

Internet-Draft  
Updates: [4252](#), [4253](#), [4254](#) (if approved)  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: September 29, 2017

D. Bider  
Bitwise Limited  
March 29, 2017

Extension Negotiation in Secure Shell (SSH)  
draft-ietf-curdle-ssh-ext-info-03.txt

## Abstract

This memo defines a mechanism for SSH clients and servers to exchange information about supported protocol extensions confidentially after completed key exchange.

## Status

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/lid-abstracts.html>

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>

## Copyright

Copyright (c) 2017 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 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.

## 1. Overview and Rationale

Secure Shell (SSH) is a common protocol for secure communication on the Internet. The original design of the SSH transport layer [[RFC4253](#)] lacks proper extension negotiation. Meanwhile, diverse implementations take steps to ensure that known message types contain no unrecognized information. This makes it difficult for implementations to signal capabilities and negotiate extensions without risking disconnection.

This obstacle has been recognized in relationship with [[SSH-RSA-SHA2](#)], where the need arises for a client to discover signature algorithms a server accepts, to avoid authentication penalties and trial-and-error.

### 1.1. Requirements 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 [[RFC2119](#)].

### 1.2. Wire Encoding Terminology

The wire encoding types in this document - "byte", "uint32", "string", "boolean", "name-list" - have meanings as described in [[RFC4251](#)].

## 2. Extension Negotiation Mechanism

### 2.1. Signaling of Extension Negotiation in KEXINIT

Applications implementing this mechanism MUST add to the field "kex\_algorithms", in their KEXINIT packet sent for the first key exchange, one of the following indicator names:

- When acting as server: "ext-info-s"
- When acting as client: "ext-info-c"

The indicator name is added without quotes, and MAY be added at any position in the name-list, subject to proper separation from other names as per name-list conventions.

The names are added to the "kex\_algorithms" field because this is one of two name-list fields in KEXINIT that do not have a separate copy for each data direction.

The indicator names inserted by the client and server are different to ensure that these names will not produce a match, and will be neutral with respect to key exchange algorithm negotiation.

The inclusion of textual indicator names is intended to provide a clue for implementers to discover this mechanism.

Bider

[Page 2]

---

Internet-Draft

Extension Negotiation in SSH

March 2017

## [2.2.](#) Enabling Criteria

If a client or server offers "ext-info-c" or "ext-info-s" respectively, it **MUST** be prepared to accept an SSH\_MSG\_EXT\_INFO message from the peer.

Thus a server only needs to send "ext-info-s" if it intends to process SSH\_MSG\_EXT\_INFO from the client.

If a server receives an "ext-info-c", it **MAY** send an SSH\_MSG\_EXT\_INFO message, but is not required to do so.

If an SSH\_MSG\_EXT\_INFO message is sent, then it **MUST** be the first message after the initial SSH\_MSG\_NEWKEYS.

Implementations **MUST NOT** send an incorrect indicator name for their role. Implementations **MAY** disconnect if the counter-party sends an incorrect indicator. If "ext-info-c" or "ext-info-s" ends up being negotiated as a key exchange method, the parties **MUST** disconnect.

## [2.3.](#) SSH\_MSG\_EXT\_INFO Message

A party that received the "ext-info-c" or "ext-info-s" indicator **MAY** send the following message:

```
byte      SSH_MSG_EXT_INFO (value 7)
uint32    nr-extensions
repeat the following 2 fields "nr-extensions" times:
    string extension-name
    string extension-value
```

This message is sent immediately after SSH\_MSG\_NEWKEYS, without delay. This allows a client to pipeline an authentication request after its SSH\_MSG\_SERVICE\_REQUEST, even when this needs extension information.

#### 2.4. Server's Secondary SSH\_MSG\_EXT\_INFO

If the client sent "ext-info-c", the server MAY send zero, one, or two EXT\_INFO messages. The first opportunity for the server's EXT\_INFO is after the server's NEWKEYS, as above. The second opportunity is just before (\*) SSH\_MSG\_USERAUTH\_SUCCESS, as defined in [RFC4252]. The server MAY send EXT\_INFO at the second opportunity, whether or not it sent it at the first. A client that sent "ext-info-c" MUST accept a server's EXT\_INFO at both opportunities, but MUST NOT require it.

This allows a server to reveal support for additional extensions that it was unwilling to reveal to an unauthenticated client. If a server sends a subsequent SSH\_MSG\_EXT\_INFO, this replaces any initial one, and both the client and the server re-evaluate extensions in effect. The server's last EXT\_INFO is matched against the client's original.

(\*) The message MUST be sent at this point for the following reasons: if it was sent earlier, it would not allow the server to withhold information until the client has authenticated; if it was sent later, a client that needs information from the second EXT\_INFO immediately after successful authentication would have no way of reliably knowing whether there will be a second EXT\_INFO or not.

#### 2.5. Interpretation of Extension Names and Values

Each extension is identified by its extension-name, and defines the conditions under which the extension is considered to be in effect. Applications MUST ignore unrecognized extension-names.

