

General Source Address Validation Capabilities

[draft-huang-savnet-sav-table-03](#)

M. Huang, W. Cheng, D. Li, N. Geng, M. Liu, L. Chen, C. Lin

Nov 2023

Limitations of Existing SAV Capabilities

□ Application Scenario Limitations

◆ uRPF. FIB-based

- **Strict mode.** For closed-connected interfaces, but **not applicable to asymmetric routing scenarios**, which exists in various scenarios, e.g. intra/inter-domain multi-homing access, inter-domain interconnection etc.
- Loose mode. only for unannounced prefix, massive false negatives

◆ ACL-based source filtering. Not dedicatedly designed for source prefix filtering

- **Performance and scalability issue** due to long-key based lookup
- Usually expert **maintenance efforts** required

◆ More focus on outbound filtering, **the capabilities are limited for open-connected interface protection**

□ Lack of Flexible Traffic Handling Policy Application of Validation Results

- ◆ Current common practices **just silently drop the spoofed packets**, we don't know who benefits from this and who is the attack source

Root Cause: No tools specifically designed for source address filtering
--the capabilities of current tools are derived from other functions, e.g. FIB, ACL

General Modes for Various Scenarios

- ❑ **Closed-connected scenarios** -- be able to collect complete list of source prefixes
 - ◆ **Mode 1-- interface-based source prefix allowlist**
 - Only listed source prefixes are allowed coming into the interface
 - Most preferred mode, mutually exclusive with other 2 modes
 - uRPF strict mode belongs to this mode. However, to overcome the limitation of asymmetric routing, **native-source prefix based SAV rule is suggested. This is essential for new SAV architectures** like EFP-uRPF(RFC8704), BAR-SAV, Intra-domain/Inter-domain SAVNET etc.

- ❑ **For open-connected scenarios** – not be able to collect complete list of source prefixes
 - ◆ **Mode 2-- interface-based source prefix blocklist**
 - Block specific source prefixes coming into the interface
 - The list can be **generated automatically**, e.g. one of Intra-domain SAVNET architecture cases, blocking the incoming traffic with local source prefixes.
 - Or operators can **configure the specific source prefixes** to block from the interface. This is similar to ACL, but more native SAV rule expression with better performance and scalability
 - ◆ **Mode 3-- prefix-based interface allowlist/blocklist**
 - This mode works in a router global level. For a given source prefix, the traffic only be allowed coming in through the specific interface list
 - Operators can **configure the allowed interface list for a specific source prefix**, to prevent DDoS attack related to this source prefix
 - Or the allowed interface list for specific prefixes can be **generated automatically**, e.g. one capability defined by Inter-domain SAVNET architecture

Flexible Traffic Handling Policies

□ **Traffic Control Policies.** One and only one of the policies must be chosen for an “invalid” validation result.

- ◆ Discard.

- ◆ Permit. This could be chosen for tentative SAV rule configuration mainly for monitoring purpose

- ◆ Rate Limit. This could be chosen while volumetric attacks happen

- ◆ Redirect. Traffic will be redirected to scrubbing center etc.

- ◆

□ **Traffic Monitor Policies.** These policies are options.

- ◆ Sample. NetStream/Netflow could be applied to the “invalid” traffic for threat awareness and further analysis

- ◆

Summary

- To achieve better source address validation, **we need dedicated source prefix based rules rather than those are derived from other functions**, e.g. FIB, ACL.
 - ◆ Asymmetric routing challenge for closed-connected scenarios interface-based source prefix allowlist
 - ◆ Enhance the source filtering capabilities for open-connected scenarios, i.e. Interface-based source prefix blacklist and source-prefix-based interface allowlist
- To encourage operators deploy SAV, **we need more policies for flexible traffic handling, visibility, analysis and mitigation closed-loop**, rather than just silently dropping.
- Adoption?

Thanks!