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Chapter 2: Roadmap

2.1 Principles of network applications
2.2 Web and HTTP
2.3 FTP
2.4 Electronic Mail
   - SMTP, POP3, IMAP
2.5 DNS (extras)
2.6 P2P file sharing
2.7 Socket programming with TCP
2.8 Socket programming with UDP
2.9 Building a Web server
DNS Reality

- DNS is an old protocol with seemingly simple operation
  - Standardized in 1987, mostly unchanged since then
  - Single-packet query, single-packet response
  - UDP-based operation, no congestion/flow control
  - Timeout-based retransmission

- In practice, DNS is rather complex
  - Many decisions go into writing a good resolver, some of which are still not well understood
  - Topic of ongoing research in security, distributed systems, Internet measurement, future network architecture

- Goal now is to understand the limitations of DNS, its vulnerabilities, and various uses
CDNs

- Content Distribution Networks (CDNs)
  - Push replicated content (files, video, images) towards edges
  - Distributed system of application-layer servers
- One of the pioneering CDNs is Akamai
- Desired model of operation:
**CDNs 2**

- How to direct user to closest replica?
  - Akamai relies on DNS to bounce the user to the best server
  - Based on location of local resolver to find best server (e.g., using distance, load, latency, available bandwidth)

1) replicated content for www.xyz.com

2) DNS type A query for www.xyz.com

3) DNS type A query for www.xyz.com

ns1.xyz.com controlled by Akamai

www.xyz.com

Akamai edge server at TAMU

4) page downloaded locally
**CDNs 3**

- How many servers are there?
  - Over 200K in 120 countries and 1500 networks

- Often Akamai produces long redirect chains
  - Usually through CNAMEs based on the IP of local resolver

1) DNS type A query for www.xyz.com

2) DNS type A query for www.xyz.com
• One research problem in CDNs is how to determine best edge server for the user
  - If multiple options are present, which one is better?
  - What if closest server is overloaded?
  - Not all servers have every possible version of content
  - Need to account for ISP agreements on bandwidth

• Example:

  ```
  www.dhs.gov.edgekey.net CNAME e4340.dscg.akamaiedge.net
  e4340.dscg.akamaiedge.net A 23.45.237.161 (TTL 20 seconds)
  ```
• One pitfall of CDNs is that distance from user to their local resolver is generally unknown
  - May lead to inaccuracies for large ISPs
• Another drawback is long resolution chains
  - 15 CNAMEs back-to-back is not just huge latency, but also prone to incorrect configuration, dead-ends, loops
• Caching helps with latency, but Akamai uses extremely small TTLs (e.g., 20 sec), so might still be an issue
• Useful online tools
  - ip2location.com tries to map IPs to country/city
  - Registrars (e.g., ARIN, RIPE) allocate subnets; their whois database can be used to map IPs to owner networks
DNS Vulnerabilities

- Terminology: IP spoofing
  - Packets with fake source IP
- For spoofing to work, ISP network of attacker must allow such packets to depart
    - Of 12K IPs tested, 31% were able to spoof (18% across the US, 5% for edu and home networks)
- TCP spoofing is hard
  - Almost impossible to complete the handshake without knowing parameters of the response packet (only B sees them)
- However, UDP spoofing is easy
DNS Vulnerabilities 2

• **Terminology**: amplification attacks
  - Hacker transmits small packets to intermediate hosts, which then generate more traffic towards the victim
  - Relies on spoofing the IP of the victim
  - Difficult to trace as the attacker remains hidden

• **DNS amplification (1999)**
  - Short questions produce large replies, combined with spoofing
  - Large reply = many answers or additional records

• How much amplification can be achieved?
  - IP+UDP+DNS headers = 40 bytes, question \( \approx \) 15 bytes
  - Maximum reply is 512 bytes over UDP, ratio 9.3:1
  - 1 Mbps upstream bandwidth per attacker host \( \rightarrow \) 9.3 Mbps
DNS Vulnerabilities 3

• 1000 hijacked hosts → 9.3 Gbps
  - Even a tiny botnet (collection of infected computers under centralized control) can saturate 10 Gbps link

• Main problem: how to find DNS zone with large replies?

• 1) DNS TXT queries
  - Some text associated with a host/domain

  C:\>nslookup -querytype=txt google.com
  Server: s18.irl.cs.tamu.edu
  Address: 128.194.135.58
  Non-authoritative answer:
  google.com  text = "v=spf1 include:_netblocks.google.com ip4:216.73.93.70/31
  ip4:216.73.93.72/31 ~all"

  Sender Policy Framework (SPF) shows which IPs are authorized to send email on behalf of this domain

  • Text may be large, which leads to easy amplification
    - Traditionally, TXT records were rare; however, new spam-related verification protocols are now actively using them
DNS Vulnerabilities

2) Domains with many A records/host
   - Google returns 11 IPs per query (212 bytes per packet)
3) IPv6 queries (type AAAA) and SOA
   - IPv6 addresses are 16 bytes, SOA contains lots of fields
4) DNS extensions (EDNS)
   - Extensions to DNS that support large packets
   - Necessary for signed replies (DNSSEC)

Amplification falls under the umbrella of DDoS (Distributed Denial of Service) attacks
   - Goal is to overload target server with incoming traffic

Terminology: insertion of falsified records into local DNS resolver is called cache poisoning
Remote TXID Guess attack (1997)
- DNS responses cannot be verified for authenticity
- Possible for attacker to send fake replies to fool local resolver
- With fake DNS replies, user may arrive to a phishing server and allow attackers to steal their login credentials

