

DNSOP
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Best Current Practice
Expires: February 12, 2017

W. Hardaker
Parsons
O. Gudmundsson
CloudFlare
S. Krishnaswamy
Parsons
August 11, 2016

DNSSEC Roadblock Avoidance
draft-ietf-dnsop-dnssec-roadblock-avoidance-05.txt

Abstract

This document describes problems that a Validating DNS resolver, stub-resolver or application might run into within a non-compliant infrastructure. It outlines potential detection and mitigation techniques. The scope of the document is to create a shared approach to detect and overcome network issues that a DNSSEC software/system may face.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

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 <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

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 February 12, 2017.

Copyright Notice

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

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) 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

1.	Introduction	3
1.1.	Notation	3
1.2.	Background	3
1.3.	Implementation experiences	4
1.3.1.	Test Zone Implementation	4
2.	Goals	5
3.	Detecting DNSSEC Non-Compliance	5
3.1.	Determining DNSSEC support in recursive resolvers	6
3.1.1.	Supports UDP answers	6
3.1.2.	Supports TCP answers	6
3.1.3.	Supports EDNS0	7
3.1.4.	Supports the DO bit	7
3.1.5.	Supports the AD bit DNSKEY algorithm 5 and 8	7
3.1.6.	Returns RRSig for signed answer	8
3.1.7.	Supports querying for DNSKEY records	8
3.1.8.	Supports querying for DS records	8
3.1.9.	Supports negative answers with NSEC records	9
3.1.10.	Supports negative answers with NSEC3 records	9
3.1.11.	Supports queries where DNAME records lead to an answer	10
3.1.12.	Permissive DNSSEC	10
3.1.13.	Supports Unknown RRtypes	10
3.2.	Direct Network Queries	10
3.2.1.	Support for Remote UDP Over Port 53	11
3.2.2.	Support for Remote UDP With Fragmentation	11
3.2.3.	Support for Outbound TCP Over Port 53	11
3.3.	Support for DNSKEY and DS combinations	12
4.	Aggregating The Results	12
4.1.	Resolver capability description	12
5.	Roadblock Avoidance	13
5.1.	Partial Resolver Usage	16
5.1.1.	Known Insecure Lookups	16
5.1.2.	Partial NSEC/NSEC3 Support	16
6.	Start-Up and Network Connectivity Issues	16
6.1.	What To Do	17
7.	Quick Test	17

7.1.	Test negative answers Algorithm 5	18
7.2.	Test Algorithm 8	18
7.3.	Test Algorithm 13	18
7.4.	Fails when DNSSEC does not validate	18
8.	Security Considerations	18

9.	IANA Considerations	18
10.	Acknowledgments	18
11.	Normative References	19
	Authors' Addresses	19

[1.](#) Introduction

This document describes problems observable during DNSSEC ([\[RFC4034\]](#), [\[RFC4035\]](#)) deployment that derive from non-compliant infrastructure. It poses potential detection and mitigation techniques.

[1.1.](#) Notation

In this document a "Host Validator" can either be a validating stub-resolver, such as library that an application has linked in, or a validating resolver daemon running on the same machine. It may or may not be trying to use upstream caching resolvers during its own resolution process; both cases are covered by the tests defined in this document.

The sub-variant of this is a "Validating Forwarding Resolver", which is a resolver that is configured to use upstream Resolvers when possible. A Validating Forward Resolver also needs to perform the tests outlined in this document before using an upstream recursive resolver.

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 [\[RFC2119\]](#).

[1.2.](#) Background

Deployment of DNSSEC validation is hampered by network components that make it difficult or sometimes impossible for validating resolvers to effectively obtain the DNSSEC data they need. This can occur for many different reasons including, but not limited to:

- o Because recursive resolvers and DNS proxies [[RFC5625](#)] are not fully DNSSEC compliant
- o Because resolvers are not DNSSEC aware
- o Because "middle-boxes" actively block, modify and/or restrict outbound traffic to the DNS port (53) either UDP and/or TCP .
- o In-path network components do not allow UDP fragments

This document talks about ways that a Host Validator can detect the state of the network it is attached to, and ways to hopefully circumvent the problems associated with the network defects it discovers. The tests described in this document may be performed on any validating resolver to detect and prevent problems. While these recommendations are mainly aimed at Host Validators it is prudent to perform these tests from regular Validating Resolvers before enabling just to make sure things work.

