

Best Current Practise OCSBC – UCaaS security aspects Category: Informational February 2024, Version 1.00



### Revision History



### Abstract

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119.

The configurations provided in this document SHOULD NOT be treated as RECOMMENDED. The information is intended to provide guidance as to the OCSBC behaviour when configurations listed in this document are applied.

This document is intended to provide the reader with information regarding configuration of an OCSBC to provide user authentication via several RADIUS servers.

### Applicability

The details provided are relevant to physical & virtual Oracle Communications Session Border Controller (OCSBC) instances.



### Table of content

#### Contents



### Network function

Focus of this BCP is SBC that coexist as part of UCaaS demo LAB that terminates SIP TLS connections towards Microsoft (Direct Routing), Webex (Calling), Zoom (Phone) and Google (SipLink). SBC acts as well as media (RTP) termination point interworking in such deployments SRTP from internet legs into core RTP legs. As a best practice in general, security wise, we'll be checking lab's OCOM. Calling devices here are UCaaS native clients and lab's IMS registered softphones simulating PSTN.

### TLS generic introduction

TLS 1.2 – This document will not revert to older TLS versions as are deprecated today and should not be used at all.

In TLS 1.2 RSA, DH and DHE cipher suites are available.

Key exchange algh being RSA, handshake on high level looks as depicted below:

client hello - (client exposes TLS version, generates random, exposes cipher suits supported)

server hello - (server agrees on TLS version(or not), sends it's 'random', and picks one of the cipher suits - picks in this case RSA one)

certificates(sent by server) - server sends its certificate chain

"client key exchange", "encrypted handshake"(sent by client) - before sending this messages client authenticates the server identity by checking the server-side CA public certificate chain against its trusted store. If the check is done successfully the client proceeds with "client key exchange". In this message client creates a pre-master secret and encrypts it with learned server public key(server's endentity certificate, nothing to do with CA public certificates)

upon receipt of "client key exchange" server should be able to decrypt it with its private key as there are mathematical relations between its private and public key. That's the point server should learn same pre-master that client generated

Finally, both sides create a session key as SESSION\_KEY= HASH of(premaster secret, client random, server random) and that key is used as an encryption/decryption key for traffic as of that point on

RSA cipher suits are with obvious downside:

Note above that "client random" and "server random" are per session values but they are exchanged in clear text! Once security is compromised and one gets the server private key then the attacker has a clear view over all historically saved sessions. This is due to the fact that server private-key exists as variable in session key calculation while other variables in calculation are exchanged in clear text.

As requirements on security evolved we've got new DH, DHE cipher suits and main idea here was to rule out server's private key from session-key calculation.

So still staying in TLSv1.2 but with DH and DHE cipher suits in use that handshake would look as follows:

client hello - (client exposes TLS version, generates random, exposes cipher suits supported)

server hello - (server agrees on TLS version(or not), sends it's 'random', and picks one of the cipher suits - picks in this case DHE one)

certificates(sent by server) - server sends its certificate chain

"server key exchange"(sent by server) - this is first message that differs compared with RSA cipher suite in use. Here server sends its public key. Which public key? This key is part of the key-exchange process and has nothing to do with either server's public end entity certificates nor with CA public certs. This public key relates to DH algorithm that is pure math on how both sides may come to the same session key without involving server's private key into the picture(will explain later low level). Also, server puts a digital signature over this message with its private key(note there is nothing to decrypt here on client side, just for the client to check the signature given it learned server's certificate chain)

"client key exchange" - as same with RSA client will verify server's chain of trust getting its certificates, also, it will store the servers public key based on servers public key it will create its own public key and send to the server. saying again here, this public key has nothing tto do with any certificate and is part of DH key exchange process. Client sends this public key to the server

At this point both client and server have enough material to come to the same pre-master key that will be used for session key calculation. and SESSION KEY == HASH (premaster-secret, client random, server random)

Now, please note that as long as the final symmetric session encryption/decryption key seems to have the same formula there are big differences. So let's uncover some facts here:

#### premaster secret is independent of server's private key in new calculation

with pure DH, public keys in server-key-exchange and client-key-exchange remain the same per session that leads us potentially to the same threat as TLS had with RSA key-exchange principle. Having a piece of static info from client and server one might decrypt all historical sessions. This is the reason pure DH cipher suites do not exist in TLS1.3

with DHE(E stands for ephemeral) there are new public key's created per session on client and server side client. So this is were we should be in 2024. Compromising private key with DHE is not an issue, compromising private piece of info on client/server side that accounts in public key creation may affect only a single TLS session but not the whole communication history!



