all enabled DUT/SUT features MUST be published with the benchmarking results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DUT Features</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Included in initial Scope</th>
<th>Added to future Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSL Inspection</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS/IPS</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Filtering</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antivirus</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti Spyware</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti Botnet</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDoS</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate Validation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logging and Reporting</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: DUT/SUT Feature List

In summary, DUT/SUT SHOULD be configured as follows:
o All security inspection enabled

o Disposition of all traffic is logged - Logging to an external device is permissible

o CVEs matching the following characteristics when serving the NVD

* CVSS Version: 2
* CVSS V2 Metrics: AV:N/Au:N/I:C/A:C
* AV=Attack Vector, Au=Authentication, I=Integrity and A=Availability
* CVSS V2 Severity: High (7-10)
* If doing a group test the published start date and published end date should be the same

o Geographical location filtering and Application Identification and Control configured to be triggered based on a site or application from the defined traffic mix

In addition, it is also RECOMMENDED to configure a realistic number of access policy rules on the DUT/SUT. This document determines the number of access policy rules for three different class of DUT/SUT. The classification of the DUT/SUT MAY be based on its maximum supported firewall throughput performance number defined in the vendor data sheet. This document classifies the DUT/SUT in three different categories; namely small, medium, and maximum.

The RECOMMENDED throughput values for the following classes are:

Extra Small (XS) - supported throughput less than 1Gbit/s
Small (S) - supported throughput less than 5Gbit/s
Medium (M) - supported throughput greater than 5Gbit/s and less than 10Gbit/s
Large (L) - supported throughput greater than 10Gbit/s

The access rule defined in the table 2 MUST be configured from top to bottom in correct order shown in the table. The configured access policy rule MUST NOT block the test traffic used for the benchmarking test scenarios.
### Table 2: DUT/SUT Access List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules Type</th>
<th>Match Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>XS</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application layer</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Any application traffic NOT included in the test traffic</td>
<td>block</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport layer</td>
<td>Src IP and TCP/UDP Dst ports</td>
<td>Any src IP use in the test AND any dst ports NOT used in the test traffic</td>
<td>block</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP layer</td>
<td>Src/Dst IP</td>
<td>Any src/dst IP NOT used in the test</td>
<td>block</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application layer</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Applications included in the test traffic</td>
<td>allow</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport layer</td>
<td>Src IP and TCP/UDP Dst ports</td>
<td>Half of the src IP used in the test AND any dst ports used in the test traffic. One rule per subnet</td>
<td>allow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP layer</td>
<td>Src IP</td>
<td>The rest of the src IP subnet range used in the test. One rule per subnet</td>
<td>allow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Test Equipment Configuration

In general, test equipment allows configuring parameters in different protocol level. These parameters thereby influencing the traffic flows which will be offered and impacting performance measurements.
This document specifies common test equipment configuration parameters applicable for all test scenarios defined in Section 7. Any test scenario specific parameters are described under test setup section of each test scenario individually.

4.3.1. Client Configuration

This section specifies which parameters SHOULD be considered while configuring clients using test equipment. Also, this section specifies the recommended values for certain parameters.

4.3.1.1. TCP Stack Attributes

The TCP stack SHOULD use a TCP Reno variant, which include congestion avoidance, back off and windowing, retransmission, and recovery on every TCP connection between client and server endpoints. The default IPv4 and IPv6 MSS segments size MUST be set to 1460 bytes and 1440 bytes respectively and a TX and RX receive windows of 32768 bytes. Client initial congestion window MUST NOT exceed 10 times the MSS. Delayed ACKs are permitted and the maximum client delayed Ack MUST NOT exceed 10 times the MSS before a forced ACK. Up to 3 retries SHOULD be allowed before a timeout event is declared. All traffic MUST set the TCP PSH flag to high. The source port range SHOULD be in the range of 1024 - 65535. Internal timeout SHOULD be dynamically scalable per RFC 793. Client SHOULD initiate and close TCP connections. TCP connections MUST be closed via FIN.

4.3.1.2. Client IP Address Space

The sum of the client IP space SHOULD contain the following attributes. The traffic blocks SHOULD consist of multiple unique, discontinuous static address blocks. A default gateway is permitted. The IPv4 ToS byte or IPv6 traffic class should be set to ‘00’ or ‘000000’ respectively.

The following equation can be used to determine the required total number of client IP address.

\[
\text{Desired total number of client IP} = \frac{\text{Target throughput [Mbit/s]}}{\text{Throughput per IP address [Mbit/s]}}
\]

(Idea 1) 6-7 Mbps per IP (e.g. 1,400-1,700 IPs per 10Gbit/s throughput)

(Idea 2) 0.1-0.2 Mbps per IP (e.g. 50,000-100,000 IPs per 10Gbit/s throughput)
Based on deployment and use case scenario, client IP addresses SHOULD be distributed between IPv4 and IPv6 type. This document recommends using the following ratio(s) between IPv4 and IPv6:

(Idea 1) 100 % IPv4, no IPv6
(Idea 2) 80 % IPv4, 20 % IPv6
(Idea 3) 50 % IPv4, 50 % IPv6
(Idea 4) 0 % IPv4, 100 % IPv6

4.3.1.3. Emulated Web Browser Attributes

The emulated web browser contains attributes that will materially affect how traffic is loaded. The objective is to emulate a modern, typical browser attributes to improve realism of the result set.

For HTTP traffic emulation, the emulated browser MUST negotiate HTTP 1.1. HTTP persistency MAY be enabled depending on test scenario. The browser MAY open multiple TCP connections per Server endpoint IP at any time depending on how many sequential transactions are needed to be processed. Within the TCP connection multiple transactions MAY be processed if the emulated browser has available connections. The browser SHOULD advertise a User-Agent header. Headers MUST be sent uncompressed. The browser SHOULD enforce content length validation.

For encrypted traffic, the following attributes shall define the negotiated encryption parameters. The tests MUST use TLSv1.2 or higher with a record size of 16383, commonly used cipher suite and key strength. Depending on test scenario, Session reuse or ticket resumption MAY be used for subsequent connections to the same Server endpoint IP. The client endpoint MUST send TLS Extension Server Name Indication (SNI) information when opening a security tunnel. Cipher suite and certificate size should be defined in the parameter session of each test scenario.

4.3.2. Backend Server Configuration

This document specifies which parameters should be considerable while configuring emulated backend servers using test equipment.

4.3.2.1. TCP Stack Attributes

The TCP stack SHOULD use a TCP Reno variant, which include congestion avoidance, back off and windowing, retransmission, and recovery on every TCP connection between client and server endpoints. The default IPv4 and IPv6 MSS segment size MUST be set to 1460 bytes and
1440 bytes respectively and a TX and RX receive windows of at least 32768 bytes. Server initial congestion window MUST NOT exceed 10 times the MSS. Delayed ACKs are permitted and the maximum server delayed Ack MUST NOT exceed 10 times the MSS before a forced ACK. Up to 3 retries SHOULD be allowed before a timeout event is declared. All traffic MUST set the TCP PSH flag to high. The source port range SHOULD be in the range of 1024 - 65535. Internal timeout should be dynamically scalable per RFC 793.

4.3.2.2. Server Endpoint IP Addressing

The server IP blocks SHOULD consist of unique, discontinuous static address blocks with one IP per Server Fully Qualified Domain Name (FQDN) endpoint per test port. The IPv4 ToS byte and IPv6 traffic class bytes should be set to ‘00’ and ‘000000’ respectively.

4.3.2.3. HTTP / HTTPS Server Pool Endpoint Attributes

The server pool for HTTP SHOULD listen on TCP port 80 and emulate HTTP version 1.1 with persistence. The server MUST advertise a server type. For HTTPS server, TLS 1.2 or higher MUST be used with a record size of 16383 bytes and ticket resumption or Session ID reuse SHOULD be enabled based on test scenario. The server MUST listen on port TCP 443. The server shall serve a certificate to the client. It is REQUIRED that the HTTPS server also check Host SNI information with the FQDN. Cipher suite and certificate size should be defined in the parameter section of each test scenario.

4.3.3. Traffic Flow Definition

The section describes the traffic pattern between the client and server endpoints. At the beginning of the test, the server endpoint initializes and will be in a ready to accept connection state including initialization of the TCP stack as well as bound HTTP and HTTPS servers. When a client endpoint is needed, it will initialize and be given attributes such as the MAC and IP address. The behavior of the client is to sweep though the given server IP space, sequentially generating a recognizable service by the DUT. Thus, a balanced, mesh between client endpoints and server endpoints will be generated in a client port server port combination. Each client endpoint performs the same actions as other endpoints, with the difference being the source IP of the client endpoint and the target server IP pool. The client shall use Fully Qualified Domain Names (FQDN) in Host Headers and for TLS Server Name Indication (SNI).
4.3.3.1. Description of Intra-Client Behavior

Client endpoints are independent of other clients that are concurrently executing. When a client endpoint initiates traffic, this section describes how the client steps through different services. Once initialized, the client should randomly hold (perform no operation) for a few milliseconds to allow for better randomization of start of client traffic. The client will then either open a new TCP connection or connect to a TCP persistence stack still open to that specific server. At any point that the service profile may require encryption, a TLS encryption tunnel will form presenting the URL request to the server. The server will then perform an SNI name check with the proposed FQDN compared to the domain embedded in the certificate. Only when correct, will the server process the HTTPS response object. The initial response object to the server MUST NOT have a fixed size; its size is based on benchmarking tests described in Section 7. Multiple additional sub-URLs (response objects on the service page) MAY be requested simultaneously. This may or may not be to the same server IP as the initial URL. Each sub-object will also use a conical FQDN and URL path, as observed in the traffic mix used.

4.3.4. Traffic Load Profile

The loading of traffic is described in this section. The loading of a traffic load profile has five distinct phases: Init, ramp up, sustain, ramp down, and collection.

During the Init phase, test bed devices including the client and server endpoints should negotiate layer 2-3 connectivity such as MAC learning and ARP. Only after successful MAC learning or ARP/ND resolution shall the test iteration move to the next phase. No measurements are made in this phase. The minimum RECOMMENDED time for Init phase is 5 seconds. During this phase, the emulated clients SHOULD NOT initiate any sessions with the DUT/SUT, in contrast, the emulated servers should be ready to accept requests from DUT/SUT or from emulated clients.

In the ramp up phase, the test equipment SHOULD start to generate the test traffic. It SHOULD use a set approximate number of unique client IP addresses actively to generate traffic. The traffic should ramp from zero to desired target objective. The target objective will be defined for each benchmarking test. The duration for the ramp up phase MUST be configured long enough, so that the test equipment does not overwhelm DUT/SUT’s supported performance metrics namely; connections per second, concurrent TCP connections, and application transactions per second. The RECOMMENDED time duration
for the ramp up phase is 180-300 seconds. No measurements are made in this phase.

In the sustain phase, the test equipment SHOULD continue generating traffic to constant target value for a constant number of active client IPs. The RECOMMENDED time duration for sustain phase is 600 seconds. This is the phase where measurements occur.

In the ramp down/close phase, no new connections are established, and no measurements are made. The time duration for ramp up and ramp down phase SHOULD be same. The RECOMMENDED duration of this phase is between 180 to 300 seconds.

The last phase is administrative and will be when the tester merges and collates the report data.

5. Test Bed Considerations

This section recommends steps to control the test environment and test equipment, specifically focusing on virtualized environments and virtualized test equipment.

1. Ensure that any ancillary switching or routing functions between the system under test and the test equipment do not limit the performance of the traffic generator. This is specifically important for virtualized components (vSwitches, vRouters).

2. Verify that the performance of the test equipment matches and reasonably exceeds the expected maximum performance of the system under test.

3. Assert that the test bed characteristics are stable during the entire test session. Several factors might influence stability specifically for virtualized test beds, for example additional workloads in a virtualized system, load balancing and movement of virtual machines during the test, or simple issues such as additional heat created by high workloads leading to an emergency CPU performance reduction.

Test bed reference pre-tests help to ensure that the desired traffic generator aspects such as maximum throughput and the network performance metrics such as maximum latency and maximum packet loss are met.

Once the desired maximum performance goals for the system under test have been identified, a safety margin of 10% SHOULD be added for throughput and subtracted for maximum latency and maximum packet loss.
Test bed preparation may be performed either by configuring the DUT in the most trivial setup (fast forwarding) or without presence of DUT.

6. Reporting

This section describes how the final report should be formatted and presented. The final test report MAY have two major sections; Introduction and result sections. The following attributes SHOULD be present in the introduction section of the test report.

1. The name of the NetSecOPEN traffic mix (see Appendix A) MUST be prominent.

2. The time and date of the execution of the test MUST be prominent.

3. Summary of testbed software and Hardware details
   A. DUT Hardware/Virtual Configuration
      + This section SHOULD clearly identify the make and model of the DUT
      + The port interfaces, including speed and link information MUST be documented.
      + If the DUT is a virtual VNF, interface acceleration such as DPDK and SR-IOV MUST be documented as well as cores used, RAM used, and the pinning / resource sharing configuration. The Hypervisor and version MUST be documented.
      + Any additional hardware relevant to the DUT such as controllers MUST be documented
   B. DUT Software
      + The operating system name MUST be documented
      + The version MUST be documented
      + The specific configuration MUST be documented
   C. DUT Enabled Features
      + Specific features, such as logging, NGFW, DPI MUST be documented
+ Attributes of those featured MUST be documented
+ Any additional relevant information about features MUST be documented

D. Test equipment hardware and software
+ Test equipment vendor name
+ Hardware details including model number, interface type
+ Test equipment firmware and test application software version

4. Results Summary / Executive Summary

1. Results should resemble a pyramid in how it is reported, with the introduction section documenting the summary of results in a prominent, easy to read block.

2. In the result section of the test report, the following attributes should be present for each test scenario.
   a. KPIs MUST be documented separately for each test scenario. The format of the KPI metrics should be presented as described in Section 6.1.
   b. The next level of details SHOULD be graphs showing each of these metrics over the duration (sustain phase) of the test. This allows the user to see the measured performance stability changes over time.

6.1. Key Performance Indicators

This section lists KPIs for overall benchmarking tests scenarios. All KPIs MUST be measured during the sustain phase of the traffic load profile described in Section 4.3.4. All KPIs MUST be measured from the result output of test equipment.

- Concurrent TCP Connections
  This key performance indicator measures the average concurrent open TCP connections in the sustaining period.

- TCP Connections Per Second
  This key performance indicator measures the average established TCP connections per second in the sustaining period. For "TCP/HTTP(S) Connection Per Second" benchmarking test scenario, the KPI
is measured average established and terminated TCP connections per second simultaneously.

- **Application Transactions Per Second**
  This key performance indicator measures the average successfully completed application transactions per second in the sustaining period.

- **TLS Handshake Rate**
  This key performance indicator measures the average TLS 1.2 or higher session formation rate within the sustaining period.

- **Throughput**
  This key performance indicator measures the average Layer 2 throughput within the sustaining period as well as average packets per seconds within the same period. The value of throughput SHOULD be presented in Gbit/s rounded to two places of precision with a more specific kbps in parenthesis. Optionally, goodput MAY also be logged as an average goodput rate measured over the same period. Goodput result SHALL also be presented in the same format as throughput.

- **URL Response time / Time to Last Byte (TTLB)**
  This key performance indicator measures the minimum, average and maximum per URL response time in the sustaining period. The latency is measured at Client and in this case would be the time duration between sending a GET request from Client and the receival of the complete response from the server.

- **Application Transaction Latency**
  This key performance indicator measures the minimum, average and maximum the amount of time to receive all objects from the server. The value of application transaction latency SHOULD be presented in millisecond rounded to zero decimal.

- **Time to First Byte (TTFB)**
  This key performance indicator will measure minimum, average and maximum the time to first byte. TTFB is the elapsed time between sending the SYN packet from the client and receiving the first byte of application date from the DUT/SUT. TTFB SHOULD be expressed in millisecond.

7. Benchmarking Tests
7.1. Throughput Performance With NetSecOPEN Traffic Mix

7.1.1. Objective

Using NetSecOPEN traffic mix, determine the maximum sustainable throughput performance supported by the DUT/SUT. (see Appendix A for details about traffic mix)

7.1.2. Test Setup

Test bed setup MUST be configured as defined in Section 4. Any test scenario specific test bed configuration changes MUST be documented.

7.1.3. Test Parameters

In this section, test scenario specific parameters SHOULD be defined.

7.1.3.1. DUT/SUT Configuration Parameters

DUT/SUT parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in Section 4.2. Any configuration changes for this specific test scenario MUST be documented.

This test scenario is RECOMMENDED to perform twice; one with SSL inspection feature enabled and the second scenario with SSL inspection feature disabled on the DUT/SUT.

7.1.3.2. Test Equipment Configuration Parameters

Test equipment configuration parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in Section 4.3. Following parameters MUST be noted for this test scenario:

Client IP address range defined in Section 4.3.1.2

Server IP address range defined in Section 4.3.2.2

Traffic distribution ratio between IPv4 and IPv6 defined in Section 4.3.1.2

Traffic load objective or specification type (e.g. Throughput, SimUsers and etc.)

Target throughput: It can be defined based on requirements. Otherwise it represents aggregated line rate of interface(s) used in the DUT/SUT

Initial throughput: 10% of the "Target throughput"
7.1.3.3. Traffic Profile

Traffic profile: Test scenario MUST be run with a single application traffic mix profile (see Appendix A for details about traffic mix). The name of the NetSecOPEN traffic mix MUST be documented.

7.1.3.4. Test Results Acceptance Criteria

The following test Criteria is defined as test results acceptance criteria. Test results acceptance criteria MUST be monitored during the whole sustain phase of the traffic load profile.

a. Number of failed Application transaction MUST be less than 0.01% of total attempt transactions

b. Number of Terminated TCP connections due to unexpected TCP RST sent by DUT/SUT MUST be less than 0.01% of total initiated TCP connections

c. Maximum deviation (max. dev) of application transaction time or TTLB (Time To Last Byte) MUST be less than X (The value for "X" will be finalized and updated after completion of PoC test)

The following equation MUST be used to calculate the deviation of application transaction latency or TTLB

\[
\text{max. dev} = \max((\text{avg\_latency} - \text{min\_latency}), (\text{max\_latency} - \text{avg\_latency})) / (\text{Initial latency})
\]

Where, the initial latency is calculated using the following equation. For this calculation, the latency values (min’, avg’ and max’) MUST be measured during test procedure step 1 as defined in Section 7.1.4.1.

The variable latency represents application transaction latency or TTLB.

Initial latency:= min((avg’ latency - min’ latency) | (max’ latency - avg’ latency))

d. Maximum value of Time to First Byte MUST be less than X

7.1.3.5. Measurement

Following KPI metrics MUST be reported for this test scenario.

Mandatory KPIs: average Throughput, average Concurrent TCP connections, TTLB/application transaction latency (minimum, average and maximum) and average application transactions per second

Optional KPIs: average TCP connections per second, average TLS handshake rate and TTFB
7.1.4. Test Procedures and expected Results

The test procedures are designed to measure the throughput performance of the DUT/SUT at the sustaining period of traffic load profile. The test procedure consists of three major steps.

7.1.4.1. Step 1: Test Initialization and Qualification

Verify the link status of all connected physical interfaces. All interfaces are expected to be "UP" status.

Configure traffic load profile of the test equipment to generate test traffic at "initial throughput" rate as described in the parameters section. The test equipment SHOULD follow the traffic load profile definition as described in Section 4.3.4. The DUT/SUT SHOULD reach the "initial throughput" during the sustain phase. Measure all KPIs as defined in Section 7.1.3.5. The measured KPIs during the sustain phase MUST meet acceptance criteria "a" and "b" defined in Section 7.1.3.4.

If the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria, the test procedure MUST NOT be continued to step 2.

7.1.4.2. Step 2: Test Run with Target Objective

Configure test equipment to generate traffic at "Target throughput" rate defined in the parameter table. The test equipment SHOULD follow the traffic load profile definition as described in Section 4.3.4. The test equipment SHOULD start to measure and record all specified KPIs. The frequency of KPI metric measurements MUST be less than 5 seconds. Continue the test until all traffic profile phases are completed.

The DUT/SUT is expected to reach the desired target throughput during the sustain phase. In addition, the measured KPIs MUST meet all acceptance criteria. Follow the step 3, if the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria.

7.1.4.3. Step 3: Test Iteration

Determine the maximum and average achievable throughput within the acceptance criteria. Final test iteration MUST be performed for the test duration defined in Section 4.3.4.
7.2. TCP/HTTP Connections Per Second

7.2.1. Objective

Using HTTP traffic, determine the maximum sustainable TCP connection establishment rate supported by the DUT/SUT under different throughput load conditions.

To measure connections per second, test iterations MUST use different fixed HTTP response object sizes defined in the test equipment configuration parameters section 7.2.3.2.

7.2.2. Test Setup

Test bed setup SHOULD be configured as defined in section 4. Any specific test bed configuration changes such as number of interfaces and interface type, etc. MUST be documented.

7.2.3. Test Parameters

In this section, test scenario specific parameters SHOULD be defined.

7.2.3.1. DUT/SUT Configuration Parameters

DUT/SUT parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in the section 4.2. Any configuration changes for this specific test scenario MUST be documented.

7.2.3.2. Test Equipment Configuration Parameters

Test equipment configuration parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in the section 4.3. Following parameters MUST be documented for this test scenario:

Client IP address range defined in Section 4.3.1.2

Server IP address range defined in Section 4.3.2.2

Traffic distribution ratio between IPv4 and IPv6 defined in Section 4.3.1.2

Target connections per second: Initial value from product data sheet (if known)

Initial connections per second: 10% of "Target connections per second"
The client SHOULD negotiate HTTP 1.1 and close the connection with FIN immediately after completion of one transaction. In each test iteration, client MUST send GET command requesting a fixed HTTP response object size.

The RECOMMENDED response object sizes are 1, 2, 4, 16, 64 KByte

7.2.3.3. Test Results Acceptance Criteria

The following test criteria is defined as test results acceptance criteria. Test results acceptance criteria MUST be monitored during the whole sustain phase of the traffic load profile.

a. Number of failed Application transaction MUST be less than 0.01% of total attempt transactions

b. Number of Terminated TCP connections due to unexpected TCP RST sent by DUT/SUT MUST be less than 0.01% of total initiated TCP connections

c. During the sustain phase, traffic should be forwarded at a constant rate

d. Concurrent TCP connections SHOULD be constant during steady state. The deviation of concurrent TCP connections MUST be less than 10%. This confirms that DUT open and close the TCP connections almost at the same rate

7.2.3.4. Measurement

Following KPI metrics MUST be reported for each test iteration.

Mandatory KPIs: average TCP connections per second, average Throughput and Average Time to First Byte (TTFB).

7.2.4. Test Procedures and Expected Results

The test procedure is designed to measure the TCP connections per second rate of the DUT/SUT at the sustaining period of traffic load profile. The test procedure consists of three major steps. This test procedure MAY be repeated multiple times with different IP types; IPv4 only, IPv6 only and IPv4 and IPv6 mixed traffic distribution.
7.2.4.1. Step 1: Test Initialization and Qualification

Verify the link status of all connected physical interfaces. All interfaces are expected to be "UP" status.

Configure traffic load profile of the test equipment to establish "initial connections per second" as defined in the parameters section. The traffic load profile SHOULD be defined as described in the section 4.3.4.

The DUT/SUT SHOULD reach the "initial connections per second" before the sustain phase. The measured KPIs during the sustain phase MUST meet the acceptance criteria a, b, c, and d defined in section 7.3.3.3.

If the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria, the test procedure MUST NOT be continued to "Step 2".

7.2.4.2. Step 2: Test Run with Target Objective

Configure test equipment to establish "Target connections per second" defined in the parameters table. The test equipment SHOULD follow the traffic load profile definition as described in the section 4.3.4.

During the ramp up and sustain phase of each test iteration, other KPIs such as throughput, concurrent TCP connections and application transactions per second MUST NOT reach to the maximum value the DUT/SUT can support. The test results for specific test iterations SHOULD NOT be reported, if the above mentioned KPI (especially throughput) reaches to the maximum value. (Example: If the test iteration with 64Kbyte of HTTP response object size reached the maximum throughput limitation of the DUT, the test iteration MAY be interrupted and the result for 64kbyte SHOULD NOT be reported).

The test equipment SHOULD start to measure and record all specified KPIs. The frequency of measurement MUST be less than 5 seconds. Continue the test until all traffic profile phases are completed.

The DUT/SUT is expected to reach the desired target connections per second rate at the sustain phase. In addition, the measured KPIs MUST meet all acceptance criteria.

Follow the step 3, if the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria.
7.2.4.3. Step 3: Test Iteration

Determine the maximum and average achievable connections per second within the acceptance criteria.

7.3. HTTP Transaction per Second

7.3.1. Objective

Using HTTP 1.1 traffic, determine the maximum sustainable HTTP transactions per second supported by the DUT/SUT under different throughput load conditions.

To measure transactions per second performance under a variety of DUT Security inspection load conditions, each test iteration MUST use different fixed HTTP response object sizes defined in the test equipment configuration parameters section 7.3.3.2.

7.3.2. Test Setup

Test bed setup SHOULD be configured as defined in section 4. Any specific test bed configuration changes such as number of interfaces and interface type, etc. MUST be documented.

7.3.3. Test Parameters

In this section, test scenario specific parameters SHOULD be defined.

7.3.3.1. DUT/SUT Configuration Parameters

DUT/SUT parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in section 4.2. Any configuration changes for this specific test scenario MUST be documented.

7.3.3.2. Test Equipment Configuration Parameters

Test equipment configuration parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in the section 4.3. Following parameters MUST be documented for this test scenario:

Client IP address range defined in Section 4.3.1.2

Server IP address range defined in Section 4.3.2.2

Traffic distribution ratio between IPv4 and IPv6 defined in Section 4.3.1.2
Target Transactions per second: Initial value from product data sheet (if known)

Initial Transactions per second: 10% of "Target Transactions per second"

Test scenario SHOULD be run with a single traffic profile with following attributes:

The client MUST negotiate HTTP 1.1 and close the connections with FIN immediately after completion of 10 transactions. In each test iteration, client MUST send GET command requesting a fixed HTTP response object size. The RECOMMENDED object sizes are 1, 16 and 64 KByte

7.3.3.3. Test Results Acceptance Criteria

The following test Criteria is defined as test results acceptance criteria. Test results acceptance criteria MUST be monitored during the whole sustain phase of the traffic load profile.

a. Number of failed Application transactions MUST be zero

b. Number of Terminated HTTP connections due to unexpected TCP RST sent by DUT/SUT MUST be less than 0.01% of total initiated HTTP sessions

c. Traffic should be forwarded at a constant rate

d. Average Time to TCP First Byte MUST be constant and not increase more than 10%

e. The deviation of concurrent TCP connection Must be less than 10%

7.3.3.4. Measurement

Following KPI metrics MUST be reported for this test scenario.

average TCP Connections per second, average Throughput, Average Time to TCP First Byte and average application transaction latency.

7.3.4. Test Procedures and Expected Results

The test procedure is designed to measure the HTTP transactions per second of the DUT/SUT at the sustaining period of traffic load profile. The test procedure consists of three major steps. This test procedure MAY be repeated multiple times with different IP
types; IPv4 only, IPv6 only and IPv4 and IPv6 mixed traffic distribution.

7.3.4.1. Step 1: Test Initialization and Qualification

Verify the link status of the all connected physical interfaces. All interfaces are expected to be "up" status.

Configure traffic load profile of the test equipment to establish "initial HTTP transactions per second" as defined in the parameters section. The traffic load profile CAN be defined as described in the section 4.3.4.

The DUT/SUT SHOULD reach the "initial HTTP transactions per second" before the sustain phase. The measured KPIs during the sustain phase MUST meet the acceptance criteria a, b, c, and d defined in section 7.3.3.3.

If the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria, the test procedure MUST NOT be continued to "Step 2".

7.3.4.2. Step 2: Test Run with Target Objective

Configure test equipment to establish "Target HTTP transactions per second" defined in the parameters table. The test equipment SHOULD follow the traffic load profile definition as described in the section 4.3.4.

During the ramp up and sustain phase of each test iteration, other KPIs such as throughput, concurrent TCP connections and connection per second MUST NOT reach to the maximum value the DUT/SUT can support. The test results for specific test iterations SHOULD NOT be reported, if the above mentioned KPI (especially throughput) reaches to the maximum value. (Example: If the test iteration with 64Kbyte of HTTP response object size reached the maximum throughput limitation of the DUT, the test iteration MAY be interrupted and the result for 64kbyte SHOULD NOT be reported).

The test equipment SHOULD start to measure and record all specified KPIs. The frequency of measurement MUST be less than 5 seconds. Continue the test until all traffic profile phases are completed.

The DUT/SUT is expected to reach the desired target HTTP transactions per second at the sustain phase. In addition, the measured KPIs MUST meet all acceptance criteria.

Follow the step 3, if the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria.
7.3.4.3. Step 3: Test Iteration

Determine the maximum and average achievable HTTP transactions per second within the acceptance criteria. Final test iteration MUST be performed for the test duration defined in Section 4.3.4.

7.4. TCP/HTTP Transaction Latency

7.4.1. Objective

Using HTTP traffic, determine the average HTTP transaction latency when DUT is running with sustainable HTTP transactions per second supported by the DUT/SUT under different HTTP response object sizes.

Test iterations MUST be performed with different HTTP response object sizes twice, one with a single transaction and the other with multiple transactions within a single TCP connection. For consistency both single and multiple transaction test needs to be configured with HTTP 1.1.

7.4.2. Test Setup

Test bed setup SHOULD be configured as defined in section 4. Any specific test bed configuration changes such as number of interfaces and interface type, etc. MUST be documented.

7.4.3. Test Parameters

In this section, test scenario specific parameters SHOULD be defined.

7.4.3.1. DUT/SUT Configuration Parameters

DUT/SUT parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in the section 4.2. Any configuration changes for this specific test scenario MUST be documented.

7.4.3.2. Test Equipment Configuration Parameters

Test equipment configuration parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in the section 4.3. Following parameters MUST be documented for this test scenario:

Client IP address range defined in Section 4.3.1.2

Server IP address range defined in Section 4.3.2.2

Traffic distribution ratio between IPv4 and IPv6 defined in Section 4.3.1.2
Target connections per second: 50% of the value measured in test scenario TCP/HTTP Connections Per Second (Section 7.2)

Initial connections per second: 10% of "Target connections per second"

HTTP transaction per TCP connection: one test scenario with single transaction and another scenario with 10 transactions

Test scenario SHOULD be run with a single traffic profile with following attributes:

To measure application transaction latency with a single connection per transaction and a single connection with multiple transactions the tests should run twice:

1st test run: The client MUST negotiate HTTP 1.1 and close the connection with FIN immediately after completion of the transaction.

2nd test run: The client MUST negotiate HTTP 1.1 and close the connection after 10 transactions (GET and RESPONSE) within a single TCP connection.

HTTP 1.1 with GET command requesting a single 1, 16 or 64 Kbyte objects. For each test iteration, client MUST request a single HTTP response object size.

7.4.3.3. Test Results Acceptance Criteria

The following test Criteria is defined as test results acceptance criteria. Test results acceptance criteria MUST be monitored during the whole sustain phase of the traffic load profile. Ramp up and ramp down phase SHOULD NOT be considered.

Generica criteria:

a. Number of failed Application transaction MUST be zero.

b. Number of Terminated TCP connection due to unexpected TCP RST sent by DUT/SUT MUST be zero.

c. During the sustain phase, traffic should be forwarded at a constant rate.

d. During the sustain phase, Average connect time and average transaction time MUST be constant and latency deviation SHOULD not increase more than 10%.
e. Concurrent TCP connections should be constant during steady state. This confirms the DUT opens and closes TCP connections at the same rate.

f. After ramp up the DUT MUST achieve the target connections per second objective defined in the parameter section 7.4.3.2 and it remains in that state for the entire test duration (sustain phase).

7.4.3.4. Measurement

Following KPI metrics MUST be reported for each test scenario and HTTP response object sizes separately:

average TCP connections per second and average application transaction latency needs to be recorded.

All KPI’s are measured once the target connections per second achieves the steady state.

7.4.4. Test Procedures and Expected Results

The test procedure is designed to measure the average application transaction latencies or TTLB when the DUT is operating close to 50% of its maximum achievable connections per second. This test procedure CAN be repeated multiple times with different IP types (IPv4 only, IPv6 only and IPv4 and IPv6 mixed traffic distribution), HTTP response object sizes and single and multiple transactions per connection scenarios.

7.4.4.1. Step 1: Test Initialization and Qualification

Verify the link status of the all connected physical interfaces. All interfaces are expected to be "UP" status.

Configure traffic load profile of the test equipment to establish "initial connections per second" as defined in the parameters section. The traffic load profile CAN be defined as described in the section 4.3.4.

The DUT/SUT SHOULD reach the "initial connections per second" before the sustain phase. The measured KPIs during the sustain phase MUST meet the acceptance criteria a, b, c, d, e and f defined in section 7.4.3.3.

If the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria, the test procedure MUST NOT be continued to "Step 2".
7.4.4.2. Step 2: Test Run with Target Objective

Configure test equipment to establish "Target connections per second" defined in the parameters table. The test equipment SHOULD follow the traffic load profile definition as described in the section 4.3.4.

During the ramp up and sustain phase, other KPIs such as throughput, concurrent TCP connections and application transactions per second MUST NOT reach to the maximum value that DUT/SUT can support. The test results for specific test iterations SHOULD NOT be reported, if the above mentioned KPI (especially throughput) reaches to the maximum value. (Example: If the test iteration with 64Kbyte of HTTP response object size reached the maximum throughput limitation of the DUT, the test iteration MAY be interrupted and the result for 64kbyte SHOULD NOT be reported).

The test equipment SHOULD start to measure and record all specified KPIs. The frequency of measurement MUST be less than 5 seconds. Continue the test until all traffic profile phases are completed. DUT/SUT is expected to reach the desired target connections per second rate at the sustain phase. In addition, the measured KPIs must meet all acceptance criteria.

Follow the step 3, if the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria.

7.4.4.3. Step 3: Test Iteration

Determine the maximum achievable connections per second within the acceptance criteria and measure the latency values.

7.5. HTTP Throughput

7.5.1. Objective

Determine the throughput for HTTP transactions varying the HTTP response object size.

7.5.2. Test Setup

Test bed setup SHOULD be configured as defined in section 4. Any specific test bed configuration changes such as number of interfaces and interface type, etc. must be documented.
7.5.3. Test Parameters

In this section, test scenario specific parameters SHOULD be defined.

7.5.3.1. DUT/SUT Configuration Parameters

DUT/SUT parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in the section 4.2. Any configuration changes for this specific test scenario MUST be documented.

7.5.3.2. Test Equipment Configuration Parameters

Test equipment configuration parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in the section 4.3. Following parameters MUST be documented for this test scenario:

- Client IP address range defined in Section 4.3.1.2
- Server IP address range defined in Section 4.3.2.2
- Traffic distribution ratio between IPv4 and IPv6 defined in Section 4.3.1.2
- Target Throughput: Initial value from product data sheet (if known)
- Number of HTTP response object requests (transactions) per connection: 10
- HTTP response object size: 16KB, 64KB, 256KB and mixed objects defined in the table
### Table 3: Mixed Objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object size (KByte)</th>
<th>Number of requests/Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5.3.3. Test Results Acceptance Criteria

The following test criteria is defined as test results acceptance criteria. Test results acceptance criteria MUST be monitored during the whole sustain phase of the traffic load profile:

a. Number of failed Application transaction MUST be less than 0.01% of attempt transaction.

b. Traffic should be forwarded constantly.

c. The deviation of concurrent TCP connection MUST be less than 10%

d. The deviation of average HTTP transaction latency MUST be less than 10%

7.5.3.4. Measurement

The KPI metrics MUST be reported for this test scenario:
Average Throughput, concurrent connections, and average TCP connections per second.

7.5.4. Test Procedures and Expected Results

The test procedure is designed to measure HTTP throughput of the DUT/SUT. The test procedure consists of three major steps. This test procedure MAY be repeated multiple times with different IPv4 and IPv6 traffic distribution and HTTP response object sizes.

7.5.4.1. Step 1: Test Initialization and Qualification

Verify the link status of the all connected physical interfaces. All interfaces are expected to be "UP" status.

Configure traffic load profile of the test equipment to establish "initial throughput" as defined in the parameters section.

The traffic load profile SHOULD be defined as described in Section 4.3.4. The DUT/SUT SHOULD reach the "initial throughput" during the sustain phase. Measure all KPI as defined in Section 7.5.3.4.

The measured KPIs during the sustain phase MUST meet the acceptance criteria "a" defined in Section 7.5.3.3.

If the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria, the test procedure MUST NOT be continued to "Step 2".

7.5.4.2. Step 2: Test Run with Target Objective

The test equipment SHOULD start to measure and record all specified KPIs. The frequency of measurement MUST be less than 5 seconds. Continue the test until all traffic profile phases are completed.

The DUT/SUT is expected to reach the desired target throughput at the sustain phase. In addition, the measured KPIs must meet all acceptance criteria.

Perform the test separately for each HTTP response object size (16k, 64k, 256k and mixed HTTP response objects).

Follow the step 3, if the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria.
7.5.4.3. Step 3: Test Iteration

Determine the maximum and average achievable throughput within the acceptance criteria. Final test iteration MUST be performed for the test duration defined in Section 4.3.4.

7.6. Concurrent TCP/HTTP Connection Capacity

7.6.1. Objective

Determine the maximum number of concurrent TCP connections that DUT/SUT sustains when using HTTP traffic.

7.6.2. Test Setup

Test bed setup SHOULD be configured as defined in Section 4. Any specific test bed configuration changes such as number of interfaces and interface type, etc. must be documented.

7.6.3. Test Parameters

In this section, test scenario specific parameters SHOULD be defined.

7.6.3.1. DUT/SUT Configuration Parameters

DUT/SUT parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in Section 4.2. Any configuration changes for this specific test scenario MUST be documented.

7.6.3.2. Test Equipment Configuration Parameters

Test equipment configuration parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in Section 4.3. Following parameters MUST be noted for this test scenario:

- Client IP address range defined in Section 4.3.1.2
- Server IP address range defined in Section 4.3.2.2
- Traffic distribution ratio between IPv4 and IPv6 defined in Section 4.3.1.2
- Target concurrent connection: Initial value from product data sheet (if known)
- Initial concurrent connection: 10% of "Target concurrent connection"
The client must negotiate HTTP 1.1 with persistence and each client MAY open multiple concurrent TCP connections per server endpoint IP.

Each client sends 10 GET commands requesting 1Kbyte HTTP response object in the same TCP connection (10 transactions/TCP connection) and the delay (think time) between the transaction MUST be X seconds. The value for think time (X) MUST be defined to achieve 15% of maximum throughput measured in test scenario 7.5.

The established connections SHOULD remain open until the ramp down phase of the test. During the ramp down phase, all connections should be successfully closed with FIN.

7.6.3.3. Test Results Acceptance Criteria

The following test Criteria is defined as test results acceptance criteria. Test results acceptance criteria MUST be monitored during the whole sustain phase of the traffic load profile.

a. Number of failed Application transaction MUST be zero

b. Number of Terminated TCP connections due to unexpected TCP RST sent by DUT/SUT MUST be less than 0.01% of total initiated TCP connections

c. During the sustain phase, traffic should be forwarded constantly at the rate defined in the parameter section 7.6.3.2

d. During the sustain phase, the maximum deviation (max. dev) of application transaction latency or TTLB (Time To Last Byte) MUST be less than 10%

7.6.3.4. Measurement

Following KPI metrics MUST be reported for this test scenario:

average Throughput, max. Min. Avg. Concurrent TCP connections, TTLB/application transaction latency (minimum, average and maximum) and average application transactions per second.

7.6.4. Test Procedures and expected Results

The test procedure is designed to measure the concurrent TCP connection capacity of the DUT/SUT at the sustaining period of traffic load profile. The test procedure consists of three major steps. This test procedure MAY be repeated multiple times with different IPv4 and IPv6 traffic distribution.
7.6.4.1. Step 1: Test Initialization and Qualification

Verify the link status of all connected physical interfaces. All interfaces are expected to be "UP" status.

Configure test equipment to generate background traffic as defined in section 7.6.3.2. Measure throughput, concurrent TCP connections, and TCP connections per second.

While generating the background traffic, configure another traffic profile on the test equipment to establish "initial concurrent TCP connections" defined in section 7.6.3.2. The traffic load profile can be defined as described in the section Error: Reference source not found.

During the sustain phase, the DUT/SUT SHOULD reach the "initial concurrent TCP connections" plus concurrent TCP connections measured in background traffic. The measured KPIs during the sustain phase MUST meet the acceptance criteria "a" and "b" defined in the section Error: Reference source not found.

If the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria, the test procedure MUST NOT be continued to "Step 2".

7.6.4.2. Step 2: Test Run with Target Objective

Configure test equipment to establish "Target concurrent TCP connections" defined in the parameters table. The test equipment SHOULD follow the traffic load profile definition as described in Section 4.3.4.

Configure test equipment to establish "Target concurrent TCP connections" minus concurrent TCP connections measured in background traffic. The test equipment SHOULD follow the traffic load profile definition as described in the section Error: Reference source not found.

During the ramp up and sustain phase, the other KPIs such as throughput, TCP connections per second and application transactions per second MUST NOT reach to the maximum value that the DUT/SUT can support.

The test equipment SHOULD start to measure and record KPIs defined in section 7.6.3.4. The frequency of measurement MUST be less than 5 seconds. Continue the test until all traffic profile phases are completed.
The DUT/SUT is expected to reach the desired target concurrent connection at the sustain phase. In addition, the measured KPIs must meet all acceptance criteria.

Follow the step 3, if the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria.

7.6.4.3. Step 3: Test Iteration

Determine the maximum and average achievable concurrent TCP connections capacity within the acceptance criteria.

7.7. TCP/HTTPS Connections per second

7.7.1. Objective

Using HTTPS traffic, determine the maximum sustainable SSL/TLS session establishment rate supported by the DUT/SUT under different throughput load conditions.

Test iterations MUST include common cipher suites and key strengths as well as forward looking stronger keys. Specific test iterations MUST include ciphers and keys defined in the parameter section 7.7.3.2.

For each cipher suite and key strengths, test iterations MUST use a single HTTPS response object size defined in the test equipment configuration parameters section 7.7.3.2 to measure connections per second performance under a variety of DUT Security inspection load conditions.

7.7.2. Test Setup

Test bed setup SHOULD be configured as defined in section 4. Any specific test bed configuration changes such as number of interfaces and interface type, etc. must be documented.

7.7.3. Test Parameters

In this section, test scenario specific parameters SHOULD be defined.

7.7.3.1. DUT/SUT Configuration Parameters

DUT/SUT parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in the section 4.2. Any configuration changes for this specific test scenario MUST be documented.
7.7.3.2. Test Equipment Configuration Parameters

Test equipment configuration parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in the section 4.3. Following parameters MUST be documented for this test scenario:

Client IP address range defined in Section 4.3.1.2

Server IP address range defined in Section 4.3.2.2

Traffic distribution ratio between IPv4 and IPv6 defined in Section 4.3.1.2

Target connections per second: Initial value from product data sheet (if known)

Initial connections per second: 10% of "Target connections per second"

Ciphers and keys:

1. ECDHE-ECDSA-AES128-GCM-SHA256 with Prime256v1 (Signature Hash Algorithm: ecdsa_secp256r1_sha256 and Supported group: sepc256r1)

2. ECDHE-RSA-AES128-GCM-SHA256 with RSA 2048 (Signature Hash Algorithm: rsa_pkcs1_sha256 and Supported group: sepc256)

3. ECDHE-ECDSA-AES256-GCM-SHA384 with Secp521 (Signature Hash Algorithm: ecdsa_secp256r1_sha384 and Supported group: sepc521r1)

4. ECDHE-RSA-AES256-GCM-SHA384 with RSA 4096 (Signature Hash Algorithm: rsa_pkcs1_sha384 and Supported group: sepc256)

The client MUST negotiate HTTPS 1.1 and close the connection with FIN immediately after completion of one transaction. In each test iteration, client MUST send GET command requesting a fixed HTTPS response object size. The RECOMMENDED object sizes are 1, 2, 4, 16, 64 Kbyte.

Each client connection MUST perform a full handshake with server certificate (no Certificate on client side) and MUST NOT use session reuse or resumption. TLS record size MAY be optimized for the HTTPS response object size up to a record size of 16K.
7.7.3.3. Test Results Acceptance Criteria

The following test criteria is defined as test results acceptance criteria:

a. Number of failed Application transaction MUST be less than 0.01% of attempt transactions

b. Number of Terminated TCP connections due to unexpected TCP RST sent by DUT/SUT MUST be less than 0.01% of total initiated TCP connections

c. During the sustain phase, traffic should be forwarded at a constant rate

d. Concurrent TCP connections SHOULD be constant during steady state. This confirms that DUT open and close the TCP connections at the same rate

7.7.3.4. Measurement

Following KPI metrics MUST be reported for this test scenario:

Mandatory KPIs: average TCP connections per second, average Throughput and Average Time to TCP First Byte.

7.7.4. Test Procedures and expected Results

The test procedure is designed to measure the TCP connections per second rate of the DUT/SUT at the sustaining period of traffic load profile. The test procedure consists of three major steps. This test procedure MAY be repeated multiple times with different IPv4 and IPv6 traffic distribution.

