

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: October 7, 2017

R. Bush
IIJ Lab / Dragon Research Lab
S. Turner
sn3rd
K. Patel
Arrcus, Inc.
April 5, 2017

Router Keying for BGPsec
draft-ietf-sidr-rtr-keying-13

Abstract

BGPsec-speaking routers are provisioned with private keys in order to sign BGPsec announcements. The corresponding public keys are published in the global Resource Public Key Infrastructure, enabling verification of BGPsec messages. This document describes two methods of generating the public-private key-pairs: router-driven and operator-driven.

Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119 [RFC2119] only when they appear in all upper case. They may also appear in lower or mixed case as English words, without normative meaning.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on January 16, 2017.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2017 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Management / Router Communication	3
3. Exchanging Certificates	4
4. Set-Up	4
5. PKCS#10 Generation	4
5.1. Router-Generated Keys	4
5.2. Operator-Generated Keys	5
6. Installing Certified Keys	5
7. Advanced Deployment Scenarios	6
8. Key Management	7
8.1. Key Validity	8
8.2. Key Roll-Over	8
7.3. Key Revocation	9
8.4. Router Replacement	9
9. Security Considerations	10
10. IANA Considerations	11
11. References	11
11.1. Normative References	11
11.1. Informative References	12
Appendix A. Management/Router Channel Security	14
Appendix B. The n00b Guide to BGPsec Key Management	14
Authors' Addresses	17

1. Introduction

BGPsec-speaking routers are provisioned with private keys, which allow them to digitally sign BGPsec announcements. To verify the signature, the public key, in the form of a certificate [I-D.ietf-sidr-bgpsec-pki-profiles], is published in the Resource Public Key Infrastructure (RPKI). This document describes provisioning of

BGPsec-speaking routers with the appropriate public-private key-pairs. There are two sub-methods, router-driven and operator-driven.

These two sub-methods differ in where the keys are generated: on the router in the router-driven method, and elsewhere in the operator-driven method. Routers are required to support at least one of the methods in order to work in various deployment environments. Some routers may not allow the private key to be off-loaded while others may. While off-loading private keys would ease swapping of routing engines, exposure of private keys is a well known security risk.

In the operator-driven method, the operator generates the private/public key-pair and sends it to the router, perhaps in a PKCS#8

[ob] "perhaps" As implementer, this is somewhat confusing.
package [RFC5958].

In the router-driven method, the router generates its own public/private key-pair.

[ob] End the sentence here

[ob] ----- The paragraph below contains too much detail for the introduction private key-pair, uses the private key to sign a PKCS#10 certification request [I-D.ietf-sidr-bgpsec-pki-profiles], which includes the public key), and returns the certification request to the operator to be forwarded to the RPKI Certification Authority (CA). The CA returns a PKCS#7, which includes the certified public key in the form of a certificate, to the operator for loading into the router; and the CA also publishes the certificate in the RPKI.

[ob] -----

The router-driven model mirrors the model used by traditional PKI subscribers; the private key never leaves trusted storage (e.g., Hardware Security Module). This is by design and supports classic PKI Certification Policies for (often human) subscribers which require the private key only ever be controlled by the subscriber to ensure that no one can impersonate the subscriber. For non-humans, this model does not always work. For example, when an operator wants to support hot-swappable routers the same private key needs to be installed in the soon-to-be online router that was used by the the soon-to-be offline router. This motivated the operator-driven model.

The remainder of this document describes how operators can use the two methods to provision new and existing routers. The methods described involve the operator configuring the two end points and acting as the intermediary. Section 7 describes a method that requires more capable routers.

Useful References: [I-D.ietf-sidr-bgpsec-protocol] describes gritty

[ob] Useful References: [RFC 8205] describes the BGPsec protocol details, [I-D.ietf-sidr-bgpsec-pki-profiles] specifies the format for [ob] details, [RFC 8209] specifies the format for the PKCS #10 request, and [I-D.ietf-sidr-bgpsec-algs] specifies the [ob] the PKCS #10 request, and [RFC 8208] specifies the algorithms used to generate the signature.

2. Management / Router Communication

Bush, et al. Expires October 7, 2017 [Page 3]

Internet-Draft Router Keying for BGPsec April 5, 2017

Operators are free to use either the router-driven or operator-driven method as supported by the platform. Regardless of the method chosen, operators first establish a secure communication channel between the management system and the router. How this channel is established is router-specific and is beyond scope of this document. Though other configuration mechanisms might be used, e.g. NetConf (see [RFC6470]); for simplicity, in this document, the communication channel between the management platform and the router is assumed to be an SSH-protected CLI. See Appendix A for security considerations for this channel.