As the next logical question is what kind of public keys I'm talking about in DH(E) as part of key exchange process - I'll try to illustrate with a simple math. But let's go a bit lower into Materia. With TLS DH(E) cipher suite both client and server will create private&public key pair(again, nothing to do with certificates) and this looks in numbers like this.

server creates its private key a=5(called prime), defines a low number g=3(public piece of info) and defines modulo number p=7 (public piece of info)

server calculates its public key as  $A=g^{\wedge}a$  MOD  $p = 3^{\wedge}5$  MOD 7 == 5

server sends to client the following: A,p,g

client creates its own private key b=4 and calculates its public key as  $B=g^b$  MOD  $p = 81$  MOD 7 == 4

client sends its public key B=7 to the server

at this point with some math both sides should calculate the same pre-master key!

Server calculation for pre-master key s=B^a MOD 7 == 1024 MOD 7 == 2

Client calculation for pre-master key s=A^b MOD 7 == 625 MOD 7 == 2

math behind is  $(g \land a) \land b \land b \land c = (g \land b) \land a \land b \land c = g \land a \land b \land c \land c$ 

"s" here stands for pre-master secret and later along with client random and server random builds session encryption/decryption key

In DHE a and b(as private keys) change for each TLS session and compromising one pair of keys may uncover only one TLS session.

Moving now to TLSv1.3. RSA and Static DH ciphers are ruled out, only DHE and ECDHE(variation of DHE whereas client and server private keys sit on an elliptic curve, and you don't want to see math for that principle for key-exchange is same in nutshell as for DHE) are present. List of cipher suits reduced in TLSv1.3 to only 5 compared to 37 supported in TLSv1.2 and handshake looks as:

Client hello - looks same as with DHE in TLSv1.2 apart that client assumes key exchange algorithm that server will pick and sends its public key (DHE materials) straight away.

Server hello - looks the same as in TLSv1.2 DHE apart that message contains here also server certificates and server "finished message". Moreover, certificates and server finished message are sent encrypted as server has all details already to calculate the session key

Upon receipt of server hello client will authenticate the server and generate the session keys based on received server's public key (same math as in TLSv1.2 DHE)



In summary, with TLSv1.3 every piece of information after Client/Server Hello exchange is encrypted with future session-key. Key exchange in TLSv1.2 came into picture only after successful client-server authentication and in TLSv1.3 both authentication and session keys are established in the first two handshake messages.

#### Software

Software SBC - SCZ920.p3

Software OCOM – 5.2

### Introduction

One of the main aspects with any UCaaS deployment is security as it comes mandatory for both SIP and RTP. Given the complexity this document will outline some of the best current practices starting to prepare SBC for UCaaS deployment, being however applicable, to any setup that involves TLS and SRTP



### LAB UCaaS demo topology

### SBC security configuration objects

#### End entity certificate

Every UCaaS integration comes with mutual TLS as mandatory and preparation step one in SBC is to build its certificate-record end-entity certificate. In a nutshell this is certificate SBC is going to use to introduce itself during TLS handshake. With mutual TLS, SBC will present this certificate acting as server as server certificate or it's going to answer with this certificate acting as client upon server's certificate request, in mutual TLS server requires client side authentication too. At present there are two models end-entity certificate can be created/loaded to SBC

#### End entity certificate install from SBC generated CSR

Generating end-entity certificate starts with certificate-record creation in SBC's main security configuration branch. As highlighted below and bolded red one might see parameters that are mandatory – name, common-name(allocated SBC domain that will be protected) and optionally some extension flags(other parameters as equally important and are to be aligned between 2 ends terminating TLS). In this use case additional extension configured is client-auth as it comes mandatory with mutual TLS and CSR that will be created based on certificate record will carry out a request to support this extension. Remark here that CSR desired extension flags may be modified, removed or added by certificate signing authority. No matter correct CSR generation, signed certificate should be checked for all extension flags that are expected. That said it's obvious that wrongly signed, certificate may end up without client-auth flag that will prevent mutual TLS handshake to work. It is important in this process to be aligned with CA on what flags signed certificate should inherit from CSR.



