

strongSwan - Bug #1199

virtual ip assignment sequence when use %radius

10.11.2015 07:17 - richard hu

Status:	Closed	Start date:	10.11.2015
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	
Assignee:	Tobias Brunner	Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Category:	libcharon	Resolution:	Fixed
Target version:	5.3.4		
Affected version:	5.3.3		
Description			
when use ikev2 and eap-radius, set rightsourceip=%radius,172.16.0.0/16 found strongswan will use 172.16.0.x although radius response a valid Framed-IP-Address if set rightsourceip=%radius, then strongswan can get radius response ip. is this by design? I think radius should be first because it write in front of 172.16			

Associated revisions

Revision fdfbd401 - 12.11.2015 14:32 - Tobias Brunner

eap-radius: Compare address family when handing out virtual IPs

This also ensures that the actually released virtual IP is removed from the list of claimed IPs.

Fixes #1199.

History

#1 - 10.11.2015 08:09 - richard hu

log shows assign two ip, but finally client use 172.16.x.x

```
Nov 10 07:07:41 07[CFG] <IOS8_IKEV2i_MSCHAP|2> reassigning offline lease to 'aaa'  
Nov 10 07:07:41 07[IKE] <IOS8_IKEV2i_MSCHAP|2> assigning virtual IP 172.16.0.1 to peer 'aaa'  
Nov 10 07:07:41 07[IKE] <IOS8_IKEV2i_MSCHAP|2> peer requested virtual IP %any6  
Nov 10 07:07:41 07[IKE] <IOS8_IKEV2i_MSCHAP|2> assigning virtual IP 172.26.11.20 to peer 'aaa'  
Nov 10 07:07:41 07[IKE] <IOS8_IKEV2i_MSCHAP|2> building INTERNAL_IP4_DNS attribute  
Nov 10 07:07:41 07[IKE] <IOS8_IKEV2i_MSCHAP|2> building INTERNAL_IP4_NETMASK attribute  
Nov 10 07:07:41 07[IKE] <IOS8_IKEV2i_MSCHAP|2> CHILD_SA IOS8_IKEV2i_MSCHAP{2} established with SPIs c30b630f_i 0a5413bf_o and TS 0.0.0.0/0 === 172.16.0.1/32 172.26.11.20/32
```

#2 - 10.11.2015 09:56 - Tobias Brunner

- Status changed from New to Feedback

There is definitely a problem with the address assignment in the RADIUS plugin as there is no comparison of the IP address family. So this should never happen:

```
Nov 10 07:07:41 07[IKE] <IOS8_IKEV2i_MSCHAP|2> peer requested virtual IP %any6  
Nov 10 07:07:41 07[IKE] <IOS8_IKEV2i_MSCHAP|2> assigning virtual IP 172.26.11.20 to peer 'aaa'
```

I pushed a fix for this to the *1199-radius-vip-family* branch.

I think radius should be first because it write in front of 172.16

That depends on the order in which attribute providers register themselves, basically the plugin load order. If the *stroke* plugin (which provides the in-memory pools defined in ipsec.conf) is loaded before the *eap-radius* plugin it will be queried first for a virtual IP. The order within the *rightsouceip* option is irrelevant (unless you define multiple in-memory pools). I've added a note to [VirtualIP](#).

#3 - 11.11.2015 02:24 - richard hu

Tobias Brunner wrote:

If I want get %radius ip first, I need apply the fix and change plugin order?

There is definitely a problem with the address assignment in the RADIUS plugin as there is no comparison of the IP address family. So this should never happen:

[...]

I pushed a fix for this to the *1199-radius-vip-family* branch.

I think radius should be first because it write in front of 172.16

That depends on the order in which attribute providers register themselves, basically the plugin load order. If the *stroke* plugin (which provides the in-memory pools defined in *ipsec.conf*) is loaded before the *eap-radius* plugin it will be queried first for a virtual IP. The order within the *rightsouceip* option is irrelevant (unless you define multiple in-memory pools). I've added a note to [VirtualIP](#).

#4 - 11.11.2015 11:07 - Tobias Brunner

If I want get %radius ip first, I need apply the fix and change plugin order?

Just change the plugin order. As long as the client requests an IPv4 address first that should work fine without the patch.

#5 - 12.11.2015 02:29 - richard hu

Tobias Brunner wrote:

If I want get %radius ip first, I need apply the fix and change plugin order?

Just change the plugin order. As long as the client requests an IPv4 address first that should work fine without the patch.

then what the patch fixed?

#6 - 12.11.2015 14:35 - Tobias Brunner

- *Tracker changed from Issue to Bug*
- *Category set to libcharon*
- *Target version set to 5.3.4*
- *Resolution set to Fixed*

Just change the plugin order. As long as the client requests an IPv4 address first that should work fine without the patch.

then what the patch fixed?

It prevents the *eap-radius* plugin from handing out IPv4 addresses if the client requested an IPv6 address and vice versa (as can be seen in your log). If you only assign one Framed-IP-Address attribute, let the *eap-radius* assign IPs first (by changing the plugin order) and the client sends the IPv4 attribute request first then the current code does not cause problems.

#7 - 16.11.2015 11:36 - Tobias Brunner

- *Status changed from Feedback to Closed*