3. Exchanging Certificates

The operator management station can exchange certificate requests and certificates with routers and with the RPKI CA infrastructure using the application/pkcs10 media type [RFC5967] and application/pkcs7-mime [RFC5751], respectively, and may use FTP or HTTP per [RFC2585], or the Enrollment over Secure Transport (EST) [RFC7030].

[ob] Maybe more than one sentences make it clearer. Not easy to
[ob] understand.

4. Set-Up

To start, the operator uses the communication channel to install the appropriate RPKI Trust Anchor' Certificate (TA Cert) in the router. This will later enable the router to validate the router certificate returned in the PKCS#7.

[ob] Section 8.1 specifies that the operator is responsible to assure
[ob] that the router has valid keys. Therefore, it is not clear why this
[ob] above paragraph necessary.
[ob] Maybe the above paragraph could be a feature of the "Advanced Deployment
[ob] Scenarios" in section 7

The operator also configures the Autonomous System (AS) number to be used in the generated router certificate. This may be the sole AS configured on the router, or an operator choice if the router is configured with multiple ASs.

The operator configures or extracts from the router the BGP RouterID to be used in the generated certificate. In the case where the operator has chosen not to use unique per-router certificates, a RouterID of 0 may be used.

[ob] Sections 5 and 6 are somewhat confusing. Restructuring of the
[ob] sections into "5. PKCS#10 Generation", "6. Certificate Request", and
[ob] "7. Installing Certified Keys" would be more clear and helpful.
[ob]
[ob] The idea behind the restructuring is to streamline the implementation.
[ob] After each section there is a well-defined state:
[ob] After 5, the router has the private key installed and the PKCS#10 request
[ob] is generated and the additional information such as the ASN and RouterID
[ob] are added.
[ob] After 6, the Certificate is requested and the PKCS#7 is returned.
[ob] The operator can verify the certificates validity. No need to extra burden
[ob] the router with it.
[ob] After 7, the Certificate is installed in the router. The router can verify
[ob] that the public key in the certificate corresponds to the in section 5
[ob] installed private key.
[ob]
[ob] This keeps the flow pretty simple.

5. PKCS#10 Generation

The private key, and hence the PKCS#10 request, which is sometimes referred to as a Certificate Signing Request (CSR), may be generated by the router or by the operator.

[ob] Add below text from paragraph 5.1:

[ob]

[ob] The operator adds the chosen AS number and the RouterID to send to
[ob] the RPKI CA for the CA to certify.

[ob]

5.1. Router-Generated Keys

In the router-generated method, once the protected session is established and the initial Set-Up (Section 4) performed, the operator issues a command or commands for the router to generate the public/private key pair, to generate the PKCS#10 request, and to sign

Bush, et al.

Expires October 7, 2017

[Page 4]

Internet-Draft

Router Keying for BGPsec

April 5, 2017

the PKCS#10 with the private key. Once generated, the PKCS#10 is returned to the operator over the protected channel.

[ob] ----- The following is just information and not really needed here.

[ob] It might just cause confusion.

If a router was to communicate directly with a CA to have the CA certify the PKCS#10, there would be no way for the CA to authenticate the router. As the operator knows the authenticity of the router, the operator mediates the communication with the CA.

[ob] -----

[ob] ----- Text below moved to the top of Section 5

The operator adds the chosen AS number and the RouterID to send to the RPKI CA for the CA to certify.

[ob] ----- Text above moved to the top of Section 5

5.2. Operator-Generated Keys

In the operator-generated method, the operator generates the public/private key pair on a management station and installs the private key into the router over the protected channel. Beware that experience has shown that copy and paste from a management station to a router can be unreliable for long texts.

[ob] ---- copied from below ----

[ob] The operator then creates and signs the PKCS#10 with the private key.

[ob] -----

[ob] The following section is more an optional part and if added as sub section eases the flow.

[ob] 5.2.1 Using PKCS #8 to transfer private key

Alternatively, the private key may be encapsulated in a PKCS #8 [RFC5958], the PKCS#8 is further encapsulated in Cryptographic

[ob] Maybe lower case should rather than "Alternatively"

[ob]

[ob] The private key should be encapsulated in PKCS #8 [RFC5958]

Message Syntax (CMS) SignedData [RFC5652], and signed by the AS's End Entity (EE) certificate.

