DATA NEEDS AND FEEDS FOR FIGHTING DNS ABUSE

S(d

Raffaele Sommese - University of Twente

r.sommese@utwente.nl

IN THE PREVIOUS FALL

DarkDNS: Revisiting the Value of Rapid Zone Update

Raffaele Sommese University of Twente Enschede, The Netherlands r.sommese@utwente.nl

Moritz Müller SIDN Labs Arnhem, The Netherlands University of Twente Enschede, The Netherlands moritz.muller@sidn.nl Gautam Akiwate Stanford University Stanford, CA, USA gakiwate@cs.stanford.edu

Mattijs Jonker University of Twente Enschede, The Netherlands m.jonker@utwente.nl Antonia Affinito University of Twente Enschede, The Netherlands a.affinito@utwente.nl

> KC Claffy CAIDA San Diego, CA, USA kc@caida.org

Abstract

Malicious actors exploit the DNS namespace to launch spam campaigns, phishing attacks, malware, and other harmful activities. Combating these threats requires visibility into domain existence, ownership and nameservice activity that the DNS protocol does not itself provide. To facilitate visibility and security-related study of the expanding gTLD namespace, ICANN introduced the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) that shares daily zone file snapshots

1 Introduction

Malicious actors exploit (abuse) the DNS namespace to launch spam campaigns, phishing attacks, malware, and other harmful activities. In many dimensions the DNS ecosystem is more opaque than other aspects of Internet transport. Unlike BGP, DNS is a pull protocol, so learning internal dynamics requires an entry point *i.e.*, a domain name. Without knowing this entry point, any abuse that lies behind a domain remains opaque to everyone except the targets.

TRANSIENT DOMAINS?!

By leveraging CT Logs (stream) we demonstrated that:

- We detected 42% of newly registered domains before they appeared in the CZDS snapshot (Nov 2023 Jan 2024).
- ~76K domains per day - almost 1 domain per second.
- 1% of newly registered domains never appear in the next CZDS snapshot.
- Predominately malicious!
- With half of them died within their first 6 hours of life.

TRANSIENT DOMAINS?!

By leveraging CT Logs (stream) we demonstrated that:

- We detected 42% of newly registered domains before they appeared in the CZDS snapshot (Nov 2023 – Jan 2024).
- ~76K domains per day - almost 1 domain per second.
- 1% of newly registered domains never appear in the next CZDS snapshot.
- Predominately malicious!
- With half of them died within their first 6 hours of life.

TRANSIENT DOMAINS?!

By leveraging CT Logs (stream) we demonstrated that:

- We detected 42% of newly registered domains before they appeared in the CZDS snapshot (Nov 2023 – Jan 2024).
- ~76K domains per day - almost 1 domain per second.
- 1% of newly registered domains never appear in the next CZDS snapshot.
- Predominately malicious!
- With half of them died within their first 6 hours of life.

- The paper focused on detecting transient domains in a post-mortem scenario.
- Being able to block them quicker can help against attackers who may leverage caching.
- How can we detect them as soon as they die?
 - o Measuring newly registered domains* (every 10 min, for 48h. A/AAAA/NS (@TLDs)/MX).
 - o Detect deletion: 3x NXDOMAIN at TLD Level.
 - Issuing 2 RDAP requests, one when the domain is first detected, one when the domain is marked as deleted.
 - Checking RDAP responses for status.

- The paper focused on detecting transient domains in a post-mortem scenario.
- Being able to block them quicker can help against attackers who may leverage caching.
- How can we detect them as soon as they die?
 - Measuring newly registered domains* (every 10 min, for 48h. A/AAAA/NS (@TLDs)/MX).
 - o Detect deletion: 3x NXDOMAIN at TLD Level.
 - Issuing 2 RDAP requests, one when the domain is first detected, one when the domain is marked as deleted.
 - Checking RDAP responses for status.