If an extension requires both the client and the server to include it in order for the extension to take effect, the relative position of the extension-name in each EXT\_INFO message is irrelevant.

Extension-value fields are interpreted as defined by their respective extension. An extension-value field MAY be empty if so permitted by the extension. Applications that do not implement or recognize a particular extension MUST ignore the associated extension-value field, regardless of its size or content.

The cumulative size of an SSH\_MSG\_EXT\_INFO message is limited only by the maximum packet length that an implementation may apply in accordance with [\[RFC4253\]](#). Implementations MUST accept well-formed SSH\_MSG\_EXT\_INFO messages up to the maximum packet length they accept.

### [3.](#) Initially Defined Extensions

#### [3.1.](#) "server-sig-algs"

This extension is sent with the following extension name and value:

```
string      "server-sig-algs"
name-list   signature-algorithms-accepted
```

Note that the name-list type is a strict subset of the string type, and is thus permissible as an extension-value. See [\[RFC4251\]](#) for more information about this encoding.

This extension is sent by the server, and contains a list of signature algorithms that the server is able to process as part of a "publickey" authentication request.

If a client sends this extension, the server MAY ignore it, and MAY disconnect.

A client that wishes to proceed with public key authentication MAY wait for the server's SSH\_MSG\_EXT\_INFO so it can send a "publickey" authentication request with an appropriate signature algorithm, rather than resorting to trial and error.

Servers that implement public key authentication SHOULD implement this extension.

If a server does not send this extension, a client MUST NOT make any assumptions about the server's signature algorithm support, and MAY proceed with authentication requests using trial and error. Note that implementations are known to exist that apply authentication penalties if the client attempts to use an unexpected signature algorithm.

### [3.2.](#) "delay-compression"

This extension MAY be sent by both parties as follows:

```
string      "delay-compression"
string:
  name-list  compression_algorithms_client_to_server
  name-list  compression_algorithms_server_to_client
```

This extension allows the server and client to renegotiate compression algorithm support without having to conduct a key re-exchange, putting new algorithms into effect immediately upon successful authentication.

This extension takes effect only if both parties send it. Name-lists MAY include any compression algorithm that could have been negotiated in SSH\_MSG\_KEXINIT, except algorithms that define their own delayed compression semantics. This means "zlib,none" is a valid algorithm list in this context; but "zlib@openssh.com" is not.

If both parties send this extension, but the name-lists do not contain a common algorithm in either direction, the parties MUST disconnect in the same way as if negotiation failed as part of SSH\_MSG\_KEXINIT.

If this extension takes effect, the renegotiated compression algorithm is activated for the very next SSH message after the trigger message:

- Sent by the server, the trigger message is SSH\_MSG\_USERAUTH\_SUCCESS.
- Sent by the client, the trigger message is SSH\_MSG\_NEWCOMPRESS.

If this extension takes effect, the client MUST send the following message shortly after receiving SSH\_MSG\_USERAUTH\_SUCCESS:

```
byte      SSH_MSG_NEWCOMPRESS (value 8)
```

The purpose of NEWCOMPRESS is to avoid a race condition where the server cannot reliably know whether a message sent by the client was sent before or after receiving the server's USERAUTH\_SUCCESS.

As with all extensions, the server MAY delay including this extension until its secondary SSH\_MSG\_EXT\_INFO, sent before USERAUTH\_SUCCESS. This allows the server to avoid advertising compression support until the client has been authenticated.

If the parties re-negotiate compression using this extension in a session where compression is already enabled; and the re-negotiated algorithm is the same in one or both directions; then the internal compression state MUST be reset for each direction at the time the re-negotiated algorithm takes effect.

### [3.2.1.](#) Awkwardly Timed Key Re-Exchange

A party that has signaled, or intends to signal, support for this extension in an SSH session, MUST NOT initiate key re-exchange in that session until either of the following occurs:

- This extension was negotiated, and the party that's about to start key re-exchange already sent its trigger message for compression.
- The party has sent (if server) or received (if client) the message SSH\_MSG\_USERAUTH\_SUCCESS, and this extension was not negotiated.

If a party violates this rule, the other party MAY disconnect.

In general, parties SHOULD NOT start key re-exchange before successful user authentication, but MAY tolerate it if not using this extension.

### [3.2.2.](#) Subsequent Re-Exchange

In subsequent key re-exchanges that unambiguously begin after the compression trigger messages, the compression algorithms negotiated in re-exchange override the algorithms negotiated with this extension.

## [3.3.](#) "no-flow-control"

This extension is sent with the following extension name and value:

string	"no-flow-control"
string	choice of: "p" for preferred   "s" for supported

A party SHOULD send "s" if it supports "no-flow-control", but does not prefer to enable it. A party SHOULD send "p" if it prefers to enable the extension if the other party supports it. Parties MAY disconnect if they receive a different extension value.

To take effect, this extension MUST be:

- Sent by both parties.
- At least one party MUST have sent the value "p" (preferred).