The router SHOULD verify the signature of the encapsulated PKCS#8 to ensure the returned private key did in fact come from the operator, but this requires that the operator also provision via the CLI or include in the SignedData the RPKI CA certificate and relevant AS's EE certificate(s). The router should inform the operator whether or not the signature validates to a trust anchor; this notification mechanism is out of scope.

[ob] Below paragraph should be removed, content is moved into Section 5 above

The operator then creates and signs the PKCS#10 with the private key, and adds the chosen AS number and RouterID to be sent to the RPKI CA for the CA to certify.

[ob] -----

[ob] Chapter 6 deals somewhat with two operations, (1) get the certificate,

[ob] and (2) install the certificate. For the flow, it would be easier to

[ob] split this paragraph in to:

[ob] 6. Request the Certificate and 7. Installing Certificate Keys

[ob] ---- replace section header below

6. Installing Certified Keys

[ob] with new section header for instance:

[ob] 6. Send PKCS#10 and receive PKCS#7 - Or: Request the Certificate

The operator uses RPKI management tools to communicate with the global RPKI system to have the appropriate CA validate the PKCS#10 request, sign the key in the PKCS#10 (i.e., certify it) and generated PKCS#7 response, as well as publishing the certificate in the Global RPKI. External network connectivity may be needed if the certificate

is to be published in the Global RPKI.

After the CA certifies the key, it does two things:

1. Publishes the certificate in the Global RPKI. The CA must have

Bush, et al.
Internet-Draft

Expires October 7, 2017
Router Keying for BGPsec

[Page 5]
April 5, 2017

connectivity to the relevant publication point, which in turn must have external network connectivity as it is part of the Global RPKI.

2. Returns the certificate to the operator's management station, packaged in a PKCS#7, using the corresponding method by which it received the certificate request. It SHOULD include the certificate chain below the TA Certificate so that the router can validate the router certificate.

[ob] The below paragraph can be removed. In section 5, the operator installed already the private key. Hence the router can verify the match in both modes.

[ob] ---- Remove paragraph below

In the operator-generated method, the operator SHOULD extract the certificate from the PKCS#7, and verify that the private key it holds corresponds to the returned public key.

In the operator-generated method, the operator has already installed the private key in the router (see Section 5.2).

[ob] ---- Remove paragraph above

[ob] Renumber original section and add it here:

[ob] 7 Installing Certificate Keys

The operator provisions the PKCS#7 into the router over the secure channel.

The router SHOULD extract the certificate from the PKCS#7 and verify that the private key corresponds to the returned public key. The

[ob] that the returned public key corresponds to the stored private key. The router SHOULD inform the operator whether it successfully received the certificate and whether or not the keys correspond; the mechanism is out of scope.

[ob] Remove paragraph below:

[ob] As described in section 8.1, it is the operators' responsibility to assure the router has a valid key. Here, this is unnecessarily burden for the router.

The router SHOULD also verify that the returned certificate validates back to the installed TA Certificate, i.e., the entire chain from the installed TA Certificate through subordinate CAs to the BGPsec certificate validate. To perform this verification the CA certificate chain needs to be returned along with the router's certificate in the PKCS#7. The router SHOULD inform the operator

whether or not the signature validates to a trust anchor; this notification mechanism is out of scope.

[ob] End of removal

[ob] This is again back to trust. The operator should verify the
[ob] certificate, not the router. The operator MUST verify the
[ob] certificate prior publishing it. This is outside of the scope of the
[ob] router.

[ob] This Note paragraph should be moved to the proposed section 5.2.1

Note: The signature on the PKCS#8 and Certificate need not be made by the same entity. Signing the PKCS#8, permits more advanced configurations where the entity that generates the keys is not the direct CA.

Even if the operator cannot extract the private key from the router, this signature still provides a linkage between a private key and a router. That is the server can verify the proof of possession (POP), as required by [RFC6484].

[ob] I believe "server" refers to "router" but this paragraph is not really
[ob] clear to me.

7. Advanced Deployment Scenarios

More PKI-capable routers can take advantage of this increased

Bush, et al.	Expires October 7, 2017	[Page 6]
Internet-Draft	Router Keying for BGPsec	April 5, 2017

functionality and lighten the operator's burden. Typically, these routers include either pre-installed manufacturer-generated certificates (e.g., IEEE 802.1 AR [802.1AR]) or pre-installed manufacturer-generated Pre-Shared Keys (PSK) as well as PKI-enrollment functionality and transport protocol, e.g., CMC's "Secure Transport" [RFC7030] or the original CMC transport protocol's [RFC5273]. When the operator first establishes a secure communication channel between the management system and the router, this pre-installed key material is used to authenticate the router.

