DNSOP Working Group Internet-Draft Intended status: Standards Track Expires: January 7, 2017 R. Bellis ISC S. Cheshire Apple Inc. J. Dickinson Sinodun A. Mankin T. Pusateri Unaffiliated July 6, 2016

DNS Session Signaling draft-bellis-dnsop-session-signal-00

Abstract

The Extension Mechanisms for DNS (EDNS(0)) [<u>RFC6891</u>] is explicitly defined to only have "per-message" semantics. This document defines a new Session Signaling OpCode used to carry persistent "per-session" type-length-values (TLVs), and defines an initial set of TLVs used to handle feature negotiation and to manage session timeouts and termination.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of <u>BCP 78</u> and <u>BCP 79</u>.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <u>http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/</u>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on January 7, 2017.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2016 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to $\frac{\text{BCP }78}{\text{Provisions}}$ and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents

Internet-Draft DNS Session Signaling July 2016

(<u>http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info</u>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

$\underline{1}$. Introduction	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>2</u>
<u>2</u> . Terminology	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>3</u>
$\underline{3}$. Protocol Details \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>3</u>
<u>3.1</u> . Message Format	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>3</u>
<u>3.2</u> . Message Handling	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>4</u>
<u>3.3</u> . TLV Format	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>4</u>
$\underline{4}$. Mandatory TLVs	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>5</u>
<u>4.1</u> . Feature Negotiation	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>5</u>
<u>4.1.1</u> . TypeCode Support	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>5</u>
<u>4.2</u> . Layer 4 Connection Management TLVs	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>6</u>
<u>4.2.1</u> . Terminate	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>6</u>
<u>4.2.2</u> . Idle Timeout	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>6</u>
<u>5</u> . IANA Considerations	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>7</u>
<u>5.1</u> . DNS Session Signaling OpCode Registration .	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>7</u>
5.2. DNS Session Signaling Status Codes Registry	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>7</u>
5.3. DNS Session Signaling Type Codes Registry .	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	7
<u>6</u> . Security Considerations	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>8</u>
<u>7</u> . Acknowledgements	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>8</u>
<u>8</u> . Normative References	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>8</u>
Authors' Addresses	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u>9</u>

1. Introduction

The Extension Mechanisms for DNS (EDNS(0)) [<u>RFC6891</u>] is explicitly defined to only have "per-message" semantics. This document defines a new Session Signaling OpCode used to carry persistent "per-session" type-length-values (TLVs), and defines an initial set of TLVs used to handle feature negotiation and to manage session timeouts and termination.

A further issue with EDNS(0) is that there is no standard mechanism for a client to be able to tell whether a server has processed or otherwise acted upon the individual options contained with an OPT RR. The Session Signaling Opcode therefore requires an explicit response to each TLV within a request.

The message format (see <u>Section 3.1</u>) does not completely conform to the standard DNS packet format but is designed such that existing DNS

Bellis, et al.	Expires January 7, 2017	[Page 2]

Internet-Draft	DNS Session Signaling	July 2016
----------------	-----------------------	-----------

protocol parsers should be able to read the packet header and then simply ignore the extra data that appears thereafter.

2. Terminology

The terms "initiator" and "responder" correspond respectively to the initial sender and subsequent receiver of a Session Signaling TLV, regardless of which was the "client" and "server" in the usual DNS sense. The term "sender" may apply to either an initiator or responder.

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [<u>RFC2119</u>].

<u>3</u>. Protocol Details

Session Signaling messages MUST only be carried in protocols and in environments that can guarantee that the same two endpoints are in communication for the entire lifetime of the session.

Session Signaling messages relate only to the specific session in which they are being carried. Where a middle box (e.g. a DNS proxy, forwarder, or session multiplexer) is in the path the message MUST NOT be blindly forwarded in either direction by that middle box. This does not preclude the use of these messages in the presence of a NAT box that rewrites Layer 3 or Layer 4 headers but otherwise maintains the effect of a single session.

<< RB: OSI Layer 5 session analog? This is obviously intended for TCP "sessions" which aren't distinct from Layer 4, but is this also applicable to DNS-o-DTLS, or DNS over UDP with an EDNS cookie - I think probably "yes" for the former, but "no" for the latter. I'm wondering whether "session" is even the right term to be using here >>

3.1. Message Format

A message containing a Session Signaling Opcode does not conform to the usual DNS message format. The 12 octet header format from [<u>RFC1035</u>] is preserved, but the four section count fields (QDCOUNT, ANCOUNT, NSCOUNT and ARCOUNT) MUST all be set to zero.

A list of TLVs are used in place of the usual sections, and MUST appear immediately after the 12 octet header. The total size of the TLVs is calculated from the value of the standard two octet framing word minus the 12 octets of the DNS header.

