DNSSEC on Campus

By

Michael Sinatra

University of California, Berkeley

• You didn't think I was really going to use that font, did you?

What we did

- Began validating DNSSEC responses on our caching resolvers using ISC DLV in October 2008
- Participated in EDUCAUSE EDU testbed, Fall 2009
- Began signing berkeley.edu and most subzones, plus in-addr.arpas in January 2010. Have not yet placed our keys in any DLV or TAR

Why do it?

- Yes there is risk:
 - Research universities should still be willing to be on the bleeding edge.
 - Risk should be reasonable.
 - There is recognition at UC Berkeley that we have had a role in the development of the Internet and we shouldn't (have) abandon(ed) that role.

DLV: How'd it go?

- Surprisingly well.
- Three failures in 16 months.
 - GOV NSEC3 validation
 - This was a BIND ($\langle 9.6.0 \rangle$ coding issue (now fixed). unbound already supports NSEC3.
 - Signing issues (the first one was a doozy)
 - (didn't get too much flak, though)
 - This is a basic DNSSEC issue, not a DLV issue

DLV: How'd it go?

- The irony is that early validators may have had an easier time of it.
- Now that GOV agencies are under the gun to "signbaby-sign," we're seeing a number of issues, and sometimes we're paying for it.

EDU testbed

- UCB participated beginning in September 2009.
- Created our own testbed.
- Published keys in EDU testbed and created stub zones for testbed EDU zone to allow test resolvers to validate.
- Worked well and we learned a <u>lot</u>.



EDU testbed

- What did we learn
 - Signing is not as hard as I feared, but it is tricky.
 - If your signatures expire (usually because you don't re-sign your zone periodically), your zone WILL BREAK.
 - Serial number manipulation can be tricky, especially when you already have one process and your signing tools assume a different process.
 - ZSK rollover isn't so bad, but KSK rollover can be tricky.
 - Algorithm rollovers (e.g. RSASHA1 to DSA or RSASHA1 to RSASHA512) are even trickier.
 - MUST have KSKs and ZSKs for both algorithms (RFC 4035)…
 - …but implementations handle incomplete algorithm pairs differently!

For real

- We had a two week campus-wide furlough/shutdown and it was too hard to pass up.
- Decided to get the signed zones into the authoritative servers but not publish the trust anchor in any TAR or DLV.
 - Wanted to test effects of much larger responses
 - Worried about firewalls and the like
 - Wanted to give myself some leeway will I tweaked my automated signing processes, in case I occasionally screwed sigs up.
 - More time to test!
- UCB already had an automated signing process, so need to modify that for DNSSEC.
- Did it for the testbed, now had to modify it for production.

For real

- Had to warn campus!
 - <u>http://ls.berkeley.edu/mail/micronet/2009/1520.html</u>
 - <u>http://net.berkeley.edu/DNS/dnssec.html</u>
- You will want to do this!
- Also, let your secondaries know and make sure that they support DNSSEC. Don't learn nrc.gov's lesson the hard way!

- Signed zones were populated into authoritative servers between 1-3 January 2010.
 - Didn't want to mess anything up for end-of-year giving.
 - Populated gradually to make sure that secondaries (U. Oregon, SNS@ISC) could handle. (Didn't doubt it, but did want to verify.)
- Once all auth servers had the signed zones, I worried about firewalls.
 - Created 'sacrificial lamb'.

```
options {
    ...
    minimal-responses yes; // only send answer
    max-udp-size 512; // EDNS0 responses limited to 512B
    ...
};
```

- Caused NSes that were sending DO (w/EDNS0) but weren't getting responses back to eventually fall over to sacrificial lamb
- Even got a security/abuse report!

```
2010-01-14 09:13:54 - Big Bomb -
Source:128.32.136.6,0,WAN -
Destination:1xx.xxx.xx,0,LAN
```

• Real IP address was included, so was able to correlate this with logs:

```
13-Jan-2010 15:13:54.434 client 1xx.xxx.xxx#1025:
query: www.lib.berkeley.edu IN A -ED (128.32.136.6)
```

- Client hit sacrificial lamb about a second later, and didn't query any other auth servers. Looks like it worked!
- Found many other cases of queriers bouncing around our auth servers and then querying sacrificial lamb.
- Some also disabled EDNS0. (More to discuss in BoF.)

• Queries to sacrificial lamb (bindgraph):



• Memory footprint for an authoritative server:



• Memory footprint for a caching server:



• CPU utilization for a caching server:



- Current status:
 - Zones are being signed every night, and I have not experienced any validation problems (yet).
 - Haven't published KSK in any TAR or DLV; may wait until EDU is signed.

Lessons/Concludatory remarks

- Memory/CPU requirements are bigger, but well within today's capacities.
 - Signing is on an old machine and it takes about 30-45 minutes to sign 607 zones of varying sizes.
 - Basically, it has taken us so long to deploy DNSSEC that the hardware has caught up!
- Lot's of stuff to go wrong.
 - Test, test, test
 - Monitor, monitor, monitor
- Outside of my control (not totally)
 - Bugs, implementation issues.
 - Standards under-specify use of KSKs and ZSKs; implementations deal with operational practices differently.
- More things to do:
 - Use smokeping DNS probes at validating and non-validating servers for important zones to make sure validation is working.
 - Better key management for DR and backup.
 - Use FreeBSD jails on masters and put keys outside of the jail where named runs.

Thanks to…

- Internet Systems Consortium
 - Paul Vixie, Mark Andrews, Michael Graff, Keith Mitchell, Peter Losher
- EDUCAUSE
 - Becky Granger
- Verisign
 - Dave Blacka, Matt Larson, David Smith, others…
- UC Berkeley
 - Jim Blair, Paul Fisher (E-mail), (ex-) Network Services Group
- Internet2 DNSSEC working group
 - Everyone, especially Shumon Huque, Casey Deccio, Joe St. Sauver, Scott Rose, Steve Crocker, many others
- Others:
 - Olaf Kolkman





End