Respect the ORIGIN! A Best-case Evaluation of Connection Coalescing

Sudheesh Singanamalla

Muhammad Talha Paracha Suleman Ahmad Jonathan Hoyland Luke Valenta Yevgen Safronov Peter Wu Andrew Galloni Vasileios Giotsas Kurtis Heimerl Nick Sullivan Christopher A. Wood Marwan Fayed

Under Submission

IMC'22



What is connection coalescing?

WANT:

Same IP addresses but results in multiple **possibly blocking** DNS queries.



content.example.com

cdn.external.com







Next: What happens for subresources?





Chrome's Approach: IP addresses for different hostnames must match





Firefox's Approach: Transitivity between sets of IPs





Where are the subresources located?



Insights:

- 14% of web pages have a dependency on resources from one other AS.
- More than 50% of webpages need no more than 6 ASes for all subresources.



Where are the subresources? ... Coalescing favours CDNs

| Rank | AS Number | Org. Name | #Req | % |
|-------|-----------|---------------------|---------|-------|
| 1 | AS 15169 | Google | 7932198 | 22.10 |
| 2 | AS 13335 | Cloudflare | 4937395 | 13.75 |
| 3 | AS 16509 | Amazon 02 | 3017176 | 8.40 |
| 4 | AS 14618 | Amazon AES | 2019308 | 5.62 |
| 5 | AS 54113 | Fastly | 1281402 | 3.57 |
| 6 | AS 16625 | Akamai AS | 1087172 | 3.02 |
| 7 | AS 32934 | Facebook | 998685 | 2.78 |
| 8 | AS 20940 | Akamai Intl. B.V. | 583700 | 1.62 |
| 9 | AS 16276 | OVH SAS | 548107 | 1.52 |
| 10 | AS 24940 | Hetzner Online GmbH | 469293 | 1.30 |
| Total | | | | 63.68 |

Insights:

- The top 10 ASes handle more than 60% of all web requests for subresources
- Connection re-use potential (Min. number of connections) could be approximated to number of unique ASes contacted.



Challenges with ORIGIN Frames (RFC 8336)

- 1. Default ORIGIN Frame standard allows any hostname(s) to be sent by the server.
- 2. Clients validate the hostnames in the ORIGIN frame for authenticity
 - a. Firefox is the only client which supports ORIGIN Frame
 - b. Clients resolve DNS queries and retrieve retrieve TLS Certificates
 - i. If the IP addresses match IP based coalescing results.
 - ii. Else, new TCP+TLS connections are made.
- 3. Lack of server software support for ORIGIN Frames.





Modelling: > 60% improvement in Number of DNS and TLS connections





Active Measurements: Production traffic on 5K domains



(a) IP-Based Coalescing

(b) ORIGIN Frame

- 1. ORIGIN Frame based coalescing approaches result in lesser overall new connections
- 2. Over 65% of connections can be coalesced through ORIGIN Frame (~70% IP based)



Takeaway 1: Connection Coalescing works in practice!



~50% reduction in number of new connections to the cdnjs hostname we attempted coalescing to.

Reduced Number of Cryptographic Certificate Validations.

Implications for reduced server compute resources.



Takeaway 2: PLT Performance is no-worse, minor improvements



(a) Measured and modelled.

(b) IP and ORIGIN

Meaningful impact to PLT can only be seen if multiple operators enable ORIGIN frame support.



Takeaway 3: ORIGIN Frame based Coalescing improves privacy

Each coalesced connection hides an otherwise exposed plaintext SNI and prevents at-least one additional plaintext DNS query-response.

Potentially improved fingerprinting resistance but more detailed studies are needed.





Takeaway 4: Marwan wants you to know ...



Connection Coalescing is *NOT* about performance!

Questions:

-- Unintended ripple effects in non RFC compliant HTTP/2 stacks?

-- HTTP/3? It has no ORIGIN frame equivalent!



Thank You!

<u>sudheesh@cloudflare.com</u> / <u>sudheesh@cs.washington.edu</u> <u>marwan@cloudflare.com</u>