Network Working Group

Internet-Draft

Intended status: Informational

Expires: October 10, 2020

L. Howard PADL April 8, 2020

# A Simple Anonymous GSS-API Mechanism draft-howard-gss-sanon-04

#### Abstract

This document defines protocols, procedures and conventions for a Generic Security Service Application Program Interface (GSS-API) security mechanism that provides key agreement without authentication of either party.

#### 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 <a href="https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/">https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/</a>.

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 October 10, 2020.

described in the Simplified BSD License.

# Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to <a href="BCP-78">BCP-78</a> and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents

(<a href="https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info">https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info</a>) 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 include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as

## Table of Contents

<u>1</u> . Introduction	. <u>2</u>
<u>1.1</u> . Authentication	<u>3</u>
1.2. Application Services	<u>3</u>
$\underline{2}$ . Requirements notation	<u>3</u>
$\underline{3}$ . Discovery and Negotiation	<u>3</u>
<u>4</u> . Naming	. <u>4</u>
<u>4.1</u> . GSS Name Types	. <u>4</u>
4.1.1. GSS_C_NT_USER_NAME	. <u>4</u>
4.1.2. GSS_C_NT_HOSTBASED_SERVICE	. <u>4</u>
4.1.3. GSS_C_NT_DOMAINBASED_SERVICE	. <u>4</u>
4.1.4. GSS_C_NT_ANONYMOUS	
4.2. Canonicalization	. <u>5</u>
4.3. Mechanism Selection Hints	. <u>5</u>
<u>5</u> . Mechanism Attributes	. <u>5</u>
$\underline{6}$ . Definitions and Token Formats	<u>6</u>
<u>6.1</u> . Context Establishment Tokens	<u>6</u>
<u>6.1.1</u> . Initial context token	<u>6</u>
6.1.2. Acceptor context token	. <u>7</u>
<u>6.1.3</u> . Initiator context completion	. <u>7</u>
<u>6.2</u> . Per-Message Tokens	. <u>7</u>
<u>6.3</u> . Context Deletion Tokens	. <u>7</u>
<u>6.4</u> . Exported Name Tokens	<u>8</u>
$\underline{7}$ . Key derivation	<u>8</u>
8. Pseudo-Random Function	<u>8</u>
9. NegoEx	<u>9</u>
<u>10</u> . Test Vectors	<u>9</u>
$\underline{11}$ . Security Considerations	<u>9</u>
12. Acknowledgements	. <u>10</u>
13. Normative References	<u> 10</u>
Author's Address	. <u>11</u>

# 1. Introduction

The Generic Security Service Application Program Interface (GSS-API) [RFC2743] provides a framework for authentication and message protection services through a common programming interface.

The Simple Anonymous mechanism described in this document (hereafter SAnon) is a simple protocol based on the X25519 elliptic curve Diffie-Hellman (ECDH) key agreement scheme defined in [RFC7748]. authentication of initiator or acceptor is provided. A potential use of SAnon is to provide a degree of privacy when bootstrapping unkeyed entities.

#### 1.1. Authentication

The GSS-API protocol involves a client, known as the initiator, sending an initial security context token of a chosen GSS-API security mechanism to a peer, known as the acceptor. The two peers subsequently exchange, synchronously, as many security context tokens as necessary to complete the authentication or fail. The specific number of context tokens exchanged varies by security mechanism: in the case of the SAnon mechanism, it is two (i.e. a single round trip). Once authentication is complete, the initiator and acceptor share a security context which can be used for integrity or confidentiality, protecting subsequent application messages.

# 1.2. Application Services

GSS-API provides a number of a services to the calling application:

GSS\_Wrap() integrity and optional confidentiality for a message

GSS\_GetMIC() integrity for a message sent separately

GSS\_Pseudo\_random() shared key derivation (e.g., for keying external confidentiality and integrity layers)

These services are used with security contexts having a shared session key to protect application-layer messages.

# 2. Requirements notation

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 [RFC2119].

# 3. Discovery and Negotiation

The GSS\_API mechanism OID for the SAnon mechanism is:

```
sanon-x25519 OBJECT IDENTIFIER ::=
    {iso(1)identified-organization(3)dod(6)internet(1)
    private(4)enterprise(1)padl(5322)gss-sanon(26)
    mechanisms(1)sanon-x25519(110)}
```

The means of discovering GSS-API peers and their supported mechanisms is out of this specification's scope. To avoid multiple negotiation layers and implementation complexity, this specification is intentionally not crypto-agile. A future variant using a different key exchange algorithm would be assigned a different mechanism OID.

If anonymity is not desired then SAnon MUST NOT be used. Either party can test for the presence of GSS\_C\_ANON\_FLAG to check if anonymous authentication was performed.

