What is Routing Security?

- Bad guys play games with routing protocols.
- Traffic is diverted.
  - Enemy can see the traffic.
  - Enemy can easily modify the traffic.
  - Enemy can drop the traffic.
- Cryptography can mitigate the effects, but not stop them.

History of Routing Security

- Bellovin’s “Security Problems in the TCP/IP Protocol Suite”.
- More work starting around 1996.
- Kent et al., 2000 (two papers).

Why So Little Work?

- It’s a really hard problem.
- Actually, getting routing to work well is hard enough.
- It’s outside the scope of traditional communications security.
How is it Different?

- Most communications security failures happen because of buggy code or broken protocols.
- Routing security failures happen despite good code and functioning protocols. The problem is a dishonest participant.
- Hop-by-hop authentication isn't sufficient.

Routing Protocols

- Routers speak to each other.
- They exchange topology information and cost information.
- Each router calculates the shortest path to each destination.
- Routers forward packets along locally shortest path.
- Attacker can lie to other routers.

The Enemy's Goal?

- But how can this happen?

Normal Behavior

- Routers speak to each other.
- They exchange topology information and cost information.
- Each router calculates the shortest path to each destination.
- Routers forward packets along locally shortest path.
- Attacker can lie to other routers.
**But Z Can Lie**

**Why is the Problem Hard?**

- X has no knowledge of Z’s real connectivity.
- Even Y has no such knowledge.
- The problem isn’t the link from X to Z; the problem is the information being sent. (Note that Z might be deceived by some other neighbor Q.)

**Routing in the Internet**

- Two types, internal and external routing.
- Internal (within ISP, company): primarily OSPF.
- External (between ISPs, and some customers): BGP.
- Topology matters.
OSPF (Open Shortest Path First)

- Each node announces its own connectivity. Announcement includes link cost.
- Each node re-announces all information received from peers.
- Every node learns the full map of the network.
- Each node calculates the shortest path to all destinations.
- Note: limited to a few thousand nodes at most.

Characteristics of Internal Networks

- Common management.
- Common agreement on cost metrics.
- Companies have less rich topologies, but less controlled networks.
- ISPs have very rich—but very specialized—topologies, but well-controlled networks.
- Often based on Ethernet and its descendants.

How Do You Secure OSPF?

- Simple link security is hard: multiple-access net.
- Shared secrets guard against new machines being plugged in, but not against an authorized party being dishonest.
- Solution: digitally sign each routing update (expensive!). List authorizations in certificate.
- Experimental RFC by Murphy et al., 1997.
- Note: everyone sees the whole map; monitoring station can note discrepancies from reality. (But bad guys can send out different announcements in different directions.)

Address Authorization Certificate

- Each router has certain interfaces and hence direct network reachability.
- Each router therefore has a certificate binding its public key to its valid addresses.
- Note well: the CA has to know the proper addresses for each router.
- But that's the norm in OSPF environments.
External Routing via BGP

- No common management (hence no metrics beyond hop count).
- No shared trust.
- Policy considerations: by intent, not all paths are actually usable.

Noteworthy Points

- A lot of attention to redundancy.
- Rarely-used links (i.e., R1→R2)
  Link cost must be carefully chosen to avoid external hops.
- May have intermediate level of routers to handle fan-out.
InterISP Routing

**Path Vectors**

- Route advertisements contain a prefix and a list of ASs to traverse to reach that prefix.
- Example: if B owns address block 10.0/16, L would see \( \langle 10.0/16, \{Y,X,W,B\} \rangle \).
- ASs do not see paths filtered by upstream nodes. Y sees \( \langle 10.0/16, \{X,W,B\} \rangle \) and \( \langle 10.0/16, \{Z,W,B\} \rangle \); since only forwards the former to L, L knows nothing of the path via Z.

**Policies**

- ISPs have a great deal of freedom when choosing the “best” path.
- While hop count is one metric, local policies (i.e., for traffic engineering) count more.
- These policies — in general, not disclosed publicly — affect with path neighbors will see.

**Routing Security**

- “Tier 1” ISPs are peers, and freely exchange traffic.
- Small ISPs buy service from big ISPs.
- Different grades of service: link L-Z is for customer access, not transit. C→B goes via L-Y-X-W, not L-Z-W.
- A is multi-homed, but W-A-Z is not a legal path, even for backup.
- BGP is distance vector, based on ISP hops. Announcement is full path to origin, not just metric.