- The paper focused on detecting transient domains in a post-mortem scenario.
- Being able to block them quicker can help against attackers who may leverage caching.
- How can we detect them as soon as they die?
 - Measuring newly registered domains* (every 10 min, for 48h. A/AAAA/NS (@TLDs)/MX).
 - Detect deletion: 3x NXDOMAIN at TLD Level.
 - Issuing 2 RDAP requests, one when the domain is first detected, one when the domain is marked as deleted.
 - Checking RDAP responses for status.

- The paper focused on detecting transient domains in a post-mortem scenario.
- Being able to block them quicker can help against attackers who may leverage caching.
- How can we detect them as soon as they die?
 - Measuring newly registered domains* (every 10 min, for 48h. A/AAAA/NS (@TLDs)/MX).
 - Detect deletion: 3x NXDOMAIN at TLD Level.
 - Issuing 2 RDAP requests, one when the domain is first detected, one when the domain is marked as deleted.
 - Checking RDAP responses for status.

$\dots A N D$

It seems someone (the registry) is holding those transient domains back.

Likely abuse!

(Sometimes is client hold, registrar acting)

rdap:

copyright_notice: "

description: []

dnssec: false

entities: {*abuse*:[{*email*:*abuse@gname.com*;*handle*:*NOT APPLICABLE*;*name*:*Gname.com Pte. Ltd:*,type*:*entity*]],*registrant*:[{*address*:{* Ltd:*,type*:*entity*,*url*:*https://rdap.centralnic.com/store/entity/1923*]],*technical*:[{*handle*:*C1559112222-CNIC*,*name*:**,*type*:*entity*]]}

expiration_date: "2026-01-20 23:59:59+00:00"

handle: "D520613940-CNIC"

last_changed_date: "2025-01-20 12:48:56+00:00"

name: "aocjjo223.store"

nameservers: ["a.share-dns.com","b.share-dns.net"]

parent_handle: "

rir: "

registration_date: "2025-01-20 09:50:17+00:00"

status ["server hold","erver transfer prohibited","client transfer prohibited","add period"]

terms_of_service_url: "https://www.centralnicregistry.com/"

type: "domain"

unicode_name: "

url: "https://rdap.centralnic.com/store/domain/aocjjo223.store"

whois_server: "whois.nic.store"

success: true

tags: {"authoritative_level"."TLD";cert_index":"529532406";cert_timestamp"."1737376899";ctlog_name"."Let's Encrypt 'Oak2025h1";end_time"."2025

timestamp: 1737384500

GETTING TO THIS....



Transient Domains

GETTING TO THIS....



Transient Domains

SOME NICE BY-PRODUCTS AS LIVE STREAM (AND CLICKHOUSE STORED DATA)

- newly_registered_domain List of newly registered domains detected from CT Logs.
- confirmed_newly_registered_domain Same of above, RDAP-Confirmed.
- newly_registered_fqdn List of FDQNs of newly registered domains detected from CT Logs.
- newly_registered_domains_measurements A/AAAA/NS/MX (every 10 min for 48h).
- newly_registered_fqdn_measurements A/AAAA (every 10 min for 48h).
- certstream Certificate Transparencty Logs stream (based on https://certstream.calidog.io/).
- certstream_domains Stream of domain names learned from CT Logs.
- newly_issued_certificates_measurements A/AAAA/NS for every domain name learned from CT Logs.

SOME NICE BY-PRODUCTS AS LIVE STREAM

- newly_registered_domain List of newly registered domains detected from CT Logs.
- confirmed_newly_registered_domain Same of above, RDAP-Confirmed.
- newly_registered_fqdn List of FDQNs of newly registered domains detected from CT Logs.
- newly_registered_domains_measurements A/AAAA/NS/MX (every 10 min for 48h).
- newly_registered_fqdn_measurements A/AAAA (every 10 min for 48h).
- certstream Certificate Transparencty Logs stream (based on https://certstream.calidog.io/).
- certstream_domains Stream of domain names learned from CT Logs.
- newly_issued_certificates_measurements A/AAAA/NS for every domain name learned from CT Logs.

