

# draft-fujiwara-dnsop-bad-dns-auth-01

---

IETF61 DNSOP  
2004/11/07

Kazunori Fujiwara, JPRS <fujiwara@jprs.co.jp>  
Keisuke Ishibashi, NTT <ishibashi.keisuke@lab.ntt.co.jp>  
Katsuyasu Toyama, NTT <toyama.katsuyasu@lab.ntt.co.jp>

# Topics

---

- Protecting cache server against misconfiguration of DNS authoritative servers
  - We had a terrible cache server overload.
  - This is caused by misconfigured authoritative servers.
  - Protection method is needed for ISP cache server.
  
- This topic has more issues about DNS protocol.
  - DNS Response size consideration
  - EDNS0 implementation status
  - EDNS0(with fragmentation) and IPv6
  - DNS anycast vs TCP query (not mentioned in the draft -01)

# Cache server overload (1)

---

- There are some authoritative server misconfiguration
  - large response size RRSet
    - Many(32) PTRs in one IP address
  - no EDNS0
  - TCP filtering at authoritative servers
  
- and this RRSet is major IP address, many clients query this address frequently.
  
- What happens as a result?
  - In every query, truncation occurs.
  - At that time, cache server queries again by TCP.
  - But TCP is blocked by filter.
  - Then cache server has many 'stocled' TCP SYN\_SENT status and makes high load.

# Cache server overload (2)

---

- Authoritative server misconfiguration can create significant overloads on cache servers.
  - This behavior was found through the observation of query traffic to/from ISP cache servers.
  - And we reported it in NANOG32 meeting in October.
- Attacker can make a DoS attack to ISP cache servers using this problem.
  - Attacker prepares an authoritative server and a RRSet with this problem.
  - Attacker sends a lot of queries with spoofed source addresses, as if they are sent from various clients.
- From the ISP users view, failure of DNS cache server is almost equal to the failure of the Internet service itself.
- We should protect DNS cache servers.

# How to decrease TCP sessions in Resolver server

---

- One idea: do not query by TCP when truncation
  - It reduces TCP sessions.
  - But the answer which is supposed to be able to get it properly if it listens with TCP can't be resolved.
  - it cannot cache any data (RFC 2308).
  - All resolving request, the cache server queries to all the authoritative servers by UDP.
  - More, it may violate RFC2181.
  
- Needs new cache/resolver server algorithm

# Cache/Resolver server algorithm improvement

---

## □ We propose

- As before, the cache server queries by UDP (w/wo EDNS0) and if TC bit is set, the cache server queries again the authoritative server by TCP.
- (new) When queries for all authoritative servers are unsuccessful, the cache server caches that RRSets(name,class,type) as unresolvable.
- (new) Next query for the same RRSets from stub resolvers, the cache server does not query to authoritative servers and answers "unresolvable".
- (optional) Cache server marks misconfigured servers which does not respond TCP. (equivalent to BIND9's EDNS0 capability database.)

## □ Protocol consideration

---

### □ RFC2308 section 7 - Other Negative Responses

- This section does not mention about TCP filtering.
  - ▷ UDP is OK
  - ▷ no answer by TCP, no TCP reset
- RFC 2308 7.1: "... In either case a resolver MAY cache a server failure response. If it does so it MUST NOT cache it for longer than five (5) minutes, and it MUST be cached against the specific query tuple <query name, type, class, server IP address>."

### □ But

- 5 minutes is too small to protect from DoS.
- In our case, authoritative server's misconfiguration lasted in about a half year.

### □ Our proposal

- For protecting cache servers, we recommend to cache unresolvable information for several hours.

# DNS Response size consideration

---

- DNS response size lower than 512 octets
  - safe with Original UDP DNS protocol
  
- $512 < \text{DNS response size} \leq 1280 - (\text{IP/UDP})\text{header size}$   
(1200? octets)
  - safe with EDNS0 without IPv6 fragmentation
  - (on the present Internet, IPv4 is the same as IPv6.)
  - TCP is OK
  
- $1200? < \text{DNS response size}$ 
  - EDNS0 needs IP/IPv6 fragmentation
  - TCP is OK

# EDNS0 implementation status

---

- Question

- Now, EDNS0 requirement is "SHOULD". Is this OK?

- When will EDNS0 requirement be "MUST" ?

- This discussion is need for enum-wg.

- RRSet may be large in ENUM.

# EDNS0(with fragmentation) and IPv6

---

## □ According to RFC3226 section 3

- "All RFC 2535 and RFC 2874 compliant entities MUST be able to handle fragmented IPv4 and IPv6 UDP packets." (to support EDNS0 with large response size)

## □ But RFC2460 "IPv6 Specification" section 5

- "the use of such fragmentation is discouraged in any application that is able to adjust its packets to fit the measured path MTU."

## □ Question

- EDNS0 with large response size requires IPv4 and IPv6 fragmentation. Is it OK? (I think OK.)

# DNS anycast vs TCP query (not mentioned in the draft -01)

---

- TCP queries may work on DNS anycast with BGP.
  - Routing information may be stable for a short time.
  - Equal cost multi path doesn't occur in principle.
    - But ECMP problem occurs in the Internet, more investigation is necessary.
  - TCP communication may work for a short time.
  - DNS queries using TCP is completed in a short time.
  
- DNS anycast with IGP
  - "Equal cost multi path" problem can be solved with per flow routing.
  
- Need more consideration.

# A minimal requirement may be

---

- DNS response size exceeds 512 octets
  - the authoritative name servers MUST permit TCP queries
  - or MUST support EDNS0
  
- DNS response size exceeds 1200 octets
  - the authoritative name servers MUST permit TCP queries
  - AND MUST support EDNS0

# Summary

---

- TCP support for DNS is now mandatory, but there are many authoritative servers which do not support TCP.
  
- EDNS0 has IP/IPv6 fragment issues.
  
- Still need for protection mechanism for DNS cache server.
  
- This I-D should be separated as two I-Ds.
  - Negative cache issue
  - Today's DNS requirements

# Acknowledgement

---

- We would like to thank Ichiro Mizukoshi, Haruhiko Ohshima, Masahiro Ishino, Chika Yoshimura, Tsuyoshi Toyono, Hirotaka Matsuoka, Yasuhiro Morisita, Bill Manning and Rob Austein.

# Questions

---

- need Comments
- Please discuss in dnsop mailing list.