1) Attacker must know
- Local DNS server’s IP
- Query string

2) Attacker must send fake reply quicker than the authoritative server
- DNS servers use only the first reply they get, ignore all others
DNS Vulnerabilities 6

- Original DNS design provided protection mechanisms against this type of attack
- Recursive DNS resolver rejects answers unless:
  - Source IP of reply matches that of the authoritative server
  - Local port number used by recursive resolver is correct
  - TXID in DNS header matches that of the query
- 3) Attacker must spoof source IP of authoritative server
  - Not difficult if the lookup string (www.chase.com) is known
  - If multiple authoritative servers for chase.com, spoof them all
- 4) Attacker must guess local DNS port number
  - Old DNS servers picked a random port during boot and used it for all outgoing queries
**DNS Vulnerabilities 7**

- 5) Attacker must guess the TXID of the query
  - Possible only if local resolver (LR) uses predictable TXIDs
  - Many older implementations simply incremented the TXID between the queries or used deterministic random number generators with a fixed seed

- Full algorithm:

  1) GET index.html
  2) embedded object from blah.attacker.com
  3) DNS type A for blah.attacker.com
  4) DNS type A for blah.attacker.com
  5) attacker learns port, IP, and TXID for local resolver, predicts the next TXID
DNS Vulnerabilities

- Full algorithm (cont’d):

6) Attacker blasts resolver with DNS answers that www.chase.com is 7.144.89.100 (using correct destination port and next TXID, spoofing ns.chase.com); continues at least until step 9 is completed, i.e., 2-3 seconds.

7) Page refresh with link to www.chase.com

8) DNS type A for www.chase.com

Between steps 9 and 10, attacker manages to poison DNS cache and then control traffic to www.chase.com of all users of local resolver.

9) DNS type A for www.chase.com

10) Reply is ignored

ns.chase.com
**Improvements**

- Remote TXID Guess attack is difficult
  - Getting user to visit hijacked website is non-trivial
  - Most modern DNS servers now use unpredictable TXIDs
- The next method works around these possibilities
- Suppose LR transmits each query to authoritative server, *even if the same hostname is already pending*
  - Each repeated query gets a *new TXID*
  - BIND 8.2 did this if questions came from unique source IPs
- **Birthday paradox** (2002) relies on rogue local users
  - Attacker forces local resolver to perform lookups for [www.chase.com](http://www.chase.com) N times back-to-back
  - After N requests, attacker blasts N answers at LR with random TXIDs, spoofing ns.chase.com’s IP address

---

Birthday problem: in a group of N people, what is the probability that two of them have the same birthday (out of 366 possible birthdays)?

Paradox: 100% with 367 people, 99% with 57, and 50% with 23
Improvements 2

- Probability of success $p(N)$ scales \textit{quadratically} in $N$
  - Define $M = 2^{16}$ to be the size of TXID space
  - First guess is incorrect with probability $1 - \frac{N}{M}$
  - Second with $1 - \frac{N}{(M-1)}$, third $1 - \frac{N}{(M-2)}$, etc.
  - Approximations are accurate for $N << M$
    \[
    p(N) = 1 - \prod_{i=0}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{N}{M - i}\right) \approx 1 - \left(1 - \frac{N}{M}\right)^N \approx 1 - e^{-N^2/M} \approx \frac{N^2}{M}
    \]

- Examples
  - $p(1) = 2^{-16}$, $p(10) = 0.15\%$, $p(128) = 22\%$, $p(512) = 98\%$
  - Note that $p(N) = 100\%$ for $N > M / 2$

- What if www.chase.com is already cached by LR?
  - Both Birthday Paradox and Remote TXID Guess fail
Improvements 3

- Attacker must wait until target expires, then pull off attack just before the host gets cached again
  - For popular websites, window of opportunity is small
- Kaminsky exploit (2008) works around this problem
  - Noticed a loophole: NS records override cached versions if they come from an authoritative server
  - LR’s outbound port is known, but all other bugs are fixed (i.e., TXID is unpredictable, one pending request per hostname)
- Local user issues request for hash1.chase.com
  - Sends K spoofed packets to LR with random TXIDs
  - Spoofed packets have no answers, only NS and additional records for domain chase.com
- Response manages to overwrite existing NS entries!
Improvements 4

• Modeling probability of success
  – First packet is a correct guess with probability $1/M$
  – Second packet with probability $1/(M-1)$, third $1/(M-2)$, etc.
• If attack does not work, repeat with hash2.chase.com
  – Each attempt is independent, thus the probability to fail is the product of individual probabilities to fail in each attempt
• After N attempts ($N*K$ packets), we have:
  $$p(K, N) = 1 - \prod_{i=0}^{K-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{M-i}\right)^N \approx 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{M}\right)^{KN} \approx 1 - e^{-KN/M}$$

• Kaminsky broke common DNS implementations (IIS, BIND) in about 10 seconds
  – $p(100,10) = 1.5\%$, $p(250,40) = 14\%$, $p(500,200) = 78\%$
**Improvements 5**

- Why can’t K be equal to M?
  - May not have enough bandwidth before ns.chase.com replies

- Closing the Kaminsky loophole
  - Randomization of port numbers for each query (IIS, BIND)
  - Random capitalization of query strings (wWw.ChasE.coM) and case-sensitive comparison of answers (Pydig, Unbound)
  - Rejection of new NS records if already cached (not recommended in case domain needs to override old answers)

- With port randomization, $M = 2^{32}$ possibilities
  - Windows 7-10 has 16K (default) available ports, $M = 2^{30} = 1B$

- Random capitalization adds $2^S$ options, $S = \text{host len}$
  - For the average Internet hostname, $S = 20$
  - This increases $M$ by an additional factor of $1M$