7.7.4.1. Step 1: Test Initialization and Qualification

Verify the link status of the all connected physical interfaces. All interfaces are expected to be "UP" status.

Configure traffic load profile of the test equipment to establish "initial connections per second" as defined in the parameters section. The traffic load profile CAN be defined as described in the section 4.3.4.

The DUT/SUT SHOULD reach the "initial connections per second" before the sustain phase. The measured KPIs during the sustain phase MUST meet the acceptance criteria a, b, c, and d defined in section 7.7.3.3.
If the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria, the test procedure MUST NOT be continued to "Step 2".

7.7.4.2. Step 2: Test Run with Target Objective

Configure test equipment to establish "Target connections per second" defined in the parameters table. The test equipment SHOULD follow the traffic load profile definition as described in the section 4.3.4.

During the ramp up and sustain phase, other KPIs such as throughput, concurrent TCP connections and application transactions per second MUST NOT reach to the maximum value the DUT/SUT can support. The test results for specific test iteration SHOULD NOT be reported, if the above mentioned KPI (especially throughput) reaches to the maximum value. (Example: If the test iteration with 64Kbyte of HTTPS response object size reached the maximum throughput limitation of the DUT, the test iteration can be interrupted and the result for 64kbyte SHOULD NOT be reported).

The test equipment SHOULD start to measure and record all specified KPIs. The frequency of measurement MUST be less than 5 seconds. Continue the test until all traffic profile phases are completed.

The DUT/SUT is expected to reach the desired target connections per second rate at the sustain phase. In addition, the measured KPIs must meet all acceptance criteria.

Follow the step 3, if the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria.

7.7.4.3. Step 3: Test Iteration

Determine the maximum and average achievable connections per second within the acceptance criteria.

7.8. HTTPS Transaction per Second

7.8.1. Objective

Using HTTPS traffic, determine the maximum sustainable HTTPS transactions per second supported by the DUT/SUT under different throughput load conditions.

To measure transactions per second performance under a variety of DUT Security inspection load conditions, each test iteration MUST use different fixed HTTPS transaction object sizes defined in the test equipment configuration parameters section 7.8.3.2.
Test iterations MUST include common cipher suites and key strengths as well as forward looking stronger keys. Specific test iterations MUST include the ciphers and keys defined in the parameter section 7.8.3.2.

7.8.2. Test Setup

Test bed setup SHOULD be configured as defined in section 4. Any specific test bed configuration changes such as number of interfaces and interface type, etc. must be documented.

7.8.3. Test Parameters

In this section, test scenario specific parameters SHOULD be defined.

7.8.3.1. DUT/SUT Configuration Parameters

DUT/SUT parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in the section 4.2. Any configuration changes for this specific test scenario MUST be documented.

7.8.3.2. Test Equipment Configuration Parameters

Test equipment configuration parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in the section 4.3. Following parameters MUST be documented for this test scenario:

- Client IP address range defined in Section 4.3.1.2
- Server IP address range defined in Section 4.3.2.2
- Traffic distribution ratio between IPv4 and IPv6 defined in Section 4.3.1.2
- Target Transactions per second: Initial value from product data sheet (if known)
- Initial Transactions per second: 10% of "Target Transactions per second"

Ciphers and keys:

1. ECDHE-ECDSA-AES128-GCM-SHA256 with Prime256v1 (Signature Hash Algorithm: ecdsa_secp256r1_sha256 and Supported group: sepc256r1)
2. ECDHE-RSA-AES128-GCM-SHA256 with RSA 2048 (Signature Hash Algorithm: rsa_pkcs1_sha256 and Supported group: sepc256)
3. ECDHE-ECDSA-AES256-GCM-SHA384 with Secp521 (Signature Hash Algorithm: ecdsa_secp256r1_sha384 and Supported group: sepc521r1)

4. ECDHE-RSA-AES256-GCM-SHA384 with RSA 4096 (Signature Hash Algorithm: rsa_pkcs1_sha384 and Supported group: secp256)

The client MUST negotiate HTTPS 1.1 and close the connection with FIN immediately after completion of 10 transactions.

HTTPS 1.1 with GET command requesting a single 1, 16 and 64 KByte objects.

Each client connection MUST perform a full handshake with server certificate and SHOULD NOT use session reuse or resumption.

TLS record size MAY be optimized for the object size up to a record size of 16K.

7.8.3.3. Test Results Acceptance Criteria

The following test Criteria is defined as test results acceptance criteria. Test results acceptance criteria MUST be monitored during the whole sustain phase of the traffic load profile. Ramp up and ramp down phase SHOULD NOT be considered.

a. Number of failed Application transactions MUST be zero

b. Number of Terminated HTTP connections due to unexpected TCP RST sent by DUT/SUT MUST be less than 0.01% of total initiated HTTP sessions

c. Average Time to TCP First Byte MUST be constant and not increase more than 10%

d. The deviation of concurrent TCP connection Must be less than 10%

7.8.3.4. Measurement

Following KPI metrics MUST be reported for this test scenario.

average TCP connections per second, average Throughput, Average Time to TCP First Byte and average application transaction latency.
7.8.4. Test Procedures and Expected Results

The test procedure is designed to measure the HTTPS transactions per second rate of the DUT/SUT at the sustaining period of traffic load profile. The test procedure consists of three major steps. This test procedure MAY be repeated multiple times with different IPv4 and IPv6 traffic distribution, HTTPS response object sizes and ciphers and keys.

7.8.4.1. Step 1: Test Initialization and Qualification

Verify the link status of all connected physical interfaces. All interfaces are expected to be "UP" status.

Configure traffic load profile of the test equipment to establish "initial HTTPS transactions per second" as defined in the parameters section. The traffic load profile CAN be defined as described in the section 4.3.4.

The DUT/SUT SHOULD reach the "initial HTTPS transactions per second" before the sustain phase. The measured KPIs during the sustain phase MUST meet the acceptance criteria a, b, c, and d defined in section 7.8.3.3.

If the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria, the test procedure MUST NOT be continued to "Step 2".

7.8.4.2. Step 2: Test Run with Target Objective

Configure test equipment to establish "Target HTTPS transactions per second" defined in the parameters table. The test equipment SHOULD follow the traffic load profile definition as described in the section 4.3.4.

During the ramp up and sustain phase of each test iteration, other KPIs such as throughput, concurrent TCP connections and connections per second MUST NOT reach to the maximum value the DUT/SUT can support. The test results for specific test iterations SHOULD NOT be reported, if the above mentioned KPI (especially throughput) reaches to the maximum value. (Example: If the test iteration with 64Kbyte of HTTP response object size reached the maximum throughput limitation of the DUT, the test iteration MAY be interrupted and the result for 64kbyte SHOULD NOT be reported).

The test equipment SHOULD start to measure and record all specified KPIs. The frequency of measurement MUST be less than 5 seconds. Continue the test until all traffic profile phases are completed.
The DUT/SUT is expected to reach the desired target HTTPS transactions per second rate at the sustain phase. In addition, the measured KPIs must meet all acceptance criteria.

Follow the step 3, if the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria.

7.8.4.3. Step 3: Test Iteration

Determine the maximum and average achievable HTTPS transactions per second within the acceptance criteria. Final test iteration MUST be performed for the test duration defined in Section 4.3.4.

7.9. HTTPS Transaction Latency

7.9.1. Objective

Using HTTPS traffic, determine the average HTTPS transaction latency when DUT is running with sustainable HTTPS transactions per second supported by the DUT/SUT under different HTTPS response object size.

Test iterations MUST be performed with different HTTPS response object sizes twice, one with a single transaction and the other with multiple transactions within a single TCP connection.

7.9.2. Test Setup

Test bed setup SHOULD be configured as defined in section 4. Any specific test bed configuration changes such as number of interfaces and interface type, etc. must be documented.

7.9.3. Test Parameters

In this section, test scenario specific parameters SHOULD be defined.

7.9.3.1. DUT/SUT Configuration Parameters

DUT/SUT parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in the section 4.2. Any configuration changes for this specific test scenario MUST be documented.

7.9.3.2. Test Equipment Configuration Parameters

Test equipment configuration parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in the section 4.3. Following parameters MUST be documented for this test scenario:

   Client IP address range defined in Section 4.3.1.2
Server IP address range defined in Section 4.3.2.2

Traffic distribution ratio between IPv4 and IPv6 defined in Section 4.3.1.2

Cipher suites and key size: ECDHE-ECDSA-AES256-GCM-SHA384 with Secp521 bits key size (Signature Hash Algorithm: ecdsa_secp256r1_sha384 and Supported group: sepc521r1)

Target connections per second: 50% of the value measured in test scenario TCP/HTTPS Connections per second (Section 7.7)

Initial Transactions per second: 10% of "Target Transactions per second"

HTTPS transaction per connection: one test scenario with a single transaction and another scenario with 10 transactions

Test scenario SHOULD be run with a single traffic profile with following attributes:

To measure application transaction latency with a single connection per transaction and single connection with multiple transactions the tests should run twice:

1st test run: The client MUST negotiate HTTPS 1.1 and close the connection with FIN immediately after completion of the transaction.

2nd test run: The client MUST negotiate HTTPS 1.1 and close the connection after 10 transactions (GET and RESPONSE) within a single TCP connection.

HTTPS 1.1 with GET command requesting a single 1, 16 or 64 Kbyte objects. For each test iteration, client MUST request a single HTTPS response object size.

7.9.3.3. Test Results Acceptance Criteria

The following test Criteria is defined as test results acceptance criteria. Test results acceptance criteria MUST be monitored during the whole sustain phase of the traffic load profile. Ramp up and ramp down phase SHOULD NOT be considered.

Generic criteria:

a. Number of failed Application transactions MUST be zero
b. Number of Terminated TCP connections due to unexpected TCP RST sent by DUT/SUT MUST be zero.

c. During the sustain phase, traffic should be forwarded at a constant rate.

d. During the sustain phase and average application transaction latency MUST be constant and latency deviation SHOULD NOT increase more than 10%.

e. Concurrent TCP connections SHOULD be constant during steady state. This confirms the DUT opens and closes the TCP connections at the same rate.

f. After ramp up the DUT MUST achieve the target connections per second objective defined in the parameter section and remain in that state for the entire duration of the sustain phase.

7.9.3.4. Measurement

Following KPI metrics MUST be reported for each test scenario and HTTPS response object sizes separately:

average TCP connections per second and average application transaction latency or TTLB needs to be recorded.

All KPI’s are measured once the target connections per second achieves the steady state.

7.9.4. Test Procedures and Expected Results

The test procedure is designed to measure average application transaction latency or TTLB when the DUT is operating close to 50% of its maximum achievable connections per second. This test procedure CAN be repeated multiple times with different IP types (IPv4 only, IPv6 only and IPv4 and IPv6 mixed traffic distribution), HTTPS response object sizes and single and multiple transactions per connection scenarios.

7.9.4.1. Step 1: Test Initialization and Qualification

Verify the link status of the all connected physical interfaces. All interfaces are expected to be "UP" status.

Configure traffic load profile of the test equipment to establish "initial connections per second" as defined in the parameters section. The traffic load profile CAN be defined as described in the section 4.3.4.
The DUT/SUT SHOULD reach the "initial connections per second" before the sustain phase. The measured KPIs during the sustain phase MUST meet the acceptance criteria a, b, c, d, e, and f defined in section 7.4.3.3.

If the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria, the test procedure MUST NOT be continued to "Step 2".

7.9.4.2. Step 2: Test Run with Target Objective

Configure test equipment to establish "Target connections per second" defined in the parameters table. The test equipment SHOULD follow the traffic load profile definition as described in the section 4.3.4.

During the ramp up and sustain phase, other KPIs such as throughput, concurrent TCP connections and application transactions per second MUST NOT reach to the maximum value the DUT/SUT can support.

The test equipment SHOULD start to measure and record all specified KPIs. The frequency of measurement MUST be less than 5 seconds. Continue the test until all traffic profile phases are completed. DUT/SUT is expected to reach the desired target connections per second rate at the sustain phase. In addition, the measured KPIs must meet all acceptance criteria.

The DUT/SUT is expected to reach the desired target HTTPS transactions per second rate at the sustain phase. In addition, the measured KPIs must meet all acceptance criteria.

Follow the step 3, if the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria.

7.9.4.3. Step 3: Test Iteration

Determine the maximum achievable connections per second within the acceptance criteria and measure the latency values.

7.10. HTTPS Throughput

7.10.1. Objective

Determine the throughput for HTTPS transactions varying the HTTPS response object size.

Test iterations MUST include common cipher suites and key strengths as well as forward looking stronger keys. Specific test iterations
7.10.2. Test Setup

Test bed setup SHOULD be configured as defined in section 4. Any specific test bed configuration changes such as number of interfaces and interface type, etc. must be documented.

7.10.3. Test Parameters

In this section, test scenario specific parameters SHOULD be defined.

7.10.3.1. DUT/SUT Configuration Parameters

DUT/SUT parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in the section 4.2. Any configuration changes for this specific test scenario MUST be documented.

7.10.3.2. Test Equipment Configuration Parameters

Test equipment configuration parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in the section 4.3. Following parameters MUST be documented for this test scenario:

Client IP address range defined in Section 4.3.1.2

Server IP address range defined in Section 4.3.2.2

Traffic distribution ratio between IPv4 and IPv6 defined in Section 4.3.1.2

Target Throughput: Initial value from product data sheet (if known)

Number of HTTPS response object requests (transactions) per connection: 10

Ciphers and keys:

1. ECDHE-ECDSA-AES128-GCM-SHA256 with Prime256v1 (Signature Hash Algorithm: ecdsa_secp256r1_sha256 and Supported group: sepc256r1)

2. ECDHE-RSA-AES128-GCM-SHA256 with RSA 2048 (Signature Hash Algorithm: rsa_pkscs1_sha256 and Supported group: sepc256)
3. ECDHE-ECDSA-AES256-GCM-SHA384 with Secp521 (Signature Hash Algorithm: ecdsa_secp256r1_sha384 and Supported group: secp521r1)

4. ECDHE-RSA-AES256-GCM-SHA384 with RSA 4096 (Signature Hash Algorithm: rsa_pkcs1_sha384 and Supported group: secp256)

HTTPS response object size: 16KB, 64KB, 256KB and mixed object defined in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object size (KByte)</th>
<th>Number of requests/Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Mixed Objects

Each client connection MUST perform a full handshake with server certificate (no Certificate on client side) and 50% of connection SHOULD use session reuse or resumption.

TLS record size MAY be optimized for the HTTPS response object size up to a record size of 16K.
7.10.3.3. Test Results Acceptance Criteria

The following test criteria is defined as test results acceptance criteria. Test results acceptance criteria MUST be monitored during the whole sustain phase of the traffic load profile.

a. Number of failed Application transaction MUST be less than 0.01% of attempt transaction.

b. Traffic should be forwarded constantly.

c. The deviation of concurrent TCP connection Must be less than 10%

d. The deviation of average application transaction latency MUST be less than 10%

7.10.3.4. Measurement

The KPI metrics MUST be reported for this test scenario:

Average Throughput, concurrent connections, and average TCP connections per second.

7.10.4. Test Procedures and Expected Results

The test procedure consists of three major steps. This test procedure MAY be repeated multiple times with different IPv4 and IPv6 traffic distribution and HTTPS response object sizes.

7.10.4.1. Step 1: Test Initialization and Qualification

Verify the link status of the all connected physical interfaces. All interfaces are expected to be "UP" status.

Configure traffic load profile of the test equipment to establish "initial throughput" as defined in the parameters section.

The traffic load profile should be defined as described in Section 4.3.4. The DUT/SUT SHOULD reach the "initial throughput" during the sustain phase. Measure all KPI as defined in Section 7.10.3.4.

The measured KPIs during the sustain phase MUST meet the acceptance criteria "a" defined in Section 7.10.3.3.

If the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria, the test procedure MUST NOT be continued to "Step 2".
7.10.4.2. Step 2: Test Run with Target Objective

The test equipment SHOULD start to measure and record all specified KPIs. The frequency of measurement MUST be less than 5 seconds. Continue the test until all traffic profile phases are completed.

The DUT/SUT is expected to reach the desired target throughput at the sustain phase. In addition, the measured KPIs must meet all acceptance criteria.

Perform the test separately for each HTTPS response object size (16k, 64k, 256k and mixed HTTPS response objects).

Follow the step 3, if the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria.

7.10.4.3. Step 3: Test Iteration

Determine the maximum and average achievable throughput within the acceptance criteria. Final test iteration MUST be performed for the test duration defined in Section 4.3.4.

7.11. Concurrent TCP/HTTPS Connection Capacity

7.11.1. Objective

Determine the maximum number of concurrent TCP connections that DUT/SUT sustains when using HTTPS traffic.

7.11.2. Test Setup

Test bed setup SHOULD be configured as defined in section 4. Any specific test bed configuration changes such as number of interfaces and interface type, etc. must be documented.

7.11.3. Test Parameters

In this section, test scenario specific parameters SHOULD be defined.

7.11.3.1. DUT/SUT Configuration Parameters

DUT/SUT parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in the section 4.2. Any configuration changes for this specific test scenario MUST be documented.
7.11.3.2. Test Equipment Configuration Parameters

Test equipment configuration parameters MUST conform to the requirements defined in the section Error: Reference source not found. Following parameters MUST be documented for this test scenario:

- Client IP address range defined in Section 4.3.1.2
- Server IP address range defined in Section 4.3.2.2
- Traffic distribution ratio between IPv4 and IPv6 defined in Section 4.3.1.2
- Cipher suites and key size: ECDHE-ECDSA-AES256-GCM-SHA384 with Secp521 bits key size (Signature Hash Algorithm: ecdsa_secp256r1_sha384 and Supported group: sepc521r1)
- Target concurrent connection: Initial value from product data sheet (if known)
  
  Initial concurrent connection: 10% of "Target concurrent connection"

- Maximum connections per second during ramp up phase: 50% of maximum connections per second measured in test scenario TCP/HTTPS Connections per second (Section 7.7)

- Throughput for background traffic: 10% of maximum throughput measured in test scenario HTTPS Throughput (Section 7.10) using an HTTPS response object size of 16Kbyte with a matching cipher and key size to what is being tested in this test

The client must perform HTTPS transaction with persistence and each client can open multiple concurrent TCP connections per server endpoint IP.

Each client sends 10 times of GET commands requesting 1Kbyte HTTPS response object in the same TCP connections (10 transactions/TCP connection) and the delay (think time) between the transaction MUST be X seconds. The value for think time (X) MUST be defined to achieve 15% of maximum throughput measured in test scenario 7.10.

The established connections (except background traffic connection) SHOULD remain open until the end phase of the test. During the ramp down phase, all connections should be successfully closed with FIN.
7.11.3.3. Test Results Acceptance Criteria

The following test criteria is defined as test results acceptance criteria. Test results acceptance criteria MUST be monitored during the whole sustain phase of the traffic load profile.

a. Number of failed Application transactions MUST be zero.

b. Number of Terminated TCP connections due to unexpected TCP RST sent by DUT/SUT MUST be less than 0.01% of total initiated TCP connections.

c. During the sustain phase, traffic should be forwarded constantly at the rate defined in the parameter section 7.11.3.2.

d. During the sustain phase, then maximum deviation (max. dev) of application transaction latency or TTLB (Time To Last Byte) MUST be less than 10%.

7.11.3.4. Measurement

Following KPI metrics MUST be reported for this test scenario:

Average Throughput, max. Min. Avg. Concurrent TCP connections, TTLB/application transaction latency and average application transactions per second.

7.11.4. Test Procedures and expected Results

The test procedure is designed to measure the concurrent TCP connection capacity of the DUT/SUT at the sustaining period of traffic load profile. The test procedure consists of three major steps. This test procedure MAY be repeated multiple times with different IPv4 and IPv6 traffic distribution.

7.11.4.1. Step 1: Test Initialization and Qualification

Verify the link status of the all connected physical interfaces. All interfaces are expected to be "UP" status.

Configure test equipment to generate background traffic as defined in section 7.3.11.2. Measure throughput, concurrent TCP connections, and connections per second.

While generating the background traffic, configure another traffic profile on the test equipment to establish "initial concurrent TCP connections" defined in the section 7.11.3.2. The traffic load...
profile CAN be defined as described in the section Error: Reference source not found

During the sustain phase, the DUT/SUT SHOULD reach the "initial concurrent TCP connections" plus concurrent TCP connections measured in background traffic. The measured KPIs during the sustain phase MUST meet the acceptance criteria "a" and "b" defined in the section Error: Reference source not found

If the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria, the test procedure MUST NOT be continued to "Step 2".

7.11.4.2. Step 2: Test Run with Target Objective

Configure test equipment to establish "Target concurrent TCP connections" minus concurrent TCP connections measured in background traffic. The test equipment SHOULD follow the traffic load profile definition as described in the section 4.3.4

During the ramp up and sustain phase, the other KPIs such as throughput, TCP connections per second and application transactions per second MUST NOT reach to the maximum value that the DUT/SUT can support.

The test equipment SHOULD start to measure and record KPIs defined in section 7.11.3.4. The frequency of measurement MUST be less than 5 seconds. Continue the test until all traffic profile phases are completed.

The DUT/SUT is expected to reach the desired target concurrent TCP connections at the sustain phase. In addition, the measured KPIs must meet all acceptance criteria.

Follow the step 3, if the KPI metrics do not meet the acceptance criteria.

7.11.4.3. Step 3: Test Iteration

Determine the maximum and average achievable concurrent TCP connections within the acceptance criteria.
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Appendix A. NetSecOPEN Basic Traffic Mix

A traffic mix for testing performance of next generation firewalls MUST scale to stress the DUT based on real-world conditions. In order to achieve this the following MUST be included:

- Clients connecting to multiple different server FQDNs per application
- Clients loading apps and pages with connections and objects in specific orders
- Multiple unique certificates for HTTPS/TLS
- A wide variety of different object sizes
- Different URL paths
- Mix of HTTP and HTTPS

A traffic mix for testing performance of next generation firewalls MUST also facility application identification using different detection methods with and without decryption of the traffic. Such as:

- HTTP HOST based application detection
- HTTPS/TLS Server Name Indication (SNI)
- Certificate Subject Common Name (CN)

The mix MUST be of sufficient complexity and volume to render differences in individual apps as statistically insignificant. For example, changes in like to like apps - such as one type of video service vs. another both consist of larger objects whereas one news site vs. another both typically have more connections then other apps because of trackers and embedded advertising content. To achieve sufficient complexity, a mix MUST have:

- Thousands of URLs each client walks thru
- Hundreds of FQDNs each client connects to
- Hundreds of unique certificates for HTTPS/TLS
- Thousands of different object sizes per client in orders matching applications
The following is a description of what a popular application in an enterprise traffic mix contains.

Table 5 lists the FQDNs, number of transactions and bytes transferred as an example client interacts with Office 365 Outlook, Word, Excel, Powerpoint, Sharepoint and Skype.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office365 FQDN</th>
<th>Bytes</th>
<th>Transaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r1.res.office365.com</td>
<td>14,056,960</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s1-word-edit-15.cdn.office.net</td>
<td>6,731,019</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>company1-my.sharepoint.com</td>
<td>6,269,492</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swx.cdn.skype.com</td>
<td>6,100,027</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>static.sharepointonline.com</td>
<td>6,036,947</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spoprod-a.akamaihd.net</td>
<td>3,904,250</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s1-excel-15.cdn.office.net</td>
<td>2,767,941</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outlook.office365.com</td>
<td>2,047,301</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shellprod.msocdn.com</td>
<td>1,008,370</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word-edit.officeapps.live.com</td>
<td>932,080</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>res.delve.office.com</td>
<td>760,146</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s1-powerpoint-15.cdn.office.net</td>
<td>557,604</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appsforoffice.microsoft.com</td>
<td>511,171</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerpoint.officeapps.live.com</td>
<td>471,625</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excel.officeapps.live.com</td>
<td>342,040</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s1-officeapps-15.cdn.office.net</td>
<td>331,343</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>webdir0a.online.lync.com</td>
<td>66,930</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portal.office.com</td>
<td>13,956</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>config.edge.skype.com</td>
<td>6,911</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clients MUST connect to multiple server FQDNs in the same order as real applications. Connections MUST be made when the client is interacting with the application and NOT first setup up all connections. Connections SHOULD stay open per client for subsequent transactions to the same FQDN similar to how a web browser behaves. Clients MUST use different URL Paths and Object sizes in orders as they are observed in real Applications. Clients MAY also setup multiple connections per FQDN to process multiple transactions in a sequence at the same time. Table 6 has a partial example sequence of the Office 365 Word application transactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FQDN</th>
<th>URL Path</th>
<th>Object size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>company1-my.sharepoint.com</td>
<td>/personal...</td>
<td>23,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word-edit.officeapps.live.com</td>
<td>/we/WsaUpload.ashx</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>static.sharepointonline.com</td>
<td>/bld/.../blank.js</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>static.sharepointonline.com</td>
<td>/bld/.../initstrings.js</td>
<td>23,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>static.sharepointonline.com</td>
<td>/bld/.../init.js</td>
<td>292,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>company1-my.sharepoint.com</td>
<td>/ScriptResource...</td>
<td>102,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>company1-my.sharepoint.com</td>
<td>/ScriptResource...</td>
<td>40,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>company1-my.sharepoint.com</td>
<td>/WebResource...</td>
<td>23,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word-edit.officeapps.live.com</td>
<td>/we/wordeditorframe.</td>
<td>60,657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Office365 Word Transactions

For application identification the HTTPS/TLS traffic MUST include realistic Certificate Subject Common Name (CN) data as well as Server Name Indications. For example, a DUT may detect Facebook Chat traffic by inspecting the certificate and detecting *.facebook.com in the certificate subject CN and subsequently detect the word chat in
the FQDN 5-edge-chat.facebook.com and identify traffic on the connection to be Facebook Chat.

Table 7 includes further examples in SNI and CN pairs for several FQDNs of Office 365.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Server Name Indication (SNI)</th>
<th>Certificate Subject Common Name (CN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r1.res.office365.com</td>
<td>*.res.outlook.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>login.windows.net</td>
<td>graph.windows.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>webdir0a.online.lync.com</td>
<td>*.online.lync.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>login.microsoftonline.com</td>
<td>stamp2.login.microsoftonline.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>webdir.online.lync.com</td>
<td>*.online.lync.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graph.microsoft.com</td>
<td>graph.microsoft.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outlook.office365.com</td>
<td>outlook.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appsforoffice.microsoft.com</td>
<td>appsforoffice.microsoft.com</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Office365 SNI and CN Pairs Examples

NetSecOPEN has provided a reference enterprise perimeter traffic mix with dozens of applications, hundreds of connections, and thousands of transactions.

The enterprise perimeter traffic mix consists of 70% HTTPS and 30% HTTP by Bytes, 58% HTTPS and 42% HTTP by Transactions. By connections with a single connection per FQDN the mix consists of 43% HTTPS and 57% HTTP. With multiple connections per FQDN the HTTPS percentage is higher.

Table 8 is a summary of the NetSecOPEN enterprise perimeter traffic mix sorted by bytes with unique FQDNs and transactions per applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>FQDNs</th>
<th>Transactions</th>
<th>Bytes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office365</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>52,931,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23,276,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesforce</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>23,137,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gmail</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>16,399,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkedin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>15,040,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DailyMotion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14,751,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoogleDocs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14,205,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wikia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>13,909,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxnews</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>13,758,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahoo Finance</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>13,134,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youtube</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>13,056,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>12,726,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNBC</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>11,939,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightreading</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>11,200,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BusinessInsider</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>11,001,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>10,475,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>10,423,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter Video</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10,112,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisco Webex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>9,988,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slack</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9,938,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Maps</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>8,771,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpectrumIEEE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>8,682,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yelp</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>8,607,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vimeo</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8,555,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wikihow</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>8,042,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>P99</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netflix</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7,839,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>7,230,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morningstar</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7,220,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docusign</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6,972,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6,939,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumblr</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6,877,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatsapp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6,829,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imdb</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>6,505,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAAgov</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6,316,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IndustryWeek</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6,242,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotify</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>6,231,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoNews</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>6,115,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evernote</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6,063,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NatGeo</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6,026,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC News</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>5,898,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investopedia</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>5,792,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinterest</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5,658,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succesfactors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5,049,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AbaJournal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4,985,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pbworks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4,670,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NetworkWorld</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>4,651,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WebMD</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>4,416,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OilGasJournal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4,095,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trello</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4,080,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BusinessWire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>4,055,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropbox</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4,023,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nejm</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4,003,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OilGasDaily</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>3,970,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3,719,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MedicalNews</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3,634,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketwatch</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3,291,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imgur</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3,189,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3,184,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onelogin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3,132,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concur</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3,066,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2,985,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple itunes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2,843,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BerkeleyEdu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2,622,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>2,532,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2,325,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MayoClinic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2,269,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebay</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2,219,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLAedu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,991,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConstructionDive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1,828,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EducationNews</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1,605,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BofA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1,584,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ScienceDirect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1,463,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1,441,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FoodBusinessNews</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amex</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wikipedia</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bing</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>983</td>
<td>10021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Summary of NetSecOPEN Enterprise Perimeter Traffic Mix
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Abstract

Network-based security solutions are used by enterprises, public sector, and cloud service providers today in order to both complement and enhance host-based security solutions. TLS 1.3 introduces several changes to TLS 1.2 with a goal to improve the overall security and privacy provided by TLS. However, some of these changes have a negative impact on network-based security solutions and deployments that adopt a multi-layered approach to security. While this may be viewed as a feature, there are several real-life use case scenarios where the same functionality and security cannot be offered without such network-based security solutions. In this document, we identify the TLS 1.3 changes that may impact such use cases.

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 January 9, 2020.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2019 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.
1. Introduction

Enterprises, public sector, and cloud service providers need to defend their information systems from attacks originating from both inside and outside their networks. Protection and detection are typically done both on end hosts and in the network. Host agents have deep visibility on the devices where they are installed, whereas the network has broader visibility. With such network and security devices in the network, it can provide, among other functions, homogenous security controls across heterogenous endpoints, covering devices for which no host monitoring is available (which is common today and is increasingly so in the Internet of Things). This helps protect against unauthorized devices installed by insiders, and provides a fallback in case the infection of a host disables its security agent. Because of these advantages, network-based security mechanisms are widely used. In fact, regulatory standards such as NERC CIP [NERCCIP] place strong requirements about network perimeter security and its ability to have visibility to provide security information to the security management and control systems. At the same time, the privacy of employees, customers, and other users must be respected by minimizing the collection of personal data and controlling access to what data is collected. These imperatives hold for both end host and network based security monitoring.

Network-based security solutions such as Firewalls (FW) and Intrusion Prevention Systems (IPS) rely on some level of network traffic inspection to implement perimeter-based security policies. In many use cases, only the metadata or visible aspects of the network traffic is inspected. Depending on the security functions required, these middleboxes can either be deployed as traffic monitoring devices or active in-line devices. A traffic monitoring middlebox may for example perform vulnerability detection, intrusion detection, crypto audit, compliance monitoring, etc. An active in-line middlebox may for example prevent malware download, block known malicious URLs, enforce use of strong ciphers, stop data exfiltration, etc. A portion of such security policies require clear-text traffic inspection above Layer 4, which becomes problematic when traffic is encrypted with Transport Layer Security
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(TLS) [RFC5246]. Today, network-based security solutions typically
address this problem by becoming a man-in-the-middle (MITM) for the
TLS session according to one of the following two scenarios:

1. Outbound Session, where the TLS session originates from a client
   inside the perimeter towards an entity on the outside

2. Inbound Session, where the TLS session originates from a client
   outside the perimeter towards an entity on the inside

For the outbound session scenario, MITM is enabled by generating a
local root certificate and an accompanying (local) public/private key
pair. The local root certificate is installed on the inside entities
for which TLS traffic is to be inspected, and the network security
device(s) store a copy of the private key. During the TLS handshake,
the network security device (hereafter referred to as a middlebox)
makes a policy decision on the current TLS session. The policy
decision could be pass-through, decrypt, deny, etc. On a "decrypt"
policy action, the middlebox becomes a TLS proxy for this TLS
session. It modifies the certificate provided by the (outside)
server and (re)signs it with the private key from the local root
certificate. From here on, the middlebox has visibility into further
exchanges between the client and server which enables it to decrypt
and inspect subsequent network traffic. Alternatively, based on
policy, the middlebox may allow the current session to pass through
if the session starts in monitoring mode, and then decrypt the next
session from the same client.

For the inbound session scenario, the TLS proxy on the middlebox is
configured with a copy of the local servers’ certificate(s) and
 corresponding private key(s). Based on the server certificate
presented, the TLS proxy determines the corresponding private key,
which again enables the middlebox to gain visibility into further
exchanges between the client and server and hence decrypt subsequent
network traffic.

To date, there are a number of use case scenarios that rely on the
above capabilities when used with TLS 1.2 [RFC5246] or earlier. TLS
1.3 [RFC8446] introduces several changes which prevent a number of
these use case scenarios from being satisfied with the types of TLS
proxy based capabilities that exist today.

It has been noted, that currently deployed TLS proxies on middleboxes
may reduce the security of the TLS connection itself due to a
combination of poor implementation and configuration, and they may
compromise privacy when decrypting a TLS session. As such, it has
been argued that preventing TLS proxies from working should be viewed
as a feature of TLS 1.3 and that the proper way of solving these
issues is to solely rely on endpoint (client and server) based solutions instead. We believe this is an overly constrained view of the problem that ignores a number of important real-life use case scenarios that improve the overall security posture. For instance, it goes against a layered defense approach. We also note that current endpoint-based TLS proxies suffer from many of the same security issues as the network-based TLS proxies do [HTTPSintercept].

The purpose of this document is to provide a representative set of network based security use case scenarios that are impacted by TLS 1.3. For each use case scenario, we highlight the specific aspect(s) of TLS 1.3 that make the use case problematic with a TLS proxy based solution.

It should be noted that this document addresses only security use cases with a focus on identifying the problematic ones. The document does not offer specific solutions to these as the goal is to describe how current network security solutions rely on network traffic inspection to address customer requirements and use cases.

1.1. Requirements notation

In this document, the key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14, RFC 2119 [RFC2119].

2. TLS 1.3 Change Impact Overview

Aiming to improve its overall security and privacy, TLS 1.3 introduces several changes to TLS 1.2, but some of the changes present a negative impact on network based security. In this section, we describe those TLS 1.3 changes and briefly outline some scenario impacts. We divide the changes into two groups; those that impact inbound sessions and those that impact outbound sessions.

2.1. Inbound Session Change Impacts

2.1.1. Removal of Static RSA and Diffie-Hellman Cipher Suites

TLS 1.2 supports static RSA and Diffie-Hellman(DH) cipher suites, which enables the server’s private key to be shared with server-side middleboxes. TLS 1.3 has removed support for these cipher suites in favor of supporting only ephemeral mode Diffie-Hellman in order to provide perfect forward secrecy (PFS). As a result of this, it is no longer possible for a server to share a key with the middlebox a priori, which in turn implies that the middlebox cannot gain access to the TLS session data.
Example scenarios that are impacted by this include network monitoring, troubleshooting, compliance, etc.

For further details (and a suggested solution), please refer to [I-D.green-tls-static-dh-in-tls13].

2.2. Outbound Session Change Impacts

2.2.1. Encrypted Server Certificate

In TLS, the ClientHello message is sent to the server’s transport address (IP and port). The ClientHello message may include the Server Name Indication (SNI) to specify the hostname the client wishes to contact. This is useful when multiple "virtual servers" are hosted on a given transport address (IP and port). It also provides passive observers and security devices information about the domain the client is attempting to reach. Note that while SNI is optional in TLS 1.2, it is mandatory in TLS 1.3.

The server replies with a ServerHello message, which contains the selected connection parameters, followed by a Certificate message, which contains the server’s certificate and hence its identity.

Note that even _if_ the SNI is provided by the client, there is no guarantee that the actual server responding is the one indicated in the SNI from the client. SNI alone, without comparison of the server certificate, does not provide reliable information about the server that the client attempts to reach. Where a client has been compromised by malware and connects to a command and control server, but presents an innocuous SNI to bypass protective filters, it is undetectable under TLS 1.3.

In TLS 1.2, the ClientHello, ServerHello and Certificate messages are all sent in clear-text, however in TLS 1.3, the Certificate message is encrypted thereby hiding the server identity from any intermediary.

Example scenarios that are impacted by this involve selective network security policies on the server, such as whitelists or blacklists based on security intelligence, regulatory requirements, categories (e.g. financial services), etc. Under TLS 1.3, these scenarios now require the middlebox to perform decryption and inspection of every connection to have the same information to make policy decisions. Further, the middlebox is not able to make the policy decisions without actively engaging in the TLS 1.3 session from the beginning of the handshake, and it cannot step out of the connection once it has been determined to be benign, without dropping the whole connection. In TLS 1.2, middleboxes could be more selective in
choosing what connections to engage with, and make decisions based on
the certificate without actively decrypting the connection to access
the certificate(s).

While conformant clients can generate the SNI and check that the
server certificate contains a name matching the SNI, there are non-
conformant clients that do not and some enterprises also require a
level of validation. Thus, from a network infrastructure
perspective, policies to validate SNI against the Server Certificate
can not be validated in TLS 1.3 as the Server certificate is now
obscured to the middlebox. This is an example where the network
infrastructure is using one measure to protect the enterprise from
non-conformant (e.g. evasive) clients and a conformant server. As a
general practice, security functions conduct cross checks and
consistency checks wherever possible to mitigate imperfect or
malicious implementations; even if they are deemed redundant with
fully conformant implementations.

2.2.2. Resumption and Pre-Shared Key

In TLS 1.2 and below, session resumption is provided by "session IDs"
and "session tickets" [RFC5077]. If the server does not want to
honor a ticket, then it can simply initiate a full TLS handshake with
the client as usual.

In TLS 1.3, the above mechanism is replaced by Pre-Shared Keys (PSK),
which can be negotiated as part of an initial handshake and then used
in a subsequent handshake to perform resumption using the PSK. TLS
1.3 states that the client SHOULD include a "key_share" extension to
enable the server to decline resumption and fall back to a full
handshake, however it is not an absolute requirement.

Example scenarios that are impacted by this are middleboxes that were
not part of the initial handshake, and hence do not know the PSK. If
the client does not include the "key_share" extension, the middlebox
cannot force a fallback to the full handshake. If the middlebox
policy requires it to inspect the session, it will have to fail the
connection instead.

Note that in practice though, it is unlikely that clients using
session resumption will not allow for fallback to a full handshake
since the server may treat a ticket as valid for a shorter period of
time that what is stated in the ticket_lifetime [RFC8446]. As long
as the client advertises a supported DH group, the server (or
middlebox) can always send a HelloRetryRequest to force the client to
send a key_share and hence a full handshake.

Clients that truly only support PSK mode of operation (provisioned out of band) will of course not negotiate a new key, however that is not a change in TLS 1.3.

### 2.2.3. Version Negotiation and Downgrade Protection

In TLS, the ClientHello message includes a list of supported protocol versions. The server will select the highest supported version and indicate its choice in the ServerHello message.

TLS 1.3 changes the way in which version negotiation is performed. The ClientHello message will indicate TLS version 1.3 in the new "supported_versions" extension, however for backwards compatibility with TLS 1.2, the ClientHello message will indicate TLS version 1.2 in the "legacy_version" field. A TLS 1.3 server will recognize that TLS 1.3 is being negotiated, whereas a TLS 1.2 server will simply see a TLS 1.2 ClientHello and proceed with TLS 1.2 negotiation.

In TLS 1.3, the random value in the ServerHello message includes a special value in the last eight bytes when the server negotiates either TLS 1.2 or TLS 1.1 and below. The special value(s) enable a TLS 1.3 client to detect an active attacker launching a downgrade attack when the client did indeed reach a TLS 1.3 server, provided ephemeral ciphers are being used.

From a network security point of view, the primary impact is that TLS 1.3 requires the TLS proxy to be an active man-in-the-middle from the start of the handshake. It is also required that a TLS 1.2 and below middlebox implementation must handle unsupported extensions gracefully, which is a requirement for a conformant middlebox.

### 2.2.4. SNI Encryption in TLS Through Tunneling

As noted above, with server certificates encrypted, the Server Name Indication (SNI) in the ClientHello message is the only information available in cleartext to indicate the client’s targeted server, and the actual server reached may differ.

[I-D.ietf-tls-sni-encryption] proposes to hide the SNI in the ClientHello from middleboxes.

Example scenarios that are impacted by this involve selective network security, such as whitelists or blacklists based on security intelligence, regulatory requirements, categories (e.g. financial services), etc. An added challenge is that some of these scenarios require the middlebox to perform inspection, whereas other scenarios require the middlebox to not perform inspection. Without the SNI,
however, the middlebox may not have the information required to determine the actual scenario before it is too late.

3. Inbound Session Use Cases

In this section we explain how a set of real-life inbound use case scenarios are affected by some of the TLS 1.3 changes.

3.1. Use Case I1 - Data Center Protection

Services deployed in the data center may be offered for access by external and untrusted hosts. Network security functions such as IPS and Web Application Firewall (WAF) are deployed to monitor and control the transactions to these services. While an Application level load balancer is not a security function strictly speaking, it is also an important function that resides in front of these services.

These network security functions are usually deployed in two modes: monitoring and inline. In either case, they need to access the L7 and application data such as HTTP transactions which could be protected by TLS encryption. They may monitor the TLS handshakes for additional visibility and control.

The TLS handshake monitoring function will be impacted by TLS 1.3.

For additional considerations on this scenario, see also [I-D.green-tls-static-dh-in-tls13].

3.2. Use Case I2 - Application Operation over NAT

The Network Address Translation (NAT) function translates L3 and L4 addresses and ports as the packet traverses the network device. Sophisticated NAT devices may also implement application inspection engines to correct L3/L4 data embedded in the control messages (e.g., FTP control message, SIP signaling messages) so that they are consistent with the outer L3/L4 headers.

Without the correction, the secondary data (FTP) or media (SIP) connections will likely reach a wrong destination.

The embedded address and port correction operation requires access to the L7 payload which could be protected by encryption.

3.3. Use Case I3 - Compliance

Many regulations exist today that include cyber security requirements requiring close inspection of the information traversing through the network. For example, organizations that require PCI-DSS [PCI-DSS]...
compliance must provide the ability to regularly monitor the network to prevent, detect and minimize impact of a data compromise. [PCI-DSS] Requirement #2 (and Appendix A2 as it concerns TLS) describes the need to be able to detect protocol and protocol usage correctness. Further, [PCI-DSS] Requirement #10 detailing monitoring capabilities also describe the need to provide network-based audit to ensure that the protocols and configurations are properly used.

Deployments today still use factory or default credentials and settings that must be observed, and to meet regulatory compliance, must be audited, logged and reported. As the server (certificate) credential is now encrypted in TLS 1.3, the ability to verify the appropriate (or compliant) use of these credentials are lost, unless the middlebox always becomes an active MITM.

3.4. Use Case I4 - Crypto Security Audit

Organizations may have policies around acceptable ciphers and certificates on their servers. Examples include no use of self-signed certificates, black or white-list Certificate Authority, valid certificate experitation time, etc. In TLS 1.2, the Certificate message was sent in clear-text, however in TLS 1.3 the message is encrypted thereby preventing both a network-based audit and policy enforcement around acceptable server certificates.

While the audits and policy enforcements could in theory be done on the servers themselves, the premise of the use case is that not all servers are configured correctly and hence such an approach is unlikely to work in practice. A common example where this occurs includes lab servers.

4. Outbound Session Use Cases

In this section we explain a set of real-life outbound session use case scenarios. These scenarios remain functional with TLS 1.3 though the TLS proxy’s performance is impacted by participating in the DHE key exchange from the beginning of the handshake. Similarly, while with TLS 1.2 the handshake packets could be passively inspected, with TLS 1.3 the TLS proxy may have to perform full decryption to inspect the certificates or to affect other policies impacting its performance.

4.1. Use Case O1 - Acceptable Use Policy (AUP)

Enterprises deploy security devices to enforce Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) according to the IT and workplace policies. The security devices, such as firewall/next-gen firewall, web proxy and an
application on the endpoints, act as middleboxes to scan traffic in the enterprise network for policy enforcement.

Sample AUP policies are:

- "Employees are not allowed to access ‘gaming’ websites from enterprise network"
- "Temporary workers are not allowed to use enterprise network to upload video clips to Internet, but are allowed to watch video clips"

Such enforcements are accomplished by controlling the DNS transactions and HTTP transactions. A coarse control can currently be achieved by controlling the DNS response (though this may become infeasible if it is also protected by TLS), however, in many cases, granular control is required at HTTP URL or Method levels, to distinguish a specific web page on a hosting site, or to differentiate between uploading and downloading operations.

The security device requires access to plain text HTTP header for granular AUP control.

4.2. Use Case O2 - Malware and Threat Protection

Enterprises adopt a multi-technology approach when it comes to malware and threat protection for the network assets. This includes solutions deployed on the endpoint, network and cloud.

While endpoint application based solution may be effective, to an extent, at detecting and preventing some types of attack, defense in depth is widely considered to be best security practice because it provides additional protection against compromise of endpoints. For example, network-based solutions can detect malware and threats based on network visibility and provide discovery to a compromised endpoint, even though the logs of such a compromised endpoint appear normal. That is, network based solutions provide such additional detection, prevention and mitigation of attacks with the benefit of rapid and centralized updates.