[ob] maybe more explanation on what a "More PKI-capable" router includes
[ob] would be helpful. Or at least a reference. otherwise it gives the
[ob] impression that something is missing.

The operator burden shifts here to include:

1. Securely communicating the router's authentication material to the CA prior to operator initiating the server's CSR. CAs use
[ob] the CA prior to operator initiating the router's CSR. CAs use authentication material to determine whether the router is eligible to receive a certificate. Authentication material at a minimum includes the router's AS number and RouterID as well as

the router's key material, but can also include additional information. Authentication material can be communicated to the CA (i.e., CSRs signed by this key material are issued certificates with this AS and RouterID) or to the router (i.e.,

[ob] information. Authentication material can be communicated to the CA (i.e., CSRs signed by this key material are issued certificates with this AS and RouterID) or to the router (i.e.,
[ob] How is this with RouterID 0 for shared keys within an AS? Could this
[ob] cause conflicts? Same for multiple keys for same router with the same
[ob] RouterID?

the operator uses the vendor-supplied management interface to include the AS number and routerID in the router-generated CSR).

2. Enabling the router to communicate with the CA. While the router-to-CA communications are operator-initiated, the operator's management interface need not be involved in the communications path. Enabling the router-to-CA connectivity MAY require connections to external networks (i.e., through firewalls, NATs, etc.).

Once configured, the operator can begin the process of enrolling the router. Because the router is communicating directly with the CA, there is no need for the operator to retrieve the PKCS#10 from the router or return the PKCS#7 to the router as in Section 6. Note that the checks performed by the router, namely extracting the certificate from the PKCS#7, verifying the private key corresponds to the

[ob] It should be the other way around, the public key must correspond to
[ob] the private key.

returned public key, and that the returned certificate validated back to an installed trust anchor, SHOULD be performed. Likewise, the router SHOULD notify the operator if any of these fail, but this notification mechanism is out of scope.

When a router is so configured the communication with the CA SHOULD be automatically re-established by the router at future times to renew or rekey the certificate automatically when necessary (See Section 8). This further reduces the tasks required of the operator.

[ob] Maybe this section 7 fits more into the appendix for informational purpose
[ob] only?

8. Key Management

Bush, et al.	Expires October 7, 2017	[Page 7]
Internet-Draft	Router Keying for BGPsec	April 5, 2017

An operator's responsibilities do not end after key generation, key provisioning, certificate issuance, and certificate distribution. They persist for as long as the operator wishes to operate the BGPsec-speaking router.

[ob] Maybe as an alternative introduction into "Key Management":

[ob]

[ob] Key management does not include only key generation, key provisioning,
[ob] certificate issuance, and certificate distribution. It also includes
[ob] assurance of key validity, key roll-over, and key preservation during
[ob] router replacement.

8.1. Key Validity

It is critical that a BGPsec speaking router ensures that it is
[ob] It is critical that a BGPsec speaking router is signing with a valid
signing with a valid private key at all times. To this end, the
operator needs to ensure the router always has a non-expired
certificate. I.e. the key used to sign BGPsec announcements always
has an associated certificate whose expiry time is after the current
time.

[ob] It clearly stated, that the operator is responsible to assure that the
[ob] router operates with a valid key. Therefore, the router does not need to
[ob] ensure that it is signing with a valid key, it is clearly the operators
[ob] responsibility.

Ensuring this is not terribly difficult but requires that either:

1. The router has a mechanism to notify the operator that the certificate has an impending expiration, and/or
2. The operator notes the expiry time of the certificate and uses a calendaring program to remind them of the expiry time, and/or
3. The RPKI CA warns the operator of pending expiration, and/or
4. Use some other kind of automated process to search for and track the expiry times of router certificates.

It is advisable that expiration warnings happen well in advance of the actual expiry time.

Regardless of the technique used to track router certificate expiry times, it is advisable to notify additional operators in the same organization as the expiry time approaches thereby ensuring that the forgetfulness of one operator does not affect the entire organization.

Depending on inter-operator relationship, it may be helpful to notify a peer operator that one or more of their certificates are about to expire.

[ob] Is there another ops RFC that can be referenced too?

8.2. Key Roll-Over

Routers that support multiple private keys also greatly increase the chance that routers can continuously speak BGPsec because the new private key and certificate can be obtained and distributed prior to expiration of the operational key. Obviously, the router needs to

know when to start using the new key. Once the new key is being used, having the already distributed certificate ensures continuous

Bush, et al.

Expires October 7, 2017

[Page 8]

Internet-Draft

Router Keying for BGPsec

April 5, 2017

operation.

