

Routing IPsec through NAT Gateways using Transport Mode

Jeremy Wright
Arizona State University
jlwright1@asu.edu

Abstract—

*Index Terms—*Transport Mode, Tunnel Mode, IPsec

I. INTRODUCTION

IPsec is an end-to-end security protocol for communicating over insecure channels. IPsec is defined in RFC 4301 [1]. IPsec is a layer 3 protocol according to the OSI Layer Model [2]. This is a key advantage over security protocols at higher levels of abstractions such as SSL/TLS. SSL/TLS requires applications to be specifically designed to interact with other SSL/TLS endpoints. IPsec doesn't require the application to have any knowledge of security. For some application types, this is an enormous advantage, both in terms of application correctness, and in network infrastructure roll out.

II. IPSEC

IPsec defines two modes of operation transport mode, and tunnel mode. Each mode has it's own header type. Transport mode uses the Authentication Header (AH), while Tunnel mode uses the Encapsulated Security Protocol Header. Each header provides varying levels of service, according to its intended function. Tunnel mode is typically used for connecting to networks together to form a larger virtual LAN [3]. IPsec meets the 4 tenants of security: authentication, non-repudiation, integrity, and confidentiality. The integrity tenant is broken by NAT in the default case. Transport mode is used for connecting 2 end users together such as in a VPN situation. Transport mode however has additional issues when using NAT on IPv4 networks [4].

A. Transport Mode

Transport mode encrypts the entire IP packet, but keeps the routing information in plain text.

0								1								2								3																															
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7																								
Next Header								Payload Len								Reserved																																							
Security Parameters Index																																																							
Sequence Number																																																							
Integrity Check Value																																																							

Fig. 1. IPsec: Authentication Header

The routing information however is incorporated into the hash value protecting it from tampering. Since the routing information cannot be changed this causes problems for NAT traversal in IPv4 networks. On IPv6 networks NAT is not necessary since all addresses are globally routable the routing information doesn't require change. In the presence of NAT however the NAT cannot change the source or destination fields, and preserve the integrity of the packet. Tunnel mode provides a method for dealing with this.

B. Tunnel Mode

Tunnel Mode uses the ESP header (Figure 2) to wrap the desired IP packet. The encapsulated IP package is encrypted, and the outer header defines mutable, and immutable fields available for NAT [1]. In tunnel mode, additional overhead since it doesn't use an additional IP Packet to wrap the security packet as IPsec Tunnel Mode requires.

0								1								2								3							
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Security Parameters Index																															
Sequence Number																															
Payload Data (Variable)																															
Padding (Variable)																															
Padding Length								Next Header																							
Integrity Check Value																															

Fig. 2. IPsec: Encapsulated Security Payload Header

III. NAT-T TRAVERSAL

RFC3947 provides a mechanism to use IPsec in the presence of a NAT gateway [5].

IV. ALTERNATIVE WITH GENERIC ROUTING PROTOCOL

Another option is to use the Generic Routing Protocol to route IPsec packets through the NAT [6]. This may be especially useful if the NAT in question isn't compliant and breaks the IPsec integrity packets. Also for applications where the user must act as both a server and a client, such as video games where multi-player hosts connect to one another, or in peer-to-peer. In this case, the NAT will likely drop in coming connections, or the NAT may be handing a connection on port 500 at that instant, and the incoming connection would be ambiguous [7]. In this case connecting to the correct internal host would be unlikely.

Generic Routing Protocol (GRP), is a layer 3 protocol which encapsulates any other protocol. Since this protocol is unsecured, the NAT is free to mutate fields and operate as normal. However the receiver can accept the GRP packets peel off the encapsulated inner packets, and continue routing within the network [8].

V. CONCLUSION

Traditionally, when configuring IPsec, one would use Tunnel Mode to connect to large networks together creating a larger virtual LAN. For remote users connecting to a publicly accessible server, transport mode maybe more useful. However to create a secure connection between two end users in a peer-to-peer fashion, one can look at defining a new protocol based on the GRP, to route their custom secure clients through Network Address Translators.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Seo and S. Kent. (). Security architecture for the internet protocol, [Online]. Available: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc4301> (visited on 03/15/2014).
- [2] *OSI protocols*, in *Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia*, Page Version ID: 593705554, Mar. 14, 2014. [Online]. Available: http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=OSI_protocols&oldid=593705554 (visited on 03/15/2014).
- [3] (). IPsec overview part two: modes and transforms > tunnel and transport modes, [Online]. Available: <http://www.ciscopress.com/articles/article.asp?p=25477> (visited on 03/15/2014).
- [4] K. B. Egevang and P. Srisuresh. (). Traditional IP network address translator (traditional NAT), [Online]. Available: <http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3022> (visited on 03/12/2014).
- [5] V. V. <vvolpe@cisco.com>. (). Negotiation of NAT-Traversal in the IKE, [Online]. Available: <http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3947> (visited on 03/12/2014).
- [6] S. Hanks, D. Meyer, D. Farinacci, and P. Traina. (). Generic routing encapsulation (GRE), [Online]. Available: <http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc2784> (visited on 03/15/2014).
- [7] B. Aboba and W. Dixon. (). IPsec-Network address translation (NAT) compatibility requirements, [Online]. Available: <http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3715> (visited on 03/12/2014).
- [8] B. Aboba, G. Zorn, S. Booth, W. Dixon, and B. V. Patel. (). Securing L2TP using IPsec, [Online]. Available: <http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3193> (visited on 03/12/2014).