Bellis, et al. Expires January 7, 2017	[Page 3]
--	----------

Internet-Draft DNS Session Signaling

3.2. Message Handling

Both clients and servers may unilaterally send Session Signaling messages at any point in the lifetime of a session and are therefore considered to be the initiator with respect to that message. The initiator MUST set the value of the QR bit in the DNS header to zero (0), and the responder MUST set it to one (1).

Every Session Signaling request message MUST elicit a response (which MUST have the same ID in the DNS message header as in the request) and every TLV contained within the request requires a corresponding TLV in the response.

In order to preserve the correct sequence of state, Session Signaling requests MUST NOT be processed out of order. Similarly the TLVs in a message MUST be processed in the order in which they are contained in the message, and the order of the TLVs in the response MUST correspond with the order of the TLVs in the request.

<< RB: should the presence of a SS message create a "sequencing point", such that all pending responses must be answered? >>

3.3. TLV Format

										1	1	1	1	1	1
Θ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5
++	+4		⊦+	+	+4		+	4		+4	+	+	++	4	+
SESSION-STATUS SESSION-TYPE															
+4	+4		F+	+	+4		+	4		+4	+	+	++		+

July 2016

I	SESSION-LENGTH	
+	++	+
1	SESSION-DATA	Ì
/	++	/ +

- SESSION-STATUS: A 4 bit field used in a response to indicate the success (or otherwise) of an operation, as defined in the DNS Session Signaling Status Codes Registry. It SHOULD contain "NOERROR" (0) in a request message but the responder MUST NOT reject the request if it does not.
- SESSION-TYPE: A 12 bit field in network order giving the type of the current Session Signaling TLV per the IANA DNS Session Signaling Type Codes Registry.
- SESSION-LENGTH: A 16 bit field in network order giving the size in octets of SESSION-DATA.

Bellis. et al.	Expires January 7, 2017	[Page 4]
		L, 282 .]

Internet-Draft

DNS Session Signaling

July 2016

SESSION-DATA: Type-code specific. The SESSION-DATA field MUST be NUL padded to an even number of octets such that each Session Signaling TLV is aligned on a two octet boundary relative to the start of the first Session Signaling TLV. Padding octets MUST NOT be included in the calculation of SESSION-LENGTH but MUST be included in the calculation of the overall message length.

<< RB: the padding is specified such that client code can read the type and length fields directly from an aligned uint16_t array (with byte swapping) >>

- 4. Mandatory TLVs
- <u>4.1</u>. Feature Negotiation
- 4.1.1. TypeCode Support

The TypeCode Support TLV (1) is used to allow a client and server to exchange information about which Session Signaling Type Codes they support.

The SESSION-DATA contains a list of the Session Signaling Type Codes

supported by the sender.

										1	1	1	1	1	1	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	
+	+	+	++	++	+	+	++	++	++	+	+	+	++	++	+	ł
						-	ГҮРЕ	CODE	s							
/							•									/
/																/
+	+	+	+		+	+	++			+	+	+	+		+	+

TYPE CODEs: A list of 16 bit words in network order comprising the complete list of Session Signaling Type Codes supported by the sender. Since a Session Signaling Type Code is in reality only a 12 bit value, the four most significant bits of each word MUST be zero. The number of TYPE CODEs can be calculated from the total length of the TLV.

An initiator MAY send its own list of supported Session Signaling Type Codes in a TypeCode Support TLV, and if sent they MUST be complete. Otherwise the SESSION-DATA MUST be empty. In either case the responder MUST respond with its complete list of supported Type Codes.

Bellis, et al.	Expires January 7, 2017	[Page 5]

Internet-Draft	DNS Session Signaling	July 2016
----------------	-----------------------	-----------

4.2. Layer 4 Connection Management TLVs

<u>4.2.1</u>. Terminate

The Terminate TLV (64) MAY be sent by a server to request that the client terminate the session, and when sent MUST be the only TLV present. It MUST NOT be requested by a client.

The client SHOULD terminate the session as soon as possible, but MAY wait for any inflight queries to be answered. It MUST NOT initiate any new queries over the existing session, nor send any further TLVs other than its response to the Terminate request.

<< RB: dns-sd push has a "reconnect delay" option but I think it's of questionable value since in an anycast or load-balancing architecture

there's no way for the client to know which instance sent the option nor control which server instance the next connection will go to. This would IMHO be better controlled directly at the TCP layer. >>

4.2.2. Idle Timeout

The Idle Timeout TLV (65) has similar semantics to the EDNS TCP Keepalive Option [RFC7828]. It is used by a server to tell the client how long it may leave the current session idle for.

