DANE 0. Gudmundsson Internet-Draft Shinkuro Inc.

Updates: 6698 (if approved)

Intended status: Standards Track

Sninkuro Inc.
Sninkuro Inc.
Sninkuro Inc.
Sninkuro Inc.

Expires: March 23, 2014

Adding acronyms to simplify DANE conversations draft-ietf-dane-registry-acronyms-00

Abstract

Experience has show that people get confused using the three numeric fields the TLSA record. This document specifies descriptive acronyms for the three numeric fields in the TLSA records.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of \underline{BCP} 78 and \underline{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 March 23, 2014.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2013 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to $\underline{\mathsf{BCP}}$ 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.

Table of Contents

| <u>1</u> . | Introd | uct | lon | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u>2</u> |
|-------------|---------------|-----|------|-------|------|-----|-----|----|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|----------|
| 1. | <u>1</u> . Re | qui | reme | nts r | nota | iti | on | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| <u>2</u> . | IANA c | ons | ider | atior | ıs . | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 2. | <u>1</u> . TL | SA | Cert | ifica | ıte | Usa | age | es | | | | | | | | | | | <u>3</u> |
| 2. | <u>2</u> . TL | SA | Sele | ctors | · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u>3</u> |
| 2. | <u>3</u> . TL | SA | Matc | hing | typ | es | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u>3</u> |
| <u>3</u> . | Exampl | es | of u | ısage | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u>4</u> |
| <u>4</u> . | Securi | ty | cons | idera | itic | ns | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u>4</u> |
| <u>5</u> . | Acknow | led | geme | nts | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u>4</u> |
| <u>6</u> . | Normat | ive | Ref | erend | es | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u>4</u> |
| <u>Appe</u> | <u>ndix A</u> | | Docu | ment | his | toi | ۲у | | | | | | | | | | | | <u>4</u> |
| Auth | or's A | ddr | ess | | | | | | | | _ | _ | | _ | | _ | | | 4 |

1. Introduction

During discussions on how to add DANE [RFC6698] technology to new protocols/services people repeatedly have got confused as what the numeric values stand for and even the order of the fields of a TLSA record. This document updates the IANA registry definition for TLSA record to add a column with acronym for each specified field, in order to reduce confusion. This document does not change the DANE protocol in any way.

It is expected that DANE parser's in applications and DNS software MAY adopt parsing the acronyms for each field, installed base MAY NOT get updated.

1.1. 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].

2. IANA considerations

This document applies to "DNS-Based Authentication of Named Entities (DANE) Parameters" located at "http://www.iana.org/assignments/dane-parameters/dane-parameters.xhtml". Each one of the Sub-registries will add a column with an acronym for that field.

[RFC6698] and this document are both to be the reference documents for the three sub-registries.

As these acronyms are offered for human consumption, case does not matter, it is expected that software the parses TLSA records will handle any case use in the input> The expectation is that by using

the acronyms in production systems fewer bad TLSA records will be published.

2.1. TLSA Certificate Usages

| Value | Acronym | -+ Short Description -+ | Reference |
|--|--|---|-----------|
| 0 1 2 3 4-254 255 | PKIX-CA PKIX-EE DANE-TA DANE-EE PrivCert | CA constraint Service certificate constraint Trust anchor assertion | [RFC6698] |

Table 1: TLSA Certificate Usages

Note: should the short description be updated to be more expressive ?

Other options suggested for 0: PKIX-TA

2.2. TLSA Selectors

| + | | + | + |
|--|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| | Short Description | Reference | + |
| 1 SPKI 2-254 255 PrivSel | | | - + |

Table 2: TLSA Selectors

2.3. TLSA Matching types

| + | .+ | -+ | -+ |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-----|
| | Short Description | Reference | - |
| · | + | -+ | - + |
| 0 Full | No hash used | [<u>RFC6698</u>] | |
| | 256 bit hash by SHA2 | [<u>RFC6698</u>] | |
| 2 SHA2-512 | 512 bit hash by SHA2 | [<u>RFC6698</u>] | |
| 3-254 | Unassigned | | |
| 255 PrivMatch | Reserved for Private Use | [<u>RFC6698</u>] | |
| + | .+ | -+ | - + |

Table 3: TLSA Matching types

3. Examples of usage

```
TLSA records using/displaying the acronyms:
_666._tcp.first.example. TLSA PKIX-CA CERT SHA2-512 {blob}
_666._tcp.second.example. TLSA DANE-TA SPKI SHA2-256 {blob}
```

Acronym use in a specification example: "Protocol FOO only allows TLSA records using PKIX-EE and DANE-EE, with selector SPKI and using SHA2-512."

4. Security considerations

This document only changes registry fields and does not change the behavior of any protocol. The hope is to reduce confusion and lead to better specification and operations.

5. Acknowledgements

Scott Schmit offered real good suggestions to decrease the possibility of confusion. Viktor Dukhovni provided comments from expert point of view.

6. Normative References

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

[RFC6698] Hoffman, P. and J. Schlyter, "The DNS-Based Authentication of Named Entities (DANE) Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol: TLSA", RFC 6698, August 2012.

Appendix A. Document history

```
[RFC Editor: Please remove this section before publication ]
```

00 Initial version

01 Updated version based on some comments ready for WGLC

00 WG version almost identical to 01

Author's Address

Olafur Gudmundsson Shinkuro Inc. 4922 Fairmont Av, Suite 250 Bethesda, MD 20814 USA

Email: ogud@ogud.com