

Implementation experience with the two BPKI models

Having recently converted my code base to the single-trust-anchor model Russ recommended, I thought it might be useful to share what I've learned. This may not apply to all implementations, but it does apply to mine, and given what I understand of RIPE's business model, it will probably apply to RIPE's implementation as well.

In spite of a strong desire to do so, I was not able to use exactly the same BPKI keys and certificates for HTTPS and CMS. The reason for this is simple: each hosted entity in my engine has its own BPKI, as does the hosting entity, but the HTTPS listener is shared. The only ways I know of to avoid this would be to use separate listeners for each hosted entity, which scales poorly, or to rely on the TLS "Server Name Indication" extension (RFC 4366 3.1) which is not yet widely implemented.




Figure 1: Symmetric BPKI model

Figure 1 shows my engine's view of the BPKI tree in the symmetric model. Black objects belong to the hosting entity, blue objects belong to the hosted entities, red objects are cross-certified objects from peers. The arrows indicate certificate issuance: solid arrows are the ones that my own RPKI engine will care about during certificate validation, dotted arrows show the origin of EE

certificates my engine uses to sign things. “BSC” stands for “business signing context,” which is a database object in my implementation representing the context needed to sign a CMS message or TLS session.

Other than the above-mentioned annoyance with the HTTPS server certificate, the “symmetric” BPKI model worked out pretty much as expected here. The certificate tree looks complicated, but the set of certificates needed to build a particular validation chain is obvious, again excepting the HTTPS server case, where client certificate is the first hint that the engine has of the client’s identity, so the server must be prepared to accept any current client certificate.




Figure 2: Asymmetric BPKI model

Figure 2 shows my engine’s view of the BPKI tree in the asymmetric model. Note that not much has changed here from the symmetric case. As far as I can tell, the asymmetric model is just as complex for my engine as the symmetric model; the only real difference is that the engine has to keep track of a larger number of BSC EE certificates in the asymmetric case.