# 4. Naming

The GSS-API provides a rich security principal naming model. At its most basic the query forms of names consist of a user-entered/displayable string and a name type. Name types are constants with names prefixed with "GSS\_C\_NT\_" in the GSS-API.

# 4.1. GSS Name Types

## 4.1.1. GSS\_C\_NT\_USER\_NAME

This name type is supported when the input name string is the well known anonymous name string, WELLKNOWN/ANONYMOUS@WELLKNOWN:ANONYMOUS. In all other cases, importing the name MUST fail.

## 4.1.2. GSS\_C\_NT\_HOSTBASED\_SERVICE

This name type identifies a host-based service and is generally used by acceptors. To allow existing applications to work unmodified with SAnon, it is useful to allow acceptor credentials to be acquired regardless of the service name. When importing a name of this type the name string SHOULD be ignored. (Note that SAnon does not authenticate the acceptor to the initiator.)

# 4.1.3. GSS\_C\_NT\_DOMAINBASED\_SERVICE

The [RFC5179] name type, along with all other service name types, are treated identically to GSS\_C\_NT\_HOSTBASED\_SERVICE.

## 4.1.4. GSS\_C\_NT\_ANONYMOUS

When importing a name of this type the name string MUST be ignored. Functions that return a name type to the caller MUST always return this name type. The display form is the well known anonymous name string, WELLKNOWN/ANONYMOUS@WELLKNOWN:ANONYMOUS. This is always the name observed by a SAnon peer.

The well known anonymous name has the same display form as in Kerberos [RFC8062], allowing acceptors to perform name-based authorization in a mechanism-agnostic manner.

## 4.2. Canonicalization

The SAnon GSS-API mechanism has a single anonymous identity, the well known anonymous name. The canonical form is the well known anonymous name string with the GSS\_C\_NT\_ANONYMOUS name type.

## 4.3. Mechanism Selection Hints

Many deployed applications do not have explicit support for anonymous authentication. To ease deployment, we recommend allowing anonymous authentication to be requested by the initiator acquiring a credential with a well known anonymous name. Where the initiator credential name is entered by the end-user, this allows the end-user to request anonymous authentication without requiring the application be modified to support GSS\_C\_ANON\_FLAG.

This approach may, however, disadvantage applications that wish to use GSS\_C\_ANON\_FLAG to select anonymous authentication, as importing a non-anonymous initiator name will fail with this approach. We consider this an acceptable compromise given the limited deployment of GSS\_C\_ANON\_FLAG in existing implementations.

## 5. Mechanism Attributes

The [RFC5587] mechanism attributes for this mechanism are:

GSS\_C\_MA\_MECH\_CONCRETE

GSS\_C\_MA\_ITOK\_FRAMED

GSS\_C\_MA\_AUTH\_INIT\_ANON

GSS\_C\_MA\_AUTH\_TARG\_ANON

GSS\_C\_MA\_INTEG\_PROT

GSS\_C\_MA\_CONF\_PROT

GSS\_C\_MA\_MIC

GSS\_C\_MA\_WRAP

GSS\_C\_MA\_REPLAY\_DET

GSS\_C\_MA\_00S\_DET

GSS\_C\_MA\_CBINDINGS

```
{\sf GSS\_C\_MA\_PFS}
GSS_C_MA_CTX_TRANS
```

# 6. Definitions and Token Formats

#### 6.1. Context Establishment Tokens

## 6.1.1. Initial context token

```
The initial context token is framed per <a>Section 1 of [RFC2743]</a>:
GSS-API DEFINITIONS ::=
     BEGIN
     MechType ::= OBJECT IDENTIFIER
     -- representing SAnon mechanism
     GSSAPI-Token ::=
     [APPLICATION 0] IMPLICIT SEQUENCE {
         thisMech MechType,
         innerToken ANY DEFINED BY thisMech
             -- 32 byte initiator public key
     }
     END
```

On the first call to GSS\_Init\_sec\_context(), the mechanism checks for one of the following:

```
The caller set anon_req_flag (GSS_C_ANON_FLAG); or
```

The claimant\_cred\_handle identity is the well known anonymous name; or

The claimant\_cred\_handle is the default credential and targ\_name an anonymous name.

If none of the above are the case, the call MUST fail with GSS\_S\_UNAVAILABLE.

If proceeding, the initiator generates a fresh secret and public key pair per Section 6.1 of [RFC7748] and returns GSS S CONTINUE NEEDED indicating that a subsequent context token from the acceptor is expected. The innerToken field of the output\_token contains the initiator's 32 byte public key.

