Problem Statement

draft-dunbar-i2nsf-problem-statement

Sue Hares

Interface to Network Security Functions Problem Statement

- Linda Dunbar (linda.dunbar@huawei.com)
- Myo Zarny (Myo.Zarny@gs.com)
- Christian Jacquenet (Christian.jacquenet@orange.com)
- Mohamed Boucadair (mohamed.boucadair@orange.com)
- Shaibal Chakrabarty (shaibalc@us-ignite.org)



Multi-vendor & Multi-Types of NSFs

To be managed



Automation of the NSFs' control & monitor



It doesn't require NFV, it doesn't require provider domain. I2NSF is to facilitate automation

Different vendor → Different Provisioning Formats

Vendor A

same function , Different name

Vendor B

firewall name <name> default-action <action>

name	The name of the firewall rule set.
action	The default action to take if no matches are found within a rule set. Supported values are as follows: **accept:** Accepts the packet. **drop:** Drops the packet silently. **reject:** Drops the packet with an ICMP "Destination Unreachable" message.

Action

Use the **Action** field to define what occurs to traffic that matches the URL Filtering and Application Control rule. These are the **Action** options:

Action	Description
Allow	Allows the traffic.
Block	Blocks the traffic. Shows a UserCheck **Block** message. If no UserCheck object is defined for this action, no message is displayed.
Limit	Defines the maximum bandwidth that is allowed for this rule. Select or create a **Limit** object that defines the bandwidth limits.

firewall name <name> rule <rule-num> limit

Specifies traffic rate limiting parameters for a firewall rule.

Syntax

set firewall name *name* rule *rule-num* limit {burst *size* | rate *rate*}

Configuration Statement

```
firewall {
    name name {
        rule rule-num {
            limit {
                burst size
                rate rate
            }
        }
    }
}
```

same parameter , different Settings

Vendor C

Difficult to achieve automated deployment.

FW configuration: ports & links based

Virtual Networks Needs Group Policies & Abstraction. Need standard format for automation

Firewall Rules Configuration

Active	Type	Rule	Protocol	Source	Port(s)	Destination	Port(s)	Comments
No	Access	Permit	UDP	IP or Host Name 192.168.0.50	ALL	Any	53	Example - Permit DNS request to this IP
No	Access	Permit	TCP	IP or Host Name 192.168.0.50	ALL	Any	110	Example - Permit POP access to this IP
No	Access	Permit	TCP	IP or Host Name 192.168.0.50	ALL	Any	25	Example - Permit SMTP access to this IP
No	Access	Deny	ALL	IP or Host Name 192.168.0.50	ALL	Any	ALL	Example - Deny all access to this IP
No	Access	Deny	ALL	IP or Host Name 192.168.0.48/30	ALL	Any	ALL	Example - Deny access to this Sub-net
No	Access	Deny	TCP	Any	ALL	Any	21	Example - Deny access to FTP sites

Need standard method to express commonly used rules for virtual networks and groups



Port Range

plication	Start		End	Protocol	IP Address	Enabled
izz	6112	to	6112	Both	192.168.1. 100	☑
izz2	6113	to	6113	Both	192.168.1. 101	☑
izz3	6114	to	6114	Both	192.168.1. 102	☑
izz4	6115	to	6115	Both	192.168.1. 103	☑
	0	to	0	Both	192.168.1. 0	☐
	0	to	0	Both	192.168.1. 0	☐

OpenStack FWaaS Rules Configuration


```
{
    "firewall_rule": {
        "action": "allow",
        "description": "",
        "destination_ip_address": null,
        "destination_port": "80",
        "enabled": true,
        "firewall_policy_id": null,
        "id": "8722e0e0-9cc9-4490-9660-8c9a5732fbb0",
        "ip_version": 4,
        "name": "ALLOW_HTTP",
        "position": null,
        "protocol": "tcp",
        "shared": false,
        "source_ip_address": null,
        "source_port": null,
        "tenant_id": "45977fa2dbd7482098dd68d0d8970117"
    }
}
```

```
{
    "firewall_rule": {
        "action": "allow",
        "destination_port": "80",
        "enabled": true,
        "name": "ALLOW_HTTP",
        "protocol": "tcp"
    }
}
```

Challenges (Section 3 of document)

Facing Service Providers (3.1)

- Diverse types of Security functions
- Diverse interfaces to control NSFs
- Diverse interface to monitor NSFs
- More Distributed NSFs and vNSFs
- More demand to control NSFs Dynamically
- Demand for multi-tenancy and control NSFs
- Lack of Characterization of NSF and Capability Exchange
- Lack of mechanism for SMFs to utilize external profiles

Facing Customers (3.2)

- NSFs from heterogeneous administrative domains
- Control Requests are Vendors Specific
- Difficulty to Monitor the Execution of Desired Policies

Common Problems (3.4-3.6)

- Difficulty to Validate Policies across Multiple Domains
- Lack of Standard Interface to Inject Feedback to NSF
- Lack of Standard Interface for Capability Negotiation

Other Areas

- ETSI-NFV - EMS to VNF interface
  - Defines interface between EMS (element management system) and VNF
  - This matches I2NSF work

- OPNFV Moon project – An interface between EMS-VNF
  - Problems: NO dynamic control, only 1 definition, no room for existing vendor, no fine grain authentication, no allowance for central control

- CSA – 1 definition, 10 implementation agreements
  - All are concerned about the NMS-NSF interface

Is the of Bias – Running Code Important to WG?

Welcome to I2NSF Running Code

The running code is focused on the design of an I2NSF demo including the design of I2NSF client, I2NSF controller and NSF/vNSF. NETCONF protocol and YANG model are used for the I2NSF demo realization. The demo aims to enhance understanding of the I2NSF architecture and justify its feasibility.

I2NSF/Demo Description

Branch:master I2NSF/

Initial inport

I2NSF client	authored 21 days ago	latest commit	89acf 0452f
I2NSF Controller	authored 21 days ago	latest commit	89acf 0452f
UFW	authored 21 days ago	latest commit	89acf 0452f
Shorewall	authored 21 days ago	latest commit	89acf 0452f



How impor that

Import to make steps toward Open Source for I2NSF