The network based solutions utilise network traffic for a range of purposes, including but not limited to: preventing malware landing on the endpoint through signatures, detecting abnormal data exfiltration, allowing 0-day analysis and mitigation of successful attacks.”.

The security functions require access to clear text HTTP or other application level streams on a needed basis.
4.3. Use Case O3 - IoT Endpoints

As the Internet of Everything continues to evolve, more and more endpoints become connected to the Internet. From a security point of view, some of the challenges presented by these are:

- Constrained devices with limited resources (CPU, memory, battery life, etc.)
- Lack of ability to install and update endpoint protection software.
- Lack of software updates as new vulnerabilities are discovered.

In short, the security posture of such devices is expected to be weak, especially as they get older, and the only way to improve this posture is to supplement them with a network-based solution. IoT deployments are further challenged in that they host a variety of these devices, each with different update cycles and often, are very slow to update their software or firmware to ensure availability and safety of the environments they operate. This in turn requires network based solutions to afford a consistent security baseline. This solution can range from selective passive monitoring to a full and active MiTM.

4.4. Use Case O4 - Unpatched Endpoints

New vulnerabilities appear constantly and in spite of many advances in recent years in terms of automated software updates, especially in reaction to security vulnerabilities, the reality is that a very large number of endpoints continue to run versions of software with known vulnerabilities.

In theory, these endpoints should of course be patched, but in practice, it is often not done which leaves the endpoint open to the vulnerability in question. A network-based security solution can look for attempted exploits of such vulnerabilities and stop them before they reach the unpatched endpoint.

4.5. Use Case O5 - Rapid Containment of New Vulnerability and Campaigns

When a new vulnerability is discovered or an attack campaign is launched, it is important to patch the vulnerability or contain the campaign as quickly as possible. Patches however are not usually available immediately for every device on the network, and even when they are, most endpoints are in practice not patched immediately, which leaves them open to the attack.
A network-based security solution can look for attempted exploits of such new vulnerabilities or recognize an attack being launched based on security intelligence related to the campaign and stop them before they reach the vulnerable endpoint.

4.6. Use Case O6 - End-of-Life Endpoint

Older endpoints (and in some cases even new ones) will not receive any software updates. As new vulnerabilities inevitably are discovered, these endpoints will be permanently vulnerable to exploits without security solutions that are not endpoint-based.

A network-based security solution can help prevent such exploits with the MITM functions.

4.7. Use Case O7 - Compliance

This use case is similar to the inbound compliance use case described in Section 3.3, except its from the client point of view.

4.8. Use Case O8 - Crypto Security Audit

This is a variation of the use case in Section 3.4.

Organizations may have policies around acceptable ciphers and certificates for client sessions, possibly based on the destination. Examples include no use of self-signed certificates, black or white-list Certificate Authority, etc. In TLS 1.2, the Certificate message was sent in clear-text, however in TLS 1.3 the message is encrypted thereby preventing either a network-based audit or policy enforcement around acceptable server certificates.

It is not possible to implement a full security solution by relying on the client alone in this case. For example, in the many cases where the device is not under configuration control of the organisation (i.e. "Bring Your Own Device" devices, which are present in many modern organisations), as audits and policy enforcements can't be done on such clients or on clients that are not properly configured.

5. IANA considerations

This document does not include IANA considerations.
6. Security Considerations

This document describes existing functionality and use case scenarios and as such does not introduce any new security considerations.
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1. Introduction

Recent studies (see e.g. [RFC7872]) suggest that there is widespread dropping of IPv6 packets that contain IPv6 Extension Headers (EHs). In some cases, such packet drops occur at transit routers. While some operators "officially" drop packets that contain IPv6 EHs, it is possible that some of the measured packet drops be the result of improper configuration defaults, or inappropriate advice in this area.

This document analyzes both the general security implications of IPv6 EHs and the specific security implications of each EH and Option type, and provides advice on the filtering of IPv6 packets based on the IPv6 EHs and the IPv6 options they contain. Since various protocols may use IPv6 EHs (possibly with IPv6 options), discarding packets based on the IPv6 EHs or IPv6 options they contain may have implications on the proper functioning of such protocols. Thus, this document also attempts to discuss the operational and interoperability implications of such filtering policies.

The filtering policy typically depends on where in the network such policy is enforced: when the policy is enforced in a transit network, the policy typically follows a "black-list" approach, where only packets with clear negative implications are dropped. On the other hand, when the policy is enforced closer to the destination systems, the policy typically follows a "white-list" approach, where only traffic that is expected to be received is allowed. The advice in this document is aimed only at transit routers that may need to enforce a filtering policy based on the EHs and IPv6 options a packet may contain, following a "black-list" approach, and hence is likely to be much more permissive that a filtering policy to be employed e.g. at the edge of an enterprise network. The advice in this document is meant to improve the current situation of the dropping of packets with IPv6 EHs in the Internet [RFC7872].

This document is similar in nature to [RFC7126], which addresses the same problem for the IPv4 case. However, in IPv6, the problem space is compounded by the fact that IPv6 specifies a number of IPv6 EHs, and a number of IPv6 options which may be valid only when included in specific EH types.

This document completes and complements the considerations for protecting the control plane from packets containing IP options that can be found in [RFC6192].

Section 2 of this document specifies the terminology and conventions employed throughout this document. Section 3 of this document discusses IPv6 EHs and provides advice in the area of filtering IPv6
packets that contain such IPv6 EHs. Section 4 of this document discusses IPv6 options and provides advice in the area of filtering IPv6 packets that contain such options.

2. Terminology and Conventions Used in This Document

2.1. Terminology

The terms "fast path", "slow path", and associated relative terms ("faster path" and "slower path") are loosely defined as in Section 2 of [RFC6398].

The terms "permit" (allow the traffic), "drop" (drop with no notification to sender), and "reject" (drop with appropriate notification to sender) are employed as defined in [RFC3871]. Throughout this document we also employ the term "discard" as a generic term to indicate the act of discarding a packet, irrespective of whether the sender is notified of such drops, and irrespective of whether the specific filtering action is logged.

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].

2.2. Applicability Statement

This document provides advice on the filtering of IPv6 packets with EHs at transit routers for traffic *not* explicitly destined to such transit routers, for those cases in which such filtering is deemed as necessary.

2.3. Conventions

This document assumes that nodes comply with the requirements in [RFC7045]. Namely (from [RFC7045]),

- If a forwarding node discards a packet containing a standard IPv6 EH, it MUST be the result of a configurable policy and not just the result of a failure to recognise such a header.

- The discard policy for each standard type of EH MUST be individually configurable.

- The default configuration SHOULD allow all standard IPv6 EHs.

The advice provided in this document is only meant to guide an operator in configuring forwarding devices, and is *not* to be
interpreted as advice regarding default configuration settings for network devices. That is, this document provides advice with respect to operational configurations, but does not change the implementation defaults required by [RFC7045].

We recommend that configuration options are made available to govern the processing of each IPv6 EH type and each IPv6 option type. Such configuration options may include the following possible settings:

- Permit this IPv6 EH or IPv6 Option type
- Discard (and log) packets containing this IPv6 EH or option type
- Reject (and log) packets containing this IPv6 EH or option type (where the packet drop is signaled with an ICMPv6 error message)
- Rate-limit traffic containing this IPv6 EH or option type
- Ignore this IPv6 EH or option type (as if it was not present) and forward the packet. We note that if a packet carries forwarding information (e.g., in an IPv6 Routing Header) this might be an inappropriate or undesirable action.

We note that special care needs to be taken when devices log packet drops/rejects. Devices should count the number of packets dropped/rejected, but the logging of drop/reject events should be limited so as to not overburden device resources.

Finally, we note that when discarding packets, it is generally desirable that the sender be signaled of the packet drop, since this is of use for trouble-shooting purposes. However, throughout this document (when recommending that packets be discarded) we generically refer to the action as "discard" without specifying whether the sender is signaled of the packet drop.

3. IPv6 Extension Headers

3.1. General Discussion

IPv6 [RFC8200] EHs allow for the extension of the IPv6 protocol. Since both IPv6 EHs and upper-layer protocols share the same namespace ("Next Header" registry/namespace), [RFC7045] identifies which of the currently assigned Internet Protocol numbers identify IPv6 EHs vs. upper-layer protocols. This document discusses the filtering of packets based on the IPv6 EHs (as specified by [RFC7045]) they contain.
NOTE: [RFC7112] specifies that non-fragmented IPv6 datagrams and IPv6 First-Fragments MUST contain the entire IPv6 header chain [RFC7112]. Therefore, intermediate systems can enforce the filtering policies discussed in this document, or resort to simply discarding the offending packets when they fail to comply with the requirements in [RFC7112]. We note that, in order to implement filtering rules on the fast path, it may be necessary for the filtering device to limit the depth into the packet that can be inspected before giving up. In circumstances where there is such a limitation, it is recommended that implementations discard packets if, when trying to determine whether to discard or permit a packet, the aforementioned limit is encountered.

3.2. General Security Implications

In some specific device architectures, IPv6 packets that contain IPv6 EHs may cause the corresponding packets to be processed on the slow path, and hence may be leveraged for the purpose of Denial of Service (DoS) attacks [I-D.gont-v6ops-ipv6-ehs-packet-drops] [Cisco-EH] [FW-Benchmark].

Operators are urged to consider IPv6 EH filtering and IPv6 options handling capabilities of different devices as they make deployment decisions in future.

3.3. Summary of Advice on the Handling of IPv6 Packets with Specific IPv6 Extension Headers

This section summarizes the advice provided in Section 3.4, providing references to the specific sections in which a detailed analysis can be found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EH type</th>
<th>Filtering policy</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPv6 Hop-by-Hop Options (Proto=0)</td>
<td>Drop or Ignore</td>
<td>Section 3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing Header for IPv6 (Proto=43)</td>
<td>Drop only RTH0, Permit other RH Types</td>
<td>Section 3.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragment Header for IPv6 (Proto=44)</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Section 3.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encapsulating Security Payload (Proto=50)</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Section 3.4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Summary of Advice on the Handling of IPv6 Packets with Specific IPv6 Extension Headers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Header Type</th>
<th>Handling</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentication Header</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>3.4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Proto=51)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Options for IPv6</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>3.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Proto=60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Header</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>3.4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Proto=135)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Identity Protocol</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>3.4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Proto=139)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shim6 Protocol</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>3.4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Proto=140)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use for experimentation and testing</td>
<td>Drop</td>
<td>3.4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Proto=253 and 254)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4. Advice on the Handling of IPv6 Packets with Specific IPv6 Extension Headers

3.4.1. IPv6 Hop-by-Hop Options (Protocol Number=0)

3.4.1.1. Uses

The Hop-by-Hop Options header is used to carry optional information that may be examined by every node along a packet’s delivery path. It is expected that nodes will examine the Hop-by-Hop Options header if explicitly configured to do so.

NOTE: [RFC2460] required that all nodes examined and processed the Hop-by-Hop Options header. However, even before the publication of [RFC8200] a number of implementations already provided the option of ignoring this header unless explicitly configured to examine it.

3.4.1.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC8200]. At the time of this writing, the following options have been specified for the Hop-by-Hop Options EH:

- Type 0x00: Pad1 [RFC8200]
o Type 0x01: PadN [RFC8200]

o Type 0x05: Router Alert [RFC2711]

o Type 0x07: CALIPSO [RFC5570]

o Type 0x08: SMF_DPD [RFC6621]

o Type 0x23: RPL Option [I-D.ietf-roll-useofrplinfo]

o Type 0x26: Quick-Start [RFC4782]

o Type 0x4D: (Deprecated)

o Type 0x63: RPL Option [RFC6553]

o Type 0x6D: MPL Option [RFC7731]

o Type 0x8A: Endpoint Identification (Deprecated) [draft-ietf-nimrod-eid]

o Type 0xC2: Jumbo Payload [RFC2675]

o Type 0xEE: IPv6 DFF Header [RFC6971]

o Type 0x1E: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]

o Type 0x3E: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]

o Type 0x5E: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]

o Type 0x7E: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]

o Type 0x9E: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]

o Type 0xBE: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]

o Type 0xDE: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]

o Type 0xFE: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]

3.4.1.3. Specific Security Implications

Legacy nodes that may process this extension header could be subject to Denial of Service attacks.

NOTE: While [RFC8200] has removed this requirement, the deployed base may still reflect the traditional behavior for a while, and hence the
potential security problems of this EH are still of concern.

3.4.1.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets containing a Hop-by-Hop Options EH would break any of the protocols that rely on it for proper functioning. For example, it would break RSVP [RFC2205] and multicast deployments, and would cause IPv6 jumbograms to be discarded.

3.4.1.5. Advice

Nodes implementing [RFC8200] would already ignore this extension header unless explicitly required to process it. For legacy ([RFC2460] nodes, the recommended configuration for the processing of these packets depends on the features and capabilities of the underlying platform. On platforms that allow forwarding of packets with HBH Options on the fast path, we recommend that packets with a HBH Options EH be forwarded as normal. Otherwise, on platforms in which processing of packets with a IPv6 HBH Options EH is carried out in the slow path, and an option is provided to rate-limit these packets, we recommend that this option be selected. Finally, when packets containing a HBH Options EH are processed in the slow-path, and the underlying platform does not have any mitigation options available for attacks based on these packets, we recommend that such platforms discard packets containing IPv6 HBH Options EHs.

Finally, we note that, for obvious reasons, RPL (Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks) [RFC6550] routers must not discard packets based on the presence of an IPv6 Hop-by-Hop Options EH.

3.4.2. Routing Header for IPv6 (Protocol Number=43)

3.4.2.1. Uses

The Routing header is used by an IPv6 source to list one or more intermediate nodes to be "visited" on the way to a packet’s destination.

3.4.2.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC8200]. [RFC2460] had originally specified the Routing Header Type 0, which was later obsoleted by [RFC5095], and thus removed from [RFC8200].

At the time of this writing, the following Routing Types have been specified:
3.4.2.3. Specific Security Implications

The security implications of RHT0 have been discussed in detail in [Biondi2007] and [RFC5095].

3.4.2.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Blocking packets containing a RHT0 or RTH1 has no operational implications. However, blocking packets employing other routing header types will break the protocols that rely on them.

3.4.2.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should discard packets containing a RHT0 or RHT1. RHT2 and RHT3 should be permitted, as required by [RFC7045]. Other routing header types should be discarded.

3.4.3. Fragment Header for IPv6 (Protocol Number=44)

3.4.3.1. Uses

This EH provides the fragmentation functionality for IPv6.

3.4.3.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC8200].

3.4.3.3. Specific Security Implications

The security implications of the Fragment Header range from Denial of Service attacks (e.g. based on flooding a target with IPv6 fragments) to information leakage attacks [RFC7739].
3.4.3.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Blocking packets that contain a Fragment Header will break any protocol that may rely on fragmentation (e.g., the DNS [RFC1034]).

3.4.3.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should permit packets that contain a Fragment Header.

3.4.4. Encapsulating Security Payload (Protocol Number=50)

3.4.4.1. Uses

This EH is employed for the IPsec suite [RFC4303].

3.4.4.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC4303].

3.4.4.3. Specific Security Implications

Besides the general implications of IPv6 EHs, this EH could be employed to potentially perform a DoS attack at the destination system by wasting CPU resources in validating the contents of the packet.

3.4.4.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets that employ this EH would break IPsec deployments.

3.4.4.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should permit packets containing the Encapsulating Security Payload EH.

3.4.5. Authentication Header (Protocol Number=51)

3.4.5.1. Uses

The Authentication Header can be employed for provide authentication services in IPv4 and IPv6.

3.4.5.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC4302].
3.4.5.3. Specific Security Implications

Besides the general implications of IPv6 EHs, this EH could be employed to potentially perform a DoS attack at the destination system by wasting CPU resources in validating the contents of the packet.

3.4.5.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets that employ this EH would break IPsec deployments.

3.4.5.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should permit packets containing an Authentication Header.

3.4.6. Destination Options for IPv6 (Protocol Number=60)

3.4.6.1. Uses

The Destination Options header is used to carry optional information that needs be examined only by a packet’s destination node(s).

3.4.6.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC8200]. At the time of this writing, the following options have been specified for this EH:

- Type 0x00: Pad1 [RFC8200]
- Type 0x01: PadN [RFC8200]
- Type 0x04: Tunnel Encapsulation Limit [RFC2473]
- Type 0x4D: (Deprecated)
- Type 0xC9: Home Address [RFC6275]
- Type 0x8A: Endpoint Identification (Deprecated) [draft-ietf-nimrod-eid]
- Type 0x8B: ILNP Nonce [RFC6744]
- Type 0x8C: Line-Identification Option [RFC6788]
- Type 0x1E: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]
3.4.6.3. Specific Security Implications

No security implications are known, other than the general implications of IPv6 EHs. For a discussion of possible security implications of specific options specified for the DO header, please see the Section 4.3.

3.4.6.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets that contain a Destination Options header would break protocols that rely on this EH type for conveying information, including protocols such as ILNP [RFC6740] and Mobile IPv6 [RFC6275], and IPv6 tunnels that employ the Tunnel Encapsulation Limit option.

3.4.6.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should permit packets that contain a Destination Options Header.

3.4.7. Mobility Header (Protocol Number=135)

3.4.7.1. Uses

The Mobility Header is an EH used by mobile nodes, correspondent nodes, and home agents in all messaging related to the creation and management of bindings in Mobile IPv6.

3.4.7.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC6275].
3.4.7.3. Specific Security Implications

A thorough security assessment of the security implications of the Mobility Header and related mechanisms can be found in Section 15 of [RFC6275].

3.4.7.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets containing this EH would break Mobile IPv6.

3.4.7.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should permit packets containing this EH.

3.4.8. Host Identity Protocol (Protocol Number=139)

3.4.8.1. Uses

This EH is employed with the Host Identity Protocol (HIP), an experimental protocol that allows consenting hosts to securely establish and maintain shared IP-layer state, allowing separation of the identifier and locator roles of IP addresses, thereby enabling continuity of communications across IP address changes.

3.4.8.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC5201].

3.4.8.3. Specific Security Implications

The security implications of the HIP header are discussed in detail in Section 8 of [RFC6275].

3.4.8.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets that contain the Host Identity Protocol would break HIP deployments.

3.4.8.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should permit packets that contain a Host Identity Protocol EH.

3.4.9. Shim6 Protocol (Protocol Number=140)
3.4.9.1. Uses

This EH is employed by the Shim6 [RFC5533] Protocol.

3.4.9.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC5533].

3.4.9.3. Specific Security Implications

The specific security implications are discussed in detail in Section 16 of [RFC5533].

3.4.9.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets that contain this EH will break Shim6.

3.4.9.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should permit packets containing this EH.

3.4.10. Use for experimentation and testing (Protocol Numbers=253 and 254)

3.4.10.1. Uses

These IPv6 EHs are employed for performing RFC3692-Style experiments (see [RFC3692] for details).

3.4.10.2. Specification

These EHs are specified in [RFC3692] and [RFC4727].

3.4.10.3. Specific Security Implications

The security implications of these EHs will depend on their specific use.

3.4.10.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

For obvious reasons, discarding packets that contain these EHs limits the ability to perform legitimate experiments across IPv6 routers.

3.4.10.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should discard packets containing these EHs. Only in specific scenarios in which RFC3692-Style experiments are to be performed should these EHs be permitted.
3.5. Advice on the Handling of Packets with Unknown IPv6 Extension Headers

We refer to IPv6 EHs that have not been assigned an Internet Protocol Number by IANA (and marked as such) in [IANA-PROTOCOLS] as "unknown IPv6 extension headers" ("unknown IPv6 EHs").

3.5.1. Uses

New IPv6 EHs may be specified as part of future extensions to the IPv6 protocol.

Since IPv6 EHs and Upper-layer protocols employ the same namespace, it is impossible to tell whether an unknown "Internet Protocol Number" is being employed for an IPv6 EH or an Upper-Layer protocol.

3.5.2. Specification

The processing of unknown IPv6 EHs is specified in [RFC8200] and [RFC7045].

3.5.3. Specific Security Implications

For obvious reasons, it is impossible to determine specific security implications of unknown IPv6 EHs. However, from security standpoint, a device should discard IPv6 extension headers for which the security implications cannot be determined. We note that this policy is allowed by [RFC7045].

3.5.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

As noted in [RFC7045], discarding unknown IPv6 EHs may slow down the deployment of new IPv6 EHs and transport protocols. The corresponding IANA registry ([IANA-PROTOCOLS]) should be monitored such that filtering rules are updated as new IPv6 EHs are standardized.

We note that since IPv6 EHs and upper-layer protocols share the same numbering space, discarding unknown IPv6 EHs may result in packets encapsulating unknown upper-layer protocols being discarded.

3.5.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should discard packets containing unknown IPv6 EHs.
4. IPv6 Options

4.1. General Discussion

The following subsections describe specific security implications of different IPv6 options, and provide advice regarding filtering packets that contain such options.

4.2. General Security Implications of IPv6 Options

The general security implications of IPv6 options are closely related to those discussed in Section 3.2 for IPv6 EHs. Essentially, packets that contain IPv6 options might need to be processed by an IPv6 router’s general-purpose CPU, and hence could present a DDoS risk to that router’s general-purpose CPU (and thus to the router itself). For some architectures, a possible mitigation would be to rate-limit the packets that are to be processed by the general-purpose CPU (see e.g. [Cisco-EH]).

4.3. Advice on the Handling of Packets with Specific IPv6 Options

The following subsections contain a description of each of the IPv6 options that have so far been specified, a summary of the security implications of each of such options, a discussion of possible interoperability implications if packets containing such options are discarded, and specific advice regarding whether packets containing these options should be permitted.

4.3.1. Pad1 (Type=0x00)

4.3.1.1. Uses

This option is used when necessary to align subsequent options and to pad out the containing header to a multiple of 8 octets in length.

4.3.1.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC8200].

4.3.1.3. Specific Security Implications

None.

4.3.1.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets that contain this option would potentially break any protocol that relies on IPv6 EHs.
4.3.1.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should not discard packets based on the presence of this option.

4.3.2. PadN (Type=0x01)

4.3.2.1. Uses

This option is used when necessary to align subsequent options and to pad out the containing header to a multiple of 8 octets in length.

4.3.2.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC8200].

4.3.2.3. Specific Security Implications

Because of the possible size of this option, it could be leveraged as a large-bandwidth covert channel.

4.3.2.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets that contain this option would potentially break any protocol that relies on IPv6 EHs.

4.3.2.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should not discard IPv6 packets based on the presence of this option.

4.3.3. Jumbo Payload (Type=0XC2)

4.3.3.1. Uses

The Jumbo payload option provides the means of specifying payloads larger than 65535 bytes.

4.3.3.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC2675].

4.3.3.3. Specific Security Implications

There are no specific issues arising from this option, except for improper validity checks of the option and associated packet lengths.
4.3.3.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets based on the presence of this option will cause IPv6 jumbograms to be discarded.

4.3.3.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should discard packets that contain this option. An operator should permit this option only in specific scenarios in which support for IPv6 jumbograms is desired.

4.3.4. RPL Option (Type=0x63)

4.3.4.1. Uses

The RPL Option provides a mechanism to include routing information with each datagram that an RPL router forwards.

4.3.4.2. Specification

This option was originally specified in [RFC6553]. It has been deprecated by [I-D.ietf-roll-useofrplinfo].

4.3.4.3. Specific Security Implications

Those described in [RFC6553].

4.3.4.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

This option is meant to be employed within an RPL instance. As a result, discarding packets based on the presence of this option (e.g. at an ISP) will not result in interoperability implications.

4.3.4.5. Advice

Non-RPL routers should discard packets that contain an RPL option.

4.3.5. RPL Option (Type=0x23)

4.3.5.1. Uses

The RPL Option provides a mechanism to include routing information with each datagram that an RPL router forwards.

4.3.5.2. Specification

This option is specified in [I-D.ietf-roll-useofrplinfo].
4.3.5.3. Specific Security Implications

Those described in [I-D.ietf-roll-useofrplinfo].

4.3.5.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

This option is meant to survive outside of an RPL instance. As a result, discarding packets based on the presence of this option would break some use cases for RPL (see [I-D.ietf-roll-useofrplinfo]).

4.3.5.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should not discard IPv6 packets based on the presence of this option.

4.3.6. Tunnel Encapsulation Limit (Type=0x04)

4.3.6.1. Uses

The Tunnel Encapsulation Limit option can be employed to specify how many further levels of nesting the packet is permitted to undergo.

4.3.6.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC2473].

4.3.6.3. Specific Security Implications

Those described in [RFC2473].

4.3.6.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets based on the presence of this option could result in tunnel traffic being discarded.

4.3.6.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should not discard packets based on the presence of this option.

4.3.7. Router Alert (Type=0x05)

4.3.7.1. Uses

The Router Alert option [RFC2711] is typically employed for the RSVP protocol [RFC2205] and the MLD protocol [RFC2710].
4.3.7.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC2711].

4.3.7.3. Specific Security Implications

Since this option causes the contents of the packet to be inspected by the handling device, this option could be leveraged for performing DoS attacks.

4.3.7.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets that contain this option would break RSVP and multicast deployments.

4.3.7.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should discard packets that contain this option. Only in specific environments where support for RSVP, multicast routing, or similar protocols is desired, should this option be permitted.

4.3.8. Quick-Start (Type=0x26)

4.3.8.1. Uses

This IP Option is used in the specification of Quick-Start for TCP and IP, which is an experimental mechanism that allows transport protocols, in cooperation with routers, to determine an allowed sending rate at the start and, at times, in the middle of a data transfer (e.g., after an idle period) [RFC4782].

4.3.8.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC4782], on the "Experimental" track.

4.3.8.3. Specific Security Implications

Section 9.6 of [RFC4782] notes that Quick-Start is vulnerable to two kinds of attacks:

- attacks to increase the routers’ processing and state load, and,
- attacks with bogus Quick-Start Requests to temporarily tie up available Quick-Start bandwidth, preventing routers from approving Quick-Start Requests from other connections.

We note that if routers in a given environment do not implement and
enable the Quick-Start mechanism, only the general security implications of IP options (discussed in Section 4.2) would apply.

4.3.8.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

The Quick-Start functionality would be disabled, and additional delays in TCP’s connection establishment (for example) could be introduced. (Please see Section 4.7.2 of [RFC4782].) We note, however, that Quick-Start has been proposed as a mechanism that could be of use in controlled environments, and not as a mechanism that would be intended or appropriate for ubiquitous deployment in the global Internet [RFC4782].

4.3.8.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should not discard IPv6 packets based on the presence of this option.

4.3.9. CALIPSO (Type=0x07)

4.3.9.1. Uses

This option is used for encoding explicit packet Sensitivity Labels on IPv6 packets. It is intended for use only within Multi-Level Secure (MLS) networking environments that are both trusted and trustworthy.

4.3.9.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC5570].

4.3.9.3. Specific Security Implications

Presence of this option in a packet does not by itself create any specific new threat. Packets with this option ought not normally be seen on the global public Internet.

4.3.9.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

If packets with this option are discarded or if the option is stripped from the packet during transmission from source to destination, then the packet itself is likely to be discarded by the receiver because it is not properly labeled. In some cases, the receiver might receive the packet but associate an incorrect sensitivity label with the received data from the packet whose CALIPSO was stripped by an intermediate router or firewall. Associating an incorrect sensitivity label can cause the received information either to be handled as more sensitive than it really is.
("upgrading") or as less sensitive than it really is ("downgrading"), either of which is problematic.

4.3.9.5. Advice

Intermediate systems that do not operate in Multi-Level Secure (MLS) networking environments should discard packets that contain this option.

4.3.10. SMF_DPD (Type=0x08)

4.3.10.1. Uses

This option is employed in the (experimental) Simplified Multicast Forwarding (SMF) for unique packet identification for IPv6 I-DPD, and as a mechanism to guarantee non-collision of hash values for different packets when H-DPD is used.

4.3.10.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC6621].

4.3.10.3. Specific Security Implications

None. The use of identifiers is subject to the security and privacy considerations discussed in [I-D.gont-predictable-numeric-ids].

4.3.10.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Dropping packets containing this option within a MANET domain would break SMF. However, dropping such packets at the border of such domain would have no negative impact.

4.3.10.5. Advice

Intermediate system should discard packets that contain this option.

4.3.11. Home Address (Type=0xC9)

4.3.11.1. Uses

The Home Address option is used by a Mobile IPv6 node while away from home, to inform the recipient of the mobile node’s home address.

4.3.11.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC6275].
4.3.11.3. Specific Security Implications

No (known) additional security implications than those described in [RFC6275].

4.3.11.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding IPv6 packets based on the presence of this option will break Mobile IPv6.

4.3.11.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should not discard IPv6 packets based on the presence of this option.

4.3.12. Endpoint Identification (Type=0x8A)

4.3.12.1. Uses

The Endpoint Identification option was meant to be used with the Nimrod routing architecture [NIMROD-DOC], but has never seen widespread deployment.

4.3.12.2. Specification

This option is specified in [NIMROD-DOC].

4.3.12.3. Specific Security Implications

Undetermined.

4.3.12.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

None.

4.3.12.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should discard packets that contain this option.

4.3.13. ILNP Nonce (Type=0x8B)

4.3.13.1. Uses

This option is employed by Identifier-Locator Network Protocol for IPv6 (ILNPv6) for providing protection against off-path attacks for packets when ILNPv6 is in use, and as a signal during initial network-layer session creation that ILNPv6 is proposed for use with this network-layer session, rather than classic IPv6.
4.3.13.2. Specification
This option is specified in [RFC6744].

4.3.13.3. Specific Security Implications
Those described in [RFC6744].

4.3.13.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked
Discarding packets that contain this option will break INLPv6 deployments.

4.3.13.5. Advice
Intermediate systems should not discard packets based on the presence of this option.

4.3.14. Line-Identification Option (Type=0x8C)

4.3.14.1. Uses
This option is used by an Edge Router to identify the subscriber premises in scenarios where several subscriber premises may be logically connected to the same interface of an Edge Router.

4.3.14.2. Specification
This option is specified in [RFC6788].

4.3.14.3. Specific Security Implications
Those described in [RFC6788].

4.3.14.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked
Since this option is meant to be employed in Router Solicitation messages, discarding packets based on the presence of this option at intermediate systems will result in no interoperability implications.

4.3.14.5. Advice
Intermediate devices should discard packets that contain this option.

4.3.15. Deprecated (Type=0x4D)
4.3.15.1. Uses

No information has been found about this option type.

4.3.15.2. Specification

No information has been found about this option type.

4.3.15.3. Specific Security Implications

No information has been found about this option type, and hence it has been impossible to perform the corresponding security assessment.

4.3.15.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Unknown.

4.3.15.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should discard packets that contain this option.

4.3.16. MPL Option (Type=0x6D)

4.3.16.1. Uses

This option is used with the Multicast Protocol for Low power and Lossy Networks (MPL), that provides IPv6 multicast forwarding in constrained networks.

4.3.16.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC7731], and is meant to be included only in Hop-by-Hop Option headers.

4.3.16.3. Specific Security Implications

Those described in [RFC7731].

4.3.16.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Dropping packets that contain an MPL option within an MPL network would break the Multicast Protocol for Low power and Lossy Networks (MPL). However, dropping such packets at the border of such networks will have no negative impact.
4.3.16.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should not discard packets based on the presence of this option. However, since this option has been specified for the Hop-by-Hop Options, such systems should consider the discussion in Section 3.4.1.

4.3.17. IP_DFF (Type=0xEE)

4.3.17.1. Uses

This option is employed with the (Experimental) Depth-First Forwarding (DFF) in Unreliable Networks.

4.3.17.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC6971].

4.3.17.3. Specific Security Implications

Those specified in [RFC6971].

4.3.17.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Dropping packets containing this option within a routing domain that is running DFF would break DFF. However, dropping such packets at the border of such domains will have no security implications.

4.3.17.5. Advice

Intermediate systems that do not operate within a routing domain that is running DFF should discard packets containing this option.

4.3.18. RFC3692-style Experiment (Types = 0x1E, 0x3E, 0x5E, 0x7E, 0x9E, 0xBE, 0xDE, 0xFE)

4.3.18.1. Uses

These options can be employed for performing RFC3692-style experiments. It is only appropriate to use these values in explicitly configured experiments; they must not be shipped as defaults in implementations.

4.3.18.2. Specification

Specified in RFC 4727 [RFC4727] in the context of RFC3692-style experiments.
4.3.18.3. Specific Security Implications

The specific security implications will depend on the specific use of these options.

4.3.18.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

For obvious reasons, discarding packets that contain these options limits the ability to perform legitimate experiments across IPv6 routers.

4.3.18.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should discard packets that contain these options. Only in specific environments where RFC3692-style experiments are meant to be performed should these options be permitted.

4.4. Advice on the handling of Packets with Unknown IPv6 Options

We refer to IPv6 options that have not been assigned an IPv6 option type in the corresponding registry ([IANA-IPV6-PARAM]) as "unknown IPv6 options".

4.4.1. Uses

New IPv6 options may be specified as part of future protocol work.

4.4.2. Specification

The processing of unknown IPv6 options is specified in [RFC8200].

4.4.3. Specific Security Implications

For obvious reasons, it is impossible to determine specific security implications of unknown IPv6 options.

4.4.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding unknown IPv6 options may slow down the deployment of new IPv6 options. As noted in [draft-gont-6man-ipv6-opt-transmit], the corresponding IANA registry ([IANA-IPV6-PARAM] should be monitored such that IPv6 option filtering rules are updated as new IPv6 options are standardized.
4.4.5. Advice

Enterprise intermediate systems that process the contents of IPv6 EHs should discard packets that contain unknown options. Other intermediate systems that process the contents of IPv6 EHs should permit packets that contain unknown options.

5. IANA Considerations

This document has no actions for IANA.

6. Security Considerations

This document provides advice on the filtering of IPv6 packets that contain IPv6 EHs (and possibly IPv6 options) at IPv6 transit routers. It is meant to improve the current situation of widespread dropping of such IPv6 packets in those cases where the drops result from improper configuration defaults, or inappropriate advice in this area.
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Abstract

This document analyzes the security implications of IPv6 Extension Headers and associated IPv6 options. Additionally, it discusses the operational and interoperability implications of discarding packets based on the IPv6 Extension Headers and IPv6 options they contain. Finally, it provides advice on the filtering of such IPv6 packets at transit routers for traffic not directed to them, for those cases where such filtering is deemed as necessary.
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1. Introduction

IPv6 Extension Headers (EHs) allow for the extension of the IPv6 protocol, and provide support for core functionality such as IPv6 fragmentation. However, common implementation limitations suggest that EHs present a challenge for IPv6 packet routing equipment, particularly when the IPv6 header chain needs to be processed for e.g. enforcing ACLs or implementing other functions [RFC9098].
Several studies (e.g., [Huston-2022], [I-D.vyncke-v6ops-james], and [RFC7872]) suggest that there is widespread dropping of IPv6 packets that contain IPv6 Extension Headers (EHs). In some cases, such packet drops occur at transit routers. While some operators are known to intentionally drop packets that contain IPv6 EHs, it is possible that some of the measured packet drops are the result of inappropriate advice in this area.

This document analyzes both the general security implications of IPv6 EHs, as well as the security implications of specific EH and Option types. It also provides advice on the filtering of IPv6 packets based on the IPv6 EHs and the IPv6 options they contain. Since various protocols may use IPv6 EHs (possibly with IPv6 options), discarding packets based on the IPv6 EHs or IPv6 options they contain can have implications on the proper functioning of such protocols. Thus, this document also attempts to discuss the operational and interoperability implications of such filtering policies.

The resulting packet filtering policy typically depends on where in the network such policy is enforced: when the policy is enforced in a transit network, the policy typically follows a "deny-list" approach, where only packets with clear negative implications are dropped. On the other hand, when the policy is enforced closer to the destination systems, the policy typically follows an "accept-list" approach, where only traffic that is expected to be received is allowed. The advice in this document is aimed only at transit routers that may need to enforce a filtering policy based on the EHs and IPv6 options a packet may contain, following a "deny-list" approach, and hence is likely to be much more permissive than a filtering policy to be employed at e.g. the edge of an enterprise network. The advice in this document is meant to improve the current situation of the dropping of packets with IPv6 EHs in the Internet [RFC7872] in such cases where packets are being dropped due to inappropriate or missing guidelines.

This document is similar in nature to [RFC7126], which addresses the same problem for the IPv4 case. However, in IPv6, the problem space is compounded by the fact that IPv6 specifies a number of IPv6 EHs, and a number of IPv6 options which may be valid only when included in specific EH types.

This document completes and complements the considerations for protecting the control plane from packets containing IP options that can be found in [RFC6192].
Section 2 specifies the terminology and conventions employed throughout this document. Section 3 discusses IPv6 EHs and provides advice in the area of filtering IPv6 packets that contain such IPv6 EHs. Section 4 discusses IPv6 options and provides advice in the area of filtering IPv6 packets that contain such options.

2. Terminology and Assumptions Employed in This Document

2.1. Terminology

The terms "permit" (allow the traffic), "drop" (drop with no notification to sender), and "reject" (drop with appropriate notification to sender) are employed as defined in [RFC3871]. Throughout this document we also employ the term "discard" as a generic term to indicate the act of discarding a packet, irrespective of whether the sender is notified of such drops, and irrespective of whether the specific filtering action is logged.

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

2.2. Applicability Statement

This document provides advice on the filtering of IPv6 packets with EHs at transit routers for traffic not explicitly destined to them, for cases in which such filtering is deemed as necessary.

2.3. Router Default Behavior and Features

This document assumes that nodes comply with the requirements in [RFC7045]. Namely,

"If a forwarding node discards a packet containing a standard IPv6 extension header, it MUST be the result of a configurable policy and not just the result of a failure to recognise such a header. This means that the discard policy for each standard type of extension header MUST be individually configurable. The default configuration SHOULD allow all standard extension headers."

The advice provided in this document is only meant to guide an operator in configuring forwarding devices, and is not to be interpreted as advice regarding default configuration settings for network devices. That is, this document provides advice with respect to operational policies, but does not change the implementation defaults required by [RFC7045].
We recommend that configuration options are made available to govern the processing of each IPv6 EH type and each IPv6 option type. Such configuration options should include the following possible settings:

* Permit this IPv6 EH or IPv6 Option type.
* Drop packets containing this IPv6 EH or option type.
* Reject packets containing this IPv6 EH or option type (where the packet drop is signaled with an ICMPv6 error message).
* Rate-limit traffic containing this IPv6 EH or option type.
* Ignore this IPv6 EH or option type (as if it was not present) and process the packet according the rules for the remaining headers. We note that if a packet carries forwarding information (e.g., in an IPv6 Routing Header) this might be an inappropriate or undesirable action.

We note that special care needs to be taken when devices log packet drops/rejects. Devices should count the number of packets dropped/rejected, but the logging of drop/reject events should be limited so as to not overburden device resources.

Finally, we note that when discarding packets, it is generally desirable that the sender be signaled of the packet drop, since this is of use for trouble-shooting purposes. However, throughout this document (when recommending that packets be discarded) we generically refer to the action as "discard" without specifying whether the sender is signaled of the packet drop.

3. IPv6 Extension Headers

3.1. General Discussion

IPv6 [RFC8200] EHs allow for the extension of the IPv6 protocol. Since both IPv6 EHs and upper-layer protocols share the same namespace ("Next Header" registry/namespace), [RFC7045] identifies which of the currently assigned Internet Protocol numbers identify IPv6 EHs vs. upper-layer protocols. This document discusses the filtering of packets based on the IPv6 EHs (as specified by [RFC7045]) they contain.

NOTE: [RFC8200] specifies that non-fragmented IPv6 datagrams and IPv6 First-Fragments must contain the entire IPv6 header chain [RFC7112]. Therefore, intermediate systems can enforce the filtering policies discussed in this document, or resort to simply discarding the offending packets when they fail to comply with the
requirements in [RFC8200]. We note that, in order to implement filtering rules on the fast path, it may be necessary for the filtering device to limit the depth into the packet that can be inspected before giving up. In circumstances where such a limitation exists, it is recommended that implementations provide a configuration option that specifies whether to discard packets if the aforementioned limit is encountered. Operators may then determine according to their own circumstances how such packets will be handled.

3.2. General Security Implications

In some device architectures, IPv6 packets that contain IPv6 EHs can cause the corresponding packets to be processed on the slow path, and hence may be leveraged for the purpose of Denial of Service (DoS) attacks [RFC9098] [Cisco-EH] [FW-Benchmark].

Operators are urged to consider the IPv6 EH and IPv6 options handling capabilities of their devices as they make deployment decisions in the future.

3.3. Rationale for Our Advice on the Handling of IPv6 Packets with Specific IPv6 Extension Headers

* IPv6 Packets with IPv6 Extension Headers (or options) that are not expected to traverse transit routers should be dropped.

* IPv6 Packets with IPv6 Extension Headers (or options) that are only expected to traverse transit routers when a specific technology is employed, should be permitted (or dropped) based on the knowledge regarding the use of such technology in transit provider in question (i.e. permit the packets if the technology is employed, or drop them)

* IPv6 Packets with IPv6 Extension Headers (or options) that represent a concrete attack vector to network infrastructure devices should be dropped.

* IPv6 packets with any other IPv6 Extension headers (or options) should be permitted. This is an intentional trade-off made to minimize ossification.

3.4. Summary of Advice on the Handling of IPv6 Packets with Specific IPv6 Extension Headers

This section summarizes the advice provided in Section 3.5, providing references to the specific sections in which a detailed analysis can be found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EH type</th>
<th>Filtering policy</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPv6 Hop-by-Hop Options (Proto=0)</td>
<td>Drop or Ignore</td>
<td>Section 3.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing Header for IPv6 (Proto=43)</td>
<td>Drop only RHT0 and RHT1. Permit other RH Types</td>
<td>Section 3.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragment Header for IPv6 (Proto=44)</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Section 3.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encapsulating Security Payload (Proto=50)</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Section 3.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentication Header (Proto=51)</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Section 3.5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Options for IPv6 (Proto=60)</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Section 3.5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Header (Proto=135)</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Section 3.5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Identity Protocol (Proto=139)</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Section 3.5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shim6 Protocol (Proto=140)</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Section 3.5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use for experimentation and testing (Proto=253 and 254)</td>
<td>Drop</td>
<td>Section 3.5.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Summary of Advice on the Handling of IPv6 Packets with Specific IPv6 Extension Headers

3.5. Advice on the Handling of IPv6 Packets with Specific IPv6 Extension Headers

3.5.1. IPv6 Hop-by-Hop Options (Protocol Number=0)
3.5.1.1. Uses

The Hop-by-Hop Options header is used to carry optional information that may be examined by every node along a packet’s delivery path. It is expected that nodes will examine the Hop-by-Hop Options header if explicitly configured to do so.

NOTE: A previous revision of the IPv6 core specification, [RFC2460], originally required that all nodes examined and processed the Hop-by-Hop Options header. However, even before the publication of [RFC8200] a number of implementations already provided the option of ignoring this header unless explicitly configured to examine it.

3.5.1.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC8200]. As of May 2022, the following options have been specified for the Hop-by-Hop Options EH:

* Type 0x00: Pad1 [RFC8200]
* Type 0x01: PadN [RFC8200]
* Type 0x05: Router Alert [RFC2711]
* Type 0x07: CALIPSO [RFC5570]
* Type 0x08: SMF_DPD [RFC6621]
* Type 0x23: RPL Option [RFC9008]
* Type 0x26: Quick-Start [RFC4782]
* Type 0x4D: (Deprecated)
* Type 0x63: RPL Option [RFC6553]
* Type 0x6D: MPL Option [RFC7731]
* Type 0x8A: Endpoint Identification (Deprecated) [draft-ietf-nimrod-eid]
* Type 0xC2: Jumbo Payload [RFC2675]
* Type 0xEE: IPv6 DFF Header [RFC6971]
* Type 0x1E: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]
* Type 0x3E: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]
* Type 0x5E: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]
* Type 0x7E: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]
* Type 0x9E: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]
* Type 0xBE: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]
* Type 0xDE: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]
* Type 0xFE: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]

3.5.1.3. Specific Security Implications

Legacy nodes that process this extension header might be subject to Denial of Service attacks.

NOTE: While [RFC8200] has removed this requirement, the deployed base may still reflect the classical behavior for a while, and hence the potential security problems of this EH are still of concern.

3.5.1.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets containing a Hop-by-Hop Options EH would break any of the protocols that rely on it for proper functioning. For example, it would break RSVP [RFC2205] and multicast deployments, and would cause IPv6 jumbograms to be discarded.

3.5.1.5. Advice

Nodes implementing [RFC8200] would already ignore this extension header unless explicitly required to process it. For legacy ([RFC2460]) nodes, the recommended configuration for the processing of these packets depends on the features and capabilities of the underlying platform, the configuration of the platform, and also the deployment environment of the platform. On platforms that allow forwarding of packets with HBH Options on the fast path, we recommend that packets with a HBH Options EH be forwarded as normal. Otherwise, on platforms in which processing of packets with a IPv6 HBH Options EH is carried out in the slow path, and an option is provided to rate-limit these packets, we recommend that this option be selected. Finally, when packets containing a HBH Options EH are processed in the slow-path, and the underlying platform does not have any mitigation options available for attacks based on these packets, we recommend that such platforms discard packets containing IPv6 HBH Options EHs.
Finally, we note that RPL (Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks) routers [RFC6550] must not discard packets based on the presence of an IPv6 Hop-by-Hop Options EH, as this would break RPL.