The SESSION-DATA is as follows:

										1	1	1	1	1	1
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5
++		+	++	+	++		++		++	+	+	+	+	++	++
						IDI	_Е ТІ	ΜΕΟΙ	JT						
++	+	+	++	+	++		++		++	+	+	+	++	++	++

IDLE TIMEOUT: the idle timeout for the current session, specified as a 16 bit word in network order in units of 100 milliseconds.

It is NOT an error for this TLV and the similar EDNS option to appear within the same session. The client SHOULD pay attention to the most recently received value, regardless of which method was used to send it.

The client SHOULD terminate the current session if it remains idle for longer than the specified timeout (and MAY of course terminate the session earlier). The server MAY unilaterally terminate the connection at any time, but SHOULD allow the client to keep the connection open if further messages are received before the idle timeout expires.

Bellis, et al.	Expires January 7, 2017	[Page 6]

Internet-Draft DNS Session Signaling July 2016

<< RB: this assumes that the EDNS OPT RR is added at the final stage of message processing, and therefore not affected by out-of-order processing - c.f. comment above about sequencing points >>

5. IANA Considerations

5.1. DNS Session Signaling OpCode Registration

IANA are directed to assign the value TBD for the Session Signaling OpCode in the DNS OpCodes Registry.

5.2. DNS Session Signaling Status Codes Registry

IANA are directed to create the DNS Session Signaling Status Codes Registry, with initial values as follows:

ц			L	
	Code	Mnemonic	Description	Reference
	0	NOERROR	TLV processed successfully	RFC-TBD1
	4	NOTIMP	 TLV not implemented	RFC-TBD1
	5	REFUSED	 TLV declined for policy reasons	RFC-TBD1

Registration of additional Session Signaling Status Codes requires Standards Action.

5.3. DNS Session Signaling Type Codes Registry

IANA are directed to create the DNS Session Signaling Type Codes Registry, with initial values as follows:

Bellis, et al.	Expires January 7, 2017	[Page 7]
Internet-Draft	DNS Session Signaling	July 2016
+	++	+

Туре	Name	Status	Reference
0	Reserved		RFC-TBD1
	TypeCode Support	 Standard 	RFC-TBD1
2 - 63 	Unassigned, reserved for feature negotiation TLVs		
 64	Terminate	 Standard 	RFC-TBD1
65 	Idle Timeout	 Standard 	RFC-TBD1
66 - 127 	Unassigned, reserved for session management TLVs		
127 – 3965	Unassigned		
3968 - 4031	Reserved for local / experimental use		
4032 - 4095	Reserved for future expansion	 	 +

Registration of additional Session Signaling Type Codes requires Expert Review. << RB: definition of process required? >>

<u>6</u>. Security Considerations

The authors are not aware of any specific security considerations introduced by this specification at this time.

7. Acknowledgements

ΤBW

<u>8</u>. Normative References

[RFC1035] Mockapetris, P., "Domain names - implementation and specification", STD 13, <u>RFC 1035</u>, DOI 10.17487/RFC1035, November 1987, <<u>http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1035</u>>. Internet-Draft

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", <u>BCP 14</u>, <u>RFC 2119</u>, DOI 10.17487/ <u>RFC2119</u>, March 1997, <<u>http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119</u>>.
- [RFC6891] Damas, J., Graff, M., and P. Vixie, "Extension Mechanisms for DNS (EDNS(0))", STD 75, <u>RFC 6891</u>, DOI 10.17487/ <u>RFC6891</u>, April 2013, <<u>http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6891</u>>.
- [RFC7828] Wouters, P., Abley, J., Dickinson, S., and R. Bellis, "The edns-tcp-keepalive EDNS0 Option", <u>RFC 7828</u>, DOI 10.17487/ <u>RFC7828</u>, April 2016, <<u>http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7828</u>>.

Authors' Addresses

Ray Bellis Internet Systems Consortium, Inc. 950 Charter Street Redwood City CA 94063 USA

Phone: +1 650 423 1200 Email: ray@isc.org

Stuart Cheshire Apple Inc. 1 Infinite Loop Cupertino CA 95014 USA

Phone: +1 408 974 3207 Email: cheshire@apple.com

John Dickinson Sinodun Internet Technologies Magadalen Centre Oxford Science Park Oxford OX4 4GA United Kingdom Internet-Draft

DNS Session Signaling

July 2016

Allison Mankin Unaffiliated

Email: allison.mankin@gmail.com

Tom Pusateri Unaffiliated

Phone: +1 843 473 7394 Email: pusateri@bangj.com

Bellis, et al. Expires January 7, 2017 [Page 10]