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Example: resolving www.tum.de

- Starting with the root hints
- Authoritative server IPs are omitted, they are in the zone
- Authoritative server FQDNs are shortened, and point to the enclosing zone (solid arrow)
Example: resolving www.tum.de

- Referral indication a delegation (dotted arrow pointing from the child to the parent)
- Use glue records as provided in the referrals
Example: resolving www.tum.de

- Delegation for tum.de containing glue record for sibling domain dns1.lrz.de
- One final query to get the www.tum.de answer
Example: Resolving www.tum.de — *With All Dependencies Resolved*

- Follow all resolution paths
- Resolve NS FQDNs within the graph
Motivation

Find and resolve all recursive dependencies
  • Construct the entire dependency tree

Identify broken (previously known as lame\textsuperscript{1}) delegations
  • Authoritative servers that do not exist: NXDomain
  • Authoritative servers that do not answer: timeout, ICMP
  • Authoritative servers that do not provide useful answers: Refused, ServFail, non-authoritative answer

Multiple resolution paths and data copies
  • NS in referral and origin
  • Glue records and the authoritative data
  • Multiple authoritative servers

\textsuperscript{1} for some definition of Naab et al. — Gotta Query 'Em All, Again!
Goals

Research questions

- Study DNS dependency graph
- Find potential inconsistencies and misconfigurations
- Common resolvers do not expose this data
- Build your own resolver: how hard can it be? (-:

Implementation goals

- Discover all reasonable resolution paths
- Query all data copies
- Capture all queries to provide resolution provenance
- Deterministic and repeatable
- Fair and efficient
Implementation

Structure resolution along zones

Find all authoritative server candidates

- glue records and root hints
- resolve NS names within the resolver
- if a parent name server was authoritative

Query SOA and NS records

- NS record targets need to be resolved
- Name server is considered authoritative if at least one response is authoritative

Query all authoritative servers and use the super set of answers

Names found in NS records are resolved within the resolver, potentially adding new zones

- Is it name resolution all the way down?
• Groups of interdependent zones
• E.g. lrz.eu, lrz.de, and lrz.bayern
• Strongly connected component (SCC)
• In DNS: groups of zones where anyone can impact all other including itself
Complete resolution along SCCs, starting at the root
Postpone queries until components are identified . . .
... unless they are found to be necessary for an SCC as identified by only graph search
Zone Cut Detection

SCCs require zone identification

- All dots within a domain are potential zone cuts

Qname minimization provides a frame work

- Query all potential zone cuts
- Use SOA queries since A queries can hide the zone cut if the parent is authoritative for the child as well

Left most label (e.g. www.tum.de) within an effective second-level domain is likely not a zone cut

- Avoid sending SOA query only to discover nothing unless the answers themselves indicate a separate zone
Query Efficiency

Querying all authoritative servers explicitly might not be viable

- 26 authoritative servers in .com and a large zone
- The chosen per-name-server rate limit bottlenecks the resolution for all .com domains
- Verisign as operator would (likely) prefer not to answer the same query 26 times

Query only a subset of authoritative servers

- Assume TLD servers are consistent and properly managed
- Deterministic subset of 3 authoritative servers based on qname and servers
- Query all servers if any discrepancy is discovered

Additional optimization

- Inject referrals learned from zone files (CZDS) to avoid them all together
- Not for queries triggered by the resolver itself to be able to rerun the process
Implementing resolvers involves lots of bugs, trial and error

(Re)running against the Internet
- Queries burden authoritative servers
- Results are not 1:1 comparable due to changes in the DNS

Run against a simulation providing previously recorded responses
- Allows rerunning without involving the authoritative servers
- Record unknown queries (not seen in the original data set)
- Record unseen queries (those in the original data set, but not queried)

Due to timeout handling, compare a certain set of runs with each other to determine repeatability and determinism
Conclusion

Resolver to discover the entire dependency tree

- Repeatable and deterministic name resolution
- Saving all reasonable resolution paths for later analysis
- Process to run tests and ensure repeatability and determinism

Data set sample at tcb-resolve.github.io

- 1.6 M domains from Alexa and Majestic Million lists
- A, AAAA, TXT, MX, CAA, sensible www subdomains A, AAAA
- 118 M queries, 1.67 M zones, 254 k name servers

Future Work

- Data needs to be analyzed
- Impact of inconsistencies and misconfigurations evaluated
- Open to new/interesting question that could be answered by such data sets