Sender Policy Framework Preventing E-Mail Sender Address Forgery

I)ruid <druid@caughq.org>

Problem: Sender Address Forgery

Nearly all abusive email messages carry fake sender addresses

- Victims of forged sender addresses are the people who's addresses are being abused:
 - **Damages victims' reputations**
 - ☆ Victims often receive bounce messages to messages to that were allegedly sent by them, but weren't.
- Sender address forgery is a threat to everyone:

Erodes confidence in email's authenticity and reliability



Forged Email Origins

Spammers want to avoid receiving DSN (delivery status notifications) reporting non-delivery to their real addresses

- Representation Fraudsters want to cover their tracks and remain anonymous
- Email worms want to cause confusion or just don't care about which sender addresses they use
- Phishers want to impersonate well-known, trusted identities in order to steal sensitive information from targets



Solution: SPF

Sender Policy Framework (RFC-4408) Open Standard

- Technical method to prevent sender address forgery
- RFC-2821 layer, or, SMTP layer protocol

Protects the *envelope* sender address



Sender Addresses in Email

Envelope Sender Address (see RFC-2821)

- We Usually stored in the "Return-Path" email header
- 🖾 Used during transport of a message between mail servers
- Solution We was a straight to the sender in case of delivery failure
- Header Sender Addresses (see RFC-2822)

 - \mathbb{R} Is displayed to users by mail programs
 - Generally, mail servers don't care about this address; it's not relevant to delivery



Envelope vs. Header Illustrated





What does SPF do?

Allows the owner of a domain to specify which mail servers are allowed to send email from their domain

Restores confidence in the origin of email messages from those domains



How does it work?

The domain owner publishes an SPF record in DNS identifying authorized sending mail servers for their domain

- When a mail server receives a message claiming to be from that domain:
 - ☑ It looks up the sending domain's SPF record in DNS
 - Checks to see if the sending server is authorized by the sending domain's policy
 - If the message comes from an unauthorized server, it can be considered a forgery



It Takes Two to Tango

Published domain sender policies in DNS are not worth much alone...

Receiving mail servers still have to enforce them



Example Policy

SPF SPF Version 1 TXT record identifier

🖾 mx

The incoming mail servers (MXes) of the domain are authorized to also send mail for example.net

☆ a:druid.example.net

The server druid.example.net is authorized also

☆ include:gmail.com

Everything authorized by gmail.com is also authorized for example.net

恐-all

 \mathbb{K} All other servers are **NOT** authorized (note the "-" sign)



SPF Record Syntax

Many more *mechanisms* available than those shown in the previous example, including:

🖾 ptr

⊠ ip4

Each *mechanism* can be prefixed with one of four qualifiers:

- 🖾 fail
- 🕾 ~ softfail
- 🖾 + pass
- 🕾 ? neutral



Evaluating an SPF Record

Works like a firewall policy:

- Evaluate mechanisms in order from first to last
- If the mechanism results in a match, it's prefix value is used (default is pass (+))
- If no mechanism or modifier matches, the default result is neutral
- Most SPF records end in a catch-all rule called "all"
 Prefixed with a "+" (+all), this rule is an ALLOW all
 Prefixed with a "-" (-all), this rule is a DENY all



Example Evaluation

"v=spf1 a mx a:druid.example.net -all"

⊠a

 \mathbb{K} (+a) Does the sending server match the domain's A record? \mathbb{K} PASS

密 mx

 $\ensuremath{\mathbb{K}}$ (+mx) Does the sending server match one of the domain's MX records? $\ensuremath{\mathbb{K}}$ PASS

☆a:druid.example.net

 \mathbb{K} (+a) Does the sending server match this particular A record? \mathbb{K} PASS

🖾-all

☑ Does the sending server match everything (all)?☑ FAIL



Drawbacks

Most servers do not yet support SPF checking natively

In the special case of mail-forwarding MTA's, SPF requires that the sender address be rewritten



Benefits

Most MTAs, both commercial and opensource, have SPF extensions available

Sender Rewriting Scheme (SRS) has been developed specifically for mail-forwarding MTA's, and was discovered to have the additional benefit of being able to identify illegitimate DSNs

An SPF check can be performed before any message data is sent to the receiving mail server (checks vs. MAIL FROM)



Why do I care about SPF?

- Because I helped design Version 1
 - Eat your own dog food... or something...
- ⊠It works
 - I prevent a couple thousand SPF FAIL messages from entering my server weekly
- It's quick and easy to deploy
 - Even my unmotivated ass was able to get it implemented!



Who else cares about SPF?

AOL is requesting all of their whitelist partners switch to SPF to remain on their whitelist.

SpamAssassin (among many, many other anti-spam tools) uses SPF as one of it's weighted tests alongside RBLs and other metrics



SPF vs. Sender-ID

- Sender-ID (RFC-4406) is Microsoft's abomination of SPF
- RFC-2822 layer, or, Header Layer protocol
- ✓ Validates a header sender address (purported responsible address (RFC-4407))
- Thank god we talked them out of using XML in DNS...
- ☆ But now they use SPF record syntax... confusing!
 ☆ Sender-ID spec. directly violates the SPF spec.
 ☆ Microsoft refuses to fix it (go figure)



SPF vs. DKIM

DomainKeys Identified Mail (DKIM) Merger of Yahoo! DomainKeys and Cisco's IIM RFC-2822 layer, or, Header Layer protocol Walidates an accountable identity associated with a message when it is transferred over the Internet Cryptographically signs the email body and some of the headers

Domain public key stored in DNS TXT record under _domainkey subdomain



Everything You'll Need

http://www.openspf.org

