Network Working Group Internet-Draft

Intended status: Standards Track

Expires: August 18, 2014

I. Miers M. Green Johns Hopkins University E. Rescorla Mozilla February 14, 2014

Short Authentication Strings for TLS draft-miers-tls-sas-00

Abstract

TLS and DTLS connections generally rely on a PKI, a shared secret, or endpoint fingerprints for endpoint authentication. This document describes an authentication mechanism which instead generates a "short authentication string" (SAS) as an emergent property of the connection. The SAS can then be verified via an external channel in order to authenticate the connection.

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of $\underline{\mathsf{BCP}}$ 78 and $\underline{\mathsf{BCP}}$ 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on August 18, 2014.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2014 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must

Internet-Draft SAS for TLS February 2014

include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

This document may contain material from IETF Documents or IETF Contributions published or made publicly available before November 10, 2008. The person(s) controlling the copyright in some of this material may not have granted the IETF Trust the right to allow modifications of such material outside the IETF Standards Process. Without obtaining an adequate license from the person(s) controlling the copyright in such materials, this document may not be modified outside the IETF Standards Process, and derivative works of it may not be created outside the IETF Standards Process, except to format it for publication as an RFC or to translate it into languages other than English.

Table of Contents

<u>1</u> .	Int	roductio	n																	3
<u>2</u> .	Teri	minology	/ .																	<u>3</u>
<u>3</u> .	Bac	kground	Со	in-F	=lip	pir	ng	Pr	ot	ос	ol	S								3
<u>4</u> .	Pro	tocol De	efin.	itio	on .															<u>4</u>
4	<u>. 1</u> .	Coin Fi	Lipp	ing																<u>4</u>
4	<u>. 2</u> .	Comput	Lng	the	raw	ı SA	٩S	bi	ts											<u>5</u>
4	<u>.3</u> .	Comput	Lng	the	SAS	St	tri	ing												<u>5</u>
<u>5</u> .	Sec	urity Co	nsi	dera	atio	ns														<u>5</u>
<u>6</u> .	Nori	mative F	≀efe	rend	ces															<u>5</u>
Auth	nors	' Addres	ses																	6

1. Introduction

TLS [TLS12] and DTLS connections generally rely on a PKI, a shared secret, or endpoint fingerprints for endpoint authentication. This document describes an authentication mechanism which instead generates a "short authentication string" (SAS) as an emergent property of the connection. The SAS can then be verified via an external channel in order to authenticate the connection.

While a fingerprint can be used for authentication (and is used in SSH), it is too long to be conveniently read and compared by two users. If a predictable subset of the fingerprint is compared (e.g., the first or last bits) an attacker can create a fingerprint which just matches that subset. The mechanism described by this document is based on fingerprints but compares a small number of bits derived from the fingerprint and randomness generated by both endpoints, thus requiring an attacker to match the entire fingerprint (which is too long to be feasible) in order to produce a low probability of detection. In order to compute the SAS, the endpoints run a "coin flip" protocol to generate a short shared bitstring which is not under the control of either endpoint. The bitstring is then used, along with the TLS fingerprint, to derive a set of bits that are mapped to a SAS.

2. Terminology

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119 [RFC2119].

3. Background: Coin-Flipping Protocols

The general pattern of a coin-flipping protocol is shown below:

Alice	Bob
H(R_a)	 >
<	 - R_b
R a	 >

Alice and Bob each generate a large random number R_a and R_b . Alice (who speaks first) computes a commitment to R_a by hashing R_a and sends it to Bob. Bob then sends R_b to Alice and finally then Alice reveals R_a to Bob. Bob then verifies that R_a matches the hash Alice sent in the first message and then each side computes the shared value $S = R_a$ XOR R_b .

4. Protocol Definition

4.1. Coin Flipping

We map the coin flipping messages to TLS using a TLS extension and a new handshake message, as shown below.

```
Client
                                                 Server
ClientHello + SASXtn
                     ---->
                                    ServerHello + SASXtn
                                           Certificate*
                                      ServerKeyExchange*
                                     CertificateRequest*
                                        ServerHelloDone
                           <----
Certificate*
ClientKeyExchange
CertificateVerify*
SASShare
[ChangeCipherSpec]
                           ---->
Finished
                                               SASShare
                                      [ChangeCipherSpec]
                           <----
                                               Finished
Application Data
                           <----> Application Data
```

Each side generates a 512-bit cryptographically random value R_client and R_server.

The SASXtn is defined as follows:

```
struct {
    opaque digest<255>;
} SASExtension;
```

The client's SASXtn is a zero-length value indicating the client's desire to do the SAS handshake. The server's SASXtn is a digest of R_{server} using the Hash defined for the Finished message in $\frac{\text{Section}}{7.4.9}$ of $\frac{\text{TLS12}}{1.9}$.

The SASShare structure is defined as follows:

```
struct {
    opaque share[64];
} SASShare;
```

"share" is the raw byte value of R_client or R_server, as appropriate.

Miers, et al. Expires August 18, 2014 [Page 4]

Internet-Draft SAS for TLS February 2014

4.2. Computing the raw SAS bits

The SAS bits are computed as follows:

- If you are the client, verify that the server's R_server matches their SASExtension value. If not, abort the handshake with error handshake_failure
- 2. Compute R_shared = R_client ^ R_server
- 3. If both endpoints have certificate fingerprints compute fingerprints=fingerprint_server | fingerprint_client. If only the server has a fingerprint, compute fingerprints=fingerprint_server.
- 4. Compute SAS_bits as HASH(fingerprints||R_shared) using the Hash defined for the Finished message in Section 7.4.9 of [TLS12]

4.3. Computing the SAS String

The application should map the first 15<n<len(fingerprints) bits of SAS_bits to some set of words or symbols defined for the application. One option is the PGP word list. For a spoken language agnostic solution, symbols could be use.

5. Security Considerations

Implementations MUST use fresh, random R_client and R_server values for each TLS handshake.

Implementations MUST ensure their share of the coin flip remains secret until after the TLS session key is established.

Applications SHOULD abort if the SAS strings do not match.

Applications SHOULD abort after multiple failed TLS handshakes and notify the user. Failure to do so will allow an attacker multiple attempts to guess a SAS. They will succeed after a few thousand attempts.

6. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", <u>BCP 14</u>, <u>RFC 2119</u>, March 1997.
- [TLS12] Dierks, T. and E. Rescorla, "The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.2", <u>RFC 5246</u>, August 2008.

Authors' Addresses

Ian Miers
Johns Hopkins University

Email: imiers@cs.jhu.edu

Matthew Green Johns Hopkins University

Email: mgreen@cs.jhu.edu

Eric Rescorla Mozilla 2064 Edgewood Drive Palo Alto, CA 94303 USA

Phone: +1 650 678 2350 Email: ekr@rtfm.com