There are situations where a host can not talk directly to a Resolver; the tests below can not address how to overcome that, and inconsistent results can be seen in such cases. This can happen, for instance, when there are DNS proxies/forwarders between the user and the actual resolvers.

1.3. Implementation experiences

Multiple lessons learned from multiple implementations led to the development of this document, including (in alphabetical order) DNSSEC-Tools' DNSSEC-Check, DNSSEC_Resolver_Check, dnssec-trigger, FCC_Grade.

Detecting lack of support for specified DNSKEY algorithms and DS digest algorithms is outside the scope of this document but the document provides information on how to do that, see sample test tool: https://github.com/ogud/DNSSEC_ALG_Check

This document does describe compliance tests for algorithms 5, 7 and 13 with DS digest algorithms 1 and 2.

[1.3.1.](#) Test Zone Implementation

In this document, the "test.example.com" domain is used to refer to DNS records which contain test records that have known DNSSEC properties associated with them. For example, the "badsign-a.test.example.com" domain is used below to refer to a DNS A record where the signatures published for it are invalid (i.e., they are "bad signatures" that should cause a validation failure).

At the time of this publication, the "test.dnssec-tools.org" domain implements all of these test records. Thus, it may be possible to replace "test.example.com" in this document with "test.dnssec-tools.org" when performing real-world tests.

[2.](#) Goals

This document is intended to show how a Host Validator can detect the capabilities of a recursive resolver, and work around any problems that could potentially affect DNSSEC resolution. This enables the Host Validator to make use of the caching functionality of the recursive resolver, which is desirable in that it decreases network traffic and improves response times.

A Host Validator has two choices: it can wait to determine that it has problems with a recursive resolver based on the results that it is getting from real-world queries issued to it, or it can proactively test for problems ([Section 3](#)) to build a work around list ahead of time ([Section 5](#)). There are pros and cons to both of these paths that are application specific, and this document does not attempt to provide guidance about whether proactive tests should or should not be used. Either way, DNSSEC roadblock avoidance techniques ought to be used when needed and if possible.

Note: Besides being useful for Host Validators, the same tests can be used for a recursive resolver to check if its upstream connections hinder DNSSEC validation.

3. Detecting DNSSEC Non-Compliance

A Host Validator may choose to determine early-on what roadblocks exist that may hamper its ability to perform DNSSEC look-ups. This section outlines tests that can be done to test certain features of the surrounding network.

These tests should be performed when a resolver determines its network infrastructure has changed. Certainly a resolver should perform these tests when first starting, but MAY also perform these tests when they've detected network changes (e.g. address changes, or network reattachment, etc).

NOTE: when performing these tests against an address, we make the following assumption about that address: It is a uni-cast address or an any-cast [[RFC4786](#)] cluster where all servers have identical configuration and connectivity.

NOTE: when performing these tests we also assume that the path is clear of "DNS interfering" middle-boxes, like firewalls, proxies, forwarders. Presence of such infrastructure can easily make a recursive resolver appear to be improperly performing. It is beyond the scope of the document as how to work around such interference, although the tests defined in this document may indicate when such misbehaving middle-ware is causing interference.

NOTE: This document specifies two sets of tests to perform: a comprehensive one and a fast one. The fast one will detect most common problems, thus if the fast one passes then the comprehensive MAY be considered passed as well.

3.1. Determining DNSSEC support in recursive resolvers

Ideally, a Host Validator can make use of the caching present in recursive resolvers. This section discusses the tests that a recursive resolver MUST pass in order to be fully usable as a DNS cache.

Unless stated otherwise, all of the following tests SHOULD have the Recursion Desired (RD) flag set when sending out a query and SHOULD be sent over UDP. Unless otherwise stated, the tests MUST NOT have

the DO bit set or utilize any of the other DNSSEC related requirements, like EDNS0, unless otherwise specified. The tests are designed to check for support of one feature at a time.

