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So, you already have a Framework?

- No.
- We’re exploring an approach
- … because we’re looking for fatal flaws
- … like “can we actually generate triggers?”
- … and “can we actually send them?”
- This approach helped us ask these questions
- … but “Connectivity Restored” doesn’t need it
- … so Framework should be on hold for now
Framework Basics

- Accommodate multiple transports
  - Focus on TCP, don’t break SCTP – others?
- Initiator/Correspondent model
  - Focus on access links
  - Focus on single-homed Initiators
- Protocol flow
- Canonical triggers?
- Canonical responses?
- Notification protocol mechanisms?
- Canonical security considerations?
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Focus on Access Links

- Many problematic links are access links
- Can’t guarantee core routers see all packets
- Core network will reroute anyway
- Avoid core network scaling problem
- Access network may have incentive to deploy
- Core network does not have this incentive
Focus on Single-homed Initiators

- Maps to one class of problematic subnetworks
  - Wide-Area Wireless Networks
- Avoid “fan-in” problem at correspondent host
- Unambiguous notifications are most valuable
- New interface -> new bandwidth anyway
Protocol Flow - Initiation

TRIGTRAN Initiator HOST

TRIGTRAN Router

Correspondent HOST

Arbitrary packet with TRIGTRAN
Initiate bit set
Router Action - Initiation
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Protocol Flow - Request
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Protocol Flow - Notification
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Router Action - Notification
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Canonical Triggers?

- One proposal for minimal set of events:
  - Connectivity Interrupted
  - Connectivity Restored
  - Packets Discarded by subnetwork, not due to congestion

- More ambitious (“research”) events:
  - Sub-network path changes (“horizontal handoff”)
  - Packet corruption loss
  - Non-congestion loss
  - Nominal sub-network bandwidth change

- Current Framework does not include “ambitious” events
Notification Protocol Mechanisms?

- We’re dealing with a huge issue here
- ICMP message is right answer conceptually
  - A less ambiguous/more flexible Source Quench?
- But is it deployable?
  - Old implementations, NATs, Firewalls, etc.
- Is a new UDP message likely to be better?
- DCCP flows too heavyweight?
  - Number of flows for an access router?
  - Not a connection, but still need per-flow state
- TCP is right for end-to-end TCP Kickstart…
Canonical Security Considerations?

• **Non-starter**
  – Assume security association between TRIGTRAN access router and arbitrary correspondent host somewhere on the Internet

• **First attempt at solving this problem**
  – Limit TRIGTRAN to advisory role
  – If you have notifications and ACKs, believe ACKs!
  – No new transport behavior

• **Alternative choice?**
  – Explore Purpose-Built Keys framework
  – No identity component – only spoof-resistance
  – MIGHT allow different different class of responses
Canonical DOS Considerations?

• Assuming strawperson security considerations proposal (advisory)
  • Clearing Initiate/Request bits not interesting
    – Gives current transport behavior
• Setting Initiate/Request bits not very interesting
  – Requires attacker on both sides of router to install state in router
• Forged Connectivity Interrupted not interesting
  – Believe end-to-end ACKs if they come
• Forged Connectivity Restored not interesting
  – Probe once during Connectivity Interrupted, then normal loss processing
• Forged Packets Discarded not interesting
  – Resend packets once during loss event, then normal loss processing
• DOS flooding of TRIGTRAN routers not interesting
  – No worse than any Router Alert flooding attack
  – Reverts to current transport behavior during flooding attacks - but who cares?
Feedback in the halls so far

- “Trigger” name still seems to give the wrong message
- Need to be clear about timeframes – think “five years”
- Out-of-band notifications are very problematic
  - ICMP blocks, UDP blocks, firewalls, NATs, ALGs, etc.
- “Packets Discarded” ambiguous – looks like “handoff”
- “Connectivity Interrupted” response isn’t clear
  - Transports that retry more persistently? Or give up sooner?
- Even “Connectivity Restored” requires TCP change
- Sending notifications all the time is simpler
  - No bits, no “initiator/requestor”, no decisions
  - And, if we’re headed for general deployment, maybe right idea
- Need to be clear about topology aspects of DoS attacks
Kicking TCP

Assume “Stationary Host” is sender, and has TCP connections in RTO

Phil Karn, “Kicking TCP”, March 2000 PILC list posting
Kicking TCP

When “Mobile Host” sees interface go operational, resend last TCP packet on each TCP connection

Last TCP packet previously sent on this connection
Kicking TCP

When “Stationary Host” sees duplicate TCP packet arrive for connection in RTO, behave as if RTO timer popped and send single-packet probe

Single-packet probe on this connection
Kicking TCP

When single-packet probe arrives, “Mobile Host” sends Acknowledgement

Acknowledgement for Single-packet probe on this connection
Kicking TCP

When acknowledgement to single-packet probe arrives, “Stationary Host” enters Slow Start

Normal transmission resumes with ACK clocking
If We Really “Kick TCP”

- Need a small change to TCP for duplicate packets received on RTO connections
- Don’t need modifications to routers
- No router per-connection state
- “Last packet” goes anywhere TCP was going
  - No (more) NAT, firewall, ALG considerations
- Safe (no response to probe is no-op)
- Recovers RTOed TCP sooner
  - Could be up to 30 seconds sooner, with a human in the loop
- Need to define similar facility for other transports?
- Can’t reuse this mechanism for any other trigger
  - Likely would require explicit notification, maybe edge-to-end