[ob] More information on how to proceed with a Key Roll-Over is described in
[ob] [draft-ietf-sidrps-bgpsec-rollover-02]

[ob] -----

[ob] below text is not needed, draft-ietf-sidrps-bgpsec-rollover-02 takes
[ob] care of all that needs to be known.

Whether the certificate is re-keyed (i.e., different key in the certificate with a new expiry time) or renewed (i.e., the same key in the certificate with a new expiry time) depends on the key's lifetime and operational use. Arguably, re-keying the router's BGPsec

certificate every time the certificate expires is more secure than renewal because it limits the private key's exposure. However, if the key is not compromised the certificate could be renewed as many times as allowed by the operator's security policy. Routers that support only one key can use renewal to ensure continuous operation, assuming the certificate is renewed and distributed well in advance of the operational certificate's expiry time.

[ob] -----

7.3. Key Revocation

Certain unfortunate circumstances may occur causing a need to revoke a router's BGPsec certificate. When this occurs, the operator needs to use the RPKI CA system to revoke the certificate by placing the router's BGPsec certificate on the Certificate Revocation List (CRL) as well as re-keying the router's certificate.

When an active router key is to be revoked, the process of requesting the CA to revoke, the process of the CA actually revoking the router's certificate, and then the process of re-keying/renewing the router's certificate, (possibly distributing a new key and certificate to the router), and distributing the status takes time during which the operator must decide how they wish to maintain continuity of operations, with or without the compromised private key, or whether they wish to bring the router offline to address the compromise.

Keeping the router operational and BGPsec-speaking is the ideal goal, but if operational practices do not allow this then reconfiguring the router to disabling BGPsec is likely preferred to bringing the router offline.

[ob] Mentioning BGP4 as fallback is always a solution.

Routers which support more than one private key, where one is

operational and other(s) are soon-to-be-operational, facilitate revocation events because the operator can configure the router to make a soon-to-be-operational key operational, request revocation of the compromised key, and then make a next generation soon-to-be-operational key, all hopefully without needing to take offline or reboot the router. For routers which support only one operational key, the operators should create or install the new private key, and then request revocation of the compromised private key.

[ob] then request revocation of the certificate corresponding to the [ob] compromised private key.

8.4. Router Replacement

Bush, et al. Expires October 7, 2017 [Page 9]

Internet-Draft Router Keying for BGPsec April 5, 2017

Currently routers often generate private keys for uses such as SSH, and the private keys may not be seen or off-loaded from the router. While this is good security, it creates difficulties when a routing engine or whole router must be replaced in the field and all software which accesses the router must be updated with the new keys. Also, any network based initial contact with a new routing engine requires trust in the public key presented on first contact.

To allow operators to quickly replace routers without requiring update and distribution of the corresponding public keys in the RPKI, routers SHOULD allow the private BGPsec key to be inserted via a protected session, e.g., SSH, NetConf (see [RFC6470]), SNMP. This lets the operator escrow the old private key via the mechanism used for operator-generated keys, see Section 5.2, such that it can be re-inserted into a replacement router. The router MAY allow the private key to be off-loaded via the protected session, but this SHOULD be paired with functionality that sets the key into a permanent non-exportable state to ensure that it is not off-loaded at a future time by unauthorized operations.

9. Security Considerations

The router's manual will describe whether the router supports one, the other, or both of the key generation options discussed in the earlier sections of this draft as well as other important security-related information (e.g., how to SSH to the router). After familiarizing one's self with the capabilities of the router, operators are encouraged to ensure that the router is patched with the latest software updates available from the manufacturer.

This document defines no protocols so in some sense introduces no new security considerations. However, it relies on many others and the security considerations in the referenced documents should be consulted; notably, those documents listed in Section 1 should be consulted first. PKI-relying protocols, of which BGPsec is one, have many issues to consider so many in fact entire books have been written to address them; so listing all PKI-related security

considerations is neither useful nor helpful; regardless, some bootstrapping-related issues are listed here that are worth repeating:

Public-Private key pair generation: Mistakes here are for all practical purposes catastrophic because PKIs rely on the pairing of a difficult to generate public-private key pair with a signer; all key pairs MUST be generated from a good source of non-deterministic random input [RFC4086].

Private key protection at rest: Mistakes here are for all practical purposes catastrophic because disclosure of the private key allows

Bush, et al. Expires October 7, 2017 [Page 10]

Internet-Draft Router Keying for BGPsec April 5, 2017

another entity to masquerade as (i.e., impersonate) the signer; all private keys MUST be protected when at rest in a secure fashion. Obviously, how each router protects private keys is implementation specific. Likewise, the local storage format for the private key is just that, a local matter.