3.1.1. Supports UDP answers

Purpose: This tests basic DNS over UDP functionality to a resolver.

Test: A DNS request is sent to the resolver under test for an A record for a known existing domain, such as good-a.test.example.com.

SUCCESS: A DNS response was received that contains an A record in the answer section. (The data itself does not need to be checked.)

Note: an implementation MAY chose to not perform the rest of the tests if this test fails, as it is highly unlikely that the resolver under test will pass any of the remaining tests.

3.1.2. Supports TCP answers

Purpose: This tests basic TCP functionality to a resolver.

Test: A DNS request is sent over TCP to the resolver under test for an A record for a known existing domain, such as good-a.test.example.com.

SUCCESS: A DNS response was received that contains an A record in the answer section. (The data itself does not need to be checked.)

3.1.3. Supports EDNS0

Purpose: Test whether a resolver properly supports the EDNS0 extension option.

Pre-requisite: "Supports UDP or TCP".

Test: Send a request to the resolver under test for an A record for a

known existing domain, such as good-a.test.example.com, with an EDNS0 OPT record in the additional section.

SUCCESS: A DNS response was received that contains an EDNS0 option with version number 0.

[3.1.4.](#) Supports the DO bit

Purpose: This tests whether a resolver has minimal support of the DO bit.

Pre-requisite: "Supports EDNS0".

Test: Send a request to the resolver under test for an A record for a known existing domain such as good-a.test.example.com. Set the DO bit in the outgoing query.

SUCCESS: A DNS response was received that contains the DO bit set.

Note: this only tests that the resolver sets the DO bit in the response. Later tests will determine if the DO bit was actually made use of. Some resolvers successfully pass this test because they simply copy the unknown flags into the response. These resolvers will fail the later tests.

[3.1.5.](#) Supports the AD bit DNSKEY algorithm 5 and 8

Purpose: This tests whether the resolver is a validating resolver.

Pre-requisite: "Supports the DO bit".

Test: Send requests to the resolver under test for an A record for a known existing domain in a DNSSEC signed zone which is verifiable to a configured trust anchor, such as good-a.test.example.com using the root's published DNSKEY or DS record as a trust anchor. Set the DO bit in the outgoing query. This test should be done twice, once for a zone that contains algorithm 5 (RSASHA1) and another for algorithm 8 (RSASHA256).

SUCCESS: A DNS response was received that contains the AD bit set for

algorithm 5 (RSASHA1).

BONUS: The AD bit is set for a resolver that supports Algorithm 8 RSASHA256

3.1.6. Returns RRSig for signed answer

Purpose: This tests whether a resolver will properly return RRSIG records when the DO bit is set.

Pre-requisite: "Supports the DO bit".

Test: Send a request to the resolver under test for an A record for a known existing domain in a DNSSEC signed zone, such as good-a.test.example.com. Set the DO bit in the outgoing query.

SUCCESS: A DNS response was received that contains at least one RRSIG record.

3.1.7. Supports querying for DNSKEY records

Purpose: This tests whether a resolver can query for and receive a DNSKEY record from a signed zone.

Pre-requisite: "Supports the DO bit."

Test: Send a request to the resolver under test for an DNSKEY record which is known to exist in a signed zone, such as test.example.com/DNSKEY. Set the DO bit in the outgoing query.

SUCCESS: A DNS response was received that contains a DNSKEY record in the answer section.

Note: Some DNSKEY RRset's are large and if the network path has problems with large answers this query may result in either false positive or false negative. In general the DNSKEY queried for should be small enough to fit into a 1220 byte answer, to avoid false negative result when TCP is disabled. However, querying many zones will result in answers greater than 1220 bytes so DNS over TCP MUST be available for DNSSEC use in general.

3.1.8. Supports querying for DS records

Purpose: This tests whether a resolver can query for and receive a DS record from a signed zone.

Pre-requisite: "Supports the DO bit."

Test: Send a request to the resolver under test for an DS record which is known to exist in a signed zone, such as test.example.com/DS. Set the DO bit in the outgoing query.

SUCCESS: A DNS response was received that contains a DS record in the answer section.