3.5.2. Routing Header for IPv6 (Protocol Number=43)

3.5.2.1. Uses

The Routing header is used by an IPv6 source to list one or more intermediate nodes to be "visited" on the way to a packet’s destination.

3.5.2.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC8200]. [RFC2460] had originally specified the Routing Header Type 0, which was later obsoleted by [RFC5095], and thus removed from [RFC8200].

At of May 2022, the following Routing Types have been specified:

* Type 0: Source Route (DEPRECATED) [RFC2460] [RFC5095]
* Type 1: Nimrod (DEPRECATED)
* Type 2: Type 2 Routing Header [RFC6275]
* Type 3: RPL Source Route Header [RFC6554]
* Type 4: Segment Routing Header (SRH) [RFC8754]
* Types 5-252: Unassigned
* Type 253: RFC3692-style Experiment 1 [RFC4727]
* Type 254: RFC3692-style Experiment 2 [RFC4727]
* Type 255: Reserved

3.5.2.3. Specific Security Implications

The security implications of RHT0 have been discussed in detail in [Biondi2007] and [RFC5095]. RHT1 was never widely implemented. The security implications of RHT2, RHT3, and RHT4 (SRH) are discussed in [RFC6275], [RFC6554], and [RFC8754], respectively.
3.5.2.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Blocking packets containing a RHT0 or RHT1 has no operational implications, since both have been deprecated. Blocking packets with a RHT2 would break Mobile IPv6. Packets with a RHT3 may be safely blocked at RPL domain boundaries, since RHT3 headers are employed within a single RPL domain. Blocking packets with a RHT4 (SRH) will break Segment Routing (SR) deployments, if the filtering policy is enforced on packets being forwarded within an SR domain.

3.5.2.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should discard packets containing a RHT0, RHT1, or RHT3. Other routing header types should be permitted, as required by [RFC7045].

3.5.3. Fragment Header for IPv6 (Protocol Number=44)

3.5.3.1. Uses

This EH provides the fragmentation functionality for IPv6.

3.5.3.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC8200].

3.5.3.3. Specific Security Implications

The security implications of the Fragment Header range from Denial of Service attacks (e.g. based on flooding a target with IPv6 fragments) to information leakage attacks [RFC7739].

3.5.3.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Blocking packets that contain a Fragment Header will break any protocol that may rely on fragmentation (e.g., the DNS [RFC1034]). However, IP fragmentation is known to introduce fragility to Internet communication [RFC8900].

3.5.3.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should permit packets that contain a Fragment Header.

3.5.4. Encapsulating Security Payload (Protocol Number=50)
3.5.4.1. Uses

This EH is employed for the IPsec suite [RFC4303].

3.5.4.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC4303].

3.5.4.3. Specific Security Implications

Besides the general implications of IPv6 EHs, this EH could be employed to potentially perform a DoS attack at the destination system by wasting CPU resources in validating the contents of the packet.

3.5.4.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets that employ this EH would break IPsec deployments.

3.5.4.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should permit packets containing the Encapsulating Security Payload EH.

3.5.5. Authentication Header (Protocol Number=51)

3.5.5.1. Uses

The Authentication Header can be employed for provide authentication services in IPv4 and IPv6.

3.5.5.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC4302].

3.5.5.3. Specific Security Implications

Besides the general implications of IPv6 EHs, this EH could be employed to potentially perform a DoS attack at the destination system by wasting CPU resources in validating the contents of the packet.

3.5.5.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets that employ this EH would break IPsec deployments.
3.5.5.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should permit packets containing an Authentication Header.

3.5.6. Destination Options for IPv6 (Protocol Number=60)

3.5.6.1. Uses

The Destination Options header is used to carry optional information that needs be examined only by a packet’s destination node(s).

3.5.6.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC8200]. As of May 2022, the following options have been specified for this EH:

* Type 0x00: Pad1 [RFC8200]
* Type 0x01: PadN [RFC8200]
* Type 0x04: Tunnel Encapsulation Limit [RFC2473]
* Type 0x0F: IPv6 Performance and Diagnostic Metrics (PDM) [RFC8250]
* Type 0x4D: (Deprecated)
* Type 0xC9: Home Address [RFC6275]
* Type 0x8A: Endpoint Identification (Depreciated) [draft-ietf-nimrod-eid]
* Type 0x8B: ILNP Nonce [RFC6744]
* Type 0x8C: Line-Identification Option [RFC6788]
* Type 0x1E: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]
* Type 0x3E: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]
* Type 0x5E: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]
* Type 0x7E: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]
* Type 0x9E: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]
* Type 0xBE: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]
* Type 0xDE: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]
* Type 0xFE: RFC3692-style Experiment [RFC4727]

3.5.6.3. Specific Security Implications

No security implications are known, other than the general implications of IPv6 EHs. For a discussion of possible security implications of specific options specified for the DO header, please see the Section 4.4.

3.5.6.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets that contain a Destination Options header would break protocols that rely on this EH type for conveying information, including protocols such as ILNP [RFC6740] and Mobile IPv6 [RFC6275], and IPv6 tunnels that employ the Tunnel Encapsulation Limit option.

3.5.6.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should permit packets that contain a Destination Options Header.

3.5.7. Mobility Header (Protocol Number=135)

3.5.7.1. Uses

The Mobility Header is an EH used by mobile nodes, correspondent nodes, and home agents in all messaging related to the creation and management of bindings in Mobile IPv6.

3.5.7.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC6275].

3.5.7.3. Specific Security Implications

A thorough security assessment of the security implications of the Mobility Header and related mechanisms can be found in Section 15 of [RFC6275].

3.5.7.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets containing this EH would break Mobile IPv6.
3.5.7.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should permit packets containing this EH.

3.5.8. Host Identity Protocol (Protocol Number=139)

3.5.8.1. Uses

This EH is employed with the Host Identity Protocol (HIP), a protocol that allows consenting hosts to securely establish and maintain shared IP-layer state, allowing separation of the identifier and locator roles of IP addresses, thereby enabling continuity of communications across IP address changes.

3.5.8.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC7401].

3.5.8.3. Specific Security Implications

The security implications of the HIP header are discussed in detail in Section 8 of [RFC6275].

3.5.8.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets that contain the Host Identity Protocol would break HIP deployments.

3.5.8.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should permit packets that contain a Host Identity Protocol EH.

3.5.9. Shim6 Protocol (Protocol Number=140)

3.5.9.1. Uses

This EH is employed by the Shim6 [RFC5533] Protocol.

3.5.9.2. Specification

This EH is specified in [RFC5533].

3.5.9.3. Specific Security Implications

The specific security implications are discussed in detail in Section 16 of [RFC5533].
3.5.9.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets that contain this EH will break Shim6.

3.5.9.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should permit packets containing this EH.

3.5.10. Use for experimentation and testing (Protocol Numbers=253 and 254)

3.5.10.1. Uses

These IPv6 EHs are employed for performing RFC3692-Style experiments (see [RFC3692] for details).

3.5.10.2. Specification

These EHs are specified in [RFC3692] and [RFC4727].

3.5.10.3. Specific Security Implications

The security implications of these EHs will depend on their specific use.

3.5.10.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

For obvious reasons, discarding packets that contain these EHs limits the ability to perform legitimate experiments across IPv6 routers.

3.5.10.5. Advice

Operators should determine according to their own circumstances whether to discard packets containing these EHs.

3.6. Advice on the Handling of Packets with Unknown IPv6 Extension Headers

We refer to IPv6 EHs that have not been assigned an Internet Protocol Number by IANA (and marked as such) in [IANA-PROTOCOLS] as "unknown IPv6 extension headers" ("unknown IPv6 EHs").

3.6.1. Uses

New IPv6 EHs may be specified as part of future extensions to the IPv6 protocol.
Since IPv6 EHs and Upper-layer protocols employ the same namespace, it is impossible to tell whether an unknown "Internet Protocol Number" is being employed for an IPv6 EH or an Upper-Layer protocol.

3.6.2. Specification

The processing of unknown IPv6 EHs is specified in [RFC7045].

3.6.3. Specific Security Implications

For obvious reasons, it is impossible to determine specific security implications of unknown IPv6 EHs.

3.6.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

As noted in [RFC7045], discarding unknown IPv6 EHs may slow down the deployment of new IPv6 EHs and transport protocols. The corresponding IANA registry ([IANA-PROTOCOLS]) should be monitored such that filtering rules are updated as new IPv6 EHs are standardized.

We note that since IPv6 EHs and upper-layer protocols share the same numbering space, discarding unknown IPv6 EHs may result in packets encapsulating unknown upper-layer protocols being discarded.

3.6.5. Advice

Operators should determine according to their own circumstances whether to discard packets containing unknown IPv6 EHs.

4. IPv6 Options

4.1. General Discussion

The following subsections describe specific security implications of different IPv6 options, and provide advice regarding filtering packets that contain such options.

4.2. General Security Implications of IPv6 Options

The general security implications of IPv6 options are closely related to those discussed in Section 3.2 for IPv6 EHs. Essentially, packets that contain IPv6 options might need to be processed by an IPv6 router’s general-purpose CPU, and hence could present a DDoS risk to that router’s general-purpose CPU (and thus to the router itself). For some architectures, a possible mitigation would be to rate-limit the packets that are to be processed by the general-purpose CPU (see e.g. [Cisco-EH]).
### 4.3. Summary of Advice on the Handling of IPv6 Packets with Specific IPv6 Extension Headers

This section summarizes the advice provided in Section 3.5, providing references to the specific sections in which a detailed analysis can be found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Filtering policy</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pad1 (Type=0x00)</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Section 4.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PadN (Type=0x01)</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Section 4.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel Encapsulation Limit</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Section 4.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Type=0x04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Router Alert (Type=0x05)</td>
<td>Permit based on needed functionality</td>
<td>Section 4.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIPSO (Type=0x07)</td>
<td>Permit based on needed functionality</td>
<td>Section 4.4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMF_DPD (Type=0x08)</td>
<td>Permit based on needed functionality</td>
<td>Section 4.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM Option (Type=0x0F)</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Section 4.4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPL Option (Type=0x23)</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Section 4.4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick-Start (Type=0x26)</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Section 4.4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprecated (Type=0x4D)</td>
<td>Drop</td>
<td>Section 4.4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPL Option (Type=0x6D)</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Section 4.4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumbo Payload (Type=0xC2)</td>
<td>Permit based on needed functionality</td>
<td>Section 4.4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPL Option (Type=0x63)</td>
<td>Drop in non-RPL routers</td>
<td>Section 4.4.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Summary of Advice on the Handling of IPv6 Packets with Specific IPv6 options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endpoint Identification (Type=0x8A)</td>
<td>Drop</td>
<td>4.4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILNP Nonce (Type=0x8B)</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>4.4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line-Identification Option (Type=0x8C)</td>
<td>Drop</td>
<td>4.4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Address (Type=0xC9)</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>4.4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP_DFF (Type=0xEE)</td>
<td>Permit based on needed functionality</td>
<td>4.4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC3692-style Experiment (Types = 0x1E, 0x3E, 0x5E, 0x7E, 0x9E, 0xBE, 0xDE, 0xFE)</td>
<td>Permit based on needed functionality</td>
<td>4.4.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. Advice on the Handling of Packets with Specific IPv6 Options

The following subsections contain a description of each of the IPv6 options that have so far been specified, a summary of the security implications of each of such options, a discussion of possible interoperability implications if packets containing such options are discarded, and specific advice regarding whether packets containing these options should be permitted.

4.4.1. Pad1 (Type=0x00)

4.4.1.1. Uses

This option is used when necessary to align subsequent options and to pad out the containing header to a multiple of 8 octets in length.

4.4.1.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC8200].

4.4.1.3. Specific Security Implications

None.
4.4.1.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets that contain this option would potentially break any protocol that relies on IPv6 options.

4.4.1.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should not discard packets based on the presence of this option.

4.4.2. PadN (Type=0x01)

4.4.2.1. Uses

This option is used when necessary to align subsequent options and to pad out the containing header to a multiple of 8 octets in length.

4.4.2.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC8200].

4.4.2.3. Specific Security Implications

Because of the possible size of this option, it could be leveraged as a large-bandwidth covert channel.

4.4.2.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets that contain this option would potentially break any protocol that relies on IPv6 options.

4.4.2.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should not discard IPv6 packets based on the presence of this option.

4.4.3. Tunnel Encapsulation Limit (Type=0x04)

4.4.3.1. Uses

The Tunnel Encapsulation Limit option can be employed to specify how many further levels of nesting the packet is permitted to undergo.

4.4.3.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC2473].
4.4.3.3. Specific Security Implications

Those described in [RFC2473].

4.4.3.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets based on the presence of this option could result in tunnel traffic being discarded.

4.4.3.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should not discard packets based on the presence of this option.

4.4.4. Router Alert (Type=0x05)

4.4.4.1. Uses

The Router Alert option [RFC2711] is employed by a number of protocols, including the Resource reSerVation Protocol (RSVP) [RFC2205], Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) [RFC2710] [RFC3810], Multicast Router Discovery (MRD) [RFC4286], and General Internet Signaling Transport (GIST) [RFC5971]. Its usage is discussed in detail in [RFC6398].

4.4.4.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC2711].

4.4.4.3. Specific Security Implications

Since this option causes the contents of the packet to be inspected by the handling device, this option could be leveraged for performing DoS attacks. The security implications of the Router Alert option are discussed in detail in [RFC6398].

4.4.4.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets that contain this option would break any protocols that rely on them, such as RSVP and multicast deployments. Please see Section 4.4.4.3 for further details.

4.4.4.5. Advice

Packets containing this option should be permitted in environments where support for RSVP, multicast routing, or similar protocols is desired.
4.4.5. CALIPSO (Type=0x07)

4.4.5.1. Uses

This option is used for encoding explicit packet Sensitivity Labels on IPv6 packets. It is intended for use only within Multi-Level Secure (MLS) networking environments that are both trusted and trustworthy.

4.4.5.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC5570].

4.4.5.3. Specific Security Implications

Presence of this option in a packet does not by itself create any specific new threat. Packets with this option ought not normally be seen on the global public Internet.

4.4.5.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

If packets with this option are discarded or if the option is stripped from the packet during transmission from source to destination, then the packet itself is likely to be discarded by the receiver because it is not properly labeled. In some cases, the receiver might receive the packet but associate an incorrect sensitivity label with the received data from the packet whose CALIPSO was stripped by a middle-box (such as a packet-scrubber). Associating an incorrect sensitivity label can cause the received information either to be handled as more sensitive than it really is ("upgrading") or as less sensitive than it really is ("downgrading"), either of which is problematic. As noted in [RFC5570], IPsec [RFC4301] [RFC4302] [RFC4303] can be employed to protect the CALIPSO option.

4.4.5.5. Advice

Recommendations for handling the CALIPSO option depend on the deployment environment, rather than whether an intermediate system happens to be deployed as a transit device (e.g., IPv6 transit router).

Explicit configuration is the only method via which an intermediate system can know whether that particular intermediate system has been deployed within a Multi-Level Secure (MLS) environment. In many cases, ordinary commercial intermediate systems (e.g., IPv6 routers and firewalls) are the majority of the deployed intermediate systems inside an MLS network environment.
For Intermediate systems that DO NOT implement [RFC5570], there should be a configuration option to EITHER (a) drop packets containing the CALIPSO option OR (b) to ignore the presence of the CALIPSO option and forward the packets normally. In non-MLS environments, such intermediate systems should have this configuration option set to (a) above. In MLS environments, such intermediate systems should have this option set to (b) above. The default setting for this configuration option should be set to (a) above, because MLS environments are much less common than non-MLS environments.

For Intermediate systems that DO implement [RFC5570], there should be configuration options (a) and (b) from the preceding paragraph and also a third configuration option (c) to process packets containing a CALIPSO option as per [RFC5570]. When deployed in non-MLS environments, such intermediate systems should have this configuration option set to (a) above. When deployed in MLS environments, such intermediate systems should have this set to (c). The default setting for this configuration option MAY be set to (a) above, because MLS environments are much less common than non-MLS environments.

4.4.6. SMF_DPD (Type=0x08)

4.4.6.1. Uses

This option is employed in the (experimental) Simplified Multicast Forwarding (SMF) for unique packet identification for IPv6 I-DPD, and as a mechanism to guarantee non-collision of hash values for different packets when H-DPD is used.

4.4.6.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC6621].

4.4.6.3. Specific Security Implications

None. The use of transient numeric identifiers is subject to the security and privacy considerations discussed in [I-D.irtf-pearg-numeric-ids-generation].

4.4.6.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Dropping packets containing this option within a MANET domain would break SMF. However, dropping such packets at the border of such domain would have no negative impact.
4.4.6.5. Advice

Intermediate systems that are not within a MANET domain should discard packets that contain this option.

4.4.7. PDM (Type=0x0F)

4.4.7.1. Uses

This option is employed to convey sequence numbers and timing information in IPv6 packets as a basis for measurements.

4.4.7.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC8250].

4.4.7.3. Specific Security Implications

Those specified in [RFC8250]. Additionally, since the options employs transient numeric identifiers, implementations may be subject to the issues discussed in [I-D.irtf-pearg-numeric-ids-generation].

4.4.7.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Dropping packets containing this option will result in negative interoperability implications for traffic employing this option as a basis for measurements.

4.4.7.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should not discard packets based on the presence of this option.

4.4.8. RPL Option (Type=0x23)

4.4.8.1. Uses

The RPL Option provides a mechanism to include routing information with each datagram that an RPL router forwards.

4.4.8.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC9008].

4.4.8.3. Specific Security Implications

Those described in [RFC9008].
4.4.8.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

This option can survive outside of an RPL instance. As a result, discarding packets based on the presence of this option would break some use cases for RPL (see [RFC9008]).

4.4.8.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should not discard IPv6 packets based on the presence of this option.

4.4.9. Quick-Start (Type=0x26)

4.4.9.1. Uses

This IP Option is used in the specification of Quick-Start for TCP and IP, which is an experimental mechanism that allows transport protocols, in cooperation with routers, to determine an allowed sending rate at the start and, at times, in the middle of a data transfer (e.g., after an idle period) [RFC4782].

4.4.9.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC4782], on the "Experimental" track.

4.4.9.3. Specific Security Implications

Section 9.6 of [RFC4782] notes that Quick-Start is vulnerable to two kinds of attacks:

* attacks to increase the routers' processing and state load, and,
* attacks with bogus Quick-Start Requests to temporarily tie up available Quick-Start bandwidth, preventing routers from approving Quick-Start Requests from other connections.

We note that if routers in a given environment do not implement and enable the Quick-Start mechanism, only the general security implications of IP options (discussed in Section 4.2) would apply.

4.4.9.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

The Quick-Start functionality would be disabled, and additional delays in TCP’s connection establishment (for example) could be introduced. (Please see Section 4.7.2 of [RFC4782].) We note, however, that Quick-Start has been proposed as a mechanism that could be of use in controlled environments, and not as a mechanism that would be intended or appropriate for ubiquitous deployment in the
global Internet [RFC4782].

4.4.9.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should not discard IPv6 packets based on the presence of this option.

4.4.10. Deprecated (Type=0x4D)

4.4.10.1. Uses

No information has been found about this option type.

4.4.10.2. Specification

No information has been found about this option type.

4.4.10.3. Specific Security Implications

No information has been found about this option type, and hence it has been impossible to perform the corresponding security assessment.

4.4.10.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Unknown.

4.4.10.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should discard packets that contain this option.

4.4.11. RPL Option (Type=0x63)

4.4.11.1. Uses

The RPL Option provides a mechanism to include routing information with each datagram that an RPL router forwards.

4.4.11.2. Specification

This option was originally specified in [RFC6553]. It has been deprecated by [RFC9008].

4.4.11.3. Specific Security Implications

Those described in [RFC9008].
4.4.11.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

This option is meant to be employed within an RPL instance. As a result, discarding packets based on the presence of this option outside of an RPL instance will not result in interoperability implications.

4.4.11.5. Advice

Non-RPL routers should discard packets that contain an RPL option.

4.4.12. MPL Option (Type=0x6D)

4.4.12.1. Uses

This option is used with the Multicast Protocol for Low power and Lossy Networks (MPL), that provides IPv6 multicast forwarding in constrained networks.

4.4.12.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC7731], and is meant to be included only in Hop-by-Hop Option headers.

4.4.12.3. Specific Security Implications

Those described in [RFC7731].

4.4.12.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Dropping packets that contain an MPL option within an MPL network would break the Multicast Protocol for Low power and Lossy Networks (MPL). However, dropping such packets at the border of such networks will have no negative impact.

4.4.12.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should not discard packets based on the presence of this option. However, since this option has been specified for the Hop-by-Hop Options, such systems should consider the discussion in Section 3.5.1.

4.4.13. Endpoint Identification (Type=0x8A)
4.4.13.1. Uses

The Endpoint Identification option was meant to be used with the Nimrod routing architecture [NIMROD-DOC], but has never seen widespread deployment.

4.4.13.2. Specification

This option is specified in [NIMROD-DOC].

4.4.13.3. Specific Security Implications

Undetermined.

4.4.13.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

None.

4.4.13.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should discard packets that contain this option.

4.4.14. ILNP Nonce (Type=0x8B)

4.4.14.1. Uses

This option is employed by Identifier-Locator Network Protocol for IPv6 (ILNPv6) for providing protection against off-path attacks for packets when ILNPv6 is in use, and as a signal during initial network-layer session creation that ILNPv6 is proposed for use with this network-layer session, rather than classic IPv6.

4.4.14.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC6744].

4.4.14.3. Specific Security Implications

Those described in [RFC6744].

4.4.14.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets that contain this option will break INLPv6 deployments.
4.4.14.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should not discard packets based on the presence of this option.

4.4.15. Line-Identification Option (Type=0x8C)

4.4.15.1. Uses

This option is used by an Edge Router to identify the subscriber premises in scenarios where several subscriber premises may be logically connected to the same interface of an Edge Router.

4.4.15.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC6788].

4.4.15.3. Specific Security Implications

Those described in [RFC6788].

4.4.15.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Since this option is meant to be employed in Router Solicitation messages, discarding packets based on the presence of this option at intermediate systems will result in no interoperability implications.

4.4.15.5. Advice

Intermediate devices should discard packets that contain this option.

4.4.16. Jumbo Payload (Type=0xC2)

4.4.16.1. Uses

The Jumbo payload option provides the means of specifying payloads larger than 65535 bytes.

4.4.16.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC2675].

4.4.16.3. Specific Security Implications

There are no specific issues arising from this option, except for improper validity checks of the option and associated packet lengths.
4.4.16.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding packets based on the presence of this option will cause IPv6 jumbograms to be discarded.

4.4.16.5. Advice

An operator should permit this option only in specific scenarios in which support for IPv6 jumbograms is desired.

4.4.17. Home Address (Type=0xC9)

4.4.17.1. Uses

The Home Address option is used by a Mobile IPv6 node while away from home, to inform the recipient of the mobile node’s home address.

4.4.17.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC6275].

4.4.17.3. Specific Security Implications

No (known) additional security implications than those described in [RFC6275].

4.4.17.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding IPv6 packets based on the presence of this option will break Mobile IPv6.

4.4.17.5. Advice

Intermediate systems should not discard IPv6 packets based on the presence of this option.

4.4.18. IP_DFF (Type=0xEE)

4.4.18.1. Uses

This option is employed with the (Experimental) Depth-First Forwarding (DFF) in Unreliable Networks.

4.4.18.2. Specification

This option is specified in [RFC6971].
4.4.18.3. Specific Security Implications

Those specified in [RFC6971].

4.4.18.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Dropping packets containing this option within a routing domain that is running DFF would break DFF. However, dropping such packets at the border of such domains will have no security implications.

4.4.18.5. Advice

Intermediate systems that do not operate within a routing domain that is running DFF should discard packets containing this option.

4.4.19. RFC3692-style Experiment (Types = 0x1E, 0x3E, 0x5E, 0x7E, 0x9E, 0xBE, 0xDE, 0xFE)

4.4.19.1. Uses

These options can be employed for performing RFC3692-style experiments. It is only appropriate to use these values in explicitly configured experiments; they must not be shipped as defaults in implementations.

4.4.19.2. Specification

Specified in RFC 4727 [RFC4727] in the context of RFC3692-style experiments.

4.4.19.3. Specific Security Implications

The specific security implications will depend on the specific use of these options.

4.4.19.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

For obvious reasons, discarding packets that contain these options limits the ability to perform legitimate experiments across IPv6 routers.

4.4.19.5. Advice

Operators should determine according to their own circumstances whether to discard packets containing these IPv6 options.
4.5. Advice on the handling of Packets with Unknown IPv6 Options

We refer to IPv6 options that have not been assigned an IPv6 option type in the corresponding registry ([IANA-IPV6-PARAM]) as "unknown IPv6 options".

4.5.1. Uses

New IPv6 options may be specified as part of future protocol work.

4.5.2. Specification

The processing of unknown IPv6 options is specified in [RFC8200].

4.5.3. Specific Security Implications

For obvious reasons, it is impossible to determine specific security implications of unknown IPv6 options.

4.5.4. Operational and Interoperability Impact if Blocked

Discarding unknown IPv6 options may slow down the deployment of new IPv6 options. As noted in [draft-gont-6man-ipv6-opt-transmit], the corresponding IANA registry ([IANA-IPV6-PARAM] should be monitored such that IPv6 option filtering rules are updated as new IPv6 options are standardized.

4.5.5. Advice

Operators should determine according to their own circumstances whether to discard packets containing unknown IPv6 options.

5. IANA Considerations

This document has no actions for IANA.

6. Privacy Considerations

There are no privacy considerations associated with this document.

7. Security Considerations

This document provides advice on the filtering of IPv6 packets that contain IPv6 EHs (and possibly IPv6 options) at IPv6 transit routers. It is meant to improve the current situation of widespread dropping of such IPv6 packets in those cases where the drops result from improper configuration defaults, or inappropriate advice in this area.
As discussed in Section 3.3 of this document, one of the underlying principles for the advice provided in this document is that IPv6 packets with specific EHs or options which may represent an attack vector for infrastructure devices should be dropped. While this policy helps mitigate some specific attack vectors, the recommendations in this document will not help to mitigate vulnerabilities based on implementation errors [RFC9098].

We also note that depending on the router architecture, attempts to filter packets based on the presence of IPv6 EHs or options might itself represent an attack vector to network infrastructure devices [RFC9098].
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1. Introduction

Running an IPv6 network is new for most operators not only because they are not yet used to large scale IPv6 networks but also because there are subtle differences between IPv4 and IPv6 especially with respect to security. For example, all layer-2 interactions are now done using Neighbor Discovery Protocol [RFC4861] rather than using Address Resolution Protocol [RFC0826]. Also, there are subtle differences between NAT44 [RFC2993] and NPTv6 [RFC6296] which are explicitly pointed out in the latter’s security considerations section.

IPv6 networks are deployed using a variety of techniques, each of which have their own specific security concerns.

This document complements [RFC4942] by listing all security issues when operating a network utilizing varying transition technologies and updating with ones that have been standardized since 2007. It also provides more recent operational deployment experiences where warranted.
1.1. 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 [RFC2119] when they appear in ALL CAPS. These words may also appear in this document in lower case as plain English words, absent their normative meanings.

2. Generic Security Considerations

2.1. Addressing Architecture

IPv6 address allocations and overall architecture are an important part of securing IPv6. Initial designs, even if intended to be temporary, tend to last much longer than expected. Although initially IPv6 was thought to make renumbering easy, in practice, it may be extremely difficult to renumber without a good IP Addresses Management (IPAM) system.

Once an address allocation has been assigned, there should be some thought given to an overall address allocation plan. With the abundance of address space available, an address allocation may be structured around services along with geographic locations, which then can be a basis for more structured security policies to permit or deny services between geographic regions.

A common question is whether companies should use PI vs PA space [RFC7381], but from a security perspective there is little difference. However, one aspect to keep in mind is who has administrative ownership of the address space and who is technically responsible if/when there is a need to enforce restrictions on routability of the space due to malicious criminal activity. Using PA space exposes the organization to a renumbering of the complete network including security policies (based on ACL), audit system, ... in short a complex task which could lead to some temporary security risk if done for a large network and without automation; hence, for large network, PI space should be preferred even if it comes with additional complexities (for example BGP routing) and duties (adding a route6 object in the Regional Internet Registry database).

2.1.1. Statically Configured Addresses

When considering how to assign statically configured addresses it is necessary to take into consideration the effectiveness of perimeter security in a given environment. There is a trade-off between ease of operation (where some portions of the IPv6 address could be easily recognizable for operational debugging and troubleshooting) versus the risk of trivial scanning used for reconnaissance. [SCANNING]
shows that there are scientifically based mechanisms that make scanning for IPv6 reachable nodes more realizable than expected; see also [RFC7707]. The use of common multicast groups which are defined for important networked devices and the use of commonly repeated addresses could make it easy to figure out which devices are name servers, routers or other critical devices; even a simple traceroute will expose most of the routers on a path. There are many scanning techniques and more to come possible, hence, operators should never rely on the ‘impossible to find because my address is random’ paradigm.

While in some unmanaged environments obfuscating addresses could be considered a benefit; it is a better practice to ensure that perimeter rules are actively checked and enforced and that statically configured addresses follow some logical allocation scheme for ease of operation (as simplicity always helps security).

2.1.2. Use of ULAs

Unique Local Addresses (ULAs) RFC4193 [RFC4193] are intended for scenarios where IP addresses are not globally reachable, despite formally having global scope. They must not appear in the routing system outside the administrative domain where they are considered valid. Therefore, packets with ULA source and/or destination addresses MUST be filtered at the domain boundary.

ULAs are assigned within pseudo-random /48 prefixes created as specified in RFC4193 [RFC4193]. They could be useful for infrastructure hiding as described in RFC4864 [RFC4864].

ULAs may be used for internal communication, in conjunction with globally reachable unicast addresses (GUAs) for hosts that also require external connectivity through a firewall. For this reason, no form of address translation is required in conjunction with ULAs.

Using ULAs as described here might simplify the filtering rules needed at the domain boundary, by allowing a regime in which only hosts that require external connectivity possess a globally reachable address. However, this does not remove the need for careful design of the filtering rules. Routers with ULA on their interfaces may also leak their address to the Internet when generating ICMP messages or ICMP error messages can also include ULA address as they contain a copy of the offending packet.
2.1.3.  Point-to-Point Links

RFC6164 [RFC6164] in section 5.1 documents the reasons why to use a /127 for inter-router point-to-point links; notably, a /127 prevents the ping-pong attack between routers not implementing correctly RFC4443 [RFC4443]. The previous recommendation of RFC3627 [RFC3627] has been obsoleted and marked Historic by RFC6547 [RFC6547]).

Some environments are also using link-local addressing for point-to-point links. While this practice could further reduce the attack surface against infrastructure devices, the operational disadvantages need also to be carefully considered; see also RFC7404 [RFC7404].

2.1.4.  Temporary Addresses - Privacy Extensions for SLAAC

Normal stateless address autoconfiguration (SLAAC) relies on the automatically generated EUI-64 address, which together with the /64 prefix makes up the global unique IPv6 address. The EUI-64 address is generated from the MAC address. Randomly generating an interface ID, as described in [RFC4941], is part of SLAAC with so-called privacy extension addresses and used to address some privacy concerns. Privacy extension addresses a.k.a. temporary addresses may help to mitigate the correlation of activities of a node within the same network, and may also reduce the attack exposure window.

As privacy extension addresses could also be used to obfuscate some malevolent activities (whether on purpose or not), it is advised in scenarios where user attribution is important to rely on a layer-2 authentication mechanism such as IEEE 802.1X [IEEE-802.1X] with the appropriate RADIUS accounting (Section 2.6.1.6) or to disable SLAAC and rely only on DHCPv6. However, in scenarios where anonymity is a strong desire (protecting user privacy is more important than user attribution), privacy extension addresses should be used. When [RFC8064] is available, the stable temporary address are probably a good balance between privacy (among multiple networks) and security/user attribution (within a network).

Using privacy extension addresses prevents the operator from building a priori host specific access control lists (ACLs). It must be noted that recent versions of Windows do not use the MAC address anymore to build the stable address but use a mechanism similar to the one described in [RFC7217], this also means that such an ACL cannot be configured based solely on the MAC address of the nodes, diminishing the value of such ACL. On the other hand, different VLANs are often used to segregate users, in this case ACL can rely on a /64 prefix per VLAN rather than a per host ACL entry.
The decision to utilize privacy extension addresses can come down to whether the network is managed versus unmanaged. In some environments full visibility into the network is required at all times which requires that all traffic be attributable to where it is sourced or where it is destined to within a specific network. This situation is dependent on what level of logging is performed. If logging considerations include utilizing accurate timestamps and logging a node’s source ports [RFC6302] then there should always exist appropriate user attribution needed to get to the source of any malware originator or source of criminal activity.

Disabling SLAAC and privacy extensions addresses can be done for most OS and for non-hacker users by sending RA messages with a hint to get addresses via DHCPv6 by setting the M-bit but also disabling SLAAC by resetting all A-bits in all prefix information options. Hackers will find a way to bypass this mechanism if not enforced at the switch/router level.

2.1.5. Privacy consideration of Addresses

The reader can learn more about privacy considerations for IPv6 addresses in RFC7721 [RFC7721].

2.1.6. DHCP/DNS Considerations

Many environments use DHCPv6 to allocate addresses to ensure auditability and traceability (but see Section 2.6.1.5). A main security concern is the ability to detect and counteract against rogue DHCP servers (Section 2.3.1).

While there are no fundamental differences with IPv4 and IPv6 security concerns about DNS, there are specific consideration in DNS64 RFC6147 [RFC6147] environments that need to be understood. Specifically the interactions and potential to interference with DNSSEC implementation need to be understood - these are pointed out in detail in Section 2.7.3.2.

2.1.7. Using a /64 per host

An interesting approach is using a /64 per host as proposed in RFC8273 [RFC8273]. This allows an easier user attribution (typically based on the host MAC address) as its /64 prefix is stable even if applications, containers within the host can change of IPv6 address within this /64.
2.2. Extension Headers

The extension headers are an important difference between IPv4 and IPv6. The packet structure does make a big difference. For instance, it’s trivial to find (in IPv4-based packets) the upper layer protocol type and protocol header, while in IPv6 it actually isn’t as the extension header chain must be parsed completely. The IANA has closed the existing empty "Next Header Types" registry to new entries and is redirecting its users to a new "IPv6 Extension Header Types" registry per RFC7045 [RFC7045].

They have also become a very controversial topic since forwarding nodes that discard packets containing extension headers are known to cause connectivity failures and deployment problems RFC7872 [RFC7872]. Understanding the role of varying extension headers is important and this section enumerates the ones that need careful consideration.

A clarification on how intermediate nodes should handle existing packets with extension headers and any extension headers that are defined in the future is found in RFC7045 [RFC7045]. The uniform TLV format to be used for defining future extension headers is described in RFC6564 [RFC6564].

It must also be noted that there is no indication in the packet whether the Next Protocol field points to an extension header or to a transport header. This may confuse some filtering rules.

There is work in progress at the IETF about filtering rules for those extension headers: [I-D.ietf-opsec-ipv6-eh-filtering] for transit routers.

2.2.1. Order and Repetition of Extension Headers

While RFC8200 [RFC8200] recommends the order and the maximum repetition of extension headers, there are still IPv6 implementations at the time of writing this document which support a non-recommended order of headers (such as ESP before routing) or an illegal repetition of headers (such as multiple routing headers). The same applies for options contained in the extension headers (see [I-D.kampanakis-6man-ipv6-eh-parsing]). In some cases, it has lead to nodes crashing when receiving or forwarding wrongly formatted packets.

A firewall or any edge device able to enforce the recommended order and number of occurrences of extension headers is recommended.
2.2.2. Hop-by-Hop Options Header

The hop-by-hop options header, when present in an IPv6 packet, forces all nodes in the path to inspect this header in the original IPv6 specification RFC2460 [RFC2460]. This was of course a large avenue for a denial of service as most if not all routers cannot process this kind of packets in hardware but have to ‘punt’ this packet for software processing. Section 4.3 of the current Internet Standard for IPv6, RFC8200 [RFC8200], is more sensible to this respect as the processing of hop-by-hop options header is optional.

2.2.3. Fragment Header

The fragment header is used by the source when it has to fragment packets. RFC7112 [RFC7112] and section 4.5 of RFC8200 [RFC8200] explain why it is important to:

- firewall and security devices should drop first fragment not containing an upper-layer header;
- destination nodes should discard first fragments not containing an upper-layer header.

Else, stateless filtering could be bypassed by an hostile party. RFC6980 [RFC6980] applies the same rule to NDP and the RA-guard function described in RFC6105 [RFC6105].

2.2.4. IP Security Extension Header

The IPsec [RFC4301] [RFC4301] extension headers (AH [RFC4302] and ESP [RFC4303]) are required if IPsec is to be utilized for network level security functionality.

2.3. Link-Layer Security

IPv6 relies heavily on the Neighbor Discovery protocol (NDP) RFC4861 [RFC4861] to perform a variety of link operations such as discovering other nodes on the link, resolving their link-layer addresses, and finding routers on the link. If not secured, NDP is vulnerable to various attacks such as router/neighbor message spoofing, redirect attacks, Duplicate Address Detection (DAD) DoS attacks, etc. many of these security threats to NDP have been documented in IPv6 ND Trust Models and Threats RFC3756 [RFC3756] and in RFC6583 [RFC6583].
2.3.1. Securing DHCP

Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol for IPv6 (DHCPv6), as detailed in RFC3315 [RFC3315], enables DHCP servers to pass configuration parameters such as IPv6 network addresses and other configuration information to IPv6 nodes. DHCP plays an important role in any large network by providing robust stateful configuration and autoregistration of DNS Host Names.

The two most common threats to DHCP clients come from malicious (a.k.a. rogue) or unintentionally misconfigured DHCP servers. A malicious DHCP server is established with the intent of providing incorrect configuration information to the client to cause a denial of service attack or mount a man in the middle attack. While unintentionally, a misconfigured DHCP server can have the same impact. Additional threats against DHCP are discussed in the security considerations section of RFC3315 [RFC3315]DHCP-shield.

RFC7610 [RFC7610], DHCPv6-Shield, specifies a mechanism for protecting connected DHCPv6 clients against rogue DHCPv6 servers. This mechanism is based on DHCPv6 packet-filtering at the layer-2 device; the administrator specifies the interfaces connected to DHCPv6 servers. Of course, extension headers could be leveraged to bypass DHCPv6-Shield unless RFC7112 [RFC7112] is enforced. Another way to secure DHCPv6 would be to use the secure DHCPv6 protocol which is currently work in progress per [I-D.ietf-dhc-sedhcpv6] , but, with no real deployment known by the authors of this document.

It is recommended to use DHCP-shield and to analyze the log generated by this security feature.

2.3.2. ND/RA Rate Limiting

Neighbor Discovery (ND) can be vulnerable to denial of service (DoS) attacks in which a router is forced to perform address resolution for a large number of unassigned addresses. Possible side effects of this attack preclude new devices from joining the network or even worse rendering the last hop router ineffective due to high CPU usage. Easy mitigative steps include rate limiting Neighbor Solicitations, restricting the amount of state reserved for unresolved solicitations, and clever cache/timer management.

RFC6583 [RFC6583] discusses the potential for DoS in detail and suggests implementation improvements and operational mitigation techniques that may be used to mitigate or alleviate the impact of such attacks. Here are some feasible mitigation options that can be employed by network operators today:
- Ingress filtering of unused addresses by ACL, route filtering, longer than /64 prefix; These require static configuration of the addresses.

- Tuning of NDP process (where supported).

- Using /127 on point-to-point link per RFC6164 [RFC6164].

Additionally, IPv6 ND uses multicast extensively for signaling messages on the local link to avoid broadcast messages for on-the-wire efficiency. However, this has some side effects on wifi networks, especially a negative impact on battery life of smartphones and other battery operated devices that are connected to such networks. The following drafts are actively discussing methods to rate limit RAs and other ND messages on wifi networks in order to address this issue:

- [I-D.thubert-savi-ra-throttler]
- [I-D.chakrabarti-nordmark-6man-efficient-nd]

2.3.3. ND/RA Filtering

Router Advertisement spoofing is a well-known attack vector and has been extensively documented. The presence of rogue RAs, either intentional or malicious, can cause partial or complete failure of operation of hosts on an IPv6 link. For example, a host can select an incorrect router address which can be used as a man-in-the-middle (MITM) attack or can assume wrong prefixes to be used for stateless address configuration (SLAAC). RFC6104 [RFC6104] summarizes the scenarios in which rogue RAs may be observed and presents a list of possible solutions to the problem. RFC6105 [RFC6105] (RA-Guard) describes a solution framework for the rogue RA problem where network segments are designed around switching devices that are capable of identifying invalid RAs and blocking them before the attack packets actually reach the target nodes.

However, several evasion techniques that circumvent the protection provided by RA-Guard have surfaced. A key challenge to this mitigation technique is introduced by IPv6 fragmentation. An attacker can conceal the attack by fragmenting his packets into multiple fragments such that the switching device that is responsible for blocking invalid RAs cannot find all the necessary information to perform packet filtering in the same packet. RFC7113 [RFC7113] describes such evasion techniques, and provides advice to RA-Guard implementers such that the aforementioned evasion vectors can be eliminated.
Given that the IPv6 Fragmentation Header can be leveraged to circumvent current implementations of RA-Guard, RFC6980 [RFC6980] updates RFC4861 [RFC4861] such that use of the IPv6 Fragmentation Header is forbidden in all Neighbor Discovery messages except "Certification Path Advertisement", thus allowing for simple and effective measures to counter Neighbor Discovery attacks.

The Source Address Validation Improvements (SAVI) working group has worked on other ways to mitigate the effects of such attacks. RFC7513 [RFC7513] would help in creating bindings between a DHCPv4 RFC2131 [RFC2131] /DHCPv6 RFC3315 [RFC3315] assigned source IP address and a binding anchor RFC7039 [RFC7039] on a SAVI device. Also, RFC6620 [RFC6620] describes how to glean similar bindings when DHCP is not used. The bindings can be used to filter packets generated on the local link with forged source IP address.

It is still recommended that RA-Guard be be employed as a first line of defense against common attack vectors including misconfigured hosts. The generated log should also be analyzed to act on violations.

2.3.4. 3GPP Link-Layer Security

The 3GPP link is a point-to-point like link that has no link-layer address. This implies there can only be an end host (the mobile hand-set) and the first-hop router (i.e., a GPRS Gateway Support Node (GGSN) or a Packet Gateway (PGW)) on that link. The GGSN/PGW never configures a non link-local address on the link using the advertised /64 prefix on it. The advertised prefix must not be used for on-link determination. There is no need for an address resolution on the 3GPP link, since there are no link-layer addresses. Furthermore, the GGSN/PGW assigns a prefix that is unique within each 3GPP link that uses IPv6 stateless address autoconfiguration. This avoids the necessity to perform DAD at the network level for every address built by the mobile host. The GGSN/PGW always provides an IID to the cellular host for the purpose of configuring the link-local address and ensures the uniqueness of the IID on the link (i.e., no collisions between its own link-local address and the mobile host’s one).

The 3GPP link model itself mitigates most of the known NDP-related Denial-of-Service attacks. In practice, the GGSN/PGW only needs to route all traffic to the mobile host that falls under the prefix assigned to it. As there is also a single host on the 3GPP link, there is no need to defend that IPv6 address.

See Section 5 of RFC6459 [RFC6459] for a more detailed discussion on the 3GPP link model, NDP on it and the address configuration detail.
2.3.5. SeND and CGA

SEcure Neighbor Discovery (SeND), as described in RFC3971 [RFC3971], is a mechanism that was designed to secure ND messages. This approach involves the use of new NDP options to carry public key based signatures. Cryptographically Generated Addresses (CGA), as described in RFC3972 [RFC3972], are used to ensure that the sender of a Neighbor Discovery message is the actual "owner" of the claimed IPv6 address. A new NDP option, the CGA option, was introduced and is used to carry the public key and associated parameters. Another NDP option, the RSA Signature option, is used to protect all messages relating to neighbor and Router discovery.

SeND protects against:

- Neighbor Solicitation/Advertisement Spoofing
- Neighbor Unreachability Detection Failure
- Duplicate Address Detection DoS Attack
- Router Solicitation and Advertisement Attacks
- Replay Attacks
- Neighbor Discovery DoS Attacks

SeND does NOT:

- Protect statically configured addresses
- Protect addresses configured using fixed identifiers (i.e. EUI-64)
- Provide confidentiality for NDP communications
- Compensate for an unsecured link - SEND does not require that the addresses on the link and Neighbor Advertisements correspond

However, at this time and after many years after their specifications, CGA and SeND do not have wide support from generic operating systems; hence, their usefulness is limited.

2.4. Control Plane Security

RFC6192 [RFC6192] defines the router control plane. This definition is repeated here for the reader’s convenience.
Modern router architecture design maintains a strict separation of forwarding and router control plane hardware and software. The router control plane supports routing and management functions. It is generally described as the router architecture hardware and software components for handling packets destined to the device itself as well as building and sending packets originated locally on the device. The forwarding plane is typically described as the router architecture hardware and software components responsible for receiving a packet on an incoming interface, performing a lookup to identify the packet's IP next hop and determine the best outgoing interface towards the destination, and forwarding the packet out through the appropriate outgoing interface.