## 6.1.2. Acceptor context token

Upon receiving a context token from the initiator, the acceptor validates that the token is well formed and contains a public key of the requisite length. The acceptor generates a fresh secret and public key pair. A session key is computed as specified in Section 7.

The acceptor constructs an output\_token by concatenating its public key with the token emitted by calling GSS\_GetMIC() with the default QOP and zero-length octet string. The output token is sent to the initiator without additional framing.

The acceptor then returns GSS\_S\_COMPLETE, setting src\_name to the well known anonymous name. The reply\_det\_state (GSS\_C\_REPLAY\_FLAG), sequence\_state (GSS\_C\_SEQUENCE\_FLAG), conf\_avail (GSS\_C\_CONF\_FLAG), integ\_avail (GSS\_C\_INTEG\_FLAG) and anon\_state (GSS\_C\_ANON\_FLAG) security context flags are set to TRUE. The context is ready to use.

## <u>6.1.3</u>. Initiator context completion

Upon receiving the acceptor context token and verifying it is well formed, the initiator extracts the acceptor's public key (being the first 32 bytes of the input token) and computes the session key per Section 7.

The initiator calls GSS\_VerifyMIC() with the MIC extracted from the context token and the zero-length octet string. If successful, the initiator returns GSS\_S\_COMPLETE to the caller, to indicate the initiator is authenticated and the context is ready for use. No output token is emitted. Security context flags are set as for the acceptor context.

## <u>6.2</u>. Per-Message Tokens

The per-message tokens definitions are imported from [RFC4121] Section 4.2. The base key used to derive specific keys for signing and sealing messages is the session key defined in Section 7. The [RFC3961] encryption and checksum algorithms use the aes128-cts-hmac-sha256-128 encryption type defined in [RFC8009]. The AcceptorSubkey flag as defined in [RFC4121] Section 4.2.2 MUST be set.

# <u>6.3</u>. Context Deletion Tokens

Context deletion tokens are empty in this mechanism. The behavior of GSS\_Delete\_sec\_context() [RFC2743] is as specified in [RFC4121] Section 4.3.

## 6.4. Exported Name Tokens

The exported name token format mechanism is the standard exported name format specified by <a href="Mechanism of Section 3.2">[RFC2743]</a> Section 3.2, where MECH\_OID is the mechanism OID given in <a href="Section 3">Section 3</a> and NAME is the well known anonymous name string.

## 7. Key derivation

The ECDH shared secret k is computed by calling the X25519 function with the local secret key and the peer's public key, as specified in Section 6.1 of [RFC7748]. The context session key (K1) is computed using a key derivation function from Section 5.1 of [SP800-108] with HMAC as the PRF:

K1 = HMAC-SHA-256(key, 0x000000001 | label | 0x00 | context | k)

where:

k the ECDH shared secret computed previously

 $0\times000000001$  the iteration count from Section 5.1 of [SP800-108]

label the string "sanon-x25519" (without quotation marks)

context the concatenation of the initiator and acceptor public

keys, along with the channel binding application data

(if present), in that order

The inclusion of channel bindings in the key derivation function means that the acceptor cannot ignore initiator channel bindings; this differs from some other mechanisms.

This session key is equivalent to the acceptor-asserted subkey defined in <a href="[RFC4121] Section 2">[RFC4121] Section 2</a> and is used as the base key for generating keys for per-message tokens and the GSS-API PRF.

The session key encryption type is aes128-cts-hmac-sha256-128 as defined in [RFC8009]. The [RFC3961] algorithm protocol parameters are as given in [RFC8009] Section 5.

#### 8. Pseudo-Random Function

The [RFC4401] GSS-API pseudo-random function for this mechanism imports the definitions from [RFC8009], using the context session key as the base key for both GSS\_C\_PRF\_KEY\_FULL and GSS\_C\_PRF\_KEY\_PARTIAL usages.

# 9. NegoEx

When SAnon is negotiated by [I-D.zhu-negoex], the authentication scheme identifier is DEE384FF-1086-4E86-BE78-B94170BFD376.

The initiator and acceptor keys for NegoEx checksum generation and verification are derived using the PRF from the previous section, with the input data "sanon-x25519-initiator-negoex-key" and "sanonx25519-acceptor-negoex-key" respectively (without quotation marks).

No NegoEx metadata is specified. Any metadata present MUST be ignored. If the GSS-API implementation supports both SPNEGO [RFC4178] and NegoEx, SAnon SHOULD be advertised by both to maximise interoperability.

