
Name Paths as Policies

DKIM IETF 66

Blocking spoofs & avoiding DoS

Douglas Otis

Doug_Otis@trendmicro.com

<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-otis-smtp-name-path-00.txt>

Forward Reference PTR RRs Defining Paths

- PTR RRset
 - Is forward referenced
 - Is isolated through unique underscore label
 - Provides name compression
 - Is not constrained by automated DNS services
 - Describes extensive email Name Paths
 - Offers greater extensibility without DoS risks
- Email Address Path allows >1000 packet amplification!
- Special host names define the nature of the path:
 - “*.” == “Open-Ended”
 - “.” == “Closed-Ended at Domain”
 - “-.” == “No Path or No Service Offered”

Third-Party Signature Associations

Does OA email-address domain permit Third-Party Signers?

; not just ssp yes/no, but specific domains listed (open-ended)

```
_oasd._smtp.<email-domain>. PTR <dkim-domain-1>.  
                                <dkim-domain-2>.  
                                “* ”  
                                .
```

; only email-domain allowed (close-ended)

```
_oasd._smtp.<email-domain>. PTR “.”
```

; email-domain offers no email service (shut)

```
_oasd._smtp.<email-domain>. PTR “-.”
```

Name Path Approach Helps Mitigate Denial Of Service & Replay Attacks

If OA != DKIM-domain

→ check signature requirement

`_oasd._smtp.<dkim-domain>` PTR required signing domains

Name Path can also compare against ancillary verified Reverse DNS or Client Host Name for a mitigation strategy.

If no OA/DKIM-domain or ancillary association

→ delay acceptance or white-list

Ancillary association can otherwise bypass this grey listing for a safer means for protecting verifier resources with fewer exceptions.

Conditional delay based upon Name Path association failure affords more effective third-party blocking.

Future Efforts for high impact SSP threats

- Annotation based upon trusted transactional domain lists
- Signing domain partitioning based upon signature parameters (will not require per user DNS RRs)

See <http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-otis-dkim-reliance-level-00.txt>

In conclusion-

Signing policy, with either flags or name lists, will not prevent look-alike message abuse. With Name Paths, DoS solutions are also available while enjoying greater freedoms. Be prepared to respond with solutions addressing newer concerns that become significant with email-address internationalization and barriers imposed by DKIM.