This model of generating end-entity certificate starts with certificate-record object out of which one triggers CSR creation.



Next step is to supply certification authority with generated CSR to be signed and ported back to SBC. In this exercise I'll be using windows application "Simple authority" that acts as CA. Saving above output to a file I'm loading it to CA app for signature





As you may note on the right hand side CA loads the CSR and presents data from it as we defined them in certificate-record configuration object. As to revert to previous discussion please note a thick on "Include extension requests from CSR". This means that signing the certificate "client-auth" extension flag will remain as specified in CSR

Hitting "ok" certificate is signed and content in pem format ready to be pasted back to SBC:





Only precise verification of what has been ported back after save&activate we get executing "show security certificate-record detail/brief"

```
certificate-record: testBCP 
Certificate: 
    Data: 
         Version: 3 (0x2) 
        Serial Number: 1708075119644 (0x18db135f41c) 
     Signature Algorithm: sha256WithRSAEncryption 
         Issuer: 
            C=HR O=Matej Maric 
            OU=Certification Authority 
             CN=Ministry of Magic 
         Validity 
            Not Before: Feb 16 09:18:39 2024 GMT 
             Not After : Nov 12 09:18:39 2026 GMT 
         Subject: 
             C=US 
             ST=MA 
             L=Burlington 
            O=Engineering 
             CN=ucaas.com 
         X509v3 extensions: 
             X509v3 Authority Key Identifier: 
keyid:E8:9A:46:70:C8:7B:80:73:15:30:21:17:00:E8:45:16:1F:81:AB:2
9 
             X509v3 Basic Constraints: 
                CA:FALSE 
             X509v3 Key Usage: 
                Digital Signature, Key Encipherment 
             X509v3 Subject Key Identifier: 
C1:FB:0C:20:90:EA:C2:1C:60:8E:B8:A9:6B:98:F1:26:C6:3B:39:DA 
            X509v3 Extended Key Usage: 
                 TLS Web Server Authentication, TLS Web Client 
Authentication
```
Exchanging certificates in TLS handshake one must provide a full signing chain and not only signed certificate. For this reason we need to load in SBC also public certificate of authority that signed our CSR. For this purpose we will create another certificate-record as outlined below. Very important remark here is that there is a big difference between certificate record created to build end-entity certificate and the one we built below to load CA public certificate. First one was associated with unique private key given the CSR creation and only signed cert matching the private key is suitable to be loaded back. Latter one below is not associated with any private key and SBC will load there any CA public certificate overwriting default SBC certificate-record content. CA public(root and intermediates) certificates are public and can be easily fetched from internet.





As said content above is irrelevant loading the CA public certs and I will just load my CA Root certificate over this certificate-record. To emphasize that this step must be repeated in case there are intermediate certificates in CA signing chain.





Proper verification kicks in again with "show security certificate-record detail/brief". It will expose details of newly loaded CA public certificate. Please note below that content of this record has nothing to do anymore with default configuration we have put in public CA certificate-record object.



#### End entity certificate install from PKCS12 bundle

PKCS12 is a bundle that consists of private key and signed certificate material. In other word it's elsewhere generated end-entity certificate that SBC supports. In this approach there is no need for CSR generation in SBC as SBC is going to load signed certificate and associate with the private key being part of the same bundle. Also there is no need to create certificate-record object as it's going to be automatically created by SBC upon loading the p12 file.

In practice this means that our customers may be supplied by their security team with a file typically carrying .pfx or p12 extension. Such file needs to be put in /opt folder before attempted to be loaded to SBC. Only issue detected in field trying to upload pkcs12 form is in the way bundle was created and if



SBC prompts an error trying to load such a bundle it could be pkcs12 has to be re-created(openssl) as outlined below

openssl pkcs12 -in <filename>.pfx -nocerts -out key.pem (extracts private key from bundle) openssl pkcs12 -in <filename>.pfx -clcerts -nokeys -out cert.pem (extracts signed cert from bundle)

With these two outputs we will re-create pkcs12 bundle using PBE-SHA1-3DES as it is only one SBC today supports.

 openssl pkcs12 -keypbe PBE-SHA1-3DES -certpbe PBE-SHA1-3DES -export -out msft2023.p12 inkey key.pem -in cert.pem

At this point msft2023.p12 should be properly formatted and ready to be ported into SBC.