[3.1.9.](#) Supports negative answers with NSEC records

Purpose: This tests whether a resolver properly returns NSEC records for a non-existing domain in a DNSSEC signed zone.

Pre-requisite: "Supports the DO bit."

Test: Send a request to the resolver under test for an A record which is known to not exist in an NSEC signed zone, such as non-existent.test.example.com. Set the DO bit in the outgoing query.

SUCCESS: A DNS response was received that contains an NSEC record.

Note: The query issued in this test MUST be sent to a NSEC signed zone. Getting back appropriate NSEC3 records does not indicate a failure, but a bad test.

[3.1.10.](#) Supports negative answers with NSEC3 records

Purpose: This tests whether a resolver properly returns NSEC3 records ([[RFC5155](#)]) for a non-existing domain in a DNSSEC signed zone.

Pre-requisite: "Supports the DO bit."

Test: Send a request to the resolver under test for an A record which is known to be non-existent in a zone signed using NSEC3, such as non-existent.nsec3-ns.test.example.com. Set the DO bit in the outgoing query.

SUCCESS: A DNS response was received that contains an NSEC3 record.

Bonus: If the AD bit is set, this validator supports algorithm 7 RSASHA1-NSEC3-SHA1

Note: The query issued in this test MUST be sent to a NSEC3 signed zone. Getting back appropriate NSEC records does not indicate a failure, but a bad test.

[3.1.11.](#) Supports queries where DNAME records lead to an answer

Purpose: This tests whether a resolver can query for an A record in a zone with a known DNAME referral for the record's parent.

Test: Send a request to the resolver under test for an A record which is known to exist in a signed zone within a DNAME referral child zone, such as `good-a.dname-good-ns.test.example.com`.

SUCCESS: A DNS response was received that contains a DNAME in the answer section. An RRSIG MUST also be received in the answer section that covers the DNAME record.

[3.1.12.](#) Permissive DNSSEC

Purpose: To see if a validating resolver is ignoring DNSSEC validation failures.

Pre-requisite: Supports the AD bit.

Test: ask for data from a broken DNSSEC delegation such as `badsign-a.test.example.com`.

SUCCESS: A reply was received with the Rcode set to SERVFAIL

[3.1.13.](#) Supports Unknown RRtypes

Purpose: Some DNS Resolvers/gateways only support some RRtypes. This causes problems for applications that need recently defined types.

Pre-requisite: "Supports UDP or TCP".

Test: Send a request for recently defined type or unknown type in the 20000-22000 range, that resolves to a server that will return an answer for all types, such as `alltypes.example.com` (a server today that supports this: `alltypes.res.dnssecready.org`)

SUCCESS: A DNS response was retrieved that contains the type requested in the answer section.

[3.2.](#) Direct Network Queries

If need be, a Host Validator may need to make direct queries to authoritative servers or known Open Recursive Resolvers in order to collect data. To do that, a number of key network features MUST be functional.

Hardaker, et al.

Expires February 12, 2017

[Page 10]

Internet-Draft

DNSSEC Roadblock Avoidance

August 2016

[3.2.1.](#) Support for Remote UDP Over Port 53

Purpose: This tests basic UDP functionality to outside the local network.

Test: A DNS request is sent to a known distant authoritative server for a record known to be within that server's authoritative data.

Example: send a query to the address of ns1.test.example.com for the good-a.test.example.com/A record.

SUCCESS: A DNS response was received that contains an A record in the answer section.

Note: an implementation can use the local resolvers for determining the address of the name server that is authoritative for the given zone. The recursive bit MAY be set for this request, but does not need to be.

[3.2.2.](#) Support for Remote UDP With Fragmentation

Purpose: This tests if the local network can receive fragmented UDP answers

Pre-requisite: Local UDP traffic > 1500 in size is possible

Test: A DNS request is sent over UDP to a known distant DNS address asking for a record that has answer larger than 2000 bytes. For example, send a query for the test.example.com/DNSKEY record with the DO bit set in the outgoing query.

Success: A DNS response was received that contains the large answer.

Note: A failure in getting large answers over UDP is not a serious problem if TCP is working.

