Using the Domain Name System for System Break-ins Steven M. Bellovin

Presented by:

Thomas Repantis

trep@cs.ucr.edu

Overview

Using DNS to spoof a host's name and access network services that rely on the host name for authentication.

- 1. Introduction to the Domain Name System
- 2. Description of the Attack
- 3. Proposed Defenses
- 4. Current Status

Domain Name System (DNS)

- A distributed database, used to map host names to IP addresses, and vice-versa.
- www.cs.ucr.edu 138.23.169.15
- Paul Mockapetris RFCs 882, 883 (1983) RFCs 1034, 1035 (1987)

DNS Basics 1/2

- Periods in domain names define zones (www.example.com).
- Servers contain the authoritatitive data for each zone.
- Secondary authoritative servers poll the primary servers.
- If the data has changed, they initiate zone transfers.

DNS Basics 2/2

- The resource records returned are cached locally for some time.
- The authority for a subdomain may be delegated to a subsidiary server (hierarchical namespace).

Zone Example 1/5

small.com.	IN	SDA	server.small.com. ghu.ws1.small.com.				
			901110001 ; Serial				
			3600 ; Refresh				
			600 ; Retry				
			3600000 ; Expire				
			86400) ; Minimum Time-to-Live				
	IN	NS	Berver				
	IN	NS	server.tiny.com.				
server	IN	A	222.33.44.1				
	IN	HINFO	Smallic/100 SmallIx				
boss	IN	A	222.33.44.2				
	IN	HINFD	Smallic/50 SmallIx				
ws1	IN	A	222.33.44.3				
	IN	HINFO	Smallic/40 SmallIx				
ws2	IN	A	222.33.44.4				
	IN	HINFO	Smallic/40 SmallIx				
; Define a subdomain sa	les.so	all.com					
sales	IN	NS	thinker.sales.small.com.				
	IN	NS	ws1				
droid.sales.small.com	IN	A	222.33.45.1				
	IN	A	222.33.44.5				

Zone Example 2/5

Start Of Authority (SOA): Specifies the source of the zone information.

small.com.	IN 🤇	SOA server.small.com. ghu.ws1.sma			
	_		901110001 ; Serial		
			3600 ; Refresh		
			600 ; Retry		
			3600000 ; Expire		
			86400) ; Minimum Time-to-Live		
	IN	NS	Berver		
	IN	NS	server.tiny.com.		
server	IN	A	222.33.44.1		
	IN	HINFD	Smallic/100 SmallIx		
boss	IN	A	222.33.44.2		
	IN	HINFO	Smallic/50 SmallIx		
ws1	IN	A	222.33.44.3		
	IN	HINFO	Smallic/40 SmallIx		
ws2	IN	A	222.33.44.4		
	IN	HINFO	Smallic/40 SmallIx		
; Define a subdomain sa	les.smu	all.com			
sales	IN	NS	thinker.sales.small.com.		
	IN	NS	ws1		
droid.sales.small.com	IN	A	222.33.45.1		
	IN	A	222.33.44.5		

Zone Example 3/5

Name Server (NS):

Specifies the authoritative name servers for the domain.

small.com.	IN	SDA	server.small.com. ghn.ws1.small.com.			
			901110001 ; Serial			
			3600 ; Refresh			
			600 ; Retry			
			3600000 ; Expire			
	-		86400) ; Minimum Time-to-Live			
	IN	NS	Berver			
	IN	NO	server.tiny.com.			
server	IN	A	222.33.44.1			
	IN	HINFD	Smallic/100 SmallIx			
boss	IN	A	222.33.44.2			
	IN	HINFO	Smallic/50 SmallIx			
ws1	IN	A	222.33.44.3			
	IN	HINFO	Smallic/40 SmallIx			
ws2	IN	A	222.33.44.4			
	IN	HINFD	Smallic/40 SmallIx			
; Define a subdomain sa	les.smu	all.com				
sales	IN	NS	thinker.sales.small.com.			
	IN	NS	w81			
droid.sales.small.com	IN	A	222.33.45.1			
1777 TOTAL THE CONTRACT STREET STREET	IN	A	222.33.44.5			

Zone Example 4/5

Address (A): Specifies the address of a host.

small.com.	IN	SDA	server.small.com. ghu.ws1.small.com.				
			901110001 ; Serial				
			3600 ; Refresh				
			600 ; Retry				
			3600000 ; Expire				
			86400) ; Minimum Time-to-Live				
	IN	NS	server				
	IN	MC	server.tiny.com.				
server	IN	A	222.33.44.1				
	IN	HINTO	Smallic/100 SmallIx				
DOSS	IN	A	222.33.44.2				
	IN	HINFO	Smallic/50 SmallIx				
ws1	IN	A	222.33.44.3				
	IN	HINFO	Smallic/40 SmallIx				
wв2	IN	A	222.33.44.4				
	IN	HINFO	Smallic/40 SmallIx				
; Define a subdomain sa	les.sm	all.com					
sales	IN	NS	thinker.sales.small.com.				
	IN	NS	w61				
droid.sales.small.com	IN	A	222.33.45.1				
	IN	A	222.33.44.5				