While the forwarding plane is usually implemented in high-speed hardware, the control plane is implemented by a generic processor (named router processor RP) and cannot process packets at a high rate. Hence, this processor can be attacked by flooding its input queue with more packets than it can process. The control plane processor is then unable to process valid control packets and the router can lose OSPF or BGP adjacencies which can cause a severe network disruption.

The mitigation technique is:

- To drop non-legit control packet before they are queued to the RP (this can be done by a forwarding plane ACL) and
- To rate limit the remaining packets to a rate that the RP can sustain. Protocol specific protection should also be done (for example, a spoofed OSPFv3 packet could trigger the execution of the Dijkstra algorithm, therefore the number of Dijkstra execution should be also rate limited).

This section will consider several classes of control packets:

- Control protocols: routing protocols: such as OSPFv3, BGP and by extension Neighbor Discovery and ICMP
- Management protocols: SSH, SNMP, IPfix, etc
- Packet exceptions: which are normal data packets which requires a specific processing such as generating a packet-too-big ICMP message or having the hop-by-hop options header.
2.4.1. Control Protocols

This class includes OSPFv3, BGP, NDP, ICMP.

An ingress ACL to be applied on all the router interfaces SHOULD be configured such as:

- drop OSPFv3 (identified by Next-Header being 89) and RIPng (identified by UDP port 521) packets from a non link-local address
- allow BGP (identified by TCP port 179) packets from all BGP neighbors and drop the others
- allow all ICMP packets (transit and to the router interfaces)

Note: dropping OSPFv3 packets which are authenticated by IPsec could be impossible on some routers whose ACL are unable to parse the IPsec ESP or AH extension headers.

Rate limiting of the valid packets SHOULD be done. The exact configuration obviously depends on the power of the Route Processor.

2.4.2. Management Protocols

This class includes: SSH, SNMP, syslog, NTP, etc

An ingress ACL to be applied on all the router interfaces SHOULD be configured such as:

- Drop packets destined to the routers except those belonging to protocols which are used (for example, permit TCP 22 and drop all when only SSH is used);
- Drop packets where the source does not match the security policy, for example if SSH connections should only be originated from the NOC, then the ACL should permit TCP port 22 packets only from the NOC prefix.

Rate limiting of the valid packets SHOULD be done. The exact configuration obviously depends on the power of the Route Processor.

2.4.3. Packet Exceptions

This class covers multiple cases where a data plane packet is punted to the route processor because it requires specific processing:

- generation of an ICMP packet-too-big message when a data plane packet cannot be forwarded because it is too large;
o generation of an ICMP hop-limit-expired message when a data plane packet cannot be forwarded because its hop-limit field has reached 0;

o generation of an ICMP destination-unreachable message when a data plane packet cannot be forwarded for any reason;

o processing of the hop-by-hop options header, new implementations follow section 4.3 of RFC8200 [RFC8200] where this processing is optional;

o or more specific to some router implementation: an oversized extension header chain which cannot be processed by the hardware and force the packet to be punted to the generic router CPU.

On some routers, not everything can be done by the specialized data plane hardware which requires some packets to be ‘punted’ to the generic RP. This could include for example the processing of a long extension header chain in order to apply an ACL based on layer 4 information. RFC6980 [RFC6980] and more generally RFC7112 [RFC7112] highlights the security implications of oversized extension header chains on routers and updates RFC2460 [RFC2460] such that the first fragment of a packet is required to contain the entire IPv6 header chain.

An ingress ACL cannot help to mitigate a control plane attack using those packet exceptions. The only protection for the RP is to limit the rate of those packet exceptions forwarded to the RP, this means that some data plane packets will be dropped without any ICMP messages back to the source which may cause Path MTU holes.

In addition to limiting the rate of data plane packets queued to the RP, it is also important to limit the generation rate of ICMP messages both the save the RP but also to prevent an amplification attack using the router as a reflector.

2.5. Routing Security

Routing security in general can be broadly divided into three sections:

1. Authenticating neighbors/peers
2. Securing routing updates between peers
3. Route filtering

[RFC7454] covers these sections specifically for BGP in detail.
2.5.1. Authenticating Neighbors/Peers

A basic element of routing is the process of forming adjacencies, neighbor, or peering relationships with other routers. From a security perspective, it is very important to establish such relationships only with routers and/or administrative domains that one trusts. A traditional approach has been to use MD5 HMAC, which allows routers to authenticate each other prior to establishing a routing relationship.

OSPFv3 can rely on IPsec to fulfill the authentication function. However, it should be noted that IPsec support is not standard on all routing platforms. In some cases, this requires specialized hardware that offloads crypto over to dedicated ASICs or enhanced software images (both of which often come with added financial cost) to provide such functionality. An added detail is to determine whether OSPFv3 IPsec implementations use AH or ESP-Null for integrity protection. In early implementations all OSPFv3 IPsec configurations relied on AH since the details weren’t specified in RFC5340 [RFC5340] or RFC2740 [RFC2740] that was obsoleted by the former. However, the document which specifically describes how IPsec should be implemented for OSPFv3 RFC4552 [RFC4552] specifically states that ESP-Null MUST and AH MAY be implemented since it follows the overall IPsec standards wordings. OSPFv3 can also use normal ESP to encrypt the OSPFv3 payload to hide the routing information.

RFC7166 [RFC7166] (which obsoletes RFC6506 [RFC6506] changes OSPFv3’s reliance on IPsec by appending an authentication trailer to the end of the OSPFv3 packets; it does not specifically authenticate the specific originator of an OSPFv3 packet; rather, it allows a router to confirm that the packet has indeed been issued by a router that had access to the shared authentication key.

With all authentication mechanisms, operators should confirm that implementations can support re-keying mechanisms that do not cause outages. There have been instances where any re-keying cause outages and therefore the tradeoff between utilizing this functionality needs to be weighed against the protection it provides.

2.5.2. Securing Routing Updates Between Peers

IPv6 initially mandated the provisioning of IPsec capability in all nodes. However, in the updated IPv6 Nodes Requirement standard RFC6434 [RFC6434] is now a ‘SHOULD’ and no more a ‘MUST’ implement. Theoretically it is possible, and recommended, that communication between two IPv6 nodes, including routers exchanging routing information be encrypted using IPsec. In practice however, deploying
IPsec is not always feasible given hardware and software limitations of various platforms deployed, as described in the earlier section.

2.5.3. Route Filtering

Route filtering policies will be different depending on whether they pertain to edge route filtering vs internal route filtering. At a minimum, IPv6 routing policy as it pertains to routing between different administrative domains should aim to maintain parity with IPv4 from a policy perspective e.g.,

- Filter internal-use, non-globally routable IPv6 addresses at the perimeter
- Discard packets from and to bogon and reserved space (see RFC8190 [RFC8190])
- Configure ingress route filters that validate route origin, prefix ownership, etc. through the use of various routing databases, e.g., RADB. There is additional work being done in this area to formally validate the origin ASs of BGP announcements in RFC6810 [RFC6810]

Some good recommendations for filtering can be found from Team CYMRU at [CYMRU].

2.6. Logging/Monitoring

In order to perform forensic research in case of any security incident or to detect abnormal behaviors, network operators should log multiple pieces of information.

This includes:

- logs of all applications when available (for example web servers);
- use of IP Flow Information Export [RFC7011] also known as IPfix;
- use of SNMP MIB [RFC4293];
- use of the Neighbor cache;
- use of stateful DHCPv6 [RFC3315] lease cache, especially when a relay agent [RFC6221] in layer-2 switches is used;
- use of RADIUS [RFC2866] for accounting records.
Please note that there are privacy issues related to how those logs are collected, kept and safely discarded. Operators are urged to check their country legislation.

All those pieces of information will be used for:

- forensic (Section 2.6.2.1) investigations such as who did what and when?
- correlation (Section 2.6.2.3): which IP addresses were used by a specific node (assuming the use of privacy extensions addresses [RFC4941])
- inventory (Section 2.6.2.2): which IPv6 nodes are on my network?
- abnormal behavior detection (Section 2.6.2.4): unusual traffic patterns are often the symptoms of an abnormal behavior which is in turn a potential attack (denial of services, network scan, a node being part of a botnet, ...)

2.6.1. Data Sources

This section lists the most important sources of data that are useful for operational security.

2.6.1.1. Logs of Applications

Those logs are usually text files where the remote IPv6 address is stored in all characters (not binary). This can complicate the processing since one IPv6 address, 2001:db8::1 can be written in multiple ways such as:

- 2001:DB8::1 (in uppercase)
- 2001:0db8::0001 (with leading 0)
- and many other ways including the reverse DNS mapping into a FQDN (which should not be trusted).

RFC 5952 [RFC5952] explains this problem in detail and recommends the use of a single canonical format (in short use lower case and suppress leading 0). This memo recommends the use of canonical format [RFC5952] for IPv6 addresses in all possible cases. If the existing application cannot log under the canonical format, then this memo recommends the use an external program in order to canonicalize all IPv6 addresses.

For example, this perl script can be used:
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#!/usr/bin/perl -w
use strict ;
use warnings ;
use Socket ;
use Socket6 ;
my (@words, $word, $binary_address) ;
## go through the file one line at a time
while (my $line = <STDIN>) {
chomp $line;
foreach my $word (split /[\s+]/, $line) {
$binary_address = inet_pton AF_INET6, $word ;
if ($binary_address) {
print inet_ntop AF_INET6, $binary_address ;
} else {
print $word ;
}
print " " ;
}
print "\n" ;
}
2.6.1.2.

IP Flow Information Export by IPv6 Routers

IPfix [RFC7012] defines some data elements that are useful for
security:
o

in section 5.4 (IP Header fields): nextHeaderIPv6 and
sourceIPv6Address;

o

in section 5.6 (Sub-IP fields) sourceMacAddress.

Moreover, IPfix is very efficient in terms of data handling and
transport. It can also aggregate flows by a key such as
sourceMacAddress in order to have aggregated data associated with a
specific sourceMacAddress. This memo recommends the use of IPfix and
aggregation on nextHeaderIPv6, sourceIPv6Address and
sourceMacAddress.
2.6.1.3.

SNMP MIB by IPv6 Routers

RFC 4293 [RFC4293] defines a Management Information Base (MIB) for
the two address families of IP. This memo recommends the use of:
o

ipIfStatsTable table which collects traffic counters per
interface;
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2.6.1.4. Neighbor Cache of IPv6 Routers

The neighbor cache of routers contains all mappings between IPv6 addresses and data-link layer addresses. It is usually available by two means:

- the SNMP MIB (Section 2.6.1.3) as explained above;
- using NETCONF RFC6241 [RFC6241] to collect the state of the neighbor cache;
- also by connecting over a secure management channel (such as SSH) and explicitly requesting a neighbor cache dump via the Command Line Interface or any other monitoring mechanism.

The neighbor cache is highly dynamic as mappings are added when a new IPv6 address appears on the network (could be quite often with privacy extension addresses [RFC4941] or when they are removed when the state goes from UNREACH to removed (the default time for a removal per Neighbor Unreachability Detection [RFC4861] algorithm is 38 seconds for a typical host such as Windows 7). This means that the content of the neighbor cache must periodically be fetched every 30 seconds (to be on the safe side) and stored for later use.

This is an important source of information because it is trivial (on a switch not using the SAVI [RFC7039] algorithm) to defeat the mapping between data-link layer address and IPv6 address. Let us rephrase the previous statement: having access to the current and past content of the neighbor cache has a paramount value for forensic and audit trail.

Using the approach of one /64 per host (Section 2.1.7) replaces the neighbor cache dumps by a mere caching of the allocated /64 prefix when combined with strict enforcement rule on the router and switches to prevent IPv6 spoofing.

2.6.1.5. Stateful DHCPv6 Lease

In some networks, IPv6 addresses are managed by stateful DHCPv6 server [RFC3315] that leases IPv6 addresses to clients. It is indeed quite similar to DHCP for IPv4 so it can be tempting to use this DHCP lease file to discover the mapping between IPv6 addresses and data-link layer addresses as it was usually done in the IPv4 era.
It is not so easy in the IPv6 era because not all nodes will use DHCPv6 (there are nodes which can only do stateless autoconfiguration) but also because DHCPv6 clients are identified not by their hardware-client address as in IPv4 but by a DHCP Unique ID (DUID) which can have several formats: some being the data-link layer address, some being data-link layer address prepended with time information or even an opaque number which is useless for operation security. Moreover, when the DUID is based on the data-link address, this address can be of any interface of the client (such as the wireless interface while the client actually uses its wired interface to connect to the network).

If a lightweight DHCP relay agent [RFC6221] is used in the layer-2 switches, then the DHCP server also receives the Interface-ID information which could be save in order to identify the interface of the switches which received a specific leased IPv6 address. Also, if a ‘normal’ (not lightweight) relay agent adds the data-link layer address in the option for Relay Agent Remote-ID [RFC4649] or RFC6939 [RFC6939], then the DHCPv6 server can keep track of the data-link and leased IPv6 addresses.

In short, the DHCPv6 lease file is less interesting than in the IPv4 era. DHCPv6 servers that keep the relayed data-link layer address in addition to the DUID in the lease file do not suffer from this limitation.

The mapping between data-link layer address and the IPv6 address can be secured by using switches implementing the SAVI [RFC7513] algorithms. Of course, this also requires that data-link layer address is protected by using layer-2 mechanism such as [IEEE-802.1X].

2.6.1.6. RADIUS Accounting Log

For interfaces where the user is authenticated via a RADIUS [RFC2866] server, and if RADIUS accounting is enabled, then the RADIUS server receives accounting Acct-Status-Type records at the start and at the end of the connection which include all IPv6 (and IPv4) addresses used by the user. This technique can be used notably for Wi-Fi networks with Wi-Fi Protected Address (WPA) or any other IEEE 802.1X [IEEE-802.1X]wired interface on an Ethernet switch.

2.6.1.7. Other Data Sources

There are other data sources that must be kept exactly as in the IPv4 network:
2.6.2.  Use of Collected Data

This section leverages the data collected as described before (Section 2.6.1) in order to achieve several security benefits.

2.6.2.1.  Forensic

The forensic use case is when the network operator must locate an IPv6 address that was present in the network at a certain time or is still currently in the network.

The source of information can be, in decreasing order, neighbor cache, DHCP lease file. Then, the procedure is:

1. based on the IPv6 prefix of the IPv6 address find the router(s) which are used to reach this prefix (assuming that anti-spoofing mechanisms are used);

2. based on this limited set of routers, on the incident time and on IPv6 address to retrieve the data-link address from live neighbor cache, from the historical data of the neighbor cache,

3. based on the incident time and on the IPv6 address, retrieve the data-link address from the DHCP lease file (Section 2.6.1.5);

4. based on the data-link layer address, look-up on which switch interface was this data-link layer address. In the case of wireless LAN, the RADIUS log should have the mapping between user identification and the MAC address. If a Configuration Management Data Base (CMDB) is used, the mapping between the data-link layer address and a switch port.

At the end of the process, the interface the host originating malicious activity or the username which was abused for malicious activity has been determined.

2.6.2.2.  Inventory

RFC 7707 [RFC7707] (which obsoletes RFC 5157 [RFC5157]) is about the difficulties for an attacker to scan an IPv6 network due to the vast number of IPv6 addresses per link (and why in some case it can still be done). While the huge addressing space can sometime be perceived
as a ‘protection’, it also make the inventory task difficult in an IPv6 network while it was trivial to do in an IPv4 network (a simple enumeration of all IPv4 addresses, followed by a ping and a TCP/UDP port scan). Getting an inventory of all connected devices is of prime importance for a secure operation of a network.

There are many ways to do an inventory of an IPv6 network.

The first technique is to use the IPfix information and extract the list of all IPv6 source addresses to find all IPv6 nodes that sent packets through a router. This is very efficient but alas will not discover silent node that never transmitted such packets... Also, it must be noted that link-local addresses will never be discovered by this means.

The second way is again to use the collected neighbor cache content to find all IPv6 addresses in the cache. This process will also discover all link-local addresses. See Section 2.6.1.4.

Another way works only for local network, it consists in sending a ICMP ECHO_REQUEST to the link-local multicast address ff02::1 which is all IPv6 nodes on the network. All nodes should reply to this ECHO_REQUEST per [RFC4443].

Other techniques involve obtaining data from DNS, parsing log files, leveraging service discovery such as mDNS RFC6761 [RFC6762] and RFC6763 [RFC6763].

Enumerating DNS zones, especially looking at reverse DNS records and CNAMEs, is another common method employed by various tools. As already mentioned in RFC7707 [RFC7707], this allows an attacker to prune the IPv6 reverse DNS tree, and hence enumerate it in a feasible time. Furthermore, authoritative servers that allow zone transfers (AXFR) may be a further information source.

2.6.2.3. Correlation

In an IPv4 network, it is easy to correlate multiple logs, for example to find events related to a specific IPv4 address. A simple Unix grep command was enough to scan through multiple text-based files and extract all lines relevant to a specific IPv4 address.

In an IPv6 network, this is slightly more difficult because different character strings can express the same IPv6 address. Therefore, the simple Unix grep command cannot be used. Moreover, an IPv6 node can have multiple IPv6 addresses.
In order to do correlation in IPv6-related logs, it is advised to have all logs with canonical IPv6 addresses. Then, the neighbor cache current (or historical) data set must be searched to find the data-link layer address of the IPv6 address. Then, the current and historical neighbor cache data sets must be searched for all IPv6 addresses associated to this data-link layer address: this is the search set. The last step is to search in all log files (containing only IPv6 address in canonical format) for any IPv6 addresses in the search set.

2.6.2.4. Abnormal Behavior Detection

Abnormal behaviors (such as network scanning, spamming, denial of service) can be detected in the same way as in an IPv4 network

- sudden increase of traffic detected by interface counter (SNMP) or by aggregated traffic from IPfix records [RFC7012];

- change of traffic pattern (number of connection per second, number of connection per host...) with the use of IPfix [RFC7012]

2.6.3. Summary

While some data sources (IPfix, MIB, switch CAM tables, logs, ...) used in IPv4 are also used in the secure operation of an IPv6 network, the DHCPv6 lease file is less reliable and the neighbor cache is of prime importance.

The fact that there are multiple ways to express in a character string the same IPv6 address renders the use of filters mandatory when correlation must be done.

2.7. Transition/Coexistence Technologies

As it is expected that network will not run in a pure IPv6-only way, the different transition mechanisms must be deployed and operated in a secure way. This section proposes operational guidelines for the most known and deployed transition techniques.

2.7.1. Dual Stack

Dual stack is often the first deployment choice for most existing network operators without an MPLS core where 6PE RFC4798 [RFC4798] is quite common. Dual stacking the network offers some advantages over other transition mechanisms. Firstly, the impact on existing IPv4 operations is reduced. Secondly, in the absence of tunnels or address translation, the IPv4 and IPv6 traffics are native (easier to observe) and should have the same network processing (path, quality
of service, ...). Dual stack allows you to gradually turn IPv4 operations down when your IPv6 network is ready for prime time. On the other hand, the operators have to manage two networks with the added complexities.

From an operational security perspective, this now means that you have twice the exposure. One needs to think about protecting both protocols now. At a minimum, the IPv6 portion of a dual stacked network should maintain parity with IPv4 from a security policy point of view. Typically, the following methods are employed to protect IPv4 networks at the edge:

- ACLs to permit or deny traffic
- Firewalls with stateful packet inspection

It is recommended that these ACLs and/or firewalls be additionally configured to protect IPv6 communications. Also, given the end-to-end connectivity that IPv6 provides, it is also recommended that hosts be fortified against threats. General device hardening guidelines are provided in Section 2.8.

For many years, all host operating systems have IPv6 enabled by default, so, it is possible even in an ‘IPv4-only’ network to attack layer-2 adjacent victims over IPv6 link-local address or over a global IPv6 address is rogue RA or rogue DHCPv6 addresses are provided by an attacker.

2.7.2. Transition Mechanisms

There are many tunnels used for specific use cases. Except when protected by IPsec [RFC4301], all those tunnels have a couple of security issues (most of them being described in RFC 6169 [RFC6169]);

- tunnel injection: a malevolent person knowing a few pieces of information (for example the tunnel endpoints and the used protocol) can forge a packet which looks like a legit and valid encapsulated packet that will gladly be accepted by the destination tunnel endpoint, this is a specific case of spoofing;
- traffic interception: no confidentiality is provided by the tunnel protocols (without the use of IPsec), therefore anybody on the tunnel path can intercept the traffic and have access to the clear-text IPv6 packet; combined with the absence of authentication, a man in the middle attack can also be mounted;
- service theft: as there is no authorization, even a non authorized user can use a tunnel relay for free (this is a specific case of tunnel injection);

- reflection attack: another specific use case of tunnel injection where the attacker injects packets with an IPv4 destination address not matching the IPv6 address causing the first tunnel endpoint to re-encapsulate the packet to the destination. Hence, the final IPv4 destination will not see the original IPv4 address but only one IPv4 address of the relay router.

- bypassing security policy: if a firewall or an IPS is on the path of the tunnel, then it will probably neither inspect not detect an malevolent IPv6 traffic contained in the tunnel.

To mitigate the bypassing of security policies, it is recommended to block all default configuration tunnels by denying all IPv4 traffic matching:

- IP protocol 41: this will block ISATAP (Section 2.7.2.2), 6to4 (Section 2.7.2.7), 6rd (Section 2.7.2.3) as well as 6in4 (Section 2.7.2.1) tunnels;

- IP protocol 47: this will block GRE (Section 2.7.2.1) tunnels;

- UDP protocol 3544: this will block the default encapsulation of Teredo (Section 2.7.2.6) tunnels.

Ingress filtering [RFC2827] should also be applied on all tunnel endpoints if applicable to prevent IPv6 address spoofing.

As several of the tunnel techniques share the same encapsulation (i.e. IPv4 protocol 41) and embed the IPv4 address in the IPv6 address, there are a set of well-known looping attacks described in RFC 6324 [RFC6324], this RFC also proposes mitigation techniques.

### 2.7.2.1. Site-to-Site Static Tunnels

Site-to-site static tunnels are described in RFC 2529 [RFC2529] and in GRE [RFC2784]. As the IPv4 endpoints are statically configured and are not dynamic they are slightly more secure (bi-directional service theft is mostly impossible) but traffic interception and tunnel injection are still possible. Therefore, the use of IPsec [RFC4301] in transport mode and protecting the encapsulated IPv4 packets is recommended for those tunnels. Alternatively, IPsec in tunnel mode can be used to transport IPv6 traffic over a non-trusted IPv4 network.
2.7.2.2. ISATAP

ISATAP tunnels [RFC5214] are mainly used within a single administrative domain and to connect a single IPv6 host to the IPv6 network. This means that endpoints and the tunnel endpoint are usually managed by a single entity; therefore, audit trail and strict anti-spoofing are usually possible and this raises the overall security.

Special care must be taken to avoid looping attack by implementing the measures of RFC 6324 [RFC6324] and of RFC6964 [RFC6964].

IPsec [RFC4301] in transport or tunnel mode can be used to secure the IPv4 ISATAP traffic to provide IPv6 traffic confidentiality and prevent service theft.

2.7.2.3. 6rd

While 6rd tunnels share the same encapsulation as 6to4 tunnels (Section 2.7.2.7), they are designed to be used within a single SP domain, in other words they are deployed in a more constrained environment than 6to4 tunnels and have little security issues except lack of confidentiality. The security considerations (Section 12) of RFC5969 [RFC5969] describes how to secure the 6rd tunnels.

IPsec [RFC4301] for the transported IPv6 traffic can be used if confidentiality is important.

2.7.2.4. 6PE and 6VPE

Organizations using MPLS in their core can also use 6PE [RFC4798] and 6VPE RFC4659 [RFC4659] to enable IPv6 access over MPLS. As 6PE and 6VPE are really similar to BGP/MPLS IP VPN described in RFC4364 [RFC4364], the security of these networks is also similar to the one described in RFC4381 [RFC4381]. It relies on:

- Address space, routing and traffic separation with the help of VRF (only applicable to 6VPE);
- Hiding the IPv4 core, hence removing all attacks against P-routers;
- Securing the routing protocol between CE and PE, in the case of 6PE and 6VPE, link-local addresses (see [RFC7404]) can be used and as these addresses cannot be reached from outside of the link, the security of 6PE and 6VPE is even higher than the IPv4 BGP/MPLS IP VPN.
2.7.2.5. DS-Lite

DS-lite is more a translation mechanism and is therefore analyzed further (Section 2.7.3.3) in this document.

2.7.2.6. Teredo

Teredo tunnels [RFC4380] are mainly used in a residential environment because that can easily traverse an IPv4 NAT-PT device thanks to its UDP encapsulation and they connect a single host to the IPv6 Internet. Teredo shares the same issues as other tunnels: no authentication, no confidentiality, possible spoofing and reflection attacks.

IPsec [RFC4301] for the transported IPv6 traffic is recommended.

The biggest threat to Teredo is probably for IPv4-only network as Teredo has been designed to easily traverse IPv4 NAT-PT devices which are quite often co-located with a stateful firewall. Therefore, if the stateful IPv4 firewall allows unrestricted UDP outbound and accept the return UDP traffic, then Teredo actually punches a hole in this firewall for all IPv6 traffic to the Internet and from the Internet. While host policies can be deployed to block Teredo in an IPv4-only network in order to avoid this firewall bypass, it would be more efficient to block all UDP outbound traffic at the IPv4 firewall if deemed possible (of course, at least port 53 should be left open for DNS traffic).

Teredo is now mostly never used and it is no more automated in most environment, so, it is less of a threat.

2.7.2.7. 6to4

6to4 tunnels [RFC3056] require a public routable IPv4 address in order to work correctly. They can be used to provide either one IPv6 host connectivity to the IPv6 Internet or multiple IPv6 networks connectivity to the IPv6 Internet. The 6to4 relay is usually the anycast address defined in RFC3068 [RFC3068] which has been deprecated by RFC7526 [RFC7526], and is no more used by recent Operating Systems. Some security considerations are explained in RFC3694 [RFC3964].

RFC6343 [RFC6343] points out that if an operator provides well-managed servers and relays for 6to4, non-encapsulated IPv6 packets will pass through well-defined points (the native IPv6 interfaces of those servers and relays) at which security mechanisms may be applied. Client usage of 6to4 by default is now discouraged, and significant precautions are needed to avoid operational problems.
2.7.2.8. Mapping of Address and Port

With the encapsulation and translation versions of mapping of Address and Port (MAP-E [RFC7597] and MAP-T [RFC7599]), the access network is purely an IPv6 network and MAP protocols are used to give IPv4 hosts on the subscriber network, access to IPv4 hosts on the Internet. The subscriber router does stateful operations in order to map all internal IPv4 addresses and layer-4 ports to the IPv4 address and the set of layer-4 ports received through MAP configuration process. The SP equipment always does stateless operations (either decapsulation or stateless translation). Therefore, as opposed to Section 2.7.3.3 there is no state-exhaustion DoS attack against the SP equipment because there is no state and there is no operation caused by a new layer-4 connection (no logging operation).

The SP MAP equipment MUST implement all the security considerations of [RFC7597]; notably, ensuring that the mapping of the IPv4 address and port are consistent with the configuration. As MAP has a predictable IPv4 address and port mapping, the audit logs are easier to manager.

2.7.3. Translation Mechanisms

Translation mechanisms between IPv4 and IPv6 networks are alternative coexistence strategies while networks transition to IPv6. While a framework is described in [RFC6144] the specific security considerations are documented in each individual mechanism. For the most part they specifically mention interference with IPsec or DNSSEC deployments, how to mitigate spoofed traffic and what some effective filtering strategies may be.

2.7.3.1. Carrier-Grade Nat (CGN)

Carrier-Grade NAT (CGN), also called NAT444 CGN or Large Scale NAT (LSN) or SP NAT is described in [RFC6264] and is utilized as an interim measure to prolong the use of IPv4 in a large service provider network until the provider can deploy and effective IPv6 solution. [RFC6598] requested a specific IANA allocated /10 IPv4 address block to be used as address space shared by all access networks using CGN. This has been allocated as 100.64.0.0/10.

Section 13 of [RFC6269] lists some specific security-related issues caused by large scale address sharing. The Security Considerations section of [RFC6598] also lists some specific mitigation techniques for potential misuse of shared address space. Some Law Enforcement Agencies have identified CGN as impeding their cyber-crime investigations (for example Europol press release on CGN [europol-cgn]).
RFC7422 [RFC7422] suggests the use of deterministic address mapping in order to reduce logging requirements for CGN. The idea is to have an algorithm mapping back and forth the internal subscriber to public ports.

2.7.3.2. NAT64/DNS64

Stateful NAT64 translation [RFC6146] allows IPv6-only clients to contact IPv4 servers using unicast UDP, TCP, or ICMP. It can be used in conjunction with DNS64 [RFC6147], a mechanism which synthesizes AAAA records from existing A records. There is also a stateless NAT64 [RFC6145] which is similar for the security aspects with the added benefit of being stateless, so, less prone to a state exhaustion attack.

The Security Consideration sections of [RFC6146] and [RFC6147] list the comprehensive issues. A specific issue with the use of NAT64 is that it will interfere with most IPsec deployments unless UDP encapsulation is used. DNS64 has an incidence on DNSSEC see section 3.1 of [RFC7050].

2.7.3.3. DS-Lite

Dual-Stack Lite (DS-Lite) [RFC6333] is a transition technique that enables a service provider to share IPv4 addresses among customers by combining two well-known technologies: IP in IP (IPv4-in-IPv6) and Network Address and Port Translation (NAPT).

Security considerations with respect to DS-Lite mainly revolve around logging data, preventing DoS attacks from rogue devices (as the AFTR function is stateful) and restricting service offered by the AFTR only to registered customers.

Section 11 of [RFC6333] describes important security issues associated with this technology.

2.8. General Device Hardening

There are many environments which rely too much on the network infrastructure to disallow malicious traffic to get access to critical hosts. In new IPv6 deployments it has been common to see IPv6 traffic enabled but none of the typical access control mechanisms enabled for IPv6 device access. With the possibility of network device configuration mistakes and the growth of IPv6 in the overall Internet it is important to ensure that all individual devices are hardened against miscreant behavior.
The following guidelines should be used to ensure appropriate hardening of the host, be it an individual computer or router, firewall, load-balancer, server, etc. device.

- Restrict access to the device to authorized individuals
- Monitor and audit access to the device
- Turn off any unused services on the end node
- Understand which IPv6 addresses are being used to source traffic and change defaults if necessary
- Use cryptographically protected protocols for device management if possible (SCP, SNMPv3, SSH, TLS, etc)
- Use host firewall capabilities to control traffic that gets processed by upper layer protocols
- Use virus scanners to detect malicious programs

3. Enterprises Specific Security Considerations

Enterprises generally have robust network security policies in place to protect existing IPv4 networks. These policies have been distilled from years of experiential knowledge of securing IPv4 networks. At the very least, it is recommended that enterprise networks have parity between their security policies for both protocol versions.

Security considerations in the enterprise can be broadly categorized into two sections - External and Internal.

3.1. External Security Considerations:

The external aspect deals with providing security at the edge or perimeter of the enterprise network where it meets the service providers network. This is commonly achieved by enforcing a security policy either by implementing dedicated firewalls with stateful packet inspection or a router with ACLs. A common default IPv4 policy on firewalls that could easily be ported to IPv6 is to allow all traffic outbound while only allowing specific traffic, such as established sessions, inbound (see also [RFC6092]). Here are a few more things that could enhance the default policy:

- Filter internal-use IPv6 addresses at the perimeter
o Discard packets from and to bogon and reserved space, see also [CYMRU]

o Accept certain ICMPv6 messages to allow proper operation of ND and PMTUD, see also [RFC4890]

o Filter specific extension headers by accepting only the required ones (white list approach) such as ESP, AH (not forgetting the required transport layers: ICMP, TCP, UDP, ...) , where possible at the edge and possibly inside the perimeter; see also [I-D.gont-opsec-ipv6-eh-filtering]

o Filter packets having an illegal IPv6 headers chain at the perimeter (and possible inside as well), see Section 2.2

o Filter unneeded services at the perimeter

o Implement anti-spoofing

o Implement appropriate rate-limiters and control-plane policers

3.2. Internal Security Considerations:

The internal aspect deals with providing security inside the perimeter of the network, including the end host. The most significant concerns here are related to Neighbor Discovery. At the network level, it is recommended that all security considerations discussed in Section 2.3 be reviewed carefully and the recommendations be considered in-depth as well.

As mentioned in Section 2.6.2, care must be taken when running automated IPv6-in-IP4 tunnels.

Hosts need to be hardened directly through security policy to protect against security threats. The host firewall default capabilities have to be clearly understood, especially 3rd party ones which can have different settings for IPv4 or IPv6 default permit/deny behavior. In some cases, 3rd party firewalls have no IPv6 support whereas the native firewall installed by default has it. General device hardening guidelines are provided in Section 2.8.

It should also be noted that many hosts still use IPv4 for transport for things like RADIUS, TACACS+, SYSLOG, etc. This will require some extra level of due diligence on the part of the operator.
4. Service Providers Security Considerations

4.1. BGP

The threats and mitigation techniques are identical between IPv4 and IPv6. Broadly speaking they are:

- Authenticating the TCP session;
- TTL security (which becomes hop-limit security in IPv6);
- Prefix Filtering.

These are explained in more detail in section Section 2.5.

4.1.1. Remote Triggered Black Hole Filtering

RTBH [RFC5635] works identically in IPv4 and IPv6. IANA has allocated 100::/64 as discard prefix RFC6666 [RFC6666].

4.2. Transition Mechanism

SP will typically use transition mechanisms such as 6rd, 6PE, MAP, DS-Lite which have been analyzed in the transition Section 2.7.2 section.

4.3. Lawful Intercept

The Lawful Intercept requirements are similar for IPv6 and IPv4 architectures and will be subject to the laws enforced in varying geographic regions. The local issues with each jurisdiction can make this challenging and both corporate legal and privacy personnel should be involved in discussions pertaining to what information gets logged and what the logging retention policies will be.

The target of interception will usually be a residential subscriber (e.g. his/her PPP session or physical line or CPE MAC address). With the absence of NAT on the CPE, IPv6 has the provision to allow for intercepting the traffic from a single host (a /128 target) rather than the whole set of hosts of a subscriber (which could be a /48, a /60 or /64).

In contrast, in mobile environments, since the 3GPP specifications allocate a /64 per device, it may be sufficient to intercept traffic from the /64 rather than specific /128’s (since each time the device powers up it gets a new IID).
A sample architecture which was written for informational purposes is found in [RFC3924].

5. Residential Users Security Considerations

The IETF Homenet working group is working on how IPv6 residential network should be done; this obviously includes operational security considerations; but, this is still work in progress.

Residential users have usually less experience and knowledge about security or networking. As most of the recent hosts, smartphones, tablets have all IPv6 enabled by default, IPv6 security is important for those users. Even with an IPv4-only ISP, those users can get IPv6 Internet access with the help of Teredo tunnels. Several peer-to-peer programs (notably BitTorrent) support IPv6 and those programs can initiate a Teredo tunnel through the IPv4 residential gateway, with the consequence of making the internal host reachable from any IPv6 host on the Internet. It is therefore recommended that all host security products (personal firewall, ...) are configured with a dual-stack security policy.

If the Residential Gateway has IPv6 connectivity, [RFC7084] (which obsoletes [RFC6204]) defines the requirements of an IPv6 CPE and does not take position on the debate of default IPv6 security policy as defined in [RFC6092]:

- outbound only: allowing all internally initiated connections and block all externally initiated ones, which is a common default security policy enforced by IPv4 Residential Gateway doing NAT-PT but it also breaks the end-to-end reachability promise of IPv6. [RFC6092] lists several recommendations to design such a CPE;

- open/transparent: allowing all internally and externally initiated connections, therefore restoring the end-to-end nature of the Internet for the IPv6 traffic but having a different security policy for IPv6 than for IPv4.

[RFC6092] REC-49 states that a choice must be given to the user to select one of those two policies.

There is also an alternate solution which has been deployed notably by Swisscom: open to all outbound and inbound connections at the exception of an handful of TCP and UDP ports known as vulnerable.
6. Further Reading

There are several documents that describe in more details the security of an IPv6 network; these documents are not written by the IETF but are listed here for your convenience:

1. Guidelines for the Secure Deployment of IPv6 [NIST]
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8. IANA Considerations

This memo includes no request to IANA.

9. Security Considerations

This memo attempts to give an overview of security considerations of operating an IPv6 network both in an IPv6-only network and in utilizing the most widely deployed IPv4/IPv6 coexistence strategies.
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1. Introduction

Running an IPv6 network is new for most operators not only because they are not yet used to large-scale IPv6 networks but also because there are subtle but critical and important differences between IPv4 and IPv6, especially with respect to security. For example, all layer-2 interactions are now done using Neighbor Discovery Protocol [RFC4861] rather than using Address Resolution Protocol [RFC0826]. Also, there is no Network Address Port Translation (NAPT) defined in [RFC2663] for IPv6 even if [RFC6296] specifies a Network Prefix Translation for IPv6 (NPTv6) which is a 1-to-1 mapping of IPv6 addresses. Another important difference is that IPv6 is extensible with the use of extension headers.

IPv6 networks are deployed using a variety of techniques, each of which have their own specific security concerns.

This document complements [RFC4942] by listing security issues when operating a network (including various transition technologies). It
also provides more recent operational deployment experiences where warranted.

1.1. Applicability Statement

This document is applicable to managed networks, i.e., when the network is operated by the user organization itself. Indeed, many of the recommended mitigation techniques must be configured with detailed knowledge of the network (which are the default routers, the switch trunk ports, etc.). This covers Service Provider (SP), enterprise networks and some knowledgeable-home-user-managed residential networks. This applicability statement especially applies to Section 2.3 and Section 2.5.4.

2. Generic Security Considerations

2.1. Addressing

IPv6 address allocations and overall architecture are an important part of securing IPv6. Initial designs, even if intended to be temporary, tend to last much longer than expected. Although initially IPv6 was thought to make renumbering easy, in practice it may be extremely difficult to renumber without a proper IP Address Management (IPAM) system. [RFC7010] introduces the mechanisms that could be utilized for IPv6 site renumbering and tries to cover most of the explicit issues and requirements associated with IPv6 renumbering.

A key task for a successful IPv6 deployment is to prepare an addressing plan. Because an abundance of address space is available, structuring an address plan around both services and geographic locations allows address space to become a basis for more structured security policies to permit or deny services between geographic regions. [RFC6177] documents some operational considerations of using different prefix sizes for address assignments at end sites.

A common question is whether companies should use Provider Independent (PI) vs. Provider Allocated (PA) space [RFC7381], but from a security perspective there is little difference. However, one aspect to keep in mind is who has administrative ownership of the address space and who is technically responsible if/when there is a need to enforce restrictions on routability of the space, e.g., due to malicious criminal activity originating from it. Relying on PA address space may also increase the perceived need for address translation techniques such as NPTv6 and thereby augmenting the complexity of the operations including the security operations.
In [RFC7934], it is recommended that IPv6 network deployments provide multiple IPv6 addresses from each prefix to general-purpose hosts and it specifically does not recommend limiting a host to only one IPv6 address per prefix. It also recommends that the network give the host the ability to use new addresses without requiring explicit requests (for example by using SLAAC). Privacy Extensions as of [RFC8981] constitute one of the main scenarios where hosts are expected to generate multiple addresses from the same prefix and having multiple IPv6 addresses per interface is a major change compared to the unique IPv4 address per interface for hosts (secondary IPv4 addresses are not common); especially for audits (see section Section 2.6.2.3).

2.1.1. Use of ULAs

Unique Local Addresses (ULAs) [RFC4193] are intended for scenarios where interfaces are not globally reachable, despite being routed within a domain. They formally have global scope, but [RFC4193] specifies that they must be filtered at domain boundaries. ULAs are different from [RFC1918] addresses and have different use cases. One use of ULA is described in [RFC4864], another one is for internal communication stability in networks where external connectivity may come and go (e.g., some ISPs provide ULAs in home networks connected via a cable modem). It should further be kept in mind that ULA /48s from the fd00::/8 space (L=1) MUST be generated with a pseudo-random algorithm, per [RFC4193] section 3.2.1.

2.1.2. Point-to-Point Links

[RFC6164] in section 5.1 specifies the rationale of using /127 for inter-router point-to-point links to prevent the ping-pong issue between routers not correctly implementing [RFC4443] and also prevents a DoS attack on the neighbor cache. The previous recommendation of [RFC3627] has been obsoleted and marked Historic by [RFC6547]).

Some environments are also using link-local addressing for point-to-point links. While this practice could further reduce the attack surface of infrastructure devices, the operational disadvantages also need to be carefully considered; see also [RFC7404].

2.1.3. Loopback Addresses

Many operators reserve a /64 block for all loopback addresses in their infrastructure and allocate a /128 out of this reserved /64 prefix for each loopback interface. This practice facilitates configuration of Access Control List (ACL) rules to enforce a security policy for those loopback addresses.
2.1.4. Stable Addresses

When considering how to assign stable addresses for nodes (either by static configuration or by pre-provisioned DHCPv6 lease Section 2.1.6), it is necessary to take into consideration the effectiveness of perimeter security in a given environment.

There is a trade-off between ease of operation (where some portions of the IPv6 address could be easily recognizable for operational debugging and troubleshooting) versus the risk of trivial scanning used for reconnaissance. [SCANNING] shows that there are scientifically based mechanisms that make scanning for IPv6 reachable nodes more feasible than expected; see also [RFC7707].

Stable addresses also allow easy enforcement of a security policy at the perimeter based on IPv6 addresses. E.g., Manufacturer Usage Description (MUD) [RFC8520] is a mechanism where the perimeter defense can retrieve security policy template based on the type of internal device and apply the right security policy based on the device IPv6 address.

The use of well-known IPv6 addresses (such as ff02::1 for all link-local nodes) or the use of commonly repeated addresses could make it easy to figure out which devices are name servers, routers, or other critical devices; even a simple traceroute will expose most of the routers on a path. There are many scanning techniques possible and operators should not rely on the ‘impossible to find because my address is random’ paradigm (a.k.a. “security by obscurity”), even if it is common practice to have the stable addresses randomly distributed across /64 subnets and to always use DNS (as IPv6 addresses are hard for human brains to remember).

While in some environments obfuscating addresses could be considered an added benefit, it should not preclude enforcement of perimeter rules. Stable addresses following some logical allocation scheme may ease the operation (as simplicity always helps security).

Typical deployments will have a mix of stable and non-stable addresses; the stable addresses being either predictable (e.g., ::25 for a mail server) or obfuscated (i.e., appearing as a random 64-bit number).

2.1.5. Temporary Addresses for SLAAC

Historically, stateless address autoconfiguration (SLAAC) makes up the globally unique IPv6 address based on an automatically generated 64-bit interface identifier (IID) based on the EUI-64 MAC address combined with the /64 prefix (received in the Prefix Information
Option (PIO) of the Router Advertisement (RA)). The EUI-64 address is generated from the stable 48-bit MAC address and does not change even if the host moves to another network; this is of course bad for privacy as a host can be traced from network (home) to network (office or Wi-Fi in hotels). [RFC8064] recommends against the use of EUI-64 addresses; and it must be noted that most host operating systems do not use EUI-64 addresses anymore and rely on either [RFC8981] or [RFC8064].

Randomly generating an interface ID, as described in [RFC8981], is part of SLAAC with so-called privacy extension addresses and is used to address some privacy concerns. Privacy extension addresses, a.k.a., temporary addresses may help to mitigate the correlation of activities of a node within the same network and may also reduce the attack exposure window. But using [RFC8981] privacy extension addresses might prevent the operator from building host specific access control lists (ACLs). The [RFC8981] privacy extension addresses could also be used to obfuscate some malevolent activities and specific user attribution/accountability procedures should be put in place as described in Section 2.6.

[RFC8064] combined with the address generation mechanism of [RFC7217] specifies another way to generate an address while still keeping the same IID for each network prefix; this allows SLAAC nodes to always have the same stable IPv6 address on a specific network while having different IPv6 addresses on different networks.

In some specific use cases where user accountability is more important than user privacy, network operators may consider disabling SLAAC and relying only on DHCPv6; but not all operating systems support DHCPv6 so some hosts will not get any IPv6 connectivity. Disabling SLAAC and privacy extension addresses can be done for most operating systems by sending RA messages with a hint to get addresses via DHCPv6 by setting the M-bit and disabling SLAAC by resetting all A-bits in all prefix information options. However, attackers could still find ways to bypass this mechanism if not enforced at the switch/router level.

However, in scenarios where anonymity is a strong desire (protecting user privacy is more important than user attribution), privacy extension addresses should be used. When mechanisms recommended by [RFC8064] are available, the stable privacy address is probably a good balance between privacy (among different networks) and security/user attribution (within a network).
2.1.6. DHCP Considerations

Some environments use DHCPv6 to provision addresses and other parameters in order to ensure auditability and traceability (see Section 2.6.1.5 for the limitations of DHCPv6 for auditability).

A main security concern is the ability to detect and counteract rogue DHCP servers (Section 2.3.3). It must be noted that as opposed to DHCPv4, DHCPv6 can lease several IPv6 addresses per client. For DHCPv4, the lease is bound to the 'client identifier', which may contain a hardware address, or it may contain another type of identifier, such as a DNS name. For DHCPv6, the lease is bound to the client DHCP Unique ID (DUID), which may, or may not, be bound to the client link-layer address. [RFC7824] describes the privacy issues associated with the use of DHCPv6 by Internet users. The anonymity profiles [RFC7844] are designed for clients that wish to remain anonymous to the visited network. [RFC7707] recommends that DHCPv6 servers issue addresses randomly from a large pool.