[3.2.3.](#) Support for Outbound TCP Over Port 53

Purpose: This tests basic TCP functionality to outside the local network.

Test: A DNS request is sent over TCP to a known distant authoritative server for a record known to be within that server's authoritative data. Example: send a query to the address of ns1.test.example.com for the good-a.test.example.com/A record.

SUCCESS: A DNS response was received that contains an A record in the answer section.

Hardaker, et al.

Expires February 12, 2017

[Page 11]

Internet-Draft

DNSSEC Roadblock Avoidance

August 2016

Note: an implementation can use the local resolvers for determining the address of the name server that is authoritative for the given zone. The recursive bit MAY be set for this request, but does not need to be.

[3.3.](#) Support for DNSKEY and DS combinations

Purpose: These tests can check what algorithm combinations are supported.

Pre-requisite: At least one of above tests has returned the AD bit set proving that the upstream is validating

Test: A DNS request is sent over UDP to the resolver under test for a known combination of the DS algorithm number (N) and DNSKEY algorithm number (M) of the example form ds-N.alg-M-nsec.test.example.com.

Examples:

ds-2.alg-13-nsec.test.example.com TXT
or
ds-4.alg-13-nsec3.test.example.com TXT.

SUCCESS: a DNS response is received with the AD bit set and with a matching record type in the answer section.

Note: for algorithms 6 and 7, NSEC is not defined thus query for alg-M-nsec3 is required. Similarly NSEC3 is not defined for algorithms 1, 3 and 5. Furthermore algorithms 2, 4, 9, 11 do not currently have definitions for signed zones.

[4.](#) Aggregating The Results

Some conclusions can be drawn from the results of the above tests in an "aggregated" form. This section defines some labels to assign to a resolver under test given the results of the tests run against them.

[4.1.](#) Resolver capability description

This section will group and label certain common results

Resolvers are classified into following broad behaviors:

Validator: The resolver passes all DNSSEC tests and had the AD bit appropriately set.

DNSSEC Aware: The resolver passes all DNSSEC tests, but does not appropriately set the AD bit on answers, indicating it is not

validating. A Host Validator will function fine using this resolver as a forwarder.

Non-DNSSEC capable: The resolver is not DNSSEC aware and will make it hard for a Host Validator to operate behind it. It MAY be usable for querying for data that is in known insecure sections of the DNS tree.

Not a DNS Resolver: This is a improperly behaving resolver and not should not be used at all.

While it would be great if all resolvers fell cleanly into one of the broad categories above, that is not the case. For that reason it is necessary to augment the classification with more descriptive result, this is done by adding the word "Partial" in front of Validator/ DNSSEC Aware classifications, followed by sub-descriptors of what is not working.

Unknown: Failed the Unknown test

DNAME: Failed the DNAME test

NSEC3: Failed the NSEC3 test

TCP: TCP not available

SlowBig: UDP is size limited but TCP fallback works

NoBig: TCP not available and UDP is size limited

Permissive: Passes data known to fail validation

[5.](#) Roadblock Avoidance

The goal of this document is to tie the above tests and aggregations to avoidance practices; however the document does not specify exactly how to do that.

Once we have determined what level of support is available in the network, we can determine what must be done in order to effectively act as a validating resolver. This section discusses some of the options available given the results from the previous sections.

The general fallback approach can be described by the following sequence:

If the resolver is labeled as "Validator" or "DNSSEC aware":

Send queries through this resolver and perform local validation on the results.

If validation fails, try the next resolver

Else if the resolver is labeled "Not a DNS Resolver" or "Non-DNSSEC capable":

Mark it as unusable and try next resolver

Else if no more resolvers are configured and if direct queries are supported:

1. Try iterating from the Root
2. If the answer is SECURE/BOGUS:
Return the result of the iteration
3. If the answer is INSECURE:
Re-query "Non-DNSSEC capable" servers and return answers from them w/o the AD bit set to the client.

This will increase the likelihood that split-view unsigned answers are found.

Else:

Return an error code and log a failure

While attempting resolution through a particular recursive name server with a particular transport method that worked, any transport-specific parameters MUST be remembered in order to avoid any unnecessary fallback attempts.