Zone Example 5/5

Host Info (HINFO): Specifies host information, like computer and operating system.

small.com.	IN	SDA	server.small.com. ghu.ws1.small.com.			
			901110001 ; Serial			
			3600 ; Refresh			
			-			
			600 ; Retry			
			3600000 ; Expire			
			86400) ; Minimum Time-to-Live			
	IN	NS	Berver			
	IN	NS	server.tiny.com.			
server	IN	-	222.33.44.1			
	IN 📢	HINFD	anallic/100 SmallIx			
boss	IN		222.33.44.2			
	IN	HINFO	Smallic/50 SmallIx			
ws1	IN	A	222.33.44.3			
	IN	HINFO	Smallic/40 SmallIx			
ws2	IN	A	222.33.44.4			
	IN	HINFO	Smallic/40 SmallIx			
; Define a subdomain se	les.so	all.com				
sales	IN	NS	thinker.sales.small.com.			
	IN	NS	w61			
droid.sales.small.com	IN	A	222.33.45.1			
	IN	A	222.33.44.5			

Forward queries

- Forward queries (asking for the IP address, providing a machine name) can be answered using the records from the zone.
- An item may also contain Additional Information, (e.g. providing NS and A records, when asked for the IP of an unknown host).

Inverse queries

 Inverse queries (asking for the machine name, providing an IP address) are answered using a separate, parallel tree, keyed by IP address.

\$0RI(SIN 44.83	. 222. in-2	ddr.arpa
	B	P TR	server.small.com.
2	IB	PTR	boss.small.com.
8	IN	PTR.	vs1.small.com.
4		PTR.	vs2.small.com.

Attack!

- Assumption: Attacker controlling a primary server for a DNS zone, including the inverse mapping tree, as well as all TCP port numbers.
- Attacker's goal: To find hosts that trust other hosts by name.
- Common examples:
 Clusters of time-sharing machines.
 File servers and their clients.

Starring:

Softy, the victim:

bullseye.softy.org 192.193.194.1
 ringer.softy.org 192.193.194.64
 groundzero.softy.org 192.193.194.65
 Cuckoo, the attacker:

cracker.ritts.org 150.151.152.153

Guest star:

The vulnerability in the address-to-name mapping!

- Attacker changes the inverse mapping record for 150.151.152.153 from the correct cracker.ritts.org to ringer.softy.org
- Attacker attempts rlogin to bullseye.

- bullseye, the victim, validates the name of the calling machine:
 - It calls gethostbyaddr(), passing 150.151.152.153.
 - This generates a DNS inverse query for the PTR record for 153.152.151.150.in-addr.arpa
 - This retrieves ringer.softy.org
- Call accepted, attack succeeded.



Because there is no forced linkage between the two DNS trees owned by Cuckoo, ritts.org and 152.151.150.in-addr.arpa, allowing the latter's entries to point to softy's hosts.

The rest are details...

- Finding a target host name.
- Finding a user name to impersonate.
- Finding a machine trusted by the target host.

SNMP abuse

- Cuckoo finds the target host name from mail message or news article.
- He examines its TCP connection tables using SNMP.

성가는 영화 관계를		bullse et Conn	ye.softy.org public actions		
Proto	Racv-Q	Send-Q	Local Address	Foreign Address	(state)
tcp	0	0	bullseye.softy.org.login	bullseye.softy.org.1028	ESTAB
top	0	0	bullsaya.softy.org.login	ringer.softy.org.1020	ESTAB
top	0	0	bull says.softy.org.1023	bullseye.softy.org.login	ESTAB
tcp	0	0	bull says.softy.org.3593		ESTAB

finger abuse

He examines current users using finger.

\$ finger Chullseye.softy.org

Login	Name	TTY	Idle	When	Where	
user1	User One	00		Fri	18:18	
user1	User One	p0	1:48	Non	18:15	uniz:0.0
user1	User One	p1	84	Non	18:15	uniz:0.0
user1	User One	p2		Non	18:15	unix:0.0
user 1	User One	pB	1:56	Ved	12:45	un 1x:0.0
random	Amber Random	p4	84	Yed	15:51	ringer.softy.org
bingo	Bingo Scores	рБ	1:56	Yed	12:46	bull saya.softy.org
user1	User One	p6	12	Fri	12:15	uniz:0.0

 He concludes: In bullseye, .rhosts file for bingo, authorizing user1 when coming from bullseye.

Done

He modifies the appropriate PTR record.
He creates local login names.
He attacks.

Giving away information

Apart from SNMP and finger...

- e-mail,
- DNS (SOA records, zone transfers, HINFO records)
- SMTP
- FTP
- rpcinfo

...can also provide information about the victim.