2.1.7. DNS Considerations

While the security concerns of DNS are not fundamentally different between IPv4 and IPv6, there are specific considerations in DNS64 [RFC6147] environments that need to be understood. Specifically, the interactions and the potential of interference with DNSSEC ([RFC4033]) implementation need to be understood - these are pointed out in more detail in Section 2.7.3.2.

2.1.8. Using a /64 per host

An interesting approach is using a /64 per host as proposed in [RFC8273] especially in a shared environment. This allows for easier user attribution (typically based on the host MAC address) as its /64 prefix is stable even if applications within the host can change their IPv6 address within this /64 prefix.

This can also be useful for the generation of ACLs once individual systems (e.g. admin workstations) have their own prefixes.

2.1.9. Privacy consideration of Addresses

Beside the security aspects of IPv6 addresses, there are also privacy considerations: mainly because they are of global scope and visible globally. [RFC7721] goes into more detail on the privacy considerations for IPv6 addresses by comparing the manually configured IPv6 address, DHCPv6, and SLAAC.
2.2. Extension Headers

Extension headers are an important difference between IPv4 and IPv6. In IPv4-based packets, it's trivial to find the upper-layer protocol type and protocol header, while in IPv6 it is more complex since the extension header chain must be parsed completely (even if not processed) in order to find the upper-layer protocol header. IANA has closed the existing empty "Next Header Types" registry to new entries and is redirecting its users to a new "IPv6 Extension Header Types" registry per [RFC7045].

Extension headers have also become a very controversial topic since forwarding nodes that discard packets containing extension headers are known to cause connectivity failures and deployment problems [RFC7872]. Understanding the role of various extension headers is important and this section enumerates the ones that need careful consideration.

A clarification on how intermediate nodes should handle packets with existing or future extension headers is found in [RFC7045]. The uniform TLV format to be used for defining future extension headers is described in [RFC6564]. Sections 5.2 and 5.3 of [RFC8504] provide more information on the processing of extension headers by IPv6 nodes.

Vendors of filtering solutions and operations personnel responsible for implementing packet filtering rules should be aware that the 'Next Header' field in an IPv6 header can both point to an IPv6 extension header or to an upper layer protocol header. This has to be considered when designing the user interface of filtering solutions or during the creation of filtering rule sets.

There is IETF work in progress regarding filtering rules for those extension headers: [I-D.ietf-opsec-ipv6-eh-filtering] for transit routers.

2.2.1. Order and Repetition of Extension Headers

While [RFC8200] recommends the order and the maximum repetition of extension headers, there are still IPv6 implementations, at the time of writing, which support a non-recommended order of headers (such as ESP before routing) or an illegal repetition of headers (such as multiple routing headers). The same applies for options contained in the extension headers (see [I-D.kampanakis-6man-ipv6-eh-parsing]). In some cases, it has led to nodes crashing when receiving or forwarding wrongly formatted packets.
A firewall or edge device should be used to enforce the recommended order and the maximum occurrences of extension headers by dropping non-conforming packets.

2.2.2. Hop-by-Hop Options Header

In the previous IPv6 specification [RFC2460], the hop-by-hop options header, when present in an IPv6 packet, forced all nodes to inspect and possibly process this header. This enabled denial-of-service attacks as most, if not all, routers cannot process this type of packet in hardware but have to process these packets in software and hence compete with other software tasks, such as handling the control and management plane processing.

Section 4.3 of the current Internet Standard for IPv6, [RFC8200], has taken this attack vector into account and made the processing of hop-by-hop options headers by intermediate routers explicitly configurable.

2.2.3. Fragment Header

The fragment header is used by the source (and only the source) when it has to fragment packets. [RFC7112] and section 4.5 of [RFC8200] explain why it is important that:

Firewall and security devices should drop first fragments that do not contain the entire IPv6 header chain (including the transport-layer header).

Destination nodes should discard first fragments that do not contain the entire IPv6 header chain (including the transport-layer header).

If those requirements are not met, stateless filtering could be bypassed by a hostile party. [RFC6980] applies a stricter rule to Neighbor Discovery Protocol (NDP) by enforcing the drop of fragmented NDP packets (except for "Certification Path Advertisement" messages as noted in section Section 2.3.2.1). [RFC7113] describes how the RA-guard function described in [RFC6105] should behave in the presence of fragmented RA packets.

2.2.4. IP Security Extension Header

The IPsec [RFC4301] extension headers (AH [RFC4302] and ESP [RFC4303]) are required if IPsec is to be utilized for network level security. Previously, IPv6 mandated implementation of IPsec but [RFC6434] updated that recommendation by making support of the IPsec
architecture [RFC4301] a SHOULD for all IPv6 nodes which is also retained in the latest IPv6 Nodes Requirement standard [RFC8504].

2.3. Link-Layer Security

IPv6 relies heavily on NDP [RFC4861] to perform a variety of link operations such as discovering other nodes on the link, resolving their link-layer addresses, and finding routers on the link. If not secured, NDP is vulnerable to various attacks, such as router/neighbor message spoofing, redirect attacks, Duplicate Address Detection (DAD) DoS attacks, etc. Many of these security threats to NDP have been documented in IPv6 ND Trust Models and Threats [RFC3756] and in [RFC6583].

Most of the issues are only applicable when the attacker is on the same link but NDP also has security issues when the attacker is off-link, see the section below Section 2.3.1.

2.3.1. Neighbor Solicitation Rate-Limiting

NDP can be vulnerable to remote denial of service (DoS) attacks; for example, when a router is forced to perform address resolution for a large number of unassigned addresses, i.e., when a prefix is scanned by an attacker in a fast manner. This can keep new devices from joining the network or render the last-hop router ineffective due to high CPU usage. Easy mitigative steps include rate-limiting Neighbor Solicitations, restricting the amount of state reserved for unresolved solicitations, and clever cache/timer management.

[RFC6583] discusses the potential for off-link DoS in detail and suggests implementation improvements and operational mitigation techniques that may be used to mitigate or alleviate the impact of such attacks. Here are some feasible mitigation options that can be employed by network operators today:

- Ingress filtering of unused addresses by ACL. These require stable configuration of the addresses; for example, allocating the addresses out of a /120 and using a specific ACL to only allow traffic to this /120 (of course, the actual hosts are configured with a /64 prefix for the link).

- Tuning of NDP process (where supported), e.g., enforcing limits on data structures such as the number of neighbor cache entries in ‘incomplete’ state (e.g., 256 incomplete entries per interface) or the rate of NA per interface (e.g., 100 NA per second).

- Using a /127 on a point-to-point link, per [RFC6164].
2.3.2. Router and Neighbor Advertisements Filtering

2.3.2.1. Router Advertisement Filtering

Router Advertisement spoofing is a well-known on-link attack vector and has been extensively documented. The presence of rogue RAs, either unintentional or malicious, can cause partial or complete failure of operation of hosts on an IPv6 link. For example, a node can select an incorrect router address which can then be used for an on-path attack or the node can assume wrong prefixes to be used for SLAAC. [RFC6104] summarizes the scenarios in which rogue RAs may be observed and presents a list of possible solutions to the problem. [RFC6105] (RA-Guard) describes a solution framework for the rogue RA problem where network segments are designed around switching devices that are capable of identifying invalid RAs and blocking them before the attack packets actually reach the target nodes.

However, several evasion techniques that circumvent the protection provided by RA-Guard have surfaced. A key challenge to this mitigation technique is introduced by IPv6 fragmentation. Attackers can conceal their attack by fragmenting their packets into multiple fragments such that the switching device that is responsible for blocking invalid RAs cannot find all the necessary information to perform packet filtering of the same packet. [RFC7113] describes such evasion techniques and provides advice to RA-Guard implementers such that the aforementioned evasion vectors can be eliminated.

Given that the IPv6 Fragmentation Header can be leveraged to circumvent some implementations of RA-Guard, [RFC6980] updates [RFC4861] such that use of the IPv6 Fragmentation Header is forbidden in all Neighbor Discovery messages except "Certification Path Advertisement", thus allowing for simple and effective measures to counter fragmented NDP attacks.

2.3.2.2. Neighbor Advertisement Filtering

The Source Address Validation Improvements (SAVI) working group has worked on other ways to mitigate the effects of such attacks. [RFC7513] helps in creating bindings between a DHCPv4 [RFC2131] /DHCPv6 [RFC8415] assigned source IP address and a binding anchor [RFC7039] on a SAVI device. Also, [RFC6620] describes how to glean similar bindings when DHCP is not used. The bindings can be used to filter packets generated on the local link with forged source IP addresses.
2.3.2.3. Host Isolation

Isolating hosts for the NDP traffic can be done by using a /64 per host, refer to Section 2.1.8, as NDP is only relevant within a /64 on-link prefix; 3GPP Section 2.3.4 uses a similar mechanism.

A more drastic technique to prevent all NDP attacks is based on isolation of all hosts with specific configurations. In such a scenario, hosts (i.e., all nodes that are not routers) are unable to send data-link layer frames to other hosts, therefore, no host-to-host attacks can happen. This specific setup can be established on some switches or Wi-Fi access points. This is not always feasible when hosts need to communicate with other hosts in the same subnet, e.g., for access to file shares.

2.3.2.4. NDP Recommendations

It is still recommended that RA-Guard and SAVI be employed as a first line of defense against common attack vectors including misconfigured hosts. This recommendation also applies when DHCPv6 is used, as RA messages are used to discover the default router(s) and for on-link prefix determination. This line of defense is most effective when incomplete fragments are dropped by routers and switches as described in Section 2.2.3. The generated log should also be analyzed to identify and act on violations.

Network operators should be aware that RA-Guard and SAVI do not work as expected or could even be harmful in specific network configurations (notably when there could be multiple routers).

Enabling RA-Guard by default in managed networks (e.g., Wi-Fi networks, enterprise campus networks, etc.) should be strongly considered except for specific use cases such as the presence of homenet devices emitting router advertisements.

2.3.3. Securing DHCP

The Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol for IPv6 (DHCPv6), as described in [RFC8415], enables DHCP servers to pass configuration parameters, such as IPv6 network addresses and other configuration information, to IPv6 nodes. DHCP plays an important role in most large networks by providing robust stateful configuration in the context of automated system provisioning.

The two most common threats to DHCP clients come from malicious (a.k.a., rogue) or unintentionally misconfigured DHCP servers. In these scenarios, a malicious DHCP server is established with the intent of providing incorrect configuration information to the
clients to cause a denial-of-service attack or to mount on-path attack. While unintentional, a misconfigured DHCP server can have the same impact. Additional threats against DHCP are discussed in the security considerations section of [RFC8415].

DHCPv6-Shield, [RFC7610], specifies a mechanism for protecting connected DHCPv6 clients against rogue DHCPv6 servers. This mechanism is based on DHCPv6 packet-filtering at the layer-2 device, i.e., the administrator specifies the interfaces connected to DHCPv6 servers. However, extension headers could be leveraged to bypass DHCPv6-Shield unless [RFC7112] is enforced.

It is recommended to use DHCPv6-Shield and to analyze the corresponding log messages.

2.3.4. 3GPP Link-Layer Security

The 3GPP link is a point-to-point like link that has no link-layer address. This implies there can only be one end host (the mobile hand-set) and the first-hop router (i.e., a GPRS Gateway Support Node (GGSN) or a Packet Gateway (PGW)) on that link. The GGSN/PGW never configures a non link-local address on the link using the advertised /64 prefix on it; see Section 2.1.8. The advertised prefix must not be used for on-link determination. There is no need for address resolution on the 3GPP link, since there are no link-layer addresses. Furthermore, the GGSN/PGW assigns a prefix that is unique within each 3GPP link that uses IPv6 stateless address autoconfiguration. This avoids the necessity to perform DAD at the network level for every address generated by the mobile host. The GGSN/PGW always provides an IID to the cellular host for the purpose of configuring the link-local address and ensures the uniqueness of the IID on the link (i.e., no collisions between its own link-local address and the mobile host's address).

The 3GPP link model itself mitigates most of the known NDP-related Denial-of-Service attacks. In practice, the GGSN/PGW only needs to route all traffic to the mobile host that falls under the prefix assigned to it. As there is also a single host on the 3GPP link, there is no need to defend that IPv6 address.

See Section 5 of [RFC6459] for a more detailed discussion on the 3GPP link model, NDP, and the address configuration details. In some mobile networks, DHCPv6 and DHCP-PD are also used.
2.3.5. Impact of Multicast Traffic

IPv6 uses multicast extensively for signaling messages on the local link to avoid broadcast messages for on-the-wire efficiency.

The use of multicast has some side effects on wireless networks, such as a negative impact on battery life of smartphones and other battery-operated devices that are connected to such networks. [RFC7772] and [RFC6775] (for specific wireless networks) discuss methods to rate-limit RAs and other ND messages on wireless networks in order to address this issue.

The use of link-layer multicast addresses (e.g., ff02::1 for the all nodes link-local multicast address) could also be misused for an amplification attack. Imagine, a hostile node sending an ICMPv6 ECHO_REQUEST to ff02::1 with a spoofed source address, then, all link-local nodes will reply with ICMPv6 ECHO_REPLY packets to the source address. This could be a DoS attack for the address owner. This attack is purely local to the layer-2 network as packets with a link-local destination are never forwarded by an IPv6 router.

This is the reason why large Wi-Fi network deployments often limit the use of link-layer multicast either from or to the uplink of the Wi-Fi access point, i.e., Wi-Fi stations are prevented to send link-local multicast to their direct neighboring Wi-Fi stations; this policy also blocks service discovery via mDNS ([RFC6762]) and LLMNR ([RFC4795]).

2.3.6. SeND and CGA

SEcure Neighbor Discovery (SeND), as described in [RFC3971], is a mechanism that was designed to secure ND messages. This approach involves the use of new NDP options to carry public key-based signatures. Cryptographically Generated Addresses (CGA), as described in [RFC3972], are used to ensure that the sender of a Neighbor Discovery message is the actual "owner" of the claimed IPv6 address. A new NDP option, the CGA option, was introduced and is used to carry the public key and associated parameters. Another NDP option, the RSA Signature option, is used to protect all messages relating to neighbor and Router discovery.

SeND protects against:

- Neighbor Solicitation/Advertisement Spoofing
- Neighbor Unreachability Detection Failure
- Duplicate Address Detection DoS Attack
o Router Solicitation and Advertisement Attacks

o Replay Attacks

o Neighbor Discovery DoS Attacks

Send does NOT:

o Protect statically configured addresses

o Protect addresses configured using fixed identifiers (i.e., EUI-64)

o Provide confidentiality for NDP communications

o Compensate for an unsecured link - Send does not require that the addresses on the link and Neighbor Advertisements correspond.

However, at this time and over a decade since their original specifications, CGA and SeND do not have support from widely deployed IPv6 devices; hence, their usefulness is limited and should not be relied upon.

2.4. Control Plane Security

[RFC6192] defines the router control plane and provides detailed guidance to secure it for IPv4 and IPv6 networks. This definition is repeated here for the reader’s convenience. Please note that the definition is completely protocol-version agnostic (most of this section applies to IPv6 in the same way as to IPv4).

Preamble: IPv6 control plane security is vastly congruent with its IPv4 equivalent with the exception of OSPFv3 authentication (Section 2.4.1) and some packet exceptions (see Section 2.4.3) that are specific to IPv6.

Modern router architecture design maintains a strict separation of forwarding and router control plane hardware and software. The router control plane supports routing and management functions. It is generally described as the router architecture hardware and software components for handling packets destined to the device itself, as well as, building and sending packets originated locally on the device. The forwarding plane is typically described as the router architecture hardware and software components responsible for receiving a packet on an incoming interface, performing a lookup to identify the packet’s IP next hop and best outgoing interface towards the destination, and forwarding the packet through the appropriate outgoing interface.
While the forwarding plane is usually implemented in high-speed hardware, the control plane is implemented by a generic processor (referred to as the route processor (RP)) and cannot process packets at a high rate. Hence, this processor can be attacked by flooding its input queue with more packets than it can process. The control plane processor is then unable to process valid control packets and the router can lose IGP or BGP adjacencies which can cause a severe network disruption.

[RFC6192] provides detailed guidance to protect the router control plane in IPv6 networks. The rest of this section contains simplified guidance.

The mitigation techniques are:

- To drop non-legit or potentially harmful control packets before they are queued to the RP (this can be done by a forwarding plane ACL) and
- To rate-limit the remaining packets to a rate that the RP can sustain. Protocol-specific protection should also be done (for example, a spoofed OSPFv3 packet could trigger the execution of the Dijkstra algorithm, therefore, the frequency of Dijkstra calculations should be also rate-limited).

This section will consider several classes of control packets:

- Control protocols: routing protocols: such as OSPFv3, BGP, RIPng, and by extension NDP and ICMP
- Management protocols: SSH, SNMP, NETCONF, RESTCONF, IPFIX, etc.
- Packet exceptions: normal data packets that require a specific processing such as generating a packet-too-big ICMP message or processing the hop-by-hop options header.

2.4.1. Control Protocols

This class includes OSPFv3, BGP, NDP, ICMP.

An ingress ACL to be applied on all the router interfaces for packets to be processed by the RP should be configured to:

- drop OSPFv3 (identified by Next-Header being 89) and RIPng (identified by UDP port 521) packets from a non link-local address (except for OSPFv3 virtual links)
allow BGP (identified by TCP port 179) packets from all BGP neighbors and drop the others

allow all ICMP packets (transit and to the router interfaces)

Note: dropping OSPFv3 packets which are authenticated by IPsec could be impossible on some routers that are unable to parse the IPsec ESP or AH extension headers during ACL classification.

Rate-limiting of the valid packets should be done, see also [RFC8541] for a side benefit for OSPFv3. The exact configuration will depend on the available resources of the router (CPU, TCAM, ...).

2.4.2. Management Protocols

This class includes: SSH, SNMP, RESTCONF, NETCONF, gRPC, syslog, NTP, etc.

An ingress ACL to be applied on all the router interfaces (or at ingress interfaces of the security perimeter or by using specific features of the platform) should be configured for packets destined to the RP such as:

- Drop packets destined to the routers except those belonging to protocols which are used (for example, permit TCP 22 and drop all others when only SSH is used);

- Drop packets where the source does not match the security policy, for example, if SSH connections should only be originated from the Network Operation Center (NOC), then the ACL should permit TCP port 22 packets only from the NOC prefix.

Rate-limiting of valid packets should be done. The exact configuration will depend on the available router resources.

2.4.3. Packet Exceptions

This class covers multiple cases where a data plane packet is punted to the route processor because it requires specific processing:

- generation of an ICMP packet-too-big message when a data plane packet cannot be forwarded because it is too large (required to discover the Path MTU);

- generation of an ICMP hop-limit-expired message when a data plane packet cannot be forwarded because its hop-limit field has reached 0 (also used by the traceroute utility);
generation of an ICMP destination-unreachable message when a data
plane packet cannot be forwarded for any reason;

- processing of the hop-by-hop options header, new implementations
  follow section 4.3 of [RFC8200] where this processing is optional;

- or more specific to some router implementation: an oversized
  extension header chain which cannot be processed by the hardware
  and force the packet to be punted to the RP.

On some routers, not everything can be done by the specialized data
plane hardware which requires some packets to be 'punted' to the
generic RP. This could include for example the processing of a long
extension header chain in order to apply an ACL based on layer-4
information. [RFC6980] and more generally [RFC7112] highlight the
security implications of oversized extension header chains on routers
and updates the original IPv6 specifications, [RFC2460], such that
the first fragment of a packet is required to contain the entire IPv6
header chain. Those changes are incorporated in the IPv6 standard
[RFC8200]

An ingress ACL cannot mitigate a control plane attack using these
packet exceptions. The only protection for the RP is to rate-limit
those packet exceptions that are forwarded to the RP, this means that
some data plane packets will be dropped without an ICMP message sent
to the source which may delay Path MTU discovery and cause drops.

In addition to limiting the rate of data plane packets queued to the
RP, it is also important to rate-limit the generation of ICMP
messages. This is important both to preserve RP resources and also
to prevent an amplification attack using the router as a reflector.
It is worth noting that some platforms implement this rate-limiting
in hardware. Of course, a consequence of not generating an ICMP
message will break some IPv6 mechanisms such as Path MTU discovery or
a simple traceroute.

2.5. Routing Security

Preamble: IPv6 routing security is congruent with IPv4 routing
security with the exception of OSPv3 neighbor authentication (see
Section 2.5.2).

Routing security in general can be broadly divided into three
sections:

1. Authenticating neighbors/peers

2. Securing routing updates between peers
3. Route filtering

[RFC5082] is also applicable to IPv6 and can ensure that routing protocol packets are coming from the local network; it must also be noted that in IPv6 all interior gateway protocols use link-local addresses.

As for IPv4, it is recommended to enable a routing protocol only on interfaces where it is required.

2.5.1. BGP Security

As BGP is identical for IPv4 and IPv6 and as [RFC7454] covers all the security aspects for BGP in detail, [RFC7454] is also applicable to IPv6.

2.5.2. Authenticating OSPFv3 Neighbors

OSPFv3 can rely on IPsec to fulfill the authentication function. Operators should note that IPsec support is not standard on all routing platforms. In some cases, this requires specialized hardware that offloads crypto over to dedicated ASICs or enhanced software images (both of which often come with added financial cost) to provide such functionality. An added detail is to determine whether OSPFv3 IPsec implementations use AH or ESP-Null for integrity protection. In early implementations, all OSPFv3 IPsec configurations relied on AH since the details weren’t specified in [RFC5340]. However, the document which specifically describes how IPsec should be implemented for OSPFv3 [RFC4552] specifically states that "ESP-Null MUST and AH MAY be implemented" since it follows the overall IPsec standards wording. OSPFv3 can also use normal ESP to encrypt the OSPFv3 payload to provide confidentiality for the routing information.

[RFC7166] changes OSPFv3 reliance on IPsec by appending an authentication trailer to the end of the OSPFv3 packets; it does not specifically authenticate the specific originator of an OSPFv3 packet; rather, it allows a router to confirm that the packet has been issued by a router that had access to the shared authentication key.

With all authentication mechanisms, operators should confirm that implementations can support re-keying mechanisms that do not cause outages. There have been instances where any re-keying causes outages and therefore, the tradeoff between utilizing this functionality needs to be weighed against the protection it provides. [RFC4107] documents some guidelines for crypto keys management.
2.5.3. Securing Routing Updates

IPv6 initially mandated the provisioning of IPsec capability in all nodes. However, in the updated IPv6 Nodes Requirement standard [RFC8504], IPsec is a 'SHOULD' and not a 'MUST' implement. Theoretically, it is possible that all communication between two IPv6 nodes, especially routers exchanging routing information, is encrypted using IPsec. In practice however, deploying IPsec is not always feasible given hardware and software limitations of the various platforms deployed.

Many routing protocols support the use of cryptography to protect the routing updates, the use of this protection is recommended; [RFC8177] is a YANG data model for key chains that includes re-keying functionality.

2.5.4. Route Filtering

Route filtering policies will be different depending on whether they pertain to edge route filtering vs. internal route filtering. At a minimum, IPv6 routing policy as it pertains to routing between different administrative domains should aim to maintain parity with IPv4 from a policy perspective, e.g.,

- Filter internal-use, non-globally routable IPv6 addresses at the perimeter;
- Discard routes for bogon [CYMRU] and reserved space (see [RFC8190]);
- Configure ingress route filters that validate route origin, prefix ownership, etc. through the use of various routing databases, e.g., [RADB]. [RFC8210] formally validates the origin ASs of BGP announcements.

Some good guidance can be found at [RFC7454].

A valid routing table can also be used to apply network ingress filtering (see [RFC2827]).

2.6. Logging/Monitoring

In order to perform forensic research in the cases of a security incident or detecting abnormal behavior, network operators should log multiple pieces of information. In some cases, this requires a frequent poll of devices via a Network Management Station.

This logging should include, but not limited to:
o logs of all applications using the network (including user space and kernel space) when available (for example web servers that the network operator manages);

o data from IP Flow Information Export [RFC7011] also known as IPFIX;

o data from various SNMP MIBs [RFC4293] or YANG data via RESTCONF [RFC8040] or NETCONF [RFC6241];

o historical data of Neighbor Cache entries;

o stateful DHCPv6 [RFC8415] lease cache, especially when a relay agent [RFC6221] is used;

o Source Address Validation Improvement (SAVI) [RFC7039] events, especially the binding of an IPv6 address to a MAC address and a specific switch or router interface;

o firewall ACL log;

o authentication server log;

o RADIUS [RFC2866] accounting records.

Please note that there are privacy issues or regulations related to how these logs are collected, stored, used, and safely discarded. Operators are urged to check their country legislation (e.g., General Data Protection Regulation GDPR [GDPR] in the European Union).

All those pieces of information can be used for:

o forensic (Section 2.6.2.1) investigations such as who did what and when?

o correlation (Section 2.6.2.3): which IP addresses were used by a specific node (assuming the use of privacy extensions addresses [RFC8981])

o inventory (Section 2.6.2.2): which IPv6 nodes are on my network?

o abnormal behavior detection (Section 2.6.2.4): unusual traffic patterns are often the symptoms of an abnormal behavior which is in turn a potential attack (denial-of-service, network scan, a node being part of a botnet, etc.)
2.6.1. Data Sources

This section lists the most important sources of data that are useful for operational security.

2.6.1.1. Application Logs

Those logs are usually text files where the remote IPv6 address is stored in clear text (not binary). This can complicate the processing since one IPv6 address, for example 2001:db8::1 can be written in multiple ways, such as:

- 2001:DB8::1 (in uppercase)
- 2001:0db8::0001 (with leading 0)
- and many other ways including the reverse DNS mapping into a FQDN (which should not be trusted).

[RFC5952] explains this problem in detail and recommends the use of a single canonical format. This document recommends the use of canonical format [RFC5952] for IPv6 addresses in all possible cases. If the existing application cannot log using the canonical format, then it is recommended to use an external post-processing program in order to canonicalize all IPv6 addresses.

2.6.1.2. IP Flow Information Export by IPv6 Routers

IPFIX [RFC7012] defines some data elements that are useful for security:

- nextHeaderIPv6, sourceIPv6Address, and destinationIPv6Address;
- sourceMacAddress and destinationMacAddress.

The IP version is the ipVersion element defined in [IANA-IPFIX].

Moreover, IPFIX is very efficient in terms of data handling and transport. It can also aggregate flows by a key such as sourceMacAddress in order to have aggregated data associated with a specific sourceMacAddress. This memo recommends the use of IPFIX and aggregation on nextHeaderIPv6, sourceIPv6Address, and sourceMacAddress.
2.6.1.3. SNMP MIB and NETCONF/RESTCONF YANG Modules data by IPv6 Routers

RFC 4293 [RFC4293] defines a Management Information Base (MIB) for the two address families of IP. This memo recommends the use of:

- ipIfStatsTable table which collects traffic counters per interface;
- ipNetToPhysicalTable table which is the content of the Neighbor cache, i.e., the mapping between IPv6 and data-link layer addresses.

There are also YANG modules relating to the two IP addresses families and can be used with [RFC6241] and [RFC8040]. This memo recommends the use of:

- interfaces-state/interface/statistics from ietf-interfaces@2018-02-20.yang [RFC8343] which contains counters for interfaces.
- ipv6/neighbor from ietf-ip@2018-02-22.yang [RFC8344] which is the content of the Neighbor cache, i.e., the mapping between IPv6 and data-link layer addresses.

2.6.1.4. Neighbor Cache of IPv6 Routers

The neighbor cache of routers contains all mappings between IPv6 addresses and data-link layer addresses. There are multiple ways to collect the current entries in the Neighbor Cache, notably but not limited to:

- the SNMP MIB (Section 2.6.1.3) as explained above;
- using streaming telemetry or NETCONF [RFC6241] and RESTCONF [RFC8040] to collect the operational state of the neighbor cache;
- also, by connecting over a secure management channel (such as SSH) and explicitly requesting a neighbor cache dump via the Command Line Interface (CLI) or another monitoring mechanism.

The neighbor cache is highly dynamic as mappings are added when a new IPv6 address appears on the network. This could be quite frequently with privacy extension addresses [RFC8981] or when they are removed when the state goes from UNREACH to removed (the default time for a removal per Neighbor Unreachability Detection [RFC4861] algorithm is 38 seconds for a host using Windows 7). This means that the content of the neighbor cache must periodically be fetched at an interval
which does not exhaust the router resources and still provides valuable information (suggested value is 30 seconds but this should be verified in the actual deployment) and stored for later use.

This is an important source of information because it is trivial (on a switch not using the SAVI [RFC7039] algorithm) to defeat the mapping between data-link layer address and IPv6 address. Let us rephrase the previous statement: having access to the current and past content of the neighbor cache has a paramount value for the forensic and audit trail. It should also be noted that in certain threat models this information is also deemed valuable and could itself be a target.

When using one /64 per host (Section 2.1.8) or DHCP-PD, it is sufficient to keep the history of the allocated prefixes when combined with strict source address prefix enforcement on the routers and layer-2 switches to prevent IPv6 spoofing.

2.6.1.5. Stateful DHCPv6 Lease

In some networks, IPv6 addresses/prefixes are managed by a stateful DHCPv6 server [RFC8415] that leases IPv6 addresses/prefixes to clients. It is indeed quite similar to DHCP for IPv4, so it can be tempting to use this DHCP lease file to discover the mapping between IPv6 addresses/prefixes and data-link layer addresses as is commonly used in IPv4 networking.

It is not so easy in the IPv6 networks, because not all nodes will use DHCPv6 (there are nodes which can only do stateless autoconfiguration) but also because DHCPv6 clients are identified not by their hardware-client address as in IPv4 but by a DHCP Unique ID (DUID), which can have several formats: some being the data-link layer address, some being data-link layer address prepended with time information, or even an opaque number that requires correlation with another data source to be usable for operational security. Moreover, when the DUID is based on the data-link address, this address can be of any client interface (such as the wireless interface while the client actually uses its wired interface to connect to the network).

If a lightweight DHCP relay agent [RFC6221] is used in a layer-2 switch, then the DHCP servers also receive the Interface-ID information which could be saved in order to identify the interface on which the switch received a specific leased IPv6 address. Also, if a 'normal' (not lightweight) relay agent adds the data-link layer address in the option for Relay Agent Remote-ID [RFC4649] or [RFC6939], then the DHCPv6 server can keep track of the data-link and leased IPv6 addresses.
In short, the DHCPv6 lease file is less interesting than for IPv4 networks. If possible, it is recommended to use DHCPv6 servers that keep the relayed data-link layer address in addition to the DUID in the lease file as those servers have the equivalent information to IPv4 DHCP servers.

The mapping between data-link layer address and the IPv6 address can be secured by deploying switches implementing the SAVI [RFC7513] mechanisms. Of course, this also requires that the data-link layer address is protected by using a layer-2 mechanism such as [IEEE-802.1X].

2.6.1.6. RADIUS Accounting Log

For interfaces where the user is authenticated via a RADIUS [RFC2866] server, and if RADIUS accounting is enabled, then the RADIUS server receives accounting Acct-Status-Type records at the start and at the end of the connection which include all IPv6 (and IPv4) addresses used by the user. This technique can be used notably for Wi-Fi networks with Wi-Fi Protected Address (WPA) or other IEEE 802.1X [IEEE-802.1X] wired interface on an Ethernet switch.

2.6.1.7. Other Data Sources

There are other data sources for log information that must be collected (as currently collected in IPv4 networks):

- historical mapping of IPv6 addresses to users of remote access VPN;
- historical mappings of MAC addresses to switch ports in a wired network.

2.6.2. Use of Collected Data

This section leverages the data collected as described before (Section 2.6.1) in order to achieve several security benefits. Section 9.1 of [RFC7934] contains more details about host tracking.

2.6.2.1. Forensic and User Accountability

The forensic use case is when the network operator must locate an IPv6 address (and the associated port, access point/switch, or VPN tunnel) that was present in the network at a certain time or is currently in the network.

To locate an IPv6 address in an enterprise network where the operator has control over all resources, the source of information can be the
neighbor cache, or, if not found, the DHCP lease file. Then, the procedure is:

1. Based on the IPv6 prefix of the IPv6 address, find the router(s) which is(are) used to reach this prefix (assuming that anti-spoofing mechanisms are used) perhaps based on an IPAM.

2. Based on this limited set of routers, on the incident time and on the IPv6 address, retrieve the data-link address from the live neighbor cache, from the historical neighbor cache data, or from SAVI events, or retrieve the data-link address from the DHCP lease file (Section 2.6.1.5).

3. Based on the data-link layer address, look-up the switch interface associated with the data-link layer address. In the case of wireless LAN with RADIUS accounting (see Section 2.6.1.6), the RADIUS log has the mapping between the user identification and the MAC address. If a Configuration Management Data Base (CMDB) is used, then it can be used to map the data-link layer address to a switch port.

At the end of the process, the interface of the host originating, or the subscriber identity associated with, the activity in question has been determined.

To identify the subscriber of an IPv6 address in a residential Internet Service Provider, the starting point is the DHCP-PD leased prefix covering the IPv6 address; this prefix can often be linked to a subscriber via the RADIUS log. Alternatively, the Forwarding Information Base (FIB) of the Cable Modem Termination System (CMTS) or Broadband Network Gateway (BNG) indicates the CPE of the subscriber and the RADIUS log can be used to retrieve the actual subscriber.

More generally, a mix of the above techniques can be used in most, if not all, networks.

2.6.2.2. Inventory

RFC 7707 [RFC7707] describes the difficulties for an attacker to scan an IPv6 network due to the vast number of IPv6 addresses per link (and why in some cases it can still be done). While the huge addressing space can sometimes be perceived as a 'protection', it also makes the inventory task difficult in an IPv6 network while it was trivial to do in an IPv4 network (a simple enumeration of all IPv4 addresses, followed by a ping and a TCP/UDP port scan). Getting an inventory of all connected devices is of prime importance for a secure network operation.
There are many ways to do an inventory of an IPv6 network.

The first technique is to use passive inspection such as IPFIX. Using exported IPFIX information and extracting the list of all IPv6 source addresses allows finding all IPv6 nodes that sent packets through a router. This is very efficient but, alas, will not discover silent nodes that never transmitted packets traversing the IPFIX target router. Also, it must be noted that link-local addresses will never be discovered by this means.

The second way is again to use the collected neighbor cache content to find all IPv6 addresses in the cache. This process will also discover all link-local addresses. See Section 2.6.1.4.

Another way that works only for a local network, consists of sending a ICMP ECHO_REQUEST to the link-local multicast address ff02::1 which addresses all IPv6 nodes on the network. All nodes should reply to this ECHO_REQUEST per [RFC4443].

Other techniques involve obtaining data from DNS, parsing log files, leveraging service discovery such as mDNS [RFC6762] and [RFC6763]. Enumerating DNS zones, especially looking at reverse DNS records and CNAMEs, is another common method employed by various tools. As already mentioned in [RFC7707], this allows an attacker to prune the IPv6 reverse DNS tree, and hence enumerate it in a feasible time. Furthermore, authoritative servers that allow zone transfers (AXFR) may be a further information source. An interesting research paper has analysed the entropy in various IPv6 addresses: see [ENTROPYIP].

2.6.2.3. Correlation

In an IPv4 network, it is easy to correlate multiple logs, for example to find events related to a specific IPv4 address. A simple Unix grep command is enough to scan through multiple text-based files and extract all lines relevant to a specific IPv4 address.

In an IPv6 network, this is slightly more difficult because different character strings can express the same IPv6 address. Therefore, the simple Unix grep command cannot be used. Moreover, an IPv6 node can have multiple IPv6 addresses.

In order to do correlation in IPv6-related logs, it is advised to have all logs in a format with only canonical IPv6 addresses [RFC5952]. Then, the neighbor cache current (or historical) data set must be searched to find the data-link layer address of the IPv6 address. Then, the current and historical neighbor cache data sets must be searched for all IPv6 addresses associated with this data-
link layer address to derive the search set. The last step is to search in all log files (containing only IPv6 addresses in canonical format) for any IPv6 addresses in the search set.

Moreover, [RFC7934] recommends using multiple IPv6 addresses per prefix, so, the correlation must also be done among those multiple IPv6 addresses, for example by discovering in the NDP cache (Section 2.6.1.4) all IPv6 addresses associated with the same MAC address and interface.

2.6.2.4. Abnormal Behavior Detection

Abnormal behavior (such as network scanning, spamming, denial-of-service) can be detected in the same way as in an IPv4 network.

- Sudden increase of traffic detected by interface counter (SNMP) or by aggregated traffic from IPFIX records [RFC7012].

- Rapid growth of ND cache size.

- Change in traffic pattern (number of connections per second, number of connections per host...) observed with the use of IPFIX [RFC7012].

2.6.3. Summary

While some data sources (IPFIX, MIB, switch CAM tables, logs, ...) used in IPv4 are also used in the secure operation of an IPv6 network, the DHCPv6 lease file is less reliable and the neighbor cache is of prime importance.

The fact that there are multiple ways to express the same IPv6 address in a character string renders the use of filters mandatory when correlation must be done.

2.7. Transition/Coexistence Technologies

As it is expected that some networks will not run in a pure IPv6-only mode, the different transition mechanisms must be deployed and operated in a secure way. This section proposes operational guidelines for the most known and deployed transition techniques. [RFC4942] also contains security considerations for transition or coexistence scenarios.
2.7.1. Dual Stack

Dual stack is often the first deployment choice for network operators. Dual stacking the network offers some advantages over other transition mechanisms. Firstly, the impact on existing IPv4 operations is reduced. Secondly, in the absence of tunnels or address translation, the IPv4 and IPv6 traffic are native (easier to observe and secure) and should have the same network processing (network path, quality of service, ...). Dual stack enables a gradual termination of the IPv4 operations when the IPv6 network is ready for prime time. On the other hand, the operators have to manage two network stacks with the added complexities.

From an operational security perspective, this now means that the network operator has twice the exposure. One needs to think about protecting both protocols now. At a minimum, the IPv6 portion of a dual-stacked network should be consistent with IPv4 from a security policy point of view. Typically, the following methods are employed to protect IPv4 networks at the edge or security perimeter:

- ACLs to permit or deny traffic;
- Firewalls with stateful packet inspection;
- Application firewalls inspecting the application flows.

It is recommended that these ACLs and/or firewalls be additionally configured to protect IPv6 communications. The enforced IPv6 security must be congruent with the IPv4 security policy, otherwise the attacker will use the protocol version having the more relaxed security policy. Maintaining the congruence between security policies can be challenging (especially over time); it is recommended to use a firewall or an ACL manager that is dual-stack, i.e., a system that can apply a single ACL entry to a mixed group of IPv4 and IPv6 addresses.

Application firewalls work at the application layer and are oblivious to the IP version, i.e., they work as well for IPv6 as for IPv4 and the same application security policy will work for both protocol versions.

Also, given the end-to-end connectivity that IPv6 provides, it is recommended that hosts be fortified against threats. General device hardening guidelines are provided in Section 2.8.

For many years, all host operating systems have IPv6 enabled by default, so, it is possible even in an ‘IPv4-only’ network to attack layer-2 adjacent victims via their IPv6 link-local address or via a
global IPv6 address when the attacker provides rogue RAs or a rogue DHCPv6 service.

[RFC7123] discusses the security implications of native IPv6 support and IPv6 transition/coexistence technologies on "IPv4-only" networks and describes possible mitigations for the aforementioned issues.

2.7.2. Encapsulation Mechanisms

There are many tunnels used for specific use cases. Except when protected by IPsec [RFC4301] or alternative tunnel encryption methods, all those tunnels have a number of security issues as described in RFC 6169 [RFC6169];

- tunnel injection: a malevolent actor knowing a few pieces of information (for example the tunnel endpoints and the encapsulation protocol) can forge a packet which looks like a legitimate and valid encapsulated packet that will gladly be accepted by the destination tunnel endpoint. This is a specific case of spoofing;

- traffic interception: no confidentiality is provided by the tunnel protocols (without the use of IPsec or alternative encryption methods), therefore anybody on the tunnel path can intercept the traffic and have access to the clear-text IPv6 packet; combined with the absence of authentication, an on-path attack can also be mounted;

- service theft: as there is no authorization, even a non-authorized user can use a tunnel relay for free (this is a specific case of tunnel injection);

- reflection attack: another specific use case of tunnel injection where the attacker injects packets with an IPv4 destination address not matching the IPv6 address causing the first tunnel endpoint to re-encapsulate the packet to the destination... Hence, the final IPv4 destination will not see the original IPv4 address but only the IPv4 address of the relay router.

- bypassing security policy: if a firewall or an Intrusion Prevention System (IPS) is on the path of the tunnel, then it may neither inspect nor detect malevolent IPv6 traffic transmitted over the tunnel.

To mitigate the bypassing of security policies, it is often recommended to block all automatic tunnels in default OS configuration (if they are not required) by denying IPv4 packets matching:
IP protocol 41: this will block ISATAP (Section 2.7.2.2), 6to4 (Section 2.7.2.7), 6rd (Section 2.7.2.3), as well as, 6in4 (Section 2.7.2.1) tunnels;

IP protocol 47: this will block GRE (Section 2.7.2.1) tunnels;

UDP port 3544: this will block the default encapsulation of Teredo (Section 2.7.2.8) tunnels.

Ingress filtering [RFC2827] should also be applied on all tunnel endpoints if applicable to prevent IPv6 address spoofing.

The reflection attack cited above should also be prevented by using an IPv6 ACL preventing the hair pinning of the traffic.

As several of the tunnel techniques share the same encapsulation (i.e., IPv4 protocol 41) and embed the IPv4 address in the IPv6 address, there are a set of well-known looping attacks described in RFC 6324 [RFC6324]. This RFC also proposes mitigation techniques.

2.7.2.1. Site-to-Site Static Tunnels

Site-to-site static tunnels are described in RFC 2529 [RFC2529] and in GRE [RFC2784]. As the IPv4 endpoints are statically configured and are not dynamic, they are slightly more secure (bi-directional service theft is mostly impossible) but traffic interception and tunnel injection are still possible. Therefore, the use of IPsec [RFC4301] in transport mode to protect the encapsulated IPv4 packets is recommended for those tunnels. Alternatively, IPsec in tunnel mode can be used to transport IPv6 traffic over a non-trusted IPv4 network.

2.7.2.2. ISATAP

ISATAP tunnels [RFC5214] are mainly used within a single administrative domain and to connect a single IPv6 host to the IPv6 network. This often implies that those systems are usually managed by a single entity; therefore, audit trail and strict anti-spoofing are usually possible and this raises the overall security. Even if ISATAP is no more often used, its security issues are relevant per [KRISTOFF].

Special care must be taken to avoid a looping attack by implementing the measures of [RFC6324] and [RFC6964] (especially the section 3.6).

IPsec [RFC4301] in transport or tunnel mode can be used to secure the IPv4 ISATAP traffic to provide IPv6 traffic confidentiality and prevent service theft.
2.7.2.3. 6rd

While 6rd tunnels share the same encapsulation as 6to4 tunnels (Section 2.7.2.7), they are designed to be used within a single SP domain, in other words, they are deployed in a more constrained environment (e.g., anti-spoofing, protocol 41 filtering at the edge) than 6to4 tunnels and have few security issues other than lack of confidentiality. The security considerations (Section 12) of [RFC5969] describes how to secure 6rd tunnels.

IPsec [RFC4301] for the transported IPv6 traffic can be used if confidentiality is important.

2.7.2.4. 6PE, 6VPE, and LDPv6

Organizations using MPLS in their core can also use 6PE [RFC4798] and 6VPE [RFC4659] to enable IPv6 access over MPLS. As 6PE and 6VPE are really similar to BGP/MPLS IP VPNs described in [RFC4364], the security properties of these networks are also similar to those described in [RFC4381] (please note that this RFC may resemble a published IETF work but it is not based on an IETF review and the IETF disclaims any knowledge of the fitness of this RFC for any purpose). They rely on:

- Address space, routing, and traffic separation with the help of VRFs (only applicable to 6VPE);
- Hiding the IPv4 core, hence removing all attacks against P-routers;
- Securing the routing protocol between CE and PE; in the case of 6PE and 6VPE, link-local addresses (see [RFC7404]) can be used and as these addresses cannot be reached from outside of the link, the security of 6PE and 6VPE is even higher than an IPv4 BGP/MPLS IP VPN.

LDPv6 itself does not induce new risks, see also [RFC7552].

2.7.2.5. DS-Lite

DS-lite is also a translation mechanism and is therefore analyzed further (Section 2.7.3.3) in this document as it includes IPv4 NAPT.

2.7.2.6. Mapping of Address and Port

With the encapsulation and translation versions of mapping of Address and Port (MAP) (MAP-E [RFC7597] and MAP-T [RFC7599]), the access network is purely an IPv6 network and MAP protocols are used to
provide IPv4 hosts on the subscriber network access to IPv4 hosts on the Internet. The subscriber router does stateful operations in order to map all internal IPv4 addresses and layer-4 ports to the IPv4 address and the set of layer-4 ports received through the MAP configuration process. The SP equipment always does stateless operations (either decapsulation or stateless translation). Therefore, as opposed to Section 2.7.3.3, there is no state-exhaustion DoS attack against the SP equipment because there is no state and there is no operation caused by a new layer-4 connection (no logging operation).

