Improving security of email in transit with SMTP MTA Strict Transport Security (STS)

IETF 98 - March 28, 2017

Overview

Two separate, compatible specs:

- **TLSRPT:** reporting of TLS negotiation failures
 - Also compatible with DANE
- **MTA-STS:** enforcing TLS+authentication for SMTP

Threat Model

Status quo (absent DANE!):

MTA ---MX lookup---> DNS // MX injection (absent DNSSEC)
MTA ---EHLO----> MTA // Host injection
MTA ---STARTTLS---> MTA // MITM can downgrade
MTA <--server cert-- MTA // No cert validation</pre>

Opportunistic encryption: Good, but weak against

- active MITM
- DNS injection
- BGP trickery

(like a state- or ISP-level adversary)

As seen in the wild



Top 10 countries by fraction of incoming Gmail messages that originate from the IPs stripping TLS from SMTP connections.

Country	% of inbound traffic
Tunisia	96.13%
Iraq	25.61%
Papua New Guinea	25.00%
Nepal	24.29%
Kenya	24.13%
Uganda	23.28%
Lesotho	20.25%
Sierra Leone	13.41%
New Caledonia	10.13%
Zambia	9.98%

Neither Snow Nor Rain Nor MITM ... An Empirical Analysis of Email Delivery Security (ACM IMC 2015)

STS in 60 Seconds...

1. TXT record

\$ dig -t txt +short _mta-sts.example.com.

"v=STSv1; id=20160707T010757;"

2. HTTPS endpoint with policy

Semantics:

- HTTPS cert validation
- HSTS-style policy cache
- "Report" or "enforce"

```
$ curl
https://mta-sts.example.com/.well-known/mta-sts.json
```

```
"version": "STSv1",
"mode": "report",
"mx": ["*.example.com"],
"max_age": 123456
```

TLSRPT in 5 seconds...

1. TXT record -"v=TLSRPTv1;rua=mailto:rpt@example.com" "Failure-details": [2. Reports "result-type": "StarttlsNotSupported", "sending-mta-ip": "98.22.33.99", "Session-count": 1000, "receiving-mx-hostname":

> "mx2.mail.company-y.com", "receiving-mx-helo": "mx2011.mail.company-y.com",

\$ dig -t txt +short _smtp-tlsrpt.example.com.

Current Status

- Current drafts have been reviewed by IETF UTA workgroup
 - SMTP MTA Strict Transport Security draft-ietf-uta-mta-sts-03
 - SMTP TLS Reporting <u>draft-ietf-uta-smtp-tlsrpt-03</u>
- Incorporating feedback from UTA mailing list
- Pilot implementations underway
- Working towards last call--pending questions in next slides

Open Question #1: Policy Format

- Currently JSON:
 - Pros: Standards-track (RFC 7159), widely implemented in libraries
 - \circ $\,$ Cons: Not widely implemented in MTAs $\,$

- Suggested alternative is key=value pairs:
 - Pros: Widely implemented by MTAs
 - Cons: Potentially less extensible, potentially involves handwritten parsers

Open Question #2: "host" or "identity"

(Mostly resolved in favor of option 2...)

mx: [".example.com"]

- pattern currently constrains MX hostnames:
 - "dig -t mx example.com" \rightarrow mx1.example.com, mx2.example.com
 - Pros: Easy to implement cert matching ("does it match host?")
 - Cons: Modifies MX list traversal behavior
- Alternative: pattern constrains CN/SAN of server cert
 - Ensure cert has a SAN with a DNS-ID that matches the MX patterns
 - Pros: Easy to implement MX bits (no changes!)
 - Cons: Custom matching "mx" pattern against SAN/CN
 - Wildcard-to-wildcard matching?

Implementation stages

Reporting:

- Can be implemented without STS
- Reports can be generated offline (but to report STS or TLSA failures, cert logging/evaluation needed)
- Very low bar. If you do nothing, receive reports!

STS:

- Publishing a policy is easy (just a TXT and HTTPS endpoint...if you have a valid cert)
- Do this and senders can validate and generate reports!
- Enforcement requires code in your MTA...

Known Current Efforts

- Google
 - O Policy is live https://mta-sts.gmail.com/.well-known/mta-sts.json
 - Send-time validation in progress
- Microsoft
 - Policy publication in progress
- Comcast
 - Policy is live https://mta-sts.comcast.net/.well-known/mta-sts.json
 - \circ $\,$ HTTPS in progress, report processing planned
- Yahoo
 - O Policy is live https://mta-sts.yahoo.com/.well-known/mta-sts.json
 - Report-only mode in progress
- 1&1
 - Report-only mode in progress
- Fraudmarc
 - Policy is live for ESP pilot; creating 3rd party integration tools

https://www.fraudmarc.com/smtp-mta-sts-policy-check/



Call to Action

• Submit any final feedback to the UTA mailing list