Private key protection in transit: Mistakes here are for all practical purposes catastrophic because disclosure of the private key allows another entity to masquerade as (i.e., impersonate) the signer; transport security is therefore strongly RECOMMENDED. The level of security provided by the transport layer's security mechanism SHOULD be commensurate with the strength of the BGPsec key; there's no point in spending time and energy to generate an excellent public-private key pair and then transmit the private key in the clear or with a known-to-be-broken algorithm, as it just undermines trust that the private key has been kept private. Additionally, operators SHOULD ensure the transport security mechanism is up to date, in order to addresses all known implementation bugs.

SSH key management is known, in some cases, to be lax [I-D.ylonen-sshkeybcpr]; employees that no longer need access to routers SHOULD be removed the router to ensure only those authorized have access to a router.

Though the CA's certificate is installed on the router and used to verify that the returned certificate is in fact signed by the CA, the revocation status of the CA's certificate is rarely checked as the router may not have global connectivity or CRL-aware software. The operator MUST ensure that installed CA certificate is valid.

10. IANA Considerations

This document has no IANA Considerations.

11. References

[ob] The references need to be updated using the affected RFC, title and
[ob] authors

11.1. Normative References

[I-D.ietf-sidr-bgpsec-algs]

Turner, S., "BGP Algorithms, Key Formats, & Signature Formats", draft-ietf-sidr-bgpsec-algs (work in progress), March 2013.

[I-D.ietf-sidr-bgpsec-pki-profiles]

Reynolds, M., Turner, S., and S. Kent, "A Profile for BGPSEC Router Certificates, Certificate Revocation Lists, and Certification Requests", draft-ietf-sidr-bgpsec-pki-

[ob] The references need to be updated using the affected RFC, title and [ob] authors

Bush, et al. Expires October 7, 2017 [Page 11]

Internet-Draft Router Keying for BGPsec April 5, 2017

profiles (work in progress), October 2012.

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.

[RFC4086] Eastlake 3rd, D., Schiller, J., and S. Crocker, "Randomness Requirements for Security", BCP 106, RFC 4086, DOI 10.17487/RFC4086, June 2005, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4086>>.

[RFC4253] Ylonen, T. and C. Lonvick, Ed., "The Secure Shell (SSH) Transport Layer Protocol", RFC 4253, DOI 10.17487/RFC4253, January 2006, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4253>>.

[RFC5652] Housley, R., "Cryptographic Message Syntax (CMS)", STD 70, RFC 5652, DOI 10.17487/RFC5652, September 2009, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5652>>.

[RFC5958] Turner, S., "Asymmetric Key Packages", RFC 5958, DOI 10.17487/RFC5958, August 2010, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5958>>.

[802.1AR] IEEE SA-Standards Board, "IEEE Standard for Local and metropolitan area networks - Secure Device Identity", December 2009, <<http://standards.ieee.org/findstds/standard/802.1AR-2009.html>>.

11.1. Informative References

[I-D.ietf-sidr-bgpsec-protocol]

Lepinski, M., "BGPSEC Protocol Specification", draft-ietf-

sidr-bgpsec-protocol (work in progress), February 2013.

[I-D.ylonen-sshkeybc]

Ylonen, T. and G. Kent, "Managing SSH Keys for Automated Access - Current Recommended Practice", draft-ylonen-sshkeybc (work in progress), April 2013.

[RFC2585] Housley, R. and P. Hoffman, "Internet X.509 Public Key Infrastructure Operational Protocols: FTP and HTTP", RFC 2585, DOI 10.17487/RFC2585, May 1999, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2585>>.

[RFC3766] Orman, H. and P. Hoffman, "Determining Strengths For

Bush, et al. Expires October 7, 2017 [Page 12]

Internet-Draft Router Keying for BGPsec April 5, 2017

Public Keys Used For Exchanging Symmetric Keys", BCP 86, RFC 3766, DOI 10.17487/RFC3766, April 2004, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3766>>.

[RFC5273] Schaad, J. and M. Myers, "Certificate Management over CMS (CMC): Transport Protocols", RFC 5273, DOI 10.17487/RFC5273, June 2008, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5273>>.

[RFC5480] Turner, S., Brown, D., Yiu, K., Housley, R., and T. Polk, "Elliptic Curve Cryptography Subject Public Key Information", RFC 5480, DOI 10.17487/RFC5480, March 2009, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5480>>.