The SP MAP equipment should implement all the security considerations of [RFC7597]; notably, ensuring that the mapping of the IPv4 address and port are consistent with the configuration. As MAP has a predictable IPv4 address and port mapping, the audit logs are easier to use as there is a clear mapping between the IPv6 address and the IPv4 address and ports.

2.7.2.7. 6to4

In [RFC3056]; 6to4 tunnels require a public routable IPv4 address in order to work correctly. They can be used to provide either single IPv6 host connectivity to the IPv6 Internet or multiple IPv6 networks connectivity to the IPv6 Internet. The 6to4 relay was historically the anycast address defined in [RFC3068] which has been deprecated by [RFC7526] and is no longer used by recent Operating Systems. Some security considerations are explained in [RFC3964].

[RFC6343] points out that if an operator provides well-managed servers and relays for 6to4, non-encapsulated IPv6 packets will pass through well-defined points (the native IPv6 interfaces of those servers and relays) at which security mechanisms may be applied. Client usage of 6to4 by default is now discouraged, and significant precautions are needed to avoid operational problems.

2.7.2.8. Teredo

Teredo tunnels [RFC4380] are mainly used in a residential environment because Teredo easily traverses an IPv4 NAPT device thanks to its UDP encapsulation. Teredo tunnels connect a single host to the IPv6 Internet. Teredo shares the same issues as other tunnels: no authentication, no confidentiality, possible spoofing and reflection attacks.

IPsec [RFC4301] for the transported IPv6 traffic is recommended.

The biggest threat to Teredo is probably for an IPv4-only network as Teredo has been designed to easily traverse IPv4 NAT-PT devices which
are quite often co-located with a stateful firewall. Therefore, if the stateful IPv4 firewall allows unrestricted UDP outbound and accepts the return UDP traffic, then Teredo actually punches a hole in this firewall for all IPv6 traffic to the Internet and from the Internet. Host policies can be deployed to block Teredo in an IPv4-only network in order to avoid this firewall bypass. On the IPv4 firewall all outbound UDP should be blocked except for the commonly used services (e.g., port 53 for DNS, port 123 for NTP, port 443 for QUIC, port 500 for IKE, port 3478 for STUN, etc.).

Teredo is now hardly ever used and no longer enabled by default in most environments, so it is less of a threat, however, special consideration must be taken in cases when devices with older or non-updated operating systems may be present and by default were running Teredo.

2.7.3. Translation Mechanisms

Translation mechanisms between IPv4 and IPv6 networks are alternate coexistence strategies while networks transition to IPv6. While a framework is described in [RFC6144], the specific security considerations are documented with each individual mechanism. For the most part, they specifically mention interference with IPsec or DNSSEC deployments, how to mitigate spoofed traffic, and what some effective filtering strategies may be.

While not really a transition mechanism to IPv6, this section also includes the discussion about the use of heavy IPv4-to-IPv4 network address and port translation to prolong the life of IPv4-only networks.

2.7.3.1. Carrier-Grade NAT (CGN)

Carrier-Grade NAT (CGN), also called NAT444 CGN or Large Scale NAT (LSN) or SP NAT is described in [RFC6264] and is utilized as an interim measure to extend the use of IPv4 in a large service provider network until the provider can deploy an effective IPv6 solution. [RFC6598] requested a specific IANA allocated /10 IPv4 address block to be used as address space shared by all access networks using CGN. This has been allocated as 100.64.0.0/10.

Section 13 of [RFC6269] lists some specific security-related issues caused by large scale address sharing. The Security Considerations section of [RFC6598] also lists some specific mitigation techniques for potential misuse of shared address space. Some Law Enforcement Agencies have identified CGN as impeding their cyber-crime investigations (for example Europol press release on CGN [europol-cgn]). Many translation techniques (NAT64, DS-lite, ...)

have the same security issues as CGN when one part of the connection is IPv4-only.

[RFC6302] has recommendations for Internet-facing servers to also log the source TCP or UDP ports of incoming connections in an attempt to help identify the users behind such a CGN.

[RFC7422] suggests the use of deterministic address mapping in order to reduce logging requirements for CGN. The idea is to have a known algorithm for mapping the internal subscriber to/from public TCP and UDP ports.

[RFC6888] lists common requirements for CGNs. [RFC6967] analyzes some solutions to enforce policies on misbehaving nodes when address sharing is used. [RFC7857] also updates the NAT behavioral requirements.

2.7.3.2. NAT64/DNS64 and 464XLAT

Stateful NAT64 translation [RFC6146] allows IPv6-only clients to contact IPv4 servers using unicast UDP, TCP, or ICMP. It can be used in conjunction with DNS64 [RFC6147], a mechanism which synthesizes AAAA records from existing A records. There is also a stateless NAT64 [RFC7915], which has similar security aspects but with the added benefit of being stateless, so, less prone to a state exhaustion attack.

The Security Consideration sections of [RFC6146] and [RFC6147] list the comprehensive issues; in section 8 of [RFC6147] there are some considerations on the interaction between NAT64 and DNSSEC. A specific issue with the use of NAT64 is that it will interfere with most IPsec deployments unless UDP encapsulation is used.

Another translation mechanism relying on a combination of stateful and stateless translation, 464XLAT [RFC6877], can be used to do host local translation from IPv4 to IPv6 and a network provider translation from IPv6 to IPv4, i.e., giving IPv4-only application access to an IPv4-only server over an IPv6-only network. 464XLAT shares the same security considerations as NAT64 and DNS64, however it can be used without DNS64, avoiding the DNSSEC implications.

2.7.3.3. DS-Lite

Dual-Stack Lite (DS-Lite) [RFC6333] is a transition technique that enables a service provider to share IPv4 addresses among customers by combining two well-known technologies: IP in IP (IPv4-in-IPv6) and IPv4 NAPT.

Security considerations with respect to DS-Lite mainly revolve around logging data, preventing DoS attacks from rogue devices (as the Address Family Translation Router (AFTR) [RFC6333] function is stateful) and restricting service offered by the AFTR only to registered customers.

Section 11 of [RFC6333] and section 2 of [RFC7785] describe important security issues associated with this technology.

2.8. General Device Hardening

With almost all devices being IPv6 enabled by default and with many end points having IPv6 connectivity to the Internet, it is critical to also harden those devices against attacks over IPv6.

The same techniques used to protect devices against attack over IPv4 should be used for IPv6 and should include, but not limited to:

- Restrict device access to authorized individuals
- Monitor and audit access to the device
- Turn off any unused services on the end node
- Understand which IPv6 addresses are being used to source traffic and change defaults if necessary
- Use cryptographically protected protocols for device management (SCP, SNMPv3, SSH, TLS, etc.)
- Use host firewall capabilities to control traffic that gets processed by upper-layer protocols
- apply firmware, OS and application patches/upgrades to the devices in a timely manner
- use multi-factor credentials to authenticate to devices
- Use virus scanners to detect malicious programs

3. Enterprises Specific Security Considerations

Enterprises [RFC7381] generally have robust network security policies in place to protect existing IPv4 networks. These policies have been distilled from years of experiential knowledge of securing IPv4 networks. At the very least, it is recommended that enterprise networks have parity between their security policies for both protocol versions. This section also applies to the enterprise part
of all SP networks, i.e., the part of the network where the SP employees are connected.

Security considerations in the enterprise can be broadly categorized into two groups: External and Internal.

3.1. External Security Considerations

The external aspect deals with providing security at the edge or perimeter of the enterprise network where it meets the service provider’s network. This is commonly achieved by enforcing a security policy either by implementing dedicated firewalls with stateful packet inspection or a router with ACLs. A common default IPv4 policy on firewalls that could easily be ported to IPv6 is to allow all traffic outbound while only allowing specific traffic, such as established sessions, inbound (see also [RFC6092]). Section 3.2 of [RFC7381] also provides similar recommendations.

Here are a few more things that could enhance the default policy:

- Filter internal-use IPv6 addresses at the perimeter, this will also mitigate the vulnerabilities listed in [RFC7359]
- Discard packets from and to bogon and reserved space, see also [CYMRU] and [RFC8190]
- Accept certain ICMPv6 messages to allow proper operation of ND and PMTUD, see also [RFC4890] or [REY_PF] for hosts
- Based on the use of the network, filter specific extension headers by accepting only the required ones (permit list approach) such as ESP, AH, and not forgetting the required transport layers: ICMP, TCP, UDP, ... This filtering should be done where applicable at the edge and possibly inside the perimeter; see also [I-D.ietf-opsec-ipv6-eh-filtering]
- Filter packets having an illegal IPv6 headers chain at the perimeter (and if possible, inside the network as well), see Section 2.2
- Filter unneeded services at the perimeter
- Implement ingress and egress anti-spoofing in the forwarding and control planes, see [RFC2827] and [RFC3704]
- Implement appropriate rate-limiters and control-plane policers based on traffic baselines
Having global IPv6 addresses on all the enterprise sites is different than in IPv4 where [RFC1918] addresses are often used internally and not routed over the Internet. [RFC7359] and [WEBER_VPN] explain that without careful design, there could be IPv6 leakages from layer-3 VPNs.

3.2. Internal Security Considerations

The internal aspect deals with providing security inside the perimeter of the network, including end hosts. Internal networks of enterprises are often different: University campus, wireless guest access, ... so there is no "one size fits all" recommendation.

The most significant concerns here are related to Neighbor Discovery. At the network level, it is recommended that all security considerations discussed in Section 2.3 be reviewed carefully and the recommendations be considered in-depth as well. Section 4.1 of [RFC7381] also provides some recommendations.

As mentioned in Section 2.7.2, care must be taken when running automated IPv6-in-IPv4 tunnels.

When site-to-site VPNs are used it should be kept in mind that, given the global scope of IPv6 global addresses as opposed to the common use of IPv4 private address space [RFC1918], sites might be able to communicate with each other over the Internet even when the VPN mechanism is not available and hence no traffic encryption is performed and traffic could be injected from the Internet into the site, see [WEBER_VPN]. It is recommended to filter at Internet connection(s) packets having a source or destination address belonging to the site internal prefix(es); this should be done for ingress and egress traffic.

Hosts need to be hardened directly through security policy to protect against security threats. The host firewall default capabilities have to be clearly understood. In some cases, 3rd party firewalls have no IPv6 support whereas the native firewall installed by default has IPv6 support. General device hardening guidelines are provided in Section 2.8.

It should also be noted that many hosts still use IPv4 for transporting logs for RADIUS, DIAMETER, TACACS+, SYSLOG, etc. Operators cannot rely on an IPv6-only security policy to secure such protocols that are still using IPv4.
4. Service Providers Security Considerations

4.1. BGP

The threats and mitigation techniques are identical between IPv4 and IPv6. Broadly speaking they are:

- Authenticating the TCP session;
- TTL security (which becomes hop-limit security in IPv6) as [RFC5082];
- bogon AS filtering, see [CYMRU];
- Prefix filtering.

These are explained in more detail in Section 2.5. Also, the recommendations of [RFC7454] should be considered.

4.1.1. Remote Triggered Black Hole Filtering (RTBH)

RTBH [RFC5635] works identically in IPv4 and IPv6. IANA has allocated the 100::/64 prefix to be used as the discard prefix [RFC6666].

4.2. Transition/Coexistence Mechanism

SPs will typically use transition mechanisms such as 6rd, 6PE, MAP, and NAT64 which have been analyzed in the transition and coexistence Section 2.7 section.

4.3. Lawful Intercept

The Lawful Intercept requirements are similar for IPv6 and IPv4 architectures and will be subject to the laws enforced in different geographic regions. The local issues with each jurisdiction can make this challenging and both corporate legal and privacy personnel should be involved in discussions pertaining to what information gets logged and with regard to the respective log retention policies for this information.

The target of interception will usually be a residential subscriber (e.g., his/her PPP session, physical line, or CPE MAC address). In the absence of IPv6 NAT on the CPE, IPv6 has the possibility to allow for intercepting the traffic from a single host (i.e., a /128 target) rather than the whole set of hosts of a subscriber (which could be a /48, /60, or /64).
In contrast, in mobile environments, since the 3GPP specifications allocate a /64 per device, it may be sufficient to intercept traffic from the /64 rather than specific /128’s (since each time the device establishes a data connection it gets a new IID).

5. Residential Users Security Considerations

The IETF Homenet working group is working on standards and guidelines for IPv6 residential networks; this obviously includes operational security considerations; but this is still work in progress. [RFC8520] is an interesting approach on how firewalls could retrieve and apply specific security policies to some residential devices.

Some residential users have less experience and knowledge about security or networking than experimented operators. As most of the recent hosts (e.g., smartphones, tablets) have IPv6 enabled by default, IPv6 security is important for those users. Even with an IPv4-only ISP, those users can get IPv6 Internet access with the help of Teredo (Section 2.7.2.8) tunnels. Several peer-to-peer programs support IPv6 and those programs can initiate a Teredo tunnel through an IPv4 residential gateway, with the consequence of making the internal host reachable from any IPv6 host on the Internet. It is therefore recommended that all host security products (including personal firewalls) are configured with a dual-stack security policy.

If the residential CPE has IPv6 connectivity, [RFC7084] defines the requirements of an IPv6 CPE and does not take a position on the debate of default IPv6 security policy as defined in [RFC6092]:

- outbound only: allowing all internally initiated connections and block all externally initiated ones, which is a common default security policy enforced by IPv4 Residential Gateway doing NAPT but it also breaks the end-to-end reachability promise of IPv6. [RFC6092] lists several recommendations to design such a CPE;

- open/transparent: allowing all internally and externally initiated connections, therefore restoring the end-to-end nature of the Internet for IPv6 traffic but having a different security policy for IPv6 than for IPv4.

[RFC6092] REC-49 states that a choice must be given to the user to select one of those two policies.

6. Further Reading

There are several documents that describe in more detail the security of an IPv6 network; these documents are not written by the IETF and...
some of them are dated but are listed here for the reader’s convenience:

1. Guidelines for the Secure Deployment of IPv6 [NIST]
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8. Security Considerations

This memo attempts to give an overview of security considerations of operating an IPv6 network both for an IPv6-only network and for networks utilizing the most widely deployed IPv4/IPv6 coexistence strategies.
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Abstract
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1. Introduction

Blockchain [Bitcoin] is attracting a lot of attention among the security community since it provides means for exchanging information among a set of distrusting entities without the use of digital certificates and centralized control. Blockchain provides means for the distrusting parties to reach consensus in a distributed way. Formally, it is regarded as a new solution to the Byzantine Generals problem, well-known in fault-tolerant distributed systems.

Although at the time of this writing the main application of blockchain are financial systems, their use in the field of networking is being explored (e.g., [Hari2016]). Some successful systems exist such as [Blockstack] and [Namecoin], which aim at building a secure DNS.

The main goal of this document is to represent a first step towards the understanding of the properties of blockchains and their applicability in the Internet infrastructure, specifically securing the allocation, delegation and bindings of IP addresses. First, it introduces blockchain, then it analyzes how blockchain could be used to secure the delegation of IP addresses. Finally, it presents an initial design for such an infrastructure. This document also includes a preliminary security analysis of such system. It is important to note that the goal of this document is not to provide a complete architecture that secures IP address allocation, delegation and bindings.

2. Definition of Terms

TBC

3. Blockchain in a nutshell

3.1. Overview

Conceptually, a blockchain is a distributed, secure and trustless database. It can also be regarded as a state machine with rules that clearly state which transitions can be performed. Participants in the blockchain communicate through a P2P network. The smallest data unit of a blockchain is a transaction. Users attach data to a transaction along with its signature and their associated public key. Usually, the attached data is an asset or a token, something that is unique and should not be replicated (e.g., coins in Bitcoin). Then they broadcast this transaction to the other participants. The rest of the nodes in the network store temporarily this transaction. At some fixed intervals in time, one of the nodes takes a set of these transactions and groups them in a block. It then broadcasts this
block back to the network. When the other nodes receive this block they verify it, remove the transactions contained in the block from the temporary storage and add it after the previous block, thus creating a chain of blocks. It should be noted that all nodes store the entire blockchain locally. In addition, most blockchains give some sort of reward to nodes that add new blocks, although this is not strictly necessary. Figure 1 presents an overview of the most common elements in a block.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Number</th>
<th>Hash(Previous Block)</th>
<th>Hash(All Block Transactions)</th>
<th>Block Creator Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transaction 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.- Common structure of a block

Two basic mechanisms are used to protect the chained data: a chain of signatures and a consensus algorithm.

3.1.1. Chain of signatures

The chain of signatures operates at transaction level. Consider the sender and receiver of a token, each with its public-private keypair. To change the owner of a token, the sender signs the data and the receiver's public key. It then puts together the public key, the signature, the data and the hash of the receiver's public key (Figure 2) to form a transaction.
Figure 2.- Common transaction structure in a blockchain

In conclusion, the rules of the blockchain enforce that:

- The owner of the receiver private key has total control over the contents of the transaction. In Bitcoin this translates in a central property: only this owner can spend a coin.

- When an owner sends a token to the new owner, it irreversibly transfers the control of the contents to the new owner.

3.1.2. Consensus algorithm

The consensus algorithm is the central part of blockchain and it controls the chaining of data blocks. The main role of the algorithm is to provide a set of well-defined rules so that participants agree on a consistent view of the database. For this it has the following main functions. First, forks (multiple chains) can exist, this may happen for instance due to varying network latency among participants. In this case the participants must agree on which is the valid chain. And second, another important function of the consensus algorithm is to determine which participants are allowed to add a new data blocks. Section 3.3 contains more information regarding available consensus algorithms.

It is important to note that regardless of the consensus algorithm, in blockchain data blocks are always added, never deleted nor modified. This creates a tamper-proof, shared ledger among all participants. Transactions can be tracked back by inspecting past blocks, thus enabling the verification of claims by certain parties.

3.2. Features

The following list tries to briefly summarize the main characteristics of the blockchain technology:

Decentralized: No central entity controls the blockchain, it is shared among all participants.

No CAs: No digital certificates, Certification Authorities or CRLs are needed.
Limited prior trust: It is not required to trust other nodes. It is worth noting that some consensus algorithms rely on some limited levels of trust.

Tamper-proof: Since data can be only added but never modified, attempts to alter previous records are detected.

Non-repudiation: All nodes share a common, immutable view on the status of the blockchain, and blockchain provides non-repudiation mechanisms.

Censorship-resistant: Gaining control over a transaction involves having access to the associated private key.

Append-only: Data is always added, but never modified nor deleted.

Privacy: Entities participating in the blockchain can achieve privacy using anonymous keys, i.e. randomly-generated keys not related to their identity. In addition, a new keypair should be generated for each new transaction in order to prevent tracking [Bitcoin], section 10.

Slow updates: New transactions have to be verified, added to a block and received by all nodes. This results in a delay since the transaction is created until it is finally available to all the nodes. This delay will depend on the consensus algorithm and the block creation rate.

Large storage: The size of the blockchain keeps growing forever, because data blocks are always added. This may result in scalability issues.

3.3. Description of consensus algorithms

The two more popular consensus algorithms are: Proof of Work and Proof of Stake.

3.3.1. Proof of Work (PoW)

In Proof of Work nodes have to solve a complex mathematical problem to add a block, thus requiring some computational effort, this is commonly know as mining. For example in Bitcoin the problem is to find a hash starting with a fixed amount of zeroes, the only known way to solve this problem is by brute force. The valid chain is the one with most accumulated computing power, this chain is also the more expensive in terms of computing power to modify. This is because modifying a block going N blocks back from the tip of the chain would require redoing the computations for all these N blocks.
As a result, an attacker should have more computational power than the power required to create the N blocks to be able to modify the chain. Overall, it is commonly assumed that if more than half of the nodes are honest the blockchain is considered as secure.

PoW offers relevant features, adding new blocks requires an external resource (CPU power) that has an economical cost. However this also results in some relevant drawbacks:

Risk of overtaking: The security of PoW is entirely based on computation power. This means that if an entity has access to more than half of the total blockchain’s computing power it can control the chain. As a result and in order to keep blockchain secure, the incentive of taking control of the chain must be lower than the cost of acquiring and operating the hardware that provides the equivalent to half of the participants computing power. This is hard to guarantee since the economy of the blockchain and the economy of the required hardware are independent. As an example an attacker can acquire the required hardware and operate it, take control of the blockchain to obtain an economical benefit and finally sell the hardware to reduce the final cost of the attack.

Hardware dependency: Bitcoin automatically increases -over time- the complexity of the mathematical problem that needs to be solved in order to add a block. This is done to account for Moore’s law. As a result the community has designed mining specific hardware (ASICs) that provides a competitive advantage. In this context blockchain becomes less democratic, since the cost of participating in it increases.

Energy inefficiency: PoW requires large amounts of energy to perform the computations (e.g., [miningfarm]).

3.3.2. Proof of Stake (PoS)

The main idea behind Proof of Stake is that participants with more assets (or stake) in the blockchain are more likely to add blocks. With this, the control of the chain is given to entities who own more stake. For each new block, a signer is selected randomly from the list of participants typically weighted according to their stake. A fundamental assumption behind PoS is that such entities have more incentives for honest behaviour since they have more assets in the chain.

Proof of Stake is seen as an alternative to PoW. At the time of this writing major players in the blockchain environment such as [Ethereum] are preparing a shift towards PoS, moreover several
blockchains based on PoS already exist (eg. [Peercoin]). The main reason behind this paradigm shift is that PoS addresses some of PoW’s main drawbacks:

- It does not require special hardware nor computationally or energy-expensive calculations.

- An attacker must get hold of a significant part of the assets in order to gain control of the blockchain. As opposed to PoS the investment required to gain control of the chain lies within the chain, and does not involve using external resources.

On the other side, Proof of Stake introduces new sources of attacks:

- In Proof of Stake the signer is selected randomly among the stakers. In this context attackers can manipulate the source of randomness to sign more blocks and ultimately gain control over the chain.

- As opposed to PoW, creating forks is very inexpensive, since no computational power is required. The PoS must provide means to select the valid chain, which is typically the longer one.

- Collusions of high-stakers can create alternate chains which can appear to be valid.

4. Blockchain for IP addresses

4.1. Problem statement

The objective of this section is to analyze if an infrastructure using blockchain can provide a similar degree of security to traditional PKI-based architectures. Specifically we aim to secure:

- Binding of IP address blocks to the holder (private key holder).

- The allocations and delegations of IP address blocks among their holders.

- Binding of IP address blocks to their topological locators (eg. AS numbers allocations).

This information is public and shared among a set of distrusting entities over the Internet. The architecture must be able to:

- Allow anyone to verify the legitimate holder of a block of addresses
o Let participating entities allocate address blocks without 
   requiring a trusted third party.

o Restrict the allocation of a block of addresses to only its 
   legitimate holder.

o Prevent data modification without the consent of its holder.

4.2. Analysis

The main rationale behind using blockchain to secure IP address 
allocations is that IPs can be understood as coins, both concepts 
share some fundamental characteristics:

o They are unambiguously allocated to entities.

o Can be transferred between them.

o Cannot be assigned to two entities at the same time.

o Can be divided up to a certain limit.

Such similar properties make it possible to envisage a blockchain 
that allows its participants delegate IP address blocks, similarly to 
how Bitcoin transfers coins. For example, IANA could write a 
transaction allocating addresses to the RIRs, which in turn could 
alocate them to the LIRs, etc. Complex management logic can be 
defined as needed for example, rejecting a transaction that allocates 
of a block of addresses originated by an entity that does not hold 
that block. In addition, transactions accept multiple inputs and 
outputs, i.e. an arbitrary amount of public keys either as senders or 
receivers. This means that it is possible to break and merge blocks 
of addresses as required. Section 5 provides more detailed 
information about this architecture.

4.3. A consensus algorithm for IP addresses

As stated before, the consensus algorithm is a central part of a 
blockchain. The first consensus algorithm designed for blockchain 
was PoW, and it is a common choice for new blockchain 
implementations. However it presents several drawbacks 
(Section 3.3.1) for the IP address scenario.

Using computing power as a means to secure blockchains has been 
proved to work in financial environments. However, the capability to 
add new blocks and the security of the chain itself depends on the 
computing power of the participants, which is not always aligned with 
their interest in the well-being of the blockchain. Depending on the
objectives of the attacker, certain attacks can become profitable. Namely, buying a large quantity of hardware to be able to rewrite the blockchain with false data (e.g., incorrect delegations of IP addresses). This is because the incentives of the participants of the IP addresses blockchain are not linked with their computing power.

In contrast, with Proof of Stake the capability to alter the blockchain remains within it. This aspect is of particular importance in the context of securing IP addresses: it would mean that AS domains holding large blocks of IP addresses are more likely to add blocks. These parties have a reduced incentive in tampering the blockchain because they would suffer the consequences: an insecure Internet. Typically ASes that hold large blocks of IP address space have their business within the Internet and as such, have clear incentives in the correct operation and security of the Internet.

Furthermore, in such blockchain the risk of takeover is reduced compared to PoW, the reason is that accumulating a large amount of IP addresses is typically more complex than accumulating computing power. The risk of takeover is also mitigated compared to other PoS-based blockchains. In this blockchain an attacker would buy tokens from the other parties, who receive a monetary compensation to participate in the attack. However, in a blockchain for IP addresses this would mean buying IP addresses from other parties, who do not have a clear incentive to sell their blocks of addresses to the attacker. Because of this, PoS appears to be a firm candidate for a consensus algorithm in a blockchain for securing IP addresses allocations and delegations.

5. Overview of the architecture

This architecture mimics the hierarchy of IP address allocation present in today’s Internet, with IANA on top of it. All nodes trust IANA’s public key, which writes a genesis transaction assigning all of the address space to itself (figure 3).

```
+-------------------+-----------------+-----------+----------------+
|     IANA    | Signature IANA  |  Allocate | Hash(IANA     |
| Public Key 1 |  Private Key 1  |  0/0      |  Public Key 2) |
+-------------------+-----------------+-----------+----------------+
```

Figure 3.- Genesis transaction
It then begins allocating each block of addresses to the IP address holders. Each transaction allocates part of the address space to the legitimate holder, and the rest of space is given back to IANA using a new keypair (figure 4).

+--------------+-----------------+-----------+----------------+
|              |                 |  Rest of  |   Hash(IANA    |
|    IANA      | Signature IANA  |  space    |  Public Key 3) |
| Public Key 2 | Private Key 2   |  Allocate | Hash(APNIC     |
|              |                 |  1/8      |  Public Key 1) |
|--------------+-----------------+-----------+----------------+

Figure 4.- Example allocation transaction

In turn, all the parties in the hierarchy allocate or delegate address blocks following the current allocation hierarchy. When a party wants to verify the allocation of a block of addresses, it downloads the blockchain and verifies all the blocks and transactions up to the genesis block, for which it has trust. Figure 5 presents an example of allocation of one prefix to each of the RIRs.
Inside the blockchain the typical operations to manage blocks of IP addresses can be defined, such as the delegation of prefixes (figure 6). This helps to enforce the rules of IP addresses management. For instance, since this transaction is marked as a delegation, if the new owner created an allocation transaction it would be rejected by the other nodes, because the parent transaction does not have the privileges to perform it.

Performing a key rollover is simple, because each transaction has its associated public key, and only depends on the previous transaction. In other words, rekeying means changing the public key only in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IANA Public Key 3</th>
<th>Signature IANA Private Key 3</th>
<th>Rest of space</th>
<th>Hash(IANA Public Key 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocate 5/8</td>
<td>Hash(RIPE Public Key 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate 14/8</td>
<td>Hash(APNIC Public Key 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate 23/8</td>
<td>Hash(ARIN Public Key 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate 102/8</td>
<td>Hash(APRINIC Public Key 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate 200/8</td>
<td>Hash(LACNIC Public Key 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.- Example multi-output allocation transaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APNIC Public Key 1</th>
<th>Signature APNIC Private Key 1</th>
<th>Rest of space</th>
<th>Hash(APNIC Public Key 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegate 1.2/16</td>
<td>Hash(ISP A Public Key 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.- Example delegation transaction
holder’s transaction. This can be done adding a new transaction with
the same data but transferring it to a new public key also controlled
by the initial holder (figure 7). This approach lets each entity
decide its rekeying policies independently.

+--------------+-----------------+-----------+----------------+  
|    ISP A     | Signature ISP A | Delegate  |  Hash(ISP A    |
| Public Key 1 |  Private Key 1  | 1.2/16    |  Public Key 2) |
+--------------+-----------------+-----------+----------------+

Figure 7.- Example key rollover of a prefix delegation

It is worth noting that this chain can define as many operations as
required, for instance storing the binding of AS numbers to the IP
prefixes they announce (figure 8).

+--------------+-----------------+-----------+----------------+  
|              |    Signature    | Bind      |                |
|    ISP A     |      ISP A      | 1.2/16    |  Hash(ISP A    |
| Public Key 2 |  Private Key 2  | AS no.    |  Public Key 3) |
|              |                 | 12345     |                |
+--------------+-----------------+-----------+----------------+

Figure 8.- Example binding of AS number to prefix

Additional and more complex operations can be defined if the
management logic requires it. For instance, several signatures (from
different parties) can be required to consider a transaction valid,
etc.

5.1. Pros and cons

In this section we analyze the pros and cons of this architecture
compared to traditional PKI infrastructures:

Advantages:

- Decentralized: No central entity controls the blockchain, it is
  shared among all participants.

- No CAs, CRLs or certificates needed: No digital certificates,
  Certification Authorities or CRLs are needed.
Simplified rekeying: A key rollover can easily be performed by issuing a new transaction allocating the prefixes to a new keypair controlled by the same holder. This process can be performed without involving any third-party.

Censorship-resistant: since the control of a transaction is completely under the holder of the private key, the revocation of IP addresses without the legitimate holder’s permission involves obtaining its private key. Even if the private key of the previous owner was compromised, ownership of the current transaction is still preserved, as opposed to the compromise of a CA’s private key (or a misbehaving CA).

Limited prior trust: It is not required to trust other nodes. However, in PoS it is necessary to periodically authenticate the chain state out-of-band to prevent some attacks.

Simplified management: since CAs are not required, their management overhead is avoided.

Auditable: allocations and delegations can be tracked back in the blockchain to determine if they originate from the legitimate holder.

Drawbacks:

PoS does not rely on strong cryptographic guarantees: As opposed to PKI-based systems that rely on strong and well-established cryptographic mechanisms, PoS-based infrastructures ultimately rely on the good behaviour of the high-stakers.

Costly bootstrapping: When a node is activated it has to download and verify the entire blockchain.

Large storage required: The blockchain grows forever as more blocks are added, blocks cannot be removed.

5.2. Security evaluation

5.2.1. Attacks against a PoS-based consensus algorithm

This section presents a list of the most relevant attacks against a Proof of Stake algorithm and how to mitigate them.
5.2.1.1. Stake grinding

Stake grinding refers to the manipulation of the consensus algorithm in order to progressively obtain more stake, with the goal of signing blocks more frequently with the ultimate goal of taking control of the blockchain. It proceeds as follows: when the attacker has to sign a block, it computes all the possible blocks (varying the data inside them) to find a combination that gives the highest possibility of signing another block in the future. It then signs this block and sends it to the network. This procedure is repeated for all the next signing opportunities. Over time, the attacker will sign more and more blocks until the consensus algorithm will always select the attacker to sign all blocks, thereby having taken control of the blockchain.

To prevent this attack, the source of randomness used to select the signers has to be hard to alter or to predict.

5.2.1.2. Nothing at stake

Nothing at stake is one of the fundamental drawbacks of Proof of Stake and requires careful design based on the incentives of the participants. In common PoS designs, the signers of the new block receive an economical incentive (e.g., Ethereum). However this does not hold in the IP address scenario, since participants should not receive any incentive. The incentive is, as stated before, achieving a consistent view of the IP address space and having a secure Internet.

5.2.1.3. Range attacks

A range attack is performed by creating a fork some blocks back from the tip of the chain. It is conceptually similar to the attack named as ‘Risk of overtaking’ in Section 3.3.1. In this scenario, the attacker has privately fabricated a chain which (according to the consensus algorithm rules) will be selected over the original one. Benefits of this attack include gaining more stake on the blockchain (this attack could be part of a stake grinding attack) or rewriting the transaction history to erase a payment made in the original blockchain.

The simplest solution to this attack is adding a revert limit to the blockchain, forbidding forks going back more than N blocks. This provides a means to solidify the blockchain. However, nodes that have been offline for more than N blocks will need an external source that indicates the correct chain. It has been proposed to do this out of band. This is why a PoS blockchain is not purely trustless and requires a small amount of trust.
5.2.1.4. Lack of participation

Participants in a PoS algorithm will not always sign a block, since they might be offline when they are selected or lack incentives. Because of this, the final fraction of high-stakers that sign blocks can be very different from the full set of high-stakers. The direct consequence of this situation is that the portion of participants that decide what goes into the blockchain can be a small set of nodes. If this participation is low enough, it can leave the control of the blockchain to a small amount of people/oligarchy, thus rising security concerns.

5.2.2. Attacks against the P2P network

This section presents attacks directed towards the underlying P2P network used to exchange information among the participants of the blockchain.

5.2.2.1. DDOS attacks

Since blockchains are inherently based on P2P architectures, they present a higher degree of resistance to DDOS attacks than centralized server architectures, provided that the network has a significant number of participants. In addition, it is always possible to keep an offline copy of the blockchain.

5.2.2.2. Transaction flooding

A special type of DDOS attack consists in creating a large amount of legit transactions that transfer a small amount of tokens (i.e. delegate a lot of small IP prefixes). If the number of transactions is large enough, the addition of new transactions can be significantly delayed because not all of them fit into a single block. The effectiveness of the attack also depends on the throughput of the blockchain (transactions/second). Simple solutions may be to limit the granularity upon which IP addresses can be split. Of course, only the legitimate holder of a large amount of IP address can perform this attack.

5.2.2.3. Routing attacks

The underlying P2P network in blockchains does not typically use any security mechanism, e.g. node authentication or integrity of network protocol messages. This enables potentially disruptive attacks. For example, specially located rogue nodes could drop new transactions, which would block updates on the blockchain and leave legit nodes uncommunicated. The effectiveness of this kind of attacks depends on

how the P2P algorithm selects peers and the topology of the P2P network.

However, the most potentially dangerous attack of this type are network partitions, i.e. isolating a group of nodes from the rest of the network so they cannot communicate each other (e.g., [Apostolaki2017]). The consequence of this attack is that two versions of the blockchain are created, one at each network partition. When the partition disappears and the nodes reconnect one of the two chains will be discarded, causing a service disruption. It is worth noting that Bitcoin has suffered similar attacks [reallrouteattack].

5.2.2.4. Transaction censorship

When a node adds a block it chooses arbitrarily which transactions are added into it, i.e. no specific rules control how transactions are added to a block. This enables a node to selectively add some transactions and intentionally exclude others, with the consequence that some transactions may be never added to the blockchain. In the context of IP addresses, this may be performed by a competing ISP to prevent another ISP from executing a certain modification. Possible solutions revolve around:

- Giving more priority to older transactions (similarly to Bitcoin).
- Punishing nodes that exhibit this kind of behaviour, e.g. removing part of their block of IP addresses or lowering their chance of adding blocks.

6. Other Considerations

6.1. Revocation

Due to the irreversible nature of transactions, once a block of IP addresses has been allocated to an entity it is not possible to modify or remove it, as opposed to CRLs (Certificate Revocation Lists). However, due to operational issues (compromised or lost keys, human mistake, holder misbehaviour, etc) it is critical to provide a way to recover a block of addresses. Moreover, since IP addresses are a finite public good they cannot be lost. Taking into account that a blockchain can enforce any rules its participants agree upon, this section presents some possible approaches to implement revocation, such approaches should not be considered as mutually exclusive. The revocation procedure must be discussed among the community to achieve consensus between the relevant players (IANA, RIRs, ISPs, institutions, etc).
All these mechanisms present different balances of power between the current holder and the entity whose asset is being revoked. Behind all these mechanisms there is a fundamental tradeoff between trusting an upstream provider of the addresses and retaining full control of the block of addresses.

Regardless of the revocation policy and as opposed to traditional PKI systems, each IP prefix delegation only depends on the private key of the holder of such IP block. As such, it does not need to trust a CA or a chain of certificates. Only by means of this private key the IP delegation can be altered.

6.1.1. Expiration time

A simple approach to allow revocation is adding a lease time (i.e, time-to-live) to the blocks of addresses. After the lease ends, the new holder of the address block automatically becomes the previous one, or addresses are transferred to a default holder. As stated before, this revocation procedure should be enforced by the rules of the blockchain, this means that participants would not recognise expired allocations as valid.

6.1.2. Multi-signature transactions

A multi-signature transaction is a transaction that admits more than one authorized signer. In other words, a transaction is considered valid if it has, for instance, 2 out of 5 valid signatures. This way, 3 keys can be lost but with the renaming 2 keys the block of addresses can be recovered. This approach exemplifies the aforementioned tradeoff in trust, since the holder of the block of addresses must trust the owners of the keys participating in the multi-signature transaction.

6.1.3. Revocation transaction

A simpler approach than multi-signature transactions is creating a ‘revocation’ transaction. When a block of address is required to be reassigned without the consent of the current holder, a revocation transaction (specifying the new holder) is inserted in the blockchain. This transaction should be issued either by a consensuated authority or by a disputing entity. The revocation transaction should be resolved by either accepting the revocation transaction automatically when issued by the accepted authority or by means of out-of-band mechanisms when issued by a disputing party.
6.1.4. Out-of-band mechanisms

Disputes regarding transactions can be resolved by means of out-of-band mechanisms, e.g., discussion, court, etc. In order to reflect the decision of this out-of-band mechanism the blockchain must be modified. Since this represents a deviation from the rules, it must be done through a hard blockchain fork. Although cumbersome and complex, this is feasible from a technical standpoint.

6.2. Storage management

The never ending size of the blockchain presents a potential scalability issue. At the time of this writing, mature blockchains like Bitcoin require more than 100 GB of storage. Simply deleting or summarizing old transactions degrades the security of PoW-based chains, since their security relies on the computing power required to generate them. The longer they are, the harder they are to attack.

However, PoS-based chains do not rely on computing power and hence, space-saving strategies do not degrade the security. For instance a simple solution could be to, once the PoS-based chain reaches a certain storage size, summarize a subset of the older transactions. In what follows we overview this strategy:
9.1 Old blockchain

| r0 | r1 | r2 | r3 | r4 |

9.2 Write present state to special reset blocks

| r0 | r1 | r2 | r3 | r4 | 0 | 1 | ...

9.3 Continue working after the reset blocks

Figure 9.- A simple technique to reduce blockchain storage

This approach reduces bootstrapping cost, it is worth noting that this strategy requires trust on the reset blocks, such blocks can be obtained with an out-of-band mechanism (see Section 5.2.1.3 for further information).

6.3. Proof of Networking?

In this section we speculate how one could design an equivalent of Proof-of-Work (PoW) for networks. Conceptually, PoW is a proof of computational resources, can we devise a proof of networking resources? It could be thought that a PoW equivalent may exist in the context of networks, i.e., an equivalent to spending computer cycles in a network. Some resources unique to networks are bandwidth, computation of checksums, number of BGP peers, etc. Hence, we could envisage a blockchain secured by the resources inherent to its participating computer networks. As long as half of the resources were controlled by honest members, security is guaranteed. For example, bandwidth could be a potential candidate; however it does not satisfy two key features present in PoW:
6.4. Configuration parameters

Configuration parameters refer to a set of values:

- Block creation rate
- Maximum block size
- Other parameters related to the consensus algorithm

These parameters, beyond regulating the operation of the blockchain also have an influence on its performance. For example, a small block size increases propagation speed (thus consensus can be reached faster) but reduces the number of transactions per second that the blockchain can handle. As an example, in Bitcoin, the 10-minute block creation rate seeks to balance fast confirmation times and reduced probability of forks [Antonopoulos2015]. Experimental deployments and operational requirements should help tuning such parameters.

7. Security Considerations

This document aims to understand the security implications of using the blockchain technology to secure IP addresses allocation.

8. IANA Considerations

This memo includes no request to IANA.
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1. Introduction

Blockchain [Bitcoin] is attracting a lot of attention among the security community since it provides means for exchanging information among a set of distrusting entities without the use of digital certificates and centralized control. Blockchain provides means for the distrusting parties to reach consensus in a distributed way. Formally, it is regarded as a new solution to the Byzantine Generals problem, well-known in fault-tolerant distributed systems [Byzantine].

Although at the time of this writing the main application of blockchain are financial systems, their use in the field of networking is being explored (e.g., [Hari2016]). Some successful systems exist such as [Blockstack] and [Namecoin], which aim at building a secure naming system, providing a similar functionality to that of DNSSEC.

The main goal of this document is to represent a first step towards the understanding of the properties of blockchains and their applicability in the Internet infrastructure, specifically securing the allocation, delegation and bindings of IP addresses. First, it introduces blockchain, then it analyzes how blockchain could be used to secure the delegation of IP addresses. Finally, it presents an initial design for such an infrastructure. This document also includes a preliminary security analysis of such system. It is important to note that the goal of this document is not to provide a complete architecture that secures IP address allocation, delegation and bindings.

2. Definition of Terms

TBC

3. Blockchain in a nutshell
3.1. Overview

Conceptually, a blockchain is a distributed, secure and trustless database. It can also be regarded as a state machine with rules that clearly state which transitions can be performed. Participants in the blockchain communicate through a P2P network. The smallest data unit of a blockchain is a transaction. Users attach data to a transaction along with its signature and their associated public key. Usually, the attached data is an asset or a token, something that is unique and should not be replicated (e.g., coins in Bitcoin). Then they broadcast this transaction to the other participants. The rest of the nodes in the network temporarily store this transaction. At some fixed intervals in time, one of the nodes takes a set of these transactions and groups them in a block. It then broadcasts this block back to the network. When the other nodes receive this block they verify it, remove the transactions contained in the block from the temporary storage and add it after the previous block, thus creating a chain of blocks. It should be noted that all nodes store the entire blockchain locally. In addition, most blockchains give some sort of reward to nodes that add new blocks, although this is not strictly necessary. Figure 1 presents an overview of the most common elements in a block.

![Figure 1.- Common structure of a block](image)

Two basic mechanisms are used to protect the chained data: a chain of signatures and a consensus algorithm.

3.1.1. Chain of signatures
The chain of signatures operates at transaction level. Consider the sender and receiver of a token, each with its public-private keypair. To change the owner of a token, the sender signs the data and the receiver’s public key. It then puts together its public key, the signature, the data and the hash of the receiver’s public key (Figure 2) to form a transaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sender Public Key</th>
<th>Signature Sender Private Key</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Hash(Receiver Public Key)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 2.- Common transaction structure in a blockchain

In conclusion, the rules of the blockchain enforce that:

- The owner of the receiver private key has total control over the contents of the transaction. In Bitcoin this translates in a central property: only this owner can spend a coin.
- When an owner sends a token to the new owner, it irreversibly transfers the control of the contents to the new owner.

3.1.2. Consensus algorithm

The consensus algorithm is the central part of blockchain and it controls the chaining of data blocks. The main role of the algorithm is to provide a set of well-defined rules so that participants agree on a consistent view of the database. For this it has the following main functions. First, forks (multiple chains) can exist. This may happen for instance due to varying network latency among participants. In this case the participants must agree on which is the valid chain. And second, another important function of the consensus algorithm is to determine which participants are allowed to add new data blocks. Section 3.3 contains more information regarding available consensus algorithms.

It is important to note that regardless of the consensus algorithm, in blockchain data blocks are always added, never deleted nor modified. This creates a tamper-proof, shared ledger among all participants. Transactions can be tracked back by inspecting past blocks, thus enabling the verification of claims by certain parties.
3.2. Features

The following list tries to briefly summarize the main characteristics of the blockchain technology:

Decentralized: No central entity controls the blockchain, it is shared among all participants.

No CAs: No digital certificates, Certification Authorities or CRLs are needed.

Limited prior trust: It is not required to trust other nodes. It is worth noting that some consensus algorithms rely on some limited levels of trust.

Tamper-proof: Since data can be only added but never modified, attempts to alter previous records are detected.

Non-repudiation: All nodes share a common, immutable view on the status of the blockchain, and blockchain provides non-repudiation mechanisms.

Censorship-resistant: Gaining control over a transaction involves having access to the associated private key.

Append-only: Data is always added, but never modified nor deleted.

Privacy: Entities participating in the blockchain can achieve privacy using anonymous keys, i.e. randomly-generated keys not related to their identity. In addition, a new keypair should be generated for each new transaction in order to prevent tracking [Bitcoin], section 10.

Slow updates: New transactions have to be verified, added to a block and received by all nodes. This results in a delay since the transaction is created until it is finally available to all the nodes. This delay will depend on the consensus algorithm and the block creation rate.

Large storage: The size of the blockchain keeps growing forever, because data blocks are always added. This may result in scalability issues.
3.3. Description of consensus algorithms

The two more popular consensus algorithms are: Proof of Work and Proof of Stake.

3.3.1. Proof of Work (PoW)

In Proof of Work nodes have to solve a complex mathematical problem to add a block, requiring some computational effort. This is commonly known as mining. For example, in Bitcoin the problem is to find a hash starting with a fixed amount of zeroes, the only known way to solve this problem is by brute force. The valid chain is the one with most accumulated computing power, this chain is also the more expensive in terms of computing power to modify. This is because modifying a block going N blocks back from the tip of the chain would require redoing the computations for all these N blocks. As a result, an attacker should have more computational power than the power required to create the N blocks to be able to modify the chain. Overall, it is commonly assumed that if more than half of the nodes are honest, the blockchain is considered secure.