SOME NICE BY-PRODUCTS AS LIVE STREAM

- newly_registered_domain List of newly registered domains detected from CT Logs.
- confirmed_newly_registered_domain Same of above, RDAP-Confirmed.
- newly_registered_fqdn List of FDQNs of newly registered domains detected from CT Logs.
- newly_registered_domains_measurements A/AAAA/NS/MX (every 10 min for 48h).
- newly_registered_fqdn_measurements A/AAAA (every 10 min for 48h).
- certstream Certificate Transparencty Logs stream (based on <u>https://certstream.calidog.io/</u>).
- certstream_domains Stream of domain names learned from CT Logs.
- newly_issued_certificates_measurements A/AAAA/NS for every domain name learned from CT Logs.

SOME NICE BY-PRODUCTS AS LIVE STREAM

- newly_registered_domain List of newly registered domains detected from CT Logs.
- confirmed_newly_registered_domain Same of above, RDAP-Confirmed.
- newly_registered_fqdn List of FDQNs of newly registered domains detected from CT Logs.
- newly_registered_domains_measurements A/AAAA/NS/MX (every 10 min for 48h).
- newly_registered_fqdn_measurements A/AAAA (every 10 min for 48h).
- certstream Certificate Transparencty Logs stream (based on <u>https://certstream.calidog.io/</u>).
- certstream_domains Stream of domain names learned from CT Logs.
- newly_issued_certificates_measurements A/AAAA/NS for every domain name learned from CT Logs.

ISN'T THERE A BETTER WAY?

• DNS is a *pull protocol!?* Right?

- (Rapid) Zone Updates? -> EPP
- A signal for any update in the zone, enabling a CT Logs-like system to detect changes.
- DNS-Transparency -> <u>https://www.internetfire.org/projects/dns-transparency</u>
- Why?
 - Detecting early removal of domain names.
 - Evicting from cache of public and private resolvers.
 - Revoking certificates of expired domains.
 - Build better ML models to detect future threats.
 - o Identifying hijacking
 - ...add your use case that requires you monitoring continuously the DNS

- DNS is a *pull protocol!?* Right?
- (Rapid) Zone Updates? -> EPP
- A signal for any update in the zone, enabling a CT Logs-like system to detect changes.
- DNS-Transparency -> <u>https://www.internetfire.org/projects/dns-transparency</u>
- Why?
 - Detecting early removal of domain names.
 - Evicting from cache of public and private resolvers.
 - Revoking certificates of expired domains.
 - Build better ML models to detect future threats.
 - o Identifying hijacking
 - o ...add your use case that requires you monitoring continuously the DNS

- DNS is a *pull protocol!?* Right?
- (Rapid) Zone Updates? -> EPP
- A signal for any update in the zone, enabling a CT Logs-like system to detect changes.
- DNS-Transparency -> <u>https://www.internetfire.org/projects/dns-transparency</u>
- Why?
 - Detecting early removal of domain names.
 - Evicting from cache of public and private resolvers.
 - Revoking certificates of expired domains.
 - Build better ML models to detect future threats.
 - o Identifying hijacking
 - ...add your use case that requires you monitoring continuously the DNS

- DNS is a *pull protocol!?* Right?
- (Rapid) Zone Updates? -> EPP
- A signal for any update in the zone, enabling a CT Logs-like system to detect changes.
- DNS-Transparency -> <u>https://www.internetfire.org/projects/dns-transparency</u>
- Why?
 - o Detecting early removal of domain names.
 - Evicting from cache of public and private resolvers.
 - Revoking certificates of expired domains.
 - Build better ML models to detect future threats.
 - o Identifying hijacking
 - \circ ...add your use case that requires you monitoring continuously the DNS