Please note that certificate initially created with CSR in SBC may be also exported from SBC in pkcs12 form and loaded to multiple SBCs. This however depends on exact customer deployment and may have security implication given it is same private key re-used in multiple devices. This will not be discussed deeper as part of this BCP.

#### TLS profile

Getting done with certificate creation with need to assign certificate-records properly in tls-profile configuration element. Such tls-profile is later assigned to sip-interface configuration object



Highlighting here that mutual-authenticate parameter, in UCaaS use case, must be enabled otherwise SBC as a server will not request client certificate in TLS handshake and acting as client it will fail to send its certificate upon server's request. Whilst end-entity parameter looks clear on how to be configured trusted-ca-certificates must consist of the local CA chain. In other words there we must specify all intermediates and root CA of local certificate as the whole chain must be presented in TLS handshake. Also, there we must specify roof top Root CA of remote party, certificate record of remote party CA shall be created in same fashion as for local CA, please refer to chapter "End entity certificate" public CA certs loading paragraphs.

#### SDES profile and media-security policy

Configuring two additional configuration objects in SBC we should cover SRTP negotiation and termination on legs where SRTP is mandatory, typically only legs towards UCaaS vendor. Below the sample configuration whereas media-sec-profile gets attached to UCaaS realms.



We should be now all set to test our application.



### TLS and SRTP troubleshoot

In order to verify TLS connection against remote agents works fine same steps might be followed as for any other TCP/UDP agents. SA configured to be SIP OPTIONS pinged will appear in status active in case OPTIONS are successfully replied and if SIP OPTIONS are successfully replied it means underlying transport TLS handshake went well too. Sipmsg.log may give insights in sip message details as well as calls might be checked in OCOM supplied with data from embedded probe(SBC acts as a probe). SBC sends decrypted data to OCOM mediation engine. Calls are then easily readable in form of ladder diagrams.

### Successful TLS and SRTP verification



TLS security stats will expose overall number of active and closed TLS connections along with per chipper and tls version stats.

Successful TLS session-agent verification from CLI:





Successful TLS call verification in OCOM:



OCSBC - UCaaS security aspects



SRTP is negotiated within SIP TLS encrypted connection with SDP exchange. SRTP session is considered successful if there is a match in crypto list algorithms between 2 parties.



Upon a successful SRTP call established SRTP security associations may be displayed in CLI:





#### Failing TLS and SRTP cases

Failures in TLS handshake may be observed in log.atcpd on debug log level but it's probably the easiest to troubleshoot setting up packet-trace local in SBC and viewing captured data in wireshark as most of failures pop up in a stage we still may see traffic in clear. TLS handshake may fail for couple of reasons, highlighting common ones in UCaaS environment:



- TLS version mismatch
- TLS cipher suite mismatch
- Certificate record issues

TLS 1.2 and 1.3 are commonly used today and 1.0 and 1.1 became deprecated. It's client that starts TLS handshake with "Client Hello" and indicates its TLS version and cipher suite support. If connection terminates without "Server Hello" then either TLS version or cipher suit does not match server side.

Screenshot below is packet trace local presentation where TLS was attempted from SBC simulating only TLS1.0 version support, remote are MSFT TLS session agents:



In such a case, as mentioned earlier server side will answer "client hello" message straight with error before issuing "server hello" message. This guides us to check and correct tls-profile with proper TLS version and cipher suite supported by both parties. Log.atcpd the will reflect this failure as printed below:

Jul 9 14:15:27.930 [SERVICE] (0) TLS Handshake: client <<< TLS 1.0 Alert[length 0002], fatal protocol\_version

Jul 9 14:15:27.930 [SERVICE] (0) <tlsengine.cpp:1549> SSL3 alert read:fatal:protocol version