If this extension takes effect, the "initial window size" fields in SSH\_MSG\_CHANNEL\_OPEN and SSH\_MSG\_CHANNEL\_OPEN\_CONFIRMATION, as defined in [\[RFC4254\]](#), become meaningless. The values of these fields MUST be ignored, and a channel behaves as if all window sizes are infinite. Neither side is required to send any SSH\_MSG\_CHANNEL\_WINDOW\_ADJUST messages, and if received, such messages MUST be ignored.

This extension is intended, but not limited to, use by file transfer applications that are only going to use one channel, and for which the flow control provided by SSH is an impediment, rather than a feature.

Implementations MUST refuse to open more than one simultaneous channel when this extension is in effect. Nevertheless, server implementations SHOULD support clients opening more than one non-simultaneous channel.

### [3.4.](#) "elevation"

This extension MAY be sent by the client as follows:

```
string      "elevation"  
string      choice of: "y" | "n" | "d"
```

A client sends "y" to indicate its preference that the session should be elevated (as used by Windows); "n" to not be elevated; and "d" for the server to use its default behavior. The server MAY disconnect if it receives a different extension value. If a client does not send the "elevation" extension, the server SHOULD act as if "d" was sent.

If a client has included this extension, then after authentication, a server that supports this extension SHOULD indicate to the client whether elevation was done by sending the following global request:

```
byte        SSH_MSG_GLOBAL_REQUEST  
string      "elevation"  
boolean     want_reply = false  
boolean     elevation performed
```

## [4.](#) IANA Considerations

### [4.1.](#) Additions to existing tables



IANA is requested to insert the following entries into the table Message Numbers under Secure Shell (SSH) Protocol Parameters [[RFC4250](#)]:

Bider

[Page 7]

---

Internet-Draft

Extension Negotiation in SSH

March 2017

Value	Message ID	Reference
7	SSH_MSG_EXT_INFO	[this document]
8	SSH_MSG_NEWCOMPRESS	[this document]

IANA is requested to insert the following entries into the table Key Exchange Method Names:

Method Name	Reference	Note
ext-info-s	[this document]	<a href="#">Section 2.2</a>
ext-info-c	[this document]	<a href="#">Section 2.2</a>

## [4.2.](#) New table: Extension Names

Also under Secure Shell (SSH) Protocol Parameters, IANA is requested to create a new table, Extension Names, with initial content:

Extension Name	Reference	Note
server-sig-algs	[this document]	<a href="#">Section 3.1</a>
delay-compression	[this document]	<a href="#">Section 3.2</a>
no-flow-control	[this document]	<a href="#">Section 3.3</a>
elevation	[this document]	<a href="#">Section 3.4</a>

### [4.2.1.](#) Future Assignments to Extension Names

Names in the Extension Names table MUST follow the Conventions for Names defined in [\[RFC4250\]](#), [Section 4.6.1](#).

Requests for assignments of new non-local names in the Extension Names table (i.e. names not including the '@' character) MUST be done through the IETF CONSENSUS method, as described in [\[RFC5226\]](#).

## [5.](#) References

### [5.1.](#) Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.

- [RFC4250] Lehtinen, S. and C. Lonvick, Ed., "The Secure Shell (SSH) Protocol Assigned Numbers", [RFC 4250](#), January 2006.
- [RFC4251] Lehtinen, S. and C. Lonvick, Ed., "The Secure Shell (SSH) Protocol Architecture", [RFC 4251](#), January 2006.
- [RFC4252] Ylonen, T. and C. Lonvick, Ed., "The Secure Shell (SSH) Authentication Protocol", [RFC 4252](#), January 2006.
- [RFC4253] Ylonen, T. and C. Lonvick, Ed., "The Secure Shell (SSH) Transport Layer Protocol", [RFC 4253](#), January 2006.

Bider

[Page 8]

---

Internet-Draft

Extension Negotiation in SSH

March 2017

- [RFC4254] Ylonen, T. and C. Lonvick, Ed., "The Secure Shell (SSH) Connection Protocol", [RFC 4254](#), January 2006.
- [RFC5226] Narten, T. and Alvestrand, H., "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 5226](#), May 2008.

## [5.2.](#) Informative References

- [SSH-RSA-SHA2]  
Bider, D., "Use of RSA Keys with SHA-2 256 and 512 in Secure Shell (SSH)", [draft-ietf-curdle-rsa-sha2-04.txt](#), March 2017, <<https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-curdle-rsa-sha2-04>>.

Internet-Draft

Extension Negotiation in SSH

March 2017

#### Author's Address

Denis Bider  
Bitvise Limited  
Suites 41/42, Victoria House  
26 Main Street  
GI

Phone: +506 8315 6519  
EMail: [ietf-ssh3@denisbider.com](mailto:ietf-ssh3@denisbider.com)  
URI: <https://www.bitvise.com/>

#### Acknowledgments

Thanks to Markus Friedl and Damien Miller for comments and initial implementation. Thanks to Peter Gutmann, Roumen Petrov, and Daniel Migault for review and feedback.

