



I GMP Security Problem Statement and Requirements

Brian Coan, Telcordia
Haixiang He, Nortel
Brian Weis, Cisco



Outline

- Describe attacks against IGMP
- Outline goals for securing IGMP
- Identify requirements which meet these goals
- Propose an execution plan for GSEC WG



IGMP Attacks

- Local Subnet Attacks
 - IGMPv3 specification has a very good summary
 - Local attacks can cause problems to hosts and routers
 - Waste subnet bandwidth as well as hosts and routers' resources
 - This is a message authentication issue



IGMP Attacks

- Subnet Attack Types
 - Off subnet attacks: use router alert mechanism and/or forwarding restriction proposed in IGMPv3
 - Local subnet IGMP message attacks: authenticate local IGMP messages
 - Packet flooding attacks: outside the scope of IGMP security



IGMP Attacks

- Internet Multicast Infrastructure Attacks
 - Pull multicast distribution tree all the way from the branch point to the subnet
 - Create useless routing or forwarding states even if there is no traffic
 - Waste bandwidth and router resources
 - Leak multicast traffic (even encrypted) in some scenarios
 - This is an access control (authorization) issue



IGMP Attacks

- Intra-domain attacks
 - Receivers and senders are in the same domain.
 - Easy to enforce access control and prevent the attack.
- Inter-domain attacks
 - Receivers and senders are NOT in the same domains
 - Multicast tree can cross receivers' domain, senders' domain and transit domains
 - Access control is not easy and may require routing protocol participation



Where Secure IGMP Fits

- Big Picture
 - End-to-end crypto
 - Secure multicast routing protocol
 - Secure IGMP
- Secure multicast routing protocol alone or secure IGMP alone is not enough. Both should be secure.



Overall Goals

- Define mechanisms to ensure that
 - the extension of a multicast distribution tree to a given subnet can be initiated only by the request of a currently authorized receiver on that subnet
 - only authorized receivers on the subnet can keep the multicast distribution tree current
 - only currently authorized senders are able to introduce data packets onto a multicast distribution tree



Requirement: Local Subnet Protection

- Solution should consider the benefit vs. cost since local attacks are comparatively easy to trace
- Should consider the protections proposed in IGMPv3 specification
- Should also maintain the multicast model as much as possible



Requirement: Sender Authorization

- In the current multicast model, a sender does not need IGMP to send multicast packet
- A router also does not need IGMP to forward the multicast packet
- A protocol SIMILAR to IGMP can be used to do sender authorization
- This issue will be addressed separately



Requirement: Protect Multicast Infrastructure

- Goal: protect the IGMP states maintained by the edge routers
- Why: IGMP States are
 - used to trigger the multicast routing protocol that may cause
 - the delivery of traffic to edge router
 - the creation of upstream routing and forwarding states
 - used to forward traffic downstream

Requirement: Protect Multicast Infrastructure (cont.)

- One authorized (S,G) or (G) subscription within a subnet is enough
- Several levels of authorization are possible:
 - (S,G): A particular source in a particular group
 - (*,G): Any source in a particular group
 - (S, *): A particular source in any group
 - (*, *): Any source in any group
- Intra-domain can be the first step, but Inter-domain issue needs to be addressed by a solution
 - Multiple solutions are possible
 - We will address it in requirement draft



Requirement: Minimality

- Solution must be light-weighted and scalable
- Solution should maintain the multicast model as much as possible
- Solution should minimize the introduction of using new functions

Requirement: Least affect on IGMPv3

- No new requirement that multicast senders participate in IGMP
- Solution is specific to IPv4 (IPv6 is sufficiently different as to warrant a separate analysis)
- IGMPv3 must initially be supported due to popularity of SSM
 - Solution may be implemented based on IGMPv3
 - IGMPv2/v1 can be the next step if they are really matter, but a new mechanism would be required
 - Implementations are allowed to ignore IGMPv2/v1 messages
- The use of IGMP Proxying will not be precluded.

Requirement: Integrity of Messages



- Integrity of IGMPv3 messages is required, preferably with source authentication.
- Confidentiality of IGMPv3 messages is not a requirement -- for either query or report messages
 - IGMP subscriptions can be encrypted but some features such as IGMP switch snooping that can be broken should be considered in a solution



Requirement: Authentication & Authorization

- Receivers and routers may be both authenticated (validation of identity) and authorized (validation of current authority to participate)
 - The granularity of authorization supported will be for an individual receiver to obtain an individual sender's packets from an individual group



Requirement: Key Management Choices

- Both manual and server-based establishment of security associations must be permitted



Requirement: Containment of IGMP messages

- Defenses must be provided against IGMP messages launched from off the subnet as proposed in IGMPv3
 - A router must not forward IGMP queries to another subnet
 - A router must not forward IGMP membership reports
 - A router must not act on IGMP membership reports which do not have a source IP address which belongs to the subnet of the received interface



Proposed GSEC Execution Plan

- Write a draft outlining IGMP security requirements
- Propose receiver authentication and authorization mechanisms based on IGMPv3
- Implement sender authentication mechanisms using another approach, TBD later
 - May be implemented as extension to individual multicasting routing protocols
 - May be accomplished by requiring that all senders use secure IGMP to join a group before they being sending to that group