Jul 9 14:15:27.930 [SERVICE] (0) <tlsengine.cpp:1567> SSL\_connect:error in error



Jul 9 14:15:27.930 [SERVICE] (0) <tlsengine.cpp:4237> TLSEngine::TLSMachineDOControl, appData\_m = 0, n = -1

Jul 9 14:15:27.930 [MINOR] (0) SSL\_accept failed, fatal alert sent

Jul 9 14:15:27.930 [MINOR] (0) OpenSSL Error:error:1409442E:SSL routines:ssl3\_read\_bytes:tlsv1 alert protocol version:ssl/record/rec\_layer\_s3.c:1551:SSL alert number 70

Jul 9 14:15:27.930 [SERVICE] (0) <tlsengine.cpp:4357> TLSEngine::TLSMachineDOControl, appData\_m = 0, retCode=32

Jul 9 14:15:27.930 [MINOR] (0) ServiceSocketProxyAdapter TCP:10.0.16.25:34348->52.114.75.24:5061 CheckAndRecvTLS, TLS Recv failed retCode: 32:TLS engine accept/connect failed on fd -1

Jul 9 14:15:27.930 [SERVICE] (0) <ServiceSocketProxyAdapter.cpp:1894> ServiceSocketProxyAdapter::Disconnect(void) (0x81bc3400)

Sorting out version and cipher suite there are certificates to be exchanged. Post "server hello" it is server presenting its certificate chain. Below failure simulation occurs when I remove public CA of remote party from tls-profile trusted-ca-certificate:





In this exchange TLS handshake goes further. SBC sends "client hello", as a server MSFT answers with "server hello" "certificates". Straight upon receiving remote certificate chain SBC terminates TCP connection sending FIN. SBC was not able to verify remote certificate chain trust. From the server certificate message is obvious who signed their certificate and this issue gets fixed by adding again



"DigiCert Global Root G2" back to "trusted-ca-certificate" list of corresponding TLS profile. It may be very well this certificate was not even loaded to SBC so this has to be done as step one. Log.atcpd will reflect this situation as:

Jul 9 14:32:28.538 [SERVICE] (2) TLS Handshake: client >>> TLS 1.2 Alert[length 0002], fatal unknown\_ca

Jul 9 14:32:28.538 [SERVICE] (2) <tlsengine.cpp:1549> SSL3 alert write:fatal:unknown CA

Jul 9 14:32:28.539 [SERVICE] (2) <tlsengine.cpp:1567> SSL\_connect:error in error

Jul 9 14:32:28.539 [SERVICE] (2) <tlsengine.cpp:4237> TLSEngine::TLSMachineDOControl, appData\_m = 0, n = -1

Jul 9 14:32:28.539 [SERVICE] (2) <tlsengine.cpp:5018> encrypted packet sent:

Jul 9 14:32:28.539 [SERVICE] (2) 15 03 03 00 02 02 30 length: 7

Jul 9 14:32:28.539 [ATCP] (2) <AtcpSocket.cpp:894> virtual int AtcpSocket::Send(const void\*, size\_t) bytes to send=7 fd=1071279

Jul 9 14:32:28.539 [ATCP] (2) <clog.cpp:98> atcpGetControlMblk: ALLOCED mBlk at 0x2f2769d0

Jul 9 14:32:28.539 [ATCP] (2) <clog.cpp:98> (mData:0x2dbb2828,mFlags=0,mNext:(nil),len=23)

Jul 9 14:32:28.539 [ATCP] (2) <AtcpSocket.cpp:878> int AtcpSocket::sendOnePacket(mBlk\*, int, const void\*, int) add crsId=0 to acme header for fd=1071279

Jul 9 14:32:28.539 [ATCP] (2) <AtcpServicePipe.cpp:1400> Asock::Send phy,vlan=0,0 cookie=0x0x171

Jul 9 14:32:28.539 [ATCP] (2) <AtcpServicePipe.cpp:1757> virtual int AtcpServicePipe::TransmitData(const void\*, uint32\_t) putting on transport queue, cookie=0x0x171

Jul 9 14:32:28.539 [SERVICE] (2) <Commands.h:410> add command AtcpDataCommand 0x8539c790(2) on Transport queue # 2

Jul 9 14:32:28.539 [SERVICE] (2) <tlsengine.cpp:5047> TLSEngine::FlushNetworkBIO nFD:-1, fromBIO:7, numWrite:7, writePos:7

Jul 9 14:32:28.539 [MINOR] (2) SSL\_accept failed, fatal alert sent

In next simulation TLS handshake will go even more further, here I'm simulating SBC sending incomplete chain with expectation that MSFT will terminate TLS handshake. To simulate this I will remove one intermediate (that signed the local cert) from "trusted-ca-certificate" list.