PoW offers relevant features, adding new blocks requires an external resource (CPU power) that has an economical cost. However this also results in some relevant drawbacks:

Risk of takeover: The security of PoW is entirely based on computation power. This means that if an entity has access to more than half of the total blockchain's computing power it can control the chain. As a result and in order to keep blockchain secure, the incentive of taking control of the chain must be lower than the cost of acquiring and operating the hardware that provides the equivalent to half of the participants computing power. This is hard to guarantee since the economy of the blockchain and the economy of the required hardware are independent. As an example, an attacker can acquire the required hardware and operate it, take control of the blockchain to obtain an economical benefit and finally sell the hardware to reduce the final cost of the attack.

Hardware dependency: Bitcoin automatically increases -over time- the complexity of the mathematical problem that needs to be solved in order to add a block. This is done to account for Moore's law. As a result, the community has designed mining specific hardware (ASICs) that provides a competitive advantage. In this context blockchain becomes less democratic, since the cost of participating in it increases. On the other hand, several ASIC-resistant algorithms are in use in various cryptocurrencies. This is usually achieved with memory-intensive calculations or
frequently changing the mining algorithm. Although they appear to be a promising alternative, vendors react by developing a silicon implementation of the algorithm. In this situation, the developers usually change the algorithm by means of a hard fork [monero]. Ultimately, this becomes an arms-race.

Energy inefficiency: PoW requires large amounts of energy to perform the computations (e.g., [miningfarm]).

3.3.2. Proof of Stake (PoS)

The main idea behind Proof of Stake is that participants with more assets (or stake) in the blockchain are more likely to add blocks. With this, the control of the chain is given to entities who own more stake. For each new block, a signer is pseudo-randomly selected from the list of participants typically weighted according to their stake. A fundamental assumption behind PoS is that such entities have more incentives for honest behaviour since they have more assets in the chain.

Proof of Stake is seen as an alternative to PoW. At the time of this writing, major players in the blockchain environment (such as [Ethereum]) are preparing a shift towards PoS. Moreover, several blockchains based on PoS already exist (e.g. [Peercoin]). The main reason behind this paradigm shift is that PoS addresses some of PoW’s main drawbacks:

- It does not require special hardware nor computationally or energy-expensive calculations.
- An attacker must get hold of a significant part of the assets in order to gain control of the blockchain. As opposed to PoS the investment required to gain control of the chain lies within the chain, and does not involve using external resources.

On the other side, Proof of Stake introduces new sources of attacks:

- In Proof of Stake the signer is selected randomly among the stakers. In this context attackers can manipulate the source of randomness to sign more blocks and ultimately gain control over the chain.
- As opposed to PoW, creating forks is very inexpensive, since no computational power is required. The PoS must provide means to select the valid chain, which is typically the longer one.
- Collusions of high-stakers can create alternate chains which can appear to be valid.
4. Blockchain for IP addresses

4.1. Problem statement

The objective of this section is to analyze if an infrastructure using blockchain can provide a similar degree of security to traditional PKI-based architectures. Specifically, we aim to secure:

- Binding of IP address blocks to the holder (private key holder).
- The allocations and delegations of IP address blocks among their holders.
- Binding of IP address blocks to their topological locators (e.g., AS numbers allocations).

This information is public and shared among a set of distrusting entities over the Internet. The architecture must be able to:

- Allow anyone to verify the legitimate holder of a block of addresses.
- Let participating entities allocate address blocks without requiring a trusted third party.
- Restrict the allocation of a block of addresses to only its legitimate holder.
- Prevent data modification without the consent of its holder.

4.2. Analysis

The main rationale behind using blockchain to secure IP address allocations is that IPs can be understood as coins, both concepts share some fundamental characteristics:

- They are unambiguously allocated to entities.
- Can be transferred between them.
- Cannot be assigned to two entities at the same time.
- Can be divided up to a certain limit.

Such similar properties make it possible to envisage a blockchain that allows its participants delegate IP address blocks, similarly to how Bitcoin transfers coins. For example, IANA could write a transaction allocating addresses to the RIRs, which in turn could
allocate them to the LIRs, etc. Complex management logic can be defined as needed. (For example, rejecting a transaction that allocates of a block of addresses originated by an entity that does not hold that block.) In addition, transactions accept multiple inputs and outputs, i.e. an arbitrary amount of public keys either as senders or receivers. This means that it is possible to break and merge blocks of addresses as required. Section 5 provides more detailed information about this architecture.

4.3. A consensus algorithm for IP addresses

As stated before, the consensus algorithm is a central part of a blockchain. The first consensus algorithm designed for blockchain was PoW, and it is a common choice for new blockchain implementations. However it presents several drawbacks (Section 3.3.1) for the IP address scenario.

Using computing power as a means to secure blockchains has been proved to work in financial environments. However, the capability to add new blocks and the security of the chain itself depends on the computing power of the participants, which is not always aligned with their interest in the well-being of the blockchain. Depending on the objectives of the attacker, certain attacks can become profitable. Namely, buying a large quantity of hardware to be able to rewrite the blockchain with false data (e.g., incorrect delegations of IP addresses). This is because the incentives of the participants of the IP addresses blockchain are not linked with their computing power.

In contrast, with Proof of Stake the capability to alter the blockchain remains within it. This aspect is of particular importance in the context of securing IP addresses: it would mean that entities holding large blocks of IP addresses are more likely to add blocks. These parties have a reduced incentive in tampering the blockchain because they would suffer the consequences: an insecure Internet. Typically entities that hold large blocks of the IP address space have their business within the Internet and as such, have clear incentives in the correct operation and security of the Internet.

Furthermore, in such blockchain the risk of takeover is reduced compared to PoW. The reason is that accumulating a large amount of IP addresses is typically more complex than accumulating computing power. The risk of takeover is also mitigated compared to other PoS-based blockchains. In this blockchain an attacker would buy tokens from the other parties, who receive a monetary compensation to participate in the attack. However, in a blockchain for IP addresses this would mean buying IP addresses from other parties, who do not
have a clear incentive to sell their blocks of addresses to the attacker. Because of this, PoS appears to be a firm candidate for a consensus algorithm in a blockchain for securing IP addresses allocations and delegations.

5. Overview of the architecture

This architecture mimics the hierarchy of IP address allocation present in today’s Internet, with IANA on top of it. All nodes trust IANA’s public key, which writes a genesis transaction assigning all of the address space to itself (figure 3).

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IANA</th>
<th>Signature IANA</th>
<th>Allocate</th>
<th>Hash(IANA Public Key 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Key 1</td>
<td>Private Key 1</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Figure 3.- Genesis transaction

It then begins allocating each block of addresses to the IP address holders. Each transaction allocates part of the address space to the legitimate holder, and the rest of space is given back to IANA using a new keypair (figure 4).

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IANA</th>
<th>Signature IANA</th>
<th>Rest of space</th>
<th>Hash(IANA Public Key 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Key 2</td>
<td>Private Key 2</td>
<td>Allocate 1/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Figure 4.- Example allocation transaction

In turn, all the parties in the hierarchy allocate or delegate address blocks following the current allocation hierarchy. When a party wants to verify the allocation of a block of addresses, it downloads the blockchain and verifies all the blocks and transactions up to the genesis block, for which it has trust. Figure 5 presents an example of allocation of one prefix to each of the RIRs.
Inside the blockchain the typical operations to manage blocks of IP addresses can be defined, such as the delegation of prefixes (figure 6). This helps to enforce the rules of IP addresses management. For instance, since this transaction is marked as a delegation, if the new owner created an allocation transaction it would be rejected by the other nodes, because the parent transaction does not have the privileges to perform it.

---

**Figure 5.** Example multi-output allocation transaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rest of space</th>
<th>Hash(IANA Public Key 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IANA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Key 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Key 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate 5/8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hash(RIPE Public Key 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate 14/8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hash(APNIC Public Key 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate 23/8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hash(ARIN Public Key 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate 102/8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hash(AFRINIC Public Key 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate 200/8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hash(LACNIC Public Key 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.** Example delegation transaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rest of space</th>
<th>Hash(APNIC Public Key 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>APNIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Key 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Key 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate 1.2/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hash(ISP A Public Key 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Performing a key rollover is simple, because each transaction has its associated public key, and only depends on the previous transaction. In other words, rekeying means changing the public key only in the holder’s transaction. This can be done adding a new transaction with the same data but transferring it to a new public key also controlled by the initial holder (figure 7). This approach lets each entity decide its rekeying policies independently.

| ISP A | Signature ISP A | Delegate | Hash(ISP A Public Key 2) |
|-------|-----------------+-----------+--------------------------|
| Public Key 1 | Private Key 1 | 1.2/16 |                           |

Figure 7.- Example key rollover of a prefix delegation

It is worth noting that this chain can define as many operations as required, for instance storing the binding of AS numbers to the IP prefixes they announce (figure 8).

| ISP A | Signature ISP A | Bind | Hash(ISP A Public Key 3) |
|-------|-----------------+------|--------------------------|
| Public Key 2 | Private Key 2 | 1.2/16 AS no. 12345 |                           |

Figure 8.- Example binding of AS number to prefix

Additional and more complex operations can be defined if the management logic requires it. For instance, several signatures (from different parties) can be required to consider a transaction valid, restrict permissions for customer sub-delegations, etc.

5.1. Support for IPv6 and AS numbers

The allocation and delegation of IPv6 addresses and AS numbers is equivalent to that of IPv4, maintaining the IANA -> RIR -> LIR hierarchy. For example, for IPv6:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IANA v6 Public Key 1</th>
<th>Signature IANA v6 Private Key 1</th>
<th>Allocate 0::/0</th>
<th>Hash(IANA v6 Public Key 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IANA v6 Public Key 2</td>
<td>Signature IANA v6 Private Key 2</td>
<td>Allocate 0020::/3</td>
<td>Hash(IANA v6 Public Key 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IANA v6 Public Key 4</td>
<td>Signature IANA v6 Private Key 2</td>
<td>Allocate 02c00::/12</td>
<td>Hash(AFRINIC v6 Public Key 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRINIC v6 Public Key 1</td>
<td>Signature AFRINIC v6 Private Key 1</td>
<td>Allocate 02c0c::/15</td>
<td>Hash(ISP A v6 Public Key 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9.- IPv6 allocation transactions. From top to bottom: genesis transaction, global unicast allocation, AFRINIC allocation and LIR allocation.

The process is equivalent for AS numbers. Besides, in the context of a multi-signature scheme, it is also possible to ask the holder of the AS number to confirm the binding of its AS number to a particular prefix.

5.2. Pros and cons

In this section we analyze the pros and cons of this architecture compared to traditional PKI infrastructures:
Advantages:

- Decentralized: No central entity controls the blockchain, it is shared among all participants.
- No CAs, CRLs or certificates needed: No digital certificates, Certification Authorities or CRLs are needed.
- Simplified rekeying: A key rollover can easily be performed by issuing a new transaction allocating the prefixes to a new keypair controlled by the same holder. This process can be performed without involving any third-party.
- Censorship-resistant: since the control of a transaction is completely under the holder of the private key, the revocation of IP addresses without the legitimate holder’s permission involves obtaining its private key. Even if the private key of the previous owner was compromised, ownership of the current transaction is still preserved, as opposed to the compromise of a CA’s private key (or a misbehaving CA).
- Limited prior trust: It is not required to trust other nodes. However, in PoS it is necessary to periodically authenticate the chain state out-of-band to prevent some attacks.
- Simplified management: since CAs are not required, their management overhead is avoided.
- Auditable: allocations and delegations can be tracked back in the blockchain to determine if they originate from the legitimate holder.
- Limited legal liability: since users control their private keys, Internet Registries cannot be held legally responsible of their loss. In turn, this can foster the creation of a unified registry instead of the current five. Ultimately, this would ease cross-registry resource transfers.
- No single point of failure: again, due to the fact that each user controls its private key, the compromise of a user’s key does not compromise the entire system. This starkly contrasts with the compromise of a CA, which can potentially invalidate all downstream certificates.
- Simplified state update: PKIs need specific subsystems to update its state (e.g. issue/revoke certificates). On the other hand, in a blockchain all these operations are embedded in it thanks to its transactional nature.
Drawbacks:

- PoS does not rely on strong cryptographic guarantees: As opposed to PKI-based systems that rely on strong and well-established cryptographic mechanisms, PoS-based infrastructures ultimately rely on the good behaviour of the high-stakers.

- Costly bootstrapping: When a node is activated it has to download and verify the entire blockchain.

- Large storage required: The blockchain grows forever as more blocks are added, blocks cannot be removed.

5.3. Security evaluation

5.3.1. Attacks against a PoS-based consensus algorithm

This section presents a list of the most relevant attacks against a Proof of Stake algorithm and how to mitigate them.

5.3.1.1. Stake grinding

Stake grinding refers to the manipulation of the consensus algorithm in order to progressively obtain more stake, with the goal of signing blocks more frequently with the ultimate goal of taking control of the blockchain. It proceeds as follows: when the attacker has to sign a block, it computes all the possible blocks (varying the data inside them) to find a combination that gives the highest possibility of signing another block in the future. It then signs this block and sends it to the network. This procedure is repeated for all the next signing opportunities. Over time, the attacker will sign more and more blocks until the consensus algorithm will always select the attacker to sign all blocks, thereby having taken control of the blockchain.

To prevent this attack, the source of randomness used to select the signers has to be hard to alter or to predict.

5.3.1.2. Nothing at stake

Nothing at stake is one of the fundamental drawbacks of Proof of Stake and requires careful design based on the incentives of the participants. In common PoS designs, the signers of the new block receive an economical incentive (e.g., Ethereum). However this does not hold in the IP address scenario, since participants should not receive any incentive. The incentive is, as stated before, achieving a consistent view of the IP address space and having a secure Internet.
5.3.1.3. Range attacks

A range attack is performed by creating a fork some blocks back from the tip of the chain. It is conceptually similar to the attack named as ‘Risk of takeover’ in Section 3.3.1. In this scenario, the attacker has privately fabricated a chain which (according to the consensus algorithm rules) will be selected over the original one. Benefits of this attack include gaining more stake on the blockchain (this attack could be part of a stake grinding attack) or rewriting the transaction history to erase a payment made in the original blockchain.

The simplest solution to this attack is adding a revert limit to the blockchain, forbidding forks going back more than N blocks. This provides a means to solidify the blockchain. However, nodes that have been offline for more than N blocks will need an external source that indicates the correct chain. It has been proposed to do this out of band. This is why a PoS blockchain is not purely trustless and requires a small amount of trust.

5.3.1.4. Monopolies

A monopoly refers to a single party controlling enough IP addresses so it can sign a significant proportion of new blocks, thus being able to decide which information is written in the chain (e.g., a 51% attack in Bitcoin). However and in this use-case, this is of less concern since parties do not have a clear incentive to alter normal chain operation. In order to successfully launch this attack a party should control more than 50% of the IP blocks, while this is difficult to achieve and participants do not have a clear incentive to sell/give away blocks of IPs, the attacker would also impact its own infrastructure, making the Internet less secure. Section 7.4 contains more details regarding monopolies.

5.3.1.5. Lack of participation

Participants in a PoS algorithm will not always sign a block, since they might be offline when they are selected or lack incentives. Because of this, the final fraction of high-stakers that sign blocks can be very different from the full set of high-stakers. The direct consequence of this situation is that the portion of participants that decide what goes into the blockchain can be a small set of nodes. If this participation is low enough, it can leave the control of the blockchain to a small amount of people/oligarchy, thus rising security concerns.

5.3.2. Attacks against the P2P network
This section presents attacks directed towards the underlying P2P network used to exchange information among the participants of the blockchain.

5.3.2.1. DDOS attacks

Since blockchains are inherently based on P2P architectures, they present a higher degree of resistance to DDOS attacks than centralized server architectures, provided that the network has a significant number of participants. In addition, it is always possible to keep an offline copy of the blockchain.

5.3.2.2. Transaction flooding

A special type of DDOS attack consists in creating a large amount of legit transactions that transfer a small amount of tokens (i.e. delegate a lot of small IP prefixes). If the number of transactions is large enough, the addition of new transactions can be significantly delayed because not all of them fit into a single block. The effectiveness of the attack also depends on the throughput of the blockchain (transactions/second). Simple solutions may be to limit the granularity upon which IP addresses can be split. Of course, only the legitimate holder of a large amount of IP address can perform this attack.

5.3.2.3. Routing attacks

The underlying P2P network in blockchains does not typically use any security mechanism, e.g. node authentication or integrity of network protocol messages. This enables potentially disruptive attacks. For example, specially located rogue nodes could drop new transactions, which would block updates on the blockchain and leave legit nodes uncommunicated. The effectiveness of this kind of attacks depends on how the P2P algorithm selects peers and the topology of the P2P network.

However, the most potentially dangerous attack of this type are network partitions, i.e. isolating a group of nodes from the rest of the network so they cannot communicate each other (e.g., [Apostolaki2017]). The consequence of this attack is that two versions of the blockchain are created, one at each network partition. When the partition disappears and the nodes reconnect one of the two chains will be discarded, causing a service disruption. It is worth noting that Bitcoin has suffered similar attacks [realrouteattack].

5.3.2.4. Transaction censorship
When a node adds a block it chooses arbitrarily which transactions are added into it, i.e. no specific rules control how transactions are added to a block. This enables a node to selectively add some transactions and intentionally exclude others, with the consequence that some transactions may be never added to the blockchain. In the context of IP addresses, this may be performed by a competing ISP to prevent another ISP from executing a certain modification. Possible solutions revolve around:

- Giving more priority to older transactions (similarly to Bitcoin).
- Punishing nodes that exhibit this kind of behaviour, e.g. removing part of their block of IP addresses or lowering their chance of adding blocks.

6. Revocation

Due to the irreversible nature of transactions, once a block of IP addresses has been allocated to an entity it is not possible to modify or remove it, as opposed to CRLs (Certificate Revocation Lists). However, due to operational issues (compromised or lost keys, human mistake, holder misbehaviour, etc) it is critical to provide a way to recover a block of addresses. Moreover, since IP addresses are a finite public good they cannot be lost. Taking into account that a blockchain can enforce any rules its participants agree upon, this section presents some possible approaches to implement revocation, such approaches should not be considered as mutually exclusive. The revocation procedure must be discussed among the community to achieve consensus between the relevant players (IANA, RIRs, ISPs, institutions, etc).

All these mechanisms present different balances of power between the current holder and the entity whose asset is being revoked. Behind all these mechanisms there is a fundamental tradeoff between trusting an upstream provider of the addresses and retaining full control of the block of addresses.

Regardless of the revocation policy and as opposed to traditional PKI systems, each IP prefix delegation only depends on the private key of the holder of such IP block. As such, it does not need to trust a CA or a chain of certificates. Only by means of this private key the IP delegation can be altered.
6.1. Expiration time

A simple approach to allow revocation is adding a lease time (i.e, time-to-live) to the blocks of addresses. After the lease ends, the new holder of the address block automatically becomes the previous one, or addresses are transferred to a default holder. As stated before, this revocation procedure should be enforced by the rules of the blockchain, this means that participants would not recognise expired allocations as valid.

6.2. Multi-signature transactions

A multi-signature transaction is a transaction with more than one associated public key. In other words, a transaction is considered valid if it has, for instance, 2 out of 5 valid signatures. This way, 3 keys can be lost but with the renaming 2 keys the block of addresses can be recovered. This approach exemplifies the aforementioned tradeoff in trust, since the holder of the block of addresses must trust the owners of the keys participating in the multi-signature transaction. For instance, if some of these keys are owned by IANA or an Internet Registry, we can return part of the control over the allocation to them.

6.3. Revocation transaction

A simpler approach than multi-signature transactions is creating a ‘revocation’ transaction. When a block of address is required to be reassigned without the consent of the current holder, a revocation transaction (specifying the new holder) is inserted in the blockchain. This transaction should be issued either by a consensuated authority or by a disputing entity. The revocation transaction should be resolved by either accepting the revocation transaction automatically when issued by the accepted authority or by means of out-of-band mechanisms when issued by a disputing party.

6.4. Heartbeat transaction

Another approach involves issuing a heartbeat transaction every N days, signalling to the network that the holder still owns the key associated with that particular resource. If the holder fails to issue this transaction, the blockchain considers that the resource is automatically returned to the registry.
6.5. Out-of-band mechanisms

Disputes regarding transactions can be resolved by means of out-of-band mechanisms, e.g., discussion, court, etc. In order to reflect the decision of this out-of-band mechanism the blockchain must be modified. Since this represents a deviation from the rules, it must be done through a hard blockchain fork. Although cumbersome and complex, this is feasible from a technical standpoint.

6.6. A simple revocation protocol

Here we present a simple revocation protocol to handle accidental key loss:

1. On detecting the key loss, the holder notifies the registry, e.g. via e-mail.
2. The registry issues a revocation transaction, similar to the one in section Section 6.3.
3. The current holder has a fixed period of time to issue a transaction re-claiming the resource. This transaction must be signed by the private key associated with the claimed resource.
4. If the holder issues the transaction, it retains the resource.
5. Otherwise, after the fixed time interval, the blockchain considers that the resource is returned to the registry, so it can be re-allocated.

This protocol combines two of the aforementioned techniques, and allows to balance power between resource holders and registries. Registries can revoke lost or unclaimed resources, while address holders can retain them if the registry misbehaves or its key is compromised. However, it should be noted that this protocol does not protect from stolen keys.

The time interval can be different depending on the nature of the revoking entity. For example, IANA -> RIR allocations could wait a couple of weeks, whereas RIR -> LIR allocations could go faster with a 72 hours notification period.

7. Other Considerations

7.1. Storage management

The never ending size of the blockchain presents a potential scalability issue. At the time of this writing, mature blockchains
like Bitcoin require more than 100 GB of storage. Simply deleting or summarizing old transactions degrades the security of PoW-based chains, since their security relies on the computing power required to generate them. The longer they are, the harder they are to attack.

However, PoS-based chains do not rely on computing power and hence, space-saving strategies do not degrade the security. For instance a simple solution could be to, once the PoS-based chain reaches a certain storage size, summarize a subset of the older transactions. In what follows we overview this strategy:

9.1 Old blockchain

+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----------------+-----+-----+-----+
|  0  |  1  |  2  |  3  |      .....      |47832|47833|47834|
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----------------+-----+-----+-----+

9.2 Write present state to special reset blocks

+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| 0   | r0  | r1  | r2  | r3  | r4  | 0   | 1   | ... |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+

9.3 Continue working after the reset blocks

Figure 10.- A simple technique to reduce blockchain storage

This approach reduces bootstrapping cost, it is worth noting that this strategy requires trust on the reset blocks, such blocks can be obtained with an out-of-band mechanism (see Section 5.3.1.3 for further information).

7.2. Proof of Networking?
In this section we speculate how one could design an equivalent of Proof-of-Work (PoW) for networks. Conceptually, PoW is a proof of computational resources, can we devise a proof of networking resources? It could be thought that a PoW equivalent may exist in the context of networks, i.e., an equivalent to spending computer cycles in a network. Some resources unique to networks are bandwidth, computation of checksums, number of BGP peers, etc. Hence, we could envisage a blockchain secured by the resources inherent to its participating computer networks. As long as half of the resources were controlled by honest members, security is guaranteed. For example, bandwidth could be a potential candidate; however it does not satisfy two key features present in PoW:

- **Asymmetry:** the proof has to be hard to generate but fast to verify.
- **Verifiability:** it has to be possible to embed the proof in the block in order to account for the spending of resources.

In this context, Proof-of-Networking is an open research issue.

### 7.3. Configuration parameters

Configuration parameters refer to a set of values:

- **Block creation rate**
- **Maximum block size**
- **Other parameters related to the consensus algorithm**

These parameters, beyond regulating the operation of the blockchain also have an influence on its performance. For example, a small block size increases propagation speed (thus consensus can be reached faster) but reduces the number of transactions per second that the blockchain can handle. As an example, in Bitcoin, the 10-minute block creation rate seeks to balance fast confirmation times and reduced probability of forks [Antonopoulos2015]. Experimental deployments and operational requirements should help tuning such parameters.

### 7.4. PoS algorithm design particularities

The particular use case of IP addresses presents some characteristics that the PoS algorithm should take into account:

**Monopoly prevention:** As described in section Section 5.3.1.4, monopolies can pose a threat to a PoS blockchain. In order to
prevent a small number of large-stakers from controlling the chain, we can design the PoS algorithm to have a smart mapping of IP prefixes to the weight of the random selection. A potential solution could be fine-tuning the weighting of IP addresses (slightly biasing the choice towards medium-sized holders), in order to reduce the power of high stakers. This can provide an upper-bound of the maximum number of addresses that a party can hold to avoid monopolies (ideally as high as possible).

IPv6 support: Large parts of the IPv6 address space remain unallocated and still owned by IANA (at the time of writing this document, less than 0.5% of v6 address space has been allocated to the RIRs). The PoS algorithm should ignore this space (not count it) to avoid IANA signing nearly all v6 blocks and thus, preventing an IANA monopoly.

IPv4/v6 stake isolation: Since there are more IPv6 addresses than IPv4, this creates an imbalance of power in a PoS blockchain: randomly selecting from both pools of addresses naturally causes v6 holders signing more blocks than v4 holders. Thus, some kind of isolation between v4 and v6 stake is required. For example, we could alternatively generate blocks with only v4 or v6 transactions, signed by a v4 or v6 holder, respectively.

7.5. Candidate PoS consensus algorithms

There are several existing PoS algorithms that could satisfy the requirements of a blockchain for IP addresses. The following list presents three of them that have been claimed by the authors to be proven mathematically correct. A substantial difference among them is the supported portion of offline participants. The list does not pretend to be exhaustive.

Algorand: [Algorand] leverages a multi-step protocol to provide a verifiable random selection of the block signer. The most relevant features of Algorand are:

* A cryptographic sortition mechanism to randomly select the participants in each step of the protocol, based on Verifiable Random Functions [I-D.irtf-cfrg-vrf].

* The decoupling of block creation and block signing, to avoid stake grinding attacks.

* A new Byzantine Agreement protocol (BA*) to achieve consensus.
* Player replaceability: Algorand uses a different set of participants for each of its steps. Thus, malicious participants from one step cannot influence the following.

* Upper bound of 1/3 of dishonest players.

Ouroboros: [Ouroboros] presents a similar approach to Algorand: first, it selects a subset of users. Then, these users perform the random selection by means of a secure multiparty computation. As opposed to Algorand, however, this subset lasts for several blocks, called epochs. In addition, Ouroboros assumes that the majority of participants are online when they have to participate in the protocol, and that they remain offline only short periods of time.

Snow White: The [SnowWhite] protocol improves on the previous two by supporting also large amounts of offline participants, as long as the majority of online members are honest. They call this property ‘Robustly Reconfigurable Consensus’. Snow White also leverages a random function to decide if a participant has to sign a block, and defines epochs similarly to Ouroboros: after each epoch, participants for the new one are calculated.

7.6. Privacy concerns

In order to protect privacy, the blockchain should not contain Personally Identifiable Information (PII). This is due to the fact that data in the blockchain cannot be removed and that it is a public ledger, accessible by anyone. Instead, PII like contact emails or postal addresses should be stored in the Registry’s database (e.g. RIPE Database). Ideally, the blockchain should contain the minimum amount of data for correct operation, that is: public keys, blocks of IP addresses, AS numbers and their bindings (figure 11).

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+------------------------+-----------------------------+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blockchain</td>
<td>Registry Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs of (Prefix,</td>
<td>&lt;--- Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public key)</td>
<td>prefix, key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+---*Registry Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Contact data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11.- Data flow between Registry and blockchain
```
7.7. Governance

Blockchain does not mean anarchy. In fact, any blockchain requires a governing entity that determines its rules and ensures that all of its participants agree on its operation. The need of governance is illustrated by the recent Bitcoin Cash fork [Bitcoincash]. Due to a disagreement among Bitcoin users, they created a Bitcoin hard fork called Bitcoin Cash. This split the Bitcoin blockchain in two, causing some confusion. Proper governance should avoid such situations.

This particular use case is not an exception: all concerned parties (IANA, RIRs, ISPs, etc) should reach consensus regarding which rules are enforced in the blockchain. For example, dispute resolution or revocation procedures.

8. Implementations

There are several implementations to secure the allocation of IP prefixes. They present different scopes and levels of maturity.

- IPchain uses a Proof of Stake algorithm and is specifically tailored for the allocation of IP addresses. Its performance has been evaluated [IPchain], and has been open-sourced [IPchain-repo].

- [BGPCoin] runs on top of the Ethereum blockchain and provides similar features to IPchain. It has not been possible to find open-source code.

- Another project identically named BGPCoin is designed to allow ISPs to exchange peering agreements and route advertisements by means of a blockchain [BGPCoin-repo]. It uses a hybrid PoW/PoS algorithm and has its own cryptocurrency.

9. Security Considerations

This document aims to understand the security implications of using the blockchain technology to secure IP addresses allocation.

10. IANA Considerations

This memo includes no request to IANA.
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Abstract

This document identifies a need for improvement of the unicast Reverse Path Filtering techniques (uRPF) [BCP84] for source address validation (SAV) [BCP38]. The strict uRPF is inflexible about directionality, the loose uRPF is oblivious to directionality, and the current feasible-path uRPF attempts to strike a balance between the two [BCP84]. However, as shown in this draft, the existing feasible-path uRPF still has short comings. This document describes an enhanced feasible-path uRPF technique, which aims to be more flexible (in a meaningful way) about directionality than the feasible-path uRPF. It can potentially alleviate ISPs’ concerns about the possibility of disrupting service for their customers, and encourage greater deployment of uRPF techniques.
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1. Introduction

This internet draft identifies a need for improvement of the unicast Reverse Path Filtering (uRPF) techniques [RFC2827] for source address validation (SAV) [RFC3704]. The strict uRPF is inflexible about directionality, the loose uRPF is oblivious to directionality, and the current feasible-path uRPF attempts to strike a balance between the two [RFC3704]. However, as shown in this draft, the existing feasible-path uRPF still has short comings. Even with the feasible-path uRPF, ISPs are often apprehensive that they may be dropping customers’ data packets with legitimate source addresses.
This document describes an enhanced feasible-path uRPF technique, which aims to be more flexible (in a meaningful way) about directionality than the feasible-path uRPF. It is based on the principle that if BGP updates for multiple prefixes with the same origin AS were received on different interfaces (at border routers), then incoming data packets with source addresses in any of those prefixes should be accepted on any of those interfaces (presented in Section 3). For some challenging ISP-customer scenarios (see Section 3.3), this document also describes a more relaxed version of the enhanced feasible-path uRPF technique (presented in Section 3.4). Implementation considerations are discussed in Section 3.5.

Note: Definition of Reverse Path Filtering (RPF) list: The list of permissible source address prefixes for incoming data packets on a given interface.

Note: Throughout this document, the routes in consideration are assumed to have been vetted based on prefix filtering [RFC7454] and possibly (in the future) origin validation [RFC6811].

The enhanced feasible-path uRPF methods described here are expected to add greater operational robustness and efficacy to uRPF, while minimizing ISPs’ concerns about accidental service disruption for their customers. It is expected that this will encourage more deployment of uRPF to help realize its DDoS prevention benefits network wide.

1.1. 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. Review of Existing Source Address Validation Techniques

There are various existing techniques for mitigation against DDoS attacks with spoofed addresses [RFC2827] [RFC3704]. There are also some techniques used for mitigating reflection attacks [RRL] [TA14-017A], which are used to amplify the impact in DDoS attacks. Employing a combination of these preventive techniques (as applicable) in enterprise and ISP border routers, broadband and wireless access network, data centers, and DNS servers provides reasonably effective protection against DDoS attacks.

Source address validation (SAV) is performed in network edge devices such as border routers, Cable Modem Termination Systems (CMTS), Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexers (DSLAM), and Packet Data Network (PDN) gateways in mobile networks. Ingress Access Control
List (ACL) and unicast Reverse Path Filtering (uRPF) are techniques employed for implementing SAV [RFC2827] [RFC3704] [ISOC].

2.1. SAV using Access Control List

Ingress/egress Access Control Lists (ACLs) are maintained which list acceptable (or alternatively, unacceptable) prefixes for the source addresses in the incoming Internet Protocol (IP) packets. Any packet with a source address that does not match the filter is dropped. The ACLs for the ingress/egress filters need to be maintained to keep them up to date. Updating the ACLs is an operator driven manual process, and hence operationally difficult or infeasible.

Typically, the egress ACLs in access aggregation devices (e.g. CMTS, DSLAM) permit source addresses only from the address spaces (prefixes) that are associated with the interface on which the customer network is connected. Ingress ACLs are typically deployed on border routers, and drop ingress packets when the source address is spoofed (i.e. belongs to obviously disallowed prefix blocks, RFC 1918 prefixes, or provider’s own prefixes).

2.2. SAV using Strict Unicast Reverse Path Filtering

In the strict unicast Reverse Path Filtering (uRPF) method, an ingress packet at border router is accepted only if the Forwarding Information Base (FIB) contains a prefix that encompasses the source address, and forwarding information for that prefix points back to the interface over which the packet was received. In other words, the reverse path for routing to the source address (if it were used as a destination address) should use the same interface over which the packet was received. It is well known that this method has limitations when networks are multi-homed and there is asymmetric routing of packets. Asymmetric routing occurs (see Figure 1) when a customer AS announces one prefix (P1) to one transit provider (ISP-a) and a different prefix (P2) to another transit provider (ISP-b), but routes data packets with source addresses in the second prefix (P2) to the first transit provider (ISP-a) or vice versa.
Consider data packets received at AS2
(1) from AS1 with source address in P2, or
(2) from AS3 that originated from AS1
with source address in P1:
* Strict uRPF fails
* Feasible-path uRPF fails
* Loose uRPF works (but ineffective in IPv4)
* Enhanced Feasible-path uRPF works best

Figure 1: Scenario 1 for illustration of efficacy of uRPF schemes.

2.3. SAV using Feasible-Path Unicast Reverse Path Filtering

The feasible-path uRPF helps partially overcome the problem
identified with the strict uRPF in the multi-homing case. The
feasible-path uRPF is similar to the strict uRPF, but in addition to
inserting the best-path prefix, additional prefixes from alternative
announced routes are also included in the RPF table. This method
relies on announcements for the same prefixes (albeit some may be
prepended to effect lower preference) propagating to all routers
performing feasible-path uRPF checks. Therefore, in the multi-homing
scenario, if the customer AS announces routes for both prefixes (P1,
P2) to both transit providers (with suitable prepends if needed for
traffic engineering), then the feasible-path uRPF method works (see
Figure 2). It should be mentioned that the feasible-path uRPF works
in this scenario only if customer routes are preferred at AS2 and AS3
over a shorter non-customer route.
Consider data packets received at AS2 via AS3 that originated from AS1 and have source address in P1:

* Feasible-path uRPF works (if customer route to P1 is preferred at AS3 over shorter path)
* Feasible-path uRPF fails (if shorter path to P1 is preferred at AS3 over customer route)
* Loose uRPF works (but ineffective in IPv4)
* Enhanced Feasible-path uRPF works best

Figure 2: Scenario 2 for illustration of efficacy of uRPF schemes.

However, the feasible-path uRPF method has limitations as well. One form of limitation naturally occurs when the recommendation of propagating the same prefixes to all routers is not followed. Another form of limitation can be described as follows. In Scenario 2 (described above, illustrated in Figure 2), it is possible that the second transit provider (ISP-b or AS3) does not propagate the prepended route for prefix P1 to the first transit provider (ISP-a or AS2). This is because AS3’s decision policy permits giving priority to a shorter route to prefix P1 via a peer (AS2) over a longer route learned directly from the customer (AS1). In such a scenario, AS3 would not send any route announcement for prefix P1 to AS2. Then a data packet with source address in prefix P1 that originates from AS1 and traverses via AS3 to AS2 will get dropped at AS2.

2.4. SAV using Loose Unicast Reverse Path Filtering

In the loose unicast Reverse Path Filtering (uRPF) method, an ingress packet at the border router is accepted only if the FIB has one or more prefixes that encompass the source address. That is, a packet is dropped if no route exists in the FIB for the source address. Loose uRPF sacrifices directionality. This method is not effective for prevention of address spoofing since there is little unrouted address space in IPv4. It only drops packets if the spoofed address
is unreachable in the current FIB (e.g. RFC 1918, unallocated, allocated but currently not routed).

3. SAV using Enhanced Feasible-Path uRPF

3.1. Description of the Method

Enhanced feasible-path uRPF adds greater operational robustness and efficacy to existing uRPF methods discussed in Section 2. The technique is based on the principle that if BGP updates for multiple prefixes with the same origin AS were received on different interfaces (at border routers), then incoming data packets with source addresses in any of those prefixes should be accepted on any of those interfaces. It can be best explained with an example as follows:

Let us say, a border router of ISP-A has in its Adj-RIB-Ins [RFC4271]. the set of prefixes {Q1, Q2, Q3} each of which has AS-x as its origin and AS-x is in ISP-A’s customer cone. Further, the border router received a route for prefix Q1 over a customer facing interface, while it learned routes for prefixes Q2 and Q3 from a lateral peer and an upstream transit provider, respectively. In this example scenario, the enhanced feasible-path uRPF method requires Q1, Q2, and Q3 be included in the RPF list for the customer interface in consideration. Loose uRPF (see Section 2.4) is recommended to be applied to the peer and provider interfaces in consideration.

Thus, enhanced feasible-path uRPF defines feasible paths for customer interfaces in a more generalized but precise way (as compared to feasible-path uRPF).

Looking back at Scenarios 1 and 2 (Figure 1 and Figure 2), the enhanced feasible-path uRPF provides comparable or better performance than the other uRPF methods. Scenario 3 (Figure 3) further illustrates the enhanced feasible-path uRPF method with a more concrete example. In this scenario, the focus is on operation of the feasible-path uRPF at ISP4 (AS4). ISP4 learns a route for prefix P1 via a customer-to-provider (C2P) interface from customer ISP2 (AS2). This route for P1 has origin AS1. ISP4 also learns a route for P2 via another C2P interface from customer ISP3 (AS3). Additionally, AS4 learns a route for P3 via a peer-to-peer (p2p) interface from ISP5 (AS5). Routes for all three prefixes have the same origin AS (i.e. AS1). Using the enhanced feasible-path uRPF scheme, given the commonality of the origin AS across the routes for P1, P2 and P3, AS4 includes all of these prefixes to the RPF list for the customer interfaces (from AS2 and AS3).
Consider that data packets (sourced from AS1) may be received at AS4 with source address in P1, P2 or P3 via any of the neighbors (AS2, AS3, AS5):

* Feasible-path uRPF fails
* Loose uRPF works (but not desirable)
* Enhanced Feasible-path uRPF works best

Figure 3: Scenario 3 for illustration of efficacy of uRPF schemes.

3.1.1. Algorithm A: Enhanced Feasible-Path uRPF

The underlying algorithm in the solution method described above can be specified as follows (to be implemented in a transit AS):

1. Create the list of unique origin ASes considering only the routes in the Adj-RIB-Ins of customer interfaces. Call it Set A = {AS1, AS2, ..., ASn}.

2. Considering all routes in Adj-RIB-Ins for all interfaces (customer, lateral peer, and provider), form the set of unique prefixes that have a common origin AS1. Call it Set X1.

3. Include set X1 in Reverse Path Filter (RPF) list on all customer interfaces on which one or more of the prefixes in set X1 were received.
4. Repeat Steps 2 and 3 for each of the remaining ASes in Set A (i.e., for ASi, where i = 2, ..., n).

3.2. Operational Recommendations

The following operational recommendations will make the operation of the enhanced feasible-path uRPF robust:

For multi-homed stub AS:

- A multi-homed stub AS SHOULD announce at least one of the prefixes it originates to each of its transit provider ASes.

For non-stub AS:

- A non-stub AS SHOULD also announce at least one of the prefixes it originates to each of its transit provider ASes.
- Additionally, from the routes it has learned from customers, a non-stub AS SHOULD announce at least one route per origin AS to each of its transit provider ASes.

(Note: It is worth noting that in the above recommendations if "at least one" is replaced with "all", then even traditional feasible-path uRPF will work as effectively.)

3.3. A Challenging Scenario

It should be observed that in the absence of ASes adhering the above recommendations, the following example scenario may be constructed which poses a challenge for the enhanced feasible-path uRPF (as well as for traditional feasible-path uRPF). In the scenario illustrated in Figure 4, since routes for neither P1 nor P2 are propagated on the AS2-AS4 interface, the enhanced feasible-path uRPF at AS4 will reject data packets received on that interface with source addresses in P1 or P2.
3.4. Algorithm B: Enhanced Feasible-Path uRPF with Additional Flexibility Across Customer Cone

Adding further flexibility to the enhanced feasible-path uRPF method can help address the potential limitation identified above using the scenario in Figure 4 (Section 3.3). In the following, "route" refers to a route currently existing in the Adj-RIB-in. Including the additional degree of flexibility, the modified algorithm (implemented in a transit AS) can be described as follows (we call this Algorithm B):

1. Create the set of all directly-connected customer interfaces. Call it Set I = {I1, I2, ..., Ik}.

2. Create the set of all unique prefixes for which routes exist in Adj-RIB-Ins for the interfaces in Set I. Call it Set P = {P1, P2, ..., Pm}.

3. Create the set of all unique origin ASes seen in the routes that exist in Adj-RIB-Ins for the interfaces in Set I. Call it Set A = {AS1, AS2, ..., ASn}.

4. Create the set of all unique prefixes for which routes exist in Adj-RIB-Ins of all lateral peer and provider interfaces such that

---

Figure 4: Illustration of a challenging scenario.
each of the routes has its origin AS belonging in Set A. Call it Set Q = {Q1, Q2, ..., Qj}.

5. Then, Set Z = Union(P, Q) represents the RPF list for every customer interface in Set I.

6. Apply loose uRPF method for SAV on all peer and provider interfaces.

When Algorithm B (which is more flexible than Algorithm A) is employed, the type of limitation identified in Figure 4 (Section 3.3) goes away.

3.5. Implementation Considerations

The existing RPF checks in edge routers take advantage of existing line card implementations to perform the RPF functions. For implementation of the enhanced feasible-path uRPF, the general necessary feature would be to extend the line cards to take arbitrary RPF lists that are not necessarily the same as the existing FIB contents. In the algorithms (Section 3.1.1 and Section 3.4) described here, the RPF lists are constructed by applying a set of rules to all received BGP routes (not just those selected as best path and installed in FIB).

3.5.1. Impact on FIB Memory Size Requirement

The techniques described here require that there should be FIB memory (i.e., TCAM) available to store the RPF lists in line cards. For an ISP’s AS, the RPF list size for each line card will roughly and conservatively equal the total number of prefixes in its customer cone (assuming the algorithm in Section 3.4 is used). (Note: Most ISP customer cone scenarios would not require the algorithm in Section 3.4, but instead be served best by the algorithm in Section 3.1.1, which requires much less FIB memory.) The following table shows the measured customer cone sizes for various types of ISPs [sriram-ripe63]:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of ISP</th>
<th>Measured Customer Cone Size in # Prefixes (in turn this is an estimate for RPF list size on line card)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Large Global ISP</td>
<td>32392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Large Global ISP</td>
<td>29528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Global ISP</td>
<td>20038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-size Global ISP</td>
<td>8661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional ISP (in Asia)</td>
<td>1101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Customer cone sizes (# prefixes) for various types of ISPs.

For some super large global ISPs that are at the core of the Internet, the customer cone size (# prefixes) can be as high as a few hundred thousand [CAIDA]. But uRPF is most effective when deployed at ASes at the edges of the Internet where the customer cone sizes are smaller as shown in Table 1.

A very large global ISP’s router line card is likely to have a FIB size large enough to accommodate 2 to 6 million routes [cisco1]. Similarly, the line cards in routers corresponding to a large global ISP, a mid-size global ISP, and a regional ISP are likely to have FIB sizes large enough to accommodate about 1 million, 0.5 million, and 100K routes, respectively [cisco2]. Comparing these FIB size numbers with the corresponding RPF list size numbers in Table 1, it can be surmised that the conservatively estimated RPF list size is only a small fraction of the anticipated FIB memory size under relevant ISP scenarios.

3.6. Summary of Recommendations

Depending on the scenario, an ISP or enterprise AS operator should follow one of the following recommendations concerning uRPF/SAV:

1. For directly connected networks, i.e., subnets directly connected to the AS and not multi-homed, the AS in consideration SHOULD perform ACL-based SAV.

2. For a directly connected single-homed stub AS (customer), the AS in consideration SHOULD perform SAV based on the strict uRPF method.
3. For all other scenarios:

* If the scenario does not involve complexity such as NO_EXPORT of routes (see Section 3.3, Figure 4), then the enhanced feasible-path uRPF method in Algorithm A (see Section 3.1.1) SHOULD be applied.

* Else, if the scenario involves the aforementioned complexity, then the enhanced feasible-path uRPF method in Algorithm B (see Section 3.4) SHOULD be applied.

4. Security Considerations

The security considerations in BCP 38 [RFC2827] and BCP 84 [RFC3704] apply for this document as well. In addition, AS operator should apply the uRPF method that performs best (i.e., with zero or insignificant possibility of dropping legitimate data packets) for the type of peer (customer, provider, etc.) and the nature of customer cone scenario that apply (see Section 3.1.1 and Section 3.4).

5. IANA Considerations

This document does not request new capabilities or attributes. It does not create any new IANA registries.
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