- DNS is a *pull protocol!?* Right?
- (Rapid) Zone Updates? -> EPP
- A signal for any update in the zone, enabling a CT Logs-like system to detect changes.
- DNS-Transparency -> <u>https://www.internetfire.org/projects/dns-transparency</u>
- Why?
 - o Detecting early removal of domain names.
 - Evicting from cache of public and private resolvers.
 - Revoking certificates of expired domains.
 - Build better ML models to detect future threats.
 - o Identifying hijacking
 - ...add your use case that requires you monitoring continuously the DNS

- DNS is a *pull protocol!?* Right?
- (Rapid) Zone Updates? -> EPP
- A signal for any update in the zone, enabling a CT Logs-like system to detect changes.
- DNS-Transparency -> <u>https://www.internetfire.org/projects/dns-transparency</u>
- Why?
 - o Detecting early removal of domain names.
 - Evicting from cache of public and private resolvers.
 - Revoking certificates of expired domains.
 - Build better ML models to detect future threats.
 - o Identifying hijacking
 - o ...add your use case that requires you monitoring continuously the DNS



WILL THIS BE ENOUGH TO MITIGATE ABUSE?



WILL THIS BE ENOUGH TO MITIGATE ABUSE?

DEFINITELY NOT!

WE MAY NEED TO GO BEYOND DNS

BEYOND DNS: WHERE? WHO? MONEY?

• Where?

 Exposing the registrar information in a more public manner (e.g., in a DNS Transparency Log) will enable researchers and security firms to detect and identify bad registrars' behaviors (... someone said bad CAs identified by CT Logs?)

• Who?

- GDPR complicate the matter veiling RDAP registrant information's behind privacy. But we need the ability to correlate behaviors of actors across different system, not of knowing their identity!
- How to follow the money?
 - Registrant may still lie about their identity, the (global, unique, anonymous) identifier should enable independent third-party, vetted security researcher, law enforcement to track the money flow (e.g., a hash linked to the payment method).

BEYOND DNS: WHERE? WHO? MONEY?

• Where?

- Exposing the registrar information in a more public manner (e.g., in a DNS Transparency Log) will enable researchers and security firms to detect and identify bad registrars' behaviors (... someone said bad CAs identified by CT Logs?)
- Who?
 - GDPR complicate the matter veiling RDAP registrant information's behind privacy. But we need the ability to correlate behaviors of actors across different system, not of knowing their identity!
- How to follow the money?
 - Registrant may still lie about their identity, the (global, unique, anonymous) identifier should enable independent third-party, vetted security researcher, law enforcement to track the money flow (e.g., a hash linked to the payment method).

BEYOND DNS: WHERE? WHO? MONEY?

- Where?
 - Exposing the registrar information in a more public manner (e.g., in a DNS Transparency Log) will enable researchers and security firms to detect and identify bad registrars' behaviors (... someone said bad CAs identified by CT Logs?)
- Who?
 - GDPR complicate the matter veiling RDAP registrant information's behind privacy. But we need the ability to correlate behaviors of actors across different system, not of knowing their identity!
- How to follow the money?
 - Registrant may still lie about their identity, the (global, unique, anonymous) identifier should enable independent third-party, vetted security researcher, law enforcement to track the money flow (e.g., a hash linked to the payment method).

WILL THIS SOLVE THE PROBLEM OF ABUSE?

- Probably not!
- Malicious actor may still evade detection by using fake identities.
- But we will make their life harder (and ours easier)!
- We need a zone of trust where those information can be shared and design a mechanism to enable anonymization of those identifiers without violating the privacy of the users.

WILL THIS SOLVE THE PROBLEM OF ABUSE?

- Probably not!
- Malicious actor may still evade detection by using fake identities.
- But we will make their life harder (and ours easier)!
- We need a zone of trust where those information can be shared and design a mechanism to enable anonymization of those identifiers without violating the privacy of the users.
- Or we can keep playing the cat and the mouse game!



QUESTIONS?

Raffaele Sommese <u>r.sommese@utwente.nl</u>

https://zonestream.openintel.nl https://kafka.zonestream.openintel.nl/



UNIVERSITY

OF TWENTE.