The Berkeley fix

Validate the inverse mapping tree by looking at the corresponding node on the forward mapping tree.

- If gethostbyaddr() returns bullseye.softy.org for 150.151.152.153, then gethostbyname() should return the same IP for the same name.
- Otherwise we have an impersonation.

How the fix is circumvented...

- The PTR record to answer gethostbyaddr()'s request is in Cuckoo's server.
- The A record to answer gethostbyname()'s request is in Softy's server.
- However the query might be answered by the local machine's name server cache.
- That DNS cache can be poisoned by the attacker...

Danger: Poison!

 The DNS message with the PTR record may contain a bogus A record in the Additional Information field (with short TTL).

\$ dig -x 150.151.152.153 Geerver.ritte.org

; <<>> DiG 2.0 <<>> -x Gserver.ritts.org ->>HEADER <<- opcode: QUERY , status: NOERROR, 1d: 10 flags: or as rd ra ; Ques: 1, Ans: 1, Auth: 0, Addit: 2 **QUESTIONS:** 153.252.151.150.in-addr.arpa, type = ANY, class = IN 11 :: ARSVERS: 153.252.151.150.in-addr.arpa. 30 PTR bullseve.softy.org. 1: ADDITIONAL RECORDS: 15 . 150.151.252.158 bull says.softy.org. ;; Sent 1 pkts, answer found in time: 70 msec ;; FROM: cracker to SERVER: server.ritts.org 150.151.152.154 VHEN: Tue Oct 30 13:20:54 1990

 Or the bogus A record can be included in the NS records of a response to a lookup for a hostname

Therefore...

- Caching-only name servers are vulnerable!
- Authoritative name servers for a domain will reject updates for their zones.
- Hence they cannot be poisoned.
- But they are vulnerable for requests outside their zone.

Extra measures

- The target can act as a secondary server for the inverse mapping.
- The target can use a local mapping table like NIS before consulting DNS.

Hardening DNS Servers

- Bogus A records could be tracked back, if DNS server cache entries were tagged with their source.
- Additional Information could be used only in the specific context in which it was returned, and then discarded. (At a performance cost.)

Defenses

- Use cryptographic instead of name- or address-based authentication (e.g. Kerberos).
- Apart from Berkeley's fix:
 - Limit the trusted hosts to those for which the local machine has authoritative name information.
 - Have the local name server act as a secondary server for important neighboring zones, and thus possess authoritative forward-mapping data.
 - Have all machines possess definitive mapping information for the hosts within an organization.

Logging and Audtiing

- Attempts to impersonate hosts.
- Attempts to update authoritative zones.
- Attempts to connect to rlogind or rshd.
- Compare forward- and inverse-mapping data for a zone.

Abandon DNS?

- Return to static host tables?
 no (1990) NO! (2004)
- Problem lies not in DNS, but in inadequate host authentication methods.
- The information for host-to-address mapping is distributed, hence contamination from untrustworthy sources is always possible.
- The host table is huge and cannot be updated statically in a frequent and timely manner.

Is the attack still relevant?

- Paper written in 1990, published in 1995.
- **9** 2004:
 - Name-based authentication is not that widely used anymore (ssh instead of rsh).
 - Firewalls disallow remote connections.
 - Too many BIND fixes since then.
 - Cryptographic authentication of DNS is used in experimental testbeds.
- Main idea still relevant, with new misuses.

DNS Threats in 2004

- Threat Analysis Of The Domain Name System. D. Atkins. IETF Draft (2003).
 - Packet Interception
 - ID Guessing and Query Prediction
 - Name Games
 - Betrayal By Trusted Server
 - Denial of Service
 - Authenticated Denial of Domain Names
 - Wildcards

DNSSEC

- DNS Security Extensions to provide end-to-end authenticity and integrity.
- All answers in DNSSEC are digitally signed.
- By checking the signature, a resolver is able to check if the info is identical (correct and complete) to the info on the authoritative server.
- D. Eastlake. RFC 2535 (1987).

Conclusions

- Inserting bogus resource records in a victim's DNS cache.
- Still possible.
- Luckily, name-based authentication is not that widely used anymore.
- However, other misuses like server redirection are equally grave.
- DNSSEC

References

- 1. P. Mockapetris. RFC 1034: Domain Concepts and Facilities. IETF, 1987.
- 2. P. Mockapetris. RFC 1035: Domain Implementation and Specifi cation. IETF, 1987.
- 3. S. Bellovin. Using the Domain Name System for System Break-ins. USENIX, 1995.
- 4. P. Vixie. DNS and BIND security issues. USENIX, 1995.
- 5. C. Schuba and E. Spafford. Addressing weaknesses in the domain name system protocol. Master's thesis, 1993.
- 6. D. Eastlake. RFC 2535: Domain Name System Security Extensions. IETF, 1999.
- D. Atkins. Internet Draft: Threat Analysis Of The Domain Name System. IETF, 2003.

Thank you!

Questions/comments?