[RFC5647] Igoe, K. and J. Solinas, "AES Galois Counter Mode for the Secure Shell Transport Layer Protocol", RFC 5647, DOI 10.17487/RFC5647, August 2009, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5647>>.

[RFC5656] Stebila, D. and J. Green, "Elliptic Curve Algorithm Integration in the Secure Shell Transport Layer", RFC 5656, DOI 10.17487/RFC5656, December 2009, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5656>>.

[RFC5751] Ramsdell, B. and S. Turner, "Secure/Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (S/MIME) Version 3.2 Message Specification", RFC 5751, DOI 10.17487/RFC5751, January 2010, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5751>>.

[RFC5967] Turner, S., "The application/pkcs10 Media Type", RFC 5967, DOI 10.17487/RFC5967, August 2010, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5967>>.

[RFC6187] Igoe, K. and D. Stebila, "X.509v3 Certificates for Secure Shell Authentication", RFC 6187, DOI 10.17487/RFC6187, March 2011, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6187>>.

- [RFC6470] Bierman, A., "Network Configuration Protocol (NETCONF) Base Notifications", RFC 6470, DOI 10.17487/RFC6470, February 2012, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6470>>.
- [RFC6484] Kent, S., Kong, D., Seo, K., and R. Watro, "Certificate Policy (CP) for the Resource Public Key Infrastructure (RPKI)", BCP 173, RFC 6484, DOI 10.17487/RFC6484, February 2012, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6484>>.
- [RFC6668] Bider, D. and M. Baushke, "SHA-2 Data Integrity Verification for the Secure Shell (SSH) Transport Layer

Bush, et al. Expires October 7, 2017 [Page 13]

Internet-Draft Router Keying for BGPsec April 5, 2017

Protocol", RFC 6668, DOI 10.17487/RFC6668, July 2012, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6668>>.

- [RFC7030] Pritikin, M., Ed., Yee, P., Ed., and D. Harkins, Ed., "Enrollment over Secure Transport", RFC 7030, DOI 10.17487/RFC7030, October 2013, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7030>>.

- [SP800-57] National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Special Publication 800-57: Recommendation for Key Management - Part 1 (Revised), March 2007.

Appendix A. Management/Router Channel Security

Encryption, integrity, authentication, and key exchange algorithms used by the secure communication channel SHOULD be of equal or greater strength than the BGPsec keys they protect, which for the algorithm specified in [I-D.ietf-sidr-bgpsec-algs] is 128-bit; see [RFC5480] and by reference [SP800-57] for information about this strength claim as well as [RFC3766] for "how to determine the length of an asymmetric key as a function of a symmetric key strength requirement." In other words, for the encryption algorithm, do not use export grade crypto (40-56 bits of security), do not use Triple DES (112 bits of security). Suggested minimum algorithms would be AES-128: aes128-cbc [RFC4253] and AEAD_AES_128_GCM [RFC5647] for encryption, hmac-sha2-256 [RFC6668] or AESAD_AES_128_GCM [RFC5647] for integrity, ecdsa-sha2-nistp256 [RFC5656] for authentication, and ecdh-sha2-nistp256 [RFC5656] for key exchange.

Some routers support the use of public key certificates and SSH. The certificates used for the SSH session are different than the certificates used for BGPsec. The certificates used with SSH should also enable a level of security commensurate with BGPsec keys; x509v3-ecdsa-sha2-nistp256 [RFC6187] could be used for authentication.

Appendix B. The n00b Guide to BGPsec Key Management

This appendix is informative. It attempts to explain all of the PKI technobabble in plainer language.

BGPsec speakers send signed BGPsec updates that are verified by other BGPsec speakers. In PKI parlance, the senders are referred to as signers and the receivers are referred to as relying parties. The signers with which we are concerned here are routers signing BGPsec updates. Signers use private keys to sign and relying parties use the corresponding public keys, in the form of X.509 public key

Bush, et al. Expires October 7, 2017 [Page 14]

Internet-Draft Router Keying for BGPsec April 5, 2017

certificates, to verify signatures. The third party involved is the entity that issues the X.509 public key certificate, the Certification Authority (CA). Key management is all about making these key pairs and the certificates, as well as ensuring that the relying parties trust that the certified public keys in fact correspond to the signers' private keys.

The specifics of key management greatly depend on the routers as well as management interfaces provided by the routers' vendor. Because of these differences, it is hard to write a definitive "how to," but this guide is intended to arm operators with enough information to ask the right questions. The other aspect that makes this guide informative is that the steps for the do-it-yourself (DIY) approach involve arcane commands while the GUI-based vendor-assisted management console approach will likely hide all of those commands behind some button clicks. Regardless, the operator will end up with a BGPsec-enabled router. Initially, we focus on the DIY approach and then follow up with some information about the GUI-based approach.

