

# Multi-Signer Key-Exchange (MSKE)

[draft-thomassen-dnsop-mske](#)

IETF 115 – DNSOP WG

November 8, 2022

Peter Thomassen (deSEC, Secure Systems Engineering)

# Context: DNS Resolution in a Multi-signer Setup

- **Separate queries** for RRset of interest and for validation DNSKEY
  - RRset of interest (incl. RRSIG) and DNSKEY **may be received from different providers**
  - Resolvers need not to know anything multi-signer (RFC 8901)
    - **DNSKEY responses must contain all keys** a validating resolver may need for validation
- **Need to include other providers' keys**
  - Which? ... depends on qtype
  - **DNSKEY validation requires *local* DNSKEY only** (RRSIG is always from the same provider)
  - **Everything else may need another provider's ZSK** for validation
- **DNSKEY RRset = (local DNSKEYs) U (other provider's ZSK-type DNSKEYs)**
- Also, **CDS/CDNSKEY = union of (all provider's KSK-type DNSKEYs)**

# Requirements

- Providers need to ...
  - ... **learn each others' KSKs**, to announce them in their CDS/CDNSKEY RRsets
  - ... **learn each others' ZSKs**, to announce them in their DNSKEY RRset
  - High-level description in [draft-wisser-dnssec-automation](#), but key exchange problem left open
- **How to enable providers' exchange of signing keys (public part)?**
  - Which channel?
  - How to decide whether a KSK also serves as a ZSK (CSK)?
  - How to identify obsoleted keys? (cannot be inferred from apex DNSKEY RRsets alone)
- **Which properties would be nice?**
  - **In-band**
  - **Authentication**
  - **Explicit** is better than implicit

# Proposal 1: Authenticated Key Announcement / Retrieval

- Use signaling mechanism from [draft-ietf-dnsop-dnssec-bootstrapping](#) using `_multi` prefix (“signaling type”)
  - Each provider signals **only their public keys** (for which they have the private key; **no union!**)
  - Uses nameserver hostnames’ subdomains → **Requires nameserver zones to be secure**
- Signaling Records:
  - KSK-type keys go into CDS/CDNSKEY record set (updates RFC 7344)
  - ZSK-type keys go into DNSKEY record set (updates RFC 4034)  
→ Each provider authoritatively **declares each key’s usage type**
- **Key collection** done for all providers, e.g.:
  - KSKs: `CDS/CDNSKEY` IN `_multi.example.co.uk._signal.ns1.provider.net.`
  - ZSKs: `DNSKEY` IN `_multi.example.co.uk._signal.ns1.provider.net.`

# Proposal 2: Triggering Key Synchronization

- When establishing a multi-signer setup, new provider is **not yet** in **NS** RRset
  - How do providers discover each other?
- Discovery via new record type: **CNS**
  - Holds *prospective* **NS** hostnames
  - Analogous to how **CDS** holds prospective **DS** records
- Zone owner can put **NS** hostnames of all involved parties into **CNS** RRset
  - “Source of truth” that tells each operator where to pull keys from
  - Also works to **trigger sync** for key roll
- Name inspired by other **C\*** record types
  - Lives on **child-side**, like **CDS/CDNSKEY/CSYNC**
  - Used to **convey zone configuration** (to peers though, not parent)

# Multi-Signer Key Exchange: Example Workflow

1. Initial: `example.co.uk` with DNSSEC, Provider A (`ns1.provider-a.net`, ...)
2. Domain owner creates zone at Provider B (`ns-a.provider-b.org`, ...)
3. Domain owner creates **CNS** records at both providers
  - @ IN CNS `ns1.provider-a.net.`  
`ns2.provider-a.com.`  
`ns-a.provider-b.org.`  
`ns-b.provider-b.io.`
4. Providers A and B observe this, and import (here: Provider B perspective)
  - **DNSKEY** IN `_multi.example.co.uk._signal.ns1.provider-a.net.` → **DNSKEY**
  - **CDS/CDNSKEY** IN `_multi.example.co.uk._signal.ns1.provider-a.net.` → **CDS/CDNS...**
5. Once **DNSKEY** and **CDS** are synchronized: update **NS** (e.g. EPP or **CNS** → **NS** + **CSYNC**)

# What now?

- Proposal solves multi-signer key exchange problem
  - Automated
  - Authenticated
  - In-band
  - Explicit (KSK vs ZSK)
  - Comprehensive: covers onboarding, offboarding, key roll
  - Minimal: (1) signaling mechanism, (2) trigger mechanism
- Not implying this is *the* solution
  - Maybe even no solution is needed
- What does the WG think?
  - Draft: [draft-thomassen-dnsop-mske](#)