Transport-specific parameters MUST also be remembered for each authoritative name server that is queried while performing an iterative mode lookup.

Any transport settings that are remembered for a particular name server MUST be periodically refreshed; they should also be refreshed when an error is encountered as described below.

For a stub resolver, problems with the name server can manifest themselves under the following types of error conditions:

- o No Response, error response or missing DNSSEC meta-data
- o Illegal Response: An illegal response is received, which prevents the validator from fetching all necessary records required for

constructing an authentication chain. This could result when referral loops are encountered, when any of the antecedent zone delegations are lame, when aliases are erroneously followed for certain RRtypes (such as SOA, DNSKEYs or DS records), or when resource records for certain types (e.g. DS) are returned from a zone that is not authoritative for such records.

- o Bogus Response: A Bogus Response is received, when the cryptographic assertions in the authentication chain do not validate properly.

For each of the above error conditions a validator MAY adopt the following dynamic fallback technique, preferring a particular approach if it is known to work for a given name server or zone from previous attempts.

- o No response, error response, or missing DNSSEC meta-data:
 - * Re-try with different EDNS0 sizes (4096, 1492, None)
 - * Re-try with TCP only
 - * Perform an iterative query starting from the Root if the previous error was returned from a lookup that had recursion enabled.
 - * Re-try using an alternative transport method, if this alternative method is known (configured) to be supported by the nameserver in question.
- o Illegal Response
 - * Perform an iterative query starting from the Root if the previous error was returned from a lookup that had recursion enabled.
 - * Check if any of the antecedent zones up to the closest configured trust anchor are provably insecure.
- o Bogus Response
 - * Perform an iterative query starting from the Root if the previous error was returned from a lookup that had recursion enabled.

For each fallback technique, attempts to multiple potential name servers should be skewed such that the next name server is tried when the previous one encounters an error, a timeout is reached, or whichever is earlier.

The validator SHOULD remember, in its zone-specific fallback cache, any broken behavior identified for a particular zone for a duration of that zone's SOA negative TTL.

The validator MAY place name servers that exhibit broken behavior into a blacklist, and bypass these name servers for all zones that they are authoritative for. The validator MUST time out entries in this name server blacklist periodically, where this interval could be set to be the same as the DNSSEC BAD cache default TTL.

[5.1.](#) Partial Resolver Usage

It may be possible to use Non-DNSSEC Capable caching resolvers in careful ways if maximum optimization is desired. This section describes some of the advanced techniques that could be used to use a resolver in at least a minimal way. Most of the time this would be unnecessary, except in the case where none of the resolvers are fully compliant and thus the choices would be to use them at least minimally or not at all (and no caching benefits would be available).

[5.1.1.](#) Known Insecure Lookups

If a resolver is Non-DNSSEC Capable but a section of the DNS tree has been determined to be Provably Insecure [[RFC4035](#)], then queries to this section of the tree MAY be sent through Non-DNSSEC Capable caching resolver.

[5.1.2.](#) Partial NSEC/NSEC3 Support

Resolvers that understand DNSSEC generally, and understand NSEC but not NSEC3 are partially usable. These resolvers generally also lack support for Unknown types, rendering them mostly useless and to be avoided.

[6.](#) Start-Up and Network Connectivity Issues

A number of scenarios will produce either short-term or long-term connectivity issues with respect to DNSSEC validation. Consider the following cases:

Time Synchronization: Time synchronization problems can occur when a device which has been off for a period of time and the clock is

no longer in close synchronization with "real time" or when a

device always has clock set to the same time during start-up. This will cause problems when the device needs to resolve their source of time synchronization, such as "ntp.example.com".

Changing Network Properties: A newly established network connection may change state shortly after a HTTP-based pay-wall authentication system has been used. This especially common in hotel, airport and coffee-shop style networks, where DNSSEC, validation and even DNS are not functional until the user proceeds through a series of forced web pages used to enable their network. The tests in [Section 3](#) will produce very different results before and after the network authorization has succeeded. APIs exist on many operating systems to detect initial network device status changes, such as right after DHCP has finished, but few (none?) exist to detect that authentication through a pay-wall has succeeded.