**Routing Protocols**

- Problems with BGP Certificate Issuance Certificate Tree Authorization Certificates Signed Origin BGP Problems with SOBGP Happy Packets Link-Cutting Attack (Bellovin and Gansner) Defenses Conclusions

**Routing in the Internet**


**Inter-ISP Routing**


**Path Vectors**

- Route advertisements contain a prefix and a list of ASs to traverse to reach that prefix.
- Example: if B owns address block 10.0/16, L would see \( \langle 10.0/16, \{Y,X,W,B\} \rangle \).
- ASs do not see paths filtered by upstream nodes. Y sees \( \langle 10.0/16, \{X,W,B\} \rangle \) and \( \langle 10.0/16, \{Z,W,B\} \rangle \); since only forwards the former to L, L knows nothing of the path via Z.

**Policies**

- ISPs have a great deal of freedom when choosing the “best” path.
- While hop count is one metric, local policies (i.e., for traffic engineering) count more.
- These policies — in general, not disclosed publicly — affect with path neighbors will see.
Long Prefixes and Loop-Free Routing

- Routers ignore advertisements with their own AS number in the path
- This is essential to provide loop-free paths
- Routers use longest match on prefixes when calculating a path
- These two facts can be combined to form an attack

Filtering

- ISPs can filter route advertisements from their customers.
- Doesn’t always happen: AS7007 incident, spammers, etc.
- Not feasible at peering links.

Longer Prefix Attack

- Suppose B owns 10.0/16. Z sees (10.0/16, \{W,B\})
- A advertises (10.0.0/17, \{A,W\})
- Z will route packets for 10.0.0/17 to A — it has a longer prefix
- W will never see that path, and hence won’t pass it to B — the path (falsely) contains W, so it will be rejected by W

Secure BGP (Kent et al.)

- Each node signs its announcements.
- That is, X will send \{W\}_X, \{Y\}_X, \{Z\}_X.
- W will send \{B\}_W, \{A\}_W, \{X\}_W, \{X : \{Z\}\}_W.
- Chain of accountability.
Problems with SBGP

- Lots of digital signatures to calculate and verify.
  - Can use cache
  - Verification can be delayed
- Calculation expense is greatest when topology is changing—i.e., just when you want rapid recovery. (About 120K routes...)
- How to deal with route aggregation?
- What about secure route withdrawals when link or node fails?
- Dirty data on address ownership.

Certificate Tree

- The RIRs (Regional Internet Registries) give addresses to big ISPs and big end users
- Accordingly, the RIRs should issue certificates
  (Really, it should be ICANN, but the politics of that are too painful)
- Small ISPs and small customers get address space from their own ISPs
- Every ISP is thus a certificate holder and a certificate issuer
- These are authorization certificates, not identity certificates

Certificate Issuance

- Who issues prefix ownership certificates?
- Address space comes from upstream ISP or RIRs
- RIRs really are authoritative — hence they're a monopoly
- If an RIR makes a mistake, the prefix is off the air
- Is this a risk worth taking?

Authorization Certificates

- The identity of the certificate holder is irrelevant
- What matters is the authorization: the certificate contains IP address ranges
- The signing party has its own certificate listing larger ranges of IP addresses, and hence the right to delegate them
**Signed Origin BGP**

- Suppose only the origin was digitally signed: \(10.0/16, B\)
- In addition, all policies are (securely) published in some database
- Receiving node verifies origin, then compares received path against all policies
- Query: is the received path consistent with policies?
- Advantage: many fewer signatures

**Happy Packets**

- Philosophy: don’t worry too much about routing security
- Crucial metric: do packets reach their destination?
- What about confidentiality? If it matters, encrypt end-to-end
- But what about traffic analysis?

**Problems with SOBGP**

- Sill have monopoly RIRs
- ISPs don’t like to publish policies
- Clever attackers can play games in the middle of the path

**Link-Cutting Attack (Bellovin and Gansner)**

- Suppose that we have SBGP and SOSP
d- Suppose the enemy controls a few links or nodes. Can he or she force traffic to traverse those paths?
- Yes...
Is Link-Cutting Feasible?

- Attacker must have network map. Easy for OSPF; probably doable for BGP—see “Rocketfuel” paper.
- Can attacker determine peering policy? Unclear.
- How can links be cut? Backhoes? “Ping of death”? DDoS attack on link bandwidth?

Sample Link-Cutting Attack

Cost of Link-Cutting Attacks on the Backbone

Defenses

- Hard to defend against—routing protocols are doing what they’re supposed to!
- Keeping attacker from learning the map is probably infeasible.
- Feed routing data into IDS?
- Link-level restoration is a good choice, but can be expensive.
- Others?
Conclusions

- Routing security is a major challenge.
- Mentioned specifically in White House Cybersecurity document.
- Lots of room for new ideas.