draft-kucherawy-dkimtransform

Murray Kucherawy <<u>superuser@gmail.com</u>> / IETF 108 / "Madrid", July 2020

- First posted April 2015 during the early DMARC work
- Idea originated from some OpenDKIM debugging work (I think)
 - Could actually resolve what the breakage was
- Theory: Mailing list servers break DKIM signatures, which makes DMARC unhappy, but usually this damage is made in very small and/or well understood ways
- If that's true, then it should be relatively easy to recover the original message and thus get the author domain signature to validate again in most cases
 - ...as long as you know what the mutations were, and that they are *reversible* and *acceptable*
- Not designed to be bulletproof, only to solve the majority of use cases
- If you try this and it fails, you're no worse off than you were without even trying

- So record the *reversible* transformations that commonly occur, and decide what you consider to be *acceptable*
 - Probably the order matters, but maybe not if they don't overlap
- Reached out to Mailman, Sympa, and L-Soft; only Mailman replied
 - Got a comprehensive list of message mutations they make
 - Developed a first list of common, *reversible* transformations, and descriptions for these
 - Proposed a DKIM tag that contains the list of transformations the verifier should apply to try to recover the original message
 - Declared an IANA registry for known transformations

- Assume an original message (O) bearing an author domain signature (A) arrives via a Mailing List Manager; the arriving message (M) now also has a list domain signature (L)
- L verifies but A does not, as you'd expect
- But L has a tag on it claiming the MLM made transformations T1, T2, and T3
 - So M = T3(T2(T1(O)))
- These transformations are well understood and reversible
 - Then in theory, T1'(T2'(T3'(M))) = O
 - Now you can verify A against O and, if you concur that T1, T2, and T3 were acceptable, you can treat M the same as O in terms of trust

- Upsides:
 - No crypto, no need for DNS; lightweight and simple when compared to ARC
 - The first set of proposed transformations are well understood
- Considerations:
 - The MIME transformations seem easy to describe, especially when manipulated as objects, but whitespace mush might make precision difficult
 - An attacker can take a legitimate message and subject it to these mutations, adding spam to the body or header, and claim to be an MLM
 - Harkens back to the old "I=" tag problem
 - This is why I mentioned that the transformation also has to be *acceptable*