### 10. Test Vectors

initiator secret key			cc e6													
initiator public key	d2	1e	3е	58	60	b0	16	6c	d1	cb	38	1a	aa	89	62	93
	07	13	ae	e1	76	86	93	10	46	57	a7	a1	9с	1d	76	2e
initiator token	60	2c	06	0a	2b	06	01	04	01	a9	4a	1a	01	6e	d2	1e
	Зе	58	60	b0	16	6c	d1	cb	38	1a	aa	89	62	93	07	13
	ae	e1	76	86	93	10	46	57	a7	a1	9c	1d	76	2e		
acceptor secret key	Зе	4f	e6	5b	ea	85	94	3b	5a	a2	b7	83	f6	26	84	1a
	10	39	d5	d3	6d	af	85	aa	a1	6f	12	97	57	99	6c	ff
acceptor public key	a8	32	14	9d	58	33	13	се	1c	55	7b	2b	d1	8a	е7	a5
	59	8c	a6	4b	02	20	83	5e	16	be	09	ca	2f	90	60	31
context session key	af	f1	8d	b7	45	с6	27	cd	a8	da	d4	9b	d7	e7	01	25
acceptor token	a8	32	14	9d	58	33	13	се	1c	55	7b	2b	d1	8a	e7	a5
	59	8c	a6	4b	02	20	83	5e	16	be	09	ca	2f	90	60	31
	04	04	05	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
	45	02	7b	a8	15	1c	33	05	22	bb	с4	36	84	d2	e1	8c

# **11**. Security Considerations

This document defines a GSS-API security mechanism, and therefore deals in security and has security considerations text embedded throughout. This section only addresses security considerations associated with the SAnon mechanism described in this document. It does not address security considerations associated with the GSS-API itself.

This mechanism provides only for key agreement. It does not authenticate the identity of either party. It MUST not be selected if either party requires identification of its peer.

## 12. Acknowledgements

AuriStor, Inc funded the design of this protocol, along with an implementation for the Heimdal GSS-API library.

Jeffrey Altman, Greg Hudson, Simon Josefsson, and Nicolas Williams provided valuable feedback on this document.

# 13. Normative References

## [I-D.zhu-negoex]

Short, M., Zhu, L., Damour, K., and D. McPherson, "SPNEGO Extended Negotiation (NEGOEX) Security Mechanism", <a href="mailto:draft-zhu-negoex-04">draft-zhu-negoex-04</a> (work in progress), January 2011.

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate
   Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119,
   DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997,
   <a href="https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119">https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119</a>.
- [RFC3961] Raeburn, K., "Encryption and Checksum Specifications for Kerberos 5", <u>RFC 3961</u>, DOI 10.17487/RFC3961, February 2005, <a href="https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3961">https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3961</a>>.
- [RFC4121] Zhu, L., Jaganathan, K., and S. Hartman, "The Kerberos
  Version 5 Generic Security Service Application Program
  Interface (GSS-API) Mechanism: Version 2", RFC 4121,
  DOI 10.17487/RFC4121, July 2005,
  <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4121>.
- [RFC4178] Zhu, L., Leach, P., Jaganathan, K., and W. Ingersoll, "The Simple and Protected Generic Security Service Application Program Interface (GSS-API) Negotiation Mechanism", RFC 4178, DOI 10.17487/RFC4178, October 2005, <a href="https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4178">https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4178</a>.

- [RFC4401] Williams, N., "A Pseudo-Random Function (PRF) API
  Extension for the Generic Security Service Application
  Program Interface (GSS-API)", RFC 4401,
  DOI 10.17487/RFC4401, February 2006,
  <a href="https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4401">https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4401</a>>.
- [RFC5179] Williams, N., "Generic Security Service Application
  Program Interface (GSS-API) Domain-Based Service Names
  Mapping for the Kerberos V GSS Mechanism", RFC 5179,
  DOI 10.17487/RFC5179, May 2008,
  <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5179>.
- [RFC5587] Williams, N., "Extended Generic Security Service Mechanism Inquiry APIs", <u>RFC 5587</u>, DOI 10.17487/RFC5587, July 2009, <a href="https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5587">https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5587</a>>.
- [RFC7748] Langley, A., Hamburg, M., and S. Turner, "Elliptic Curves for Security", RFC 7748, DOI 10.17487/RFC7748, January 2016, <a href="https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7748">https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7748</a>>.
- [RFC8009] Jenkins, M., Peck, M., and K. Burgin, "AES Encryption with HMAC-SHA2 for Kerberos 5", RFC 8009, DOI 10.17487/RFC8009, October 2016, <a href="https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8009">https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8009</a>>.

# [SP800-108]

Chen, L., "Recommendation for Key Derivation Using Pseudorandom Functions (Revised)", October 2009.

# Author's Address

Luke Howard PADL Software Pty Ltd PO Box 59 Central Park, VIC 3145 Australia

Email: lukeh@padl.com