In a screenshot above TLS handshake goes further and SBC as client verifies server side certificate successfully. Upon server request it also sends its certificate in frame 29. However as it sends incomplete data, only signed cert with no intermediates server will consider it incomplete and terminate TCP connection with FIN. Action point here is to verify that SBC side full chain is loaded to SBC.

SRTP application layer negotiation failure happens post TLS is up and usually reflects as human readable session termination with SIP 488 "Not acceptable here" replied back to sender's SIP INVITE. Both parties should agree on supported ciphers and sdes-profile should be tuned accordingly.

#### Abnormal TLS cases

It may happen for whatever reasons that application layer logs in SBC cannot be checked and there is no OCOM in place while we have healthy indication that underlying TLS and SRTP are all fine. With recent 9.2 feature SBC may log TLSv1.2 and TLSv1.3 pre-master and master secret for a TLS connection that helps decrypting traces in wireshark.

In my next example I have healthy TLS session-agent indication but my calls are failing. There is no sipmsg.log available nor OCOM in place. An option to go with is following:

- Setup packet-trace local on desired network-interface
- Configure system-config parameter log-tls-key



- Attempt the failing call and collect the pcap from /opt/traces(note that pcap may be from elsewhere in network)
- Fetch the pre-master and master key from /opt/logs. File is called tlskey.log
- Attempt to decrypt messages in wireshark

In wireshark one needs to go TLS protocol preferences and target the file fetched from SBC as looks below:



Only step remaining is a right click on TLS packet under inspection and use "decode as" choosing SIP given packets may be reassembled.

TLS packets became visible as raw data:





At point we'd normally see just encrypted application data now we have a full view over decrypted content. Furthermore reason of the call failure can be further explored:



As an outcome, RC of the call failure, seems to be in routing and SBC may be checked for the proper call routing configuration fine tuning.

For sake of completeness worth exposing for the case above what the TLS cipher suit negotiated was:



### Abnormal SRTP cases

There is no similar equivalent in SBC or in wireshark that would allow us to decrypt SRTP easy. However, below an example how SRTP stream fetched on network level may be decrypted with open source tool srtp-decrypt.

#### GitHub - gteissier/srtp-decrypt: Deciphers SRTP packets

Project was compiled on testing Oracle linux machine.

Attempting to decrypt SRTP assumption is that we had successful TLS handshake and that we have a view over a SIP call in clear to grab crypto key, also we need network layer of SRTP capture itself(.pcap). It may be challenging to isolate proper RTP stream from wireshark but once isolated single stream direction has to be saved as an input for srtp-decrypt application. Procedure looks as below:

Isolating proper RTP stream, filtering and saving to file:

8 N G Q & S 2 4 V N B Q Q & H

# ORACLE



One may verify first that trying to play streams we hear only crackling noise. Afterwards hitting "prepare filter" wireshark will filter the single RTP stream direction for which single crypto applies. Such file has to be saved as below



Once we have a filtered .pcap remaining is to grab 40bytes BASE64 crypto string that consists of master key and salt.



As of that point we are ready for decryption. Available options within a tool are total frame offset before the payload and srtp authentication tag length(defaults are assumed that equal 42bytes and 10bytes for latter mentioned srtp auth tag).



Application takes SRTP .pcap as an input and provides application level decrypted hex stream (only RTP content without lower layers). Output form is not an issue as hex dump can be easily imported to wireshark adding fake lower layers:

srtpdecrypt.pcap

# ORACLE





By putting a thick on IP header and UDP we insert fake destination/source IP and port. Hitting import wireshark displays our decrypted SRTP stream



#### Attempting to play the stream this time it will audible in G729

Payload: 781680a000fac20007d678ab40a000fac20007d6