The first step in the DIY approach is to generate a private key; but in fact what you do is create a key pair; one part, the private key, is kept very private and the other part, the public key, is given out to verify whatever is signed. The two models for how to create the key pair are the subject of this document, but it boils down to either doing it on-router (router-driven) or off-router (operator-driven).

If you are generating keys on the router (router-driven), then you will need to access the router. Again, how you access the router is router-specific, but generally the DIY approach uses the CLI and accessing the router either directly via the router's craft port or over the network on an administrative interface. If accessing the router over the network be sure to do it securely (i.e., use SSHv2). Once logged into the router, issue a command or a series of commands that will generate the key pair for the algorithms noted in the main body of this document; consult your router's documentation for the specific commands. The key generation process will yield multiple files: the private key and the public key; the file format varies

depending on the arcane command you issued, but generally the files are DER or PEM-encoded.

The second step is to generate the certification request, which is often referred to as a certificate signing request (CSR) or PKCS#10, and to send it to the CA to be signed. To generate the CSR, you issue some more arcane commands while logged into the router; using the private key just generated to sign the certification request with the algorithms specified in the main body of this document; the CSR is signed to prove to the CA that the router has possession of the

Bush, et al. Expires October 7, 2017 [Page 15]

Internet-Draft Router Keying for BGPsec April 5, 2017

private key (i.e., the signature is the proof-of-possession). The output of the command is the CSR file; the file format varies depending on the arcane command you issued, but generally the files are DER or PEM-encoded.

The third step is to retrieve the signed CSR from the router and send it to the CA. But before sending it, you need to also send the CA the subject name and serial number for the router. The CA needs this information to issue the certificate. How you get the CSR to the CA, is beyond the scope of this document. While you are still connected to the router, install the Trust Anchor (TA) for the root of the PKI. At this point, you no longer need access to the router for BGPsec-related initiation purposes.

The fourth step is for the CA to issue the certificate based on the CSR you sent; the certificate will include the subject name, serial number, public key, and other fields as well as being signed by the CA. After the CA issues the certificate, the CA returns the certificate, and posts the certificate to the RPKI repository. Check that the certificate corresponds to the private key by verifying the signature on the CSR sent to the CA; this is just a check to make sure that the CA issued a certificate corresponding to the private key on the router.

If generating the keys off-router (operator-driven), then the same steps are used as the on-router key generation, (possibly with the same arcane commands as those used in the on-router approach), but no access to the router is needed the first three steps are done on an administrative workstation: o Step 1: Generate key pair; o Step 2: Create CSR and sign CSR with private key, and; o Step 3: Send CSR file with the subject name and serial number to CA.

After the CA has returned the certificate and you have checked the certificate, you need to put the private key and TA in the router. Assuming the DIY approach, you will be using the CLI and accessing the router either directly via the router's craft port or over the network on an admin interface; if accessing the router over the network make doubly sure it is done securely (i.e., use SSHv2) because the private key is being moved over the network. At this

point, access to the router is no longer needed for BGPsec-related initiation purposes.

NOTE: Regardless of the approach taken, the first three steps could trivially be collapsed by a vendor-provided script to yield the private key and the signed CSR.

Given a GUI-based vendor-assisted management console, then all of these steps will likely be hidden behind pointing and clicking the

Bush, et al. Expires October 7, 2017 [Page 16]

Internet-Draft Router Keying for BGPsec April 5, 2017

way through GPsec-enabling the router.

The scenarios described above require the operator to access each router, which does not scale well to large networks. An alternative would be to create an image, perform the necessary steps to get the private key and trust anchor on the image, and then install the image via a management protocol.

One final word of advice; certificates include a notAfter field that unsurprisingly indicates when relying parties should no longer trust the certificate. To avoid having routers with expired certificates follow the recommendations in the Certification Policy (CP) [RFC6484] and make sure to renew the certificate at least one week prior to the notAfter date. Set a calendar reminder in order not to forget!

Authors' Addresses

Randy Bush
IIJ / Dragon Research Labs
5147 Crystal Springs
Bainbridge Island, Washington 98110
US

Email: randy@psg.com

Sean Turner
sn3rd

Email: sean@sn3rd.com

Keyur Patel
Arrcus, Inc.

Email: keyur@arrcus.com

Bush, et al.

Expires October 7, 2017

[Page 17]