There are only two choices when situations like this happen:

Continue to perform DNSSEC processing, which will likely result in all DNS requests failing. This is the most secure route, but causes the most operational grief for users.

Turn off DNSSEC support until the network proves to be usable. This allows the user to continue using the network, at the sacrifice of security. It also allows for a denial of security-service attack if a man-in-the-middle can convince a device that DNSSEC is impossible.

[6.1.](#) What To Do

If the Host Validator detects that DNSSEC resolution is not possible it SHOULD log the event and/or SHOULD report an error to the user. In the case there is no user, then no reporting can be performed and thus the device MAY have a policy of action, like continue or fail. Until middle boxes allow DNSSEC protected information to traverse them consistently, software implementations may need to offer this choice to let users pick the security level they require. Note that continuing without DNSSEC protection in the absence of a notification or report could lead to situations where users assume a level of

security that does not exist.

[7.](#) Quick Test

The quick tests defined below make the assumption that the questions to be asked are of a real resolver and the only real question is: "how complete is the DNSSEC support?". This quick test has been implemented in few programs developed at IETF hackthons at IETF-91

Hardaker, et al.

Expires February 12, 2017

[Page 17]

Internet-Draft

DNSSEC Roadblock Avoidance

August 2016

and IETF-92. The programs use a common grading method. For each question that returns expected answer the resolver gets a point. If the AD bit is set as expected the resolver gets a second point.

[7.1.](#) Test negative answers Algorithm 5

Query: realy-doesnotexist.test.example.com. A

Answer: RCODE= NXDOMAIN, Empty Answer, Authority: NSEC proof

[7.2.](#) Test Algorithm 8

Query: alg-8-nsec3.test.example.com. SOA

Answer: RCODE= 0, Answer: SOA record

[7.3.](#) Test Algorithm 13

Query: alg-13-nsec.test.example.com. SOA

Answer: RCODE= 0, Answer: SOA record

[7.4.](#) Fails when DNSSEC does not validate

Query: dnssec-failed.test.example.com. SOA

Answer: RCODE= SERVFAIL, empty answer, and authority, AD=0

[8.](#) Security Considerations

This document discusses problems that may occur while deploying the DNSSEC protocol. It describes what may be possible to help detect and mitigate these problems. Following the outlined suggestions will

result in a more secure DNSSEC operational environment than if DNSSEC was simply disabled.

9. IANA Considerations

No IANA actions are required.

10. Acknowledgments

We thank the IESG and DNSOP working group members for their extensive comments and suggestions.

Hardaker, et al.

Expires February 12, 2017

[Page 18]

Internet-Draft

DNSSEC Roadblock Avoidance

August 2016

11. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC4034] Arends, R., Austein, R., Larson, M., Massey, D., and S. Rose, "Resource Records for the DNS Security Extensions", [RFC 4034](#), March 2005.
- [RFC4035] Arends, R., Austein, R., Larson, M., Massey, D., and S. Rose, "Protocol Modifications for the DNS Security Extensions", [RFC 4035](#), March 2005.
- [RFC4786] Abley, J. and K. Lindqvist, "Operation of Anycast Services", [BCP 126](#), [RFC 4786](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4786, December 2006, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4786>>.
- [RFC5155] Laurie, B., Sisson, G., Arends, R., and D. Blacka, "DNS Security (DNSSEC) Hashed Authenticated Denial of Existence", [RFC 5155](#), March 2008.
- [RFC5625] Bellis, R., "DNS Proxy Implementation Guidelines", [BCP 152](#), [RFC 5625](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5625, August 2009, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5625>>.

Authors' Addresses

Wes Hardaker
Parsons
P.O. Box 382
Davis, CA 95617
US

Email: ietf@hardakers.net

Olafur Gudmundsson
CloudFlare
San Francisco, CA 94107
USA

Email: olafur+ietf@cloudflare.com

Hardaker, et al.

Expires February 12, 2017

[Page 19]

Internet-Draft

DNSSEC Roadblock Avoidance

August 2016

Suresh Krishnaswamy
Parsons
7110 Samuel Morse Dr
Columbia, MD 21046
US

Email: suresh@tislabs.com

