

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Updates: [rfc4120](#) (if approved)
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: October 1, 2017

T. Yu
MIT Kerberos Consortium
March 30, 2017

Move Kerberos protocol parameter registries to IANA
draft-ietf-kitten-kerberos-iana-registries-04

Abstract

The Kerberos 5 network authentication protocol has several numeric protocol parameters. Most of these parameters are not currently under IANA maintenance. This document requests that IANA take over the maintenance of the remainder of these Kerberos parameters.

Status of This Memo

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). 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 October 1, 2017.

Copyright Notice

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.

Internet-Draft

Kerberos IANA registries

March 2017

[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.](#) Introduction

The Kerberos 5 network authentication protocol [[RFC4120](#)] [[RFC1510](#)] has several numeric protocol parameters. This document requests that IANA take over the maintenance of the Kerberos protocol parameters that are not currently under IANA maintenance. Several instances of number conflicts in Kerberos implementations could have been prevented by having IANA registries for those numbers. This document updates [[RFC4120](#)].

[3.](#) General registry format

Unless otherwise specified, each Kerberos protocol number registry will have the following fields: "number", "name", "reference", and "comments".

The name must begin with a lowercase letter, and must consist of ASCII letters, digits, and hyphens. Two or more hyphens must not appear directly adjacent to each other. A hyphen must not appear at the end of a name. It is preferred that words in a name be separated by hyphens, and that all of the letters be lowercase.

(These rules are consistent with the lexical rules for an ASN.1 valuereference or identifier. Where the constraints are stricter than the ASN.1 lexical rules, they make it easier to systematically transform the names for use in implementation languages.)

Names for numeric parameter values have no inherent meaning in the Kerberos protocol, but they can guide choices for internal implementation symbol names and for user-visible non-numeric representations. When written in English prose in specifications, or when used as symbolic constants in implementation languages (e.g., C preprocessor macros), it is common to transform the name into all uppercase letters, and possibly to replace hyphens with underscores.

[4.](#) General registration procedure

This document requests that the IESG establish a pool of Kerberos experts who will manage the Kerberos registries using these guidelines. The IESG may wish to consider including the set of designated IANA experts for existing Kerberos IANA registries as candidates for this pool.

IANA will select an expert from this pool for each registration request. The expert will review the registration request and may approve the registration, decline the registration with comments, or recommend that the registration request should follow a specific alternative process. The alternative processes that the expert may recommend are the IETF review process and the standards action process.

Initially, the expert reviewers will use a permissive process, generally approving registrations that are architecturally consistent with Kerberos and the protocol parameter in question. Over time, with input from the community, the experts may refine the requirements that registrations are expected to meet. The experts will maintain a current version of these guidelines in a manner that is generally accessible to the entire community. As the guidelines evolve, experts may consider the technical quality of specifications, security impacts of the registrations, architectural consistency, and interoperability impact. Experts may require a publicly available specification in order to make certain registrations.

[For the individual registries, include "Registrations in this registry are managed by the expert review process [[RFC5226](#)] or in exceptional cases by IESG approval. See section x for guidelines for the experts to be used with this registry."]

5. Integer assignments

Names for integer assignments must be unique across all Kerberos integer parameter registries. This is normally accomplished by including a name prefix that identifies the registry.

Assignments for integers parameters will follow the general registration procedure outlined above, except as otherwise noted in the section that contains the description of the parameter. Kerberos integer parameters take on signed 32-bit values (-2147483648 to 2147483647). Negative values are for private or local use.

[5.1.](#) Address types

Registry name: Address types

Assignment policy: General registration procedure

Valid values: Signed 32-bit integers

Address types historically align with numeric constants used in the Berkeley sockets API. Future address type assignments should conform

Yu

Expires October 1, 2017

[Page 3]

Internet-Draft

Kerberos IANA registries

March 2017

to this historical practice when possible. The name prefix for address types is "addrtype-".

[5.2.](#) Authorization data types

Registry name: Authorization data types

Assignment policy: General registration procedure

Valid values: Signed 32-bit integers

The name prefix for authorization data types is "ad-".

[5.3.](#) Error codes

Registry name: Error codes

Assignment policy: Standards action

Valid values: Signed 32-bit integers

Assignments for error codes require standards action due to their scarcity: assigning error codes greater than 127 could require significant changes to certain implementations. The name prefixes for error codes are "kdc-err-", "krb-err-", and "krb-ap-err-".

[5.4.](#) Key usages

Registry name: Key usages

Assignment policy: General registration procedure

Valid values: Unsigned 32-bit integers

Key usages are unsigned 32-bit integers (0 to 4294967295). Zero is reserved and may not be assigned.

The name prefix for key usages is "ku-".

[5.5](#). Name types

Registry name: Name types

Assignment policy: General registration procedure

Valid values: Signed 32-bit integers

The name prefix for name types is "nt-".

number	name	reference	comment
0	nt-unknown	RFC4120	Name type not known
1	nt-principal	RFC4120	Just the name of the principal as in DCE, or for users
2	nt-srv-inst	RFC4120	Service and other unique instance (krbtgt)
3	nt-srv-hst	RFC4120	Service with host name as instance (telnet, rcommands)
4	nt-srv-xhst	RFC4120	Service with host as remaining components
5	nt-uid	RFC4120	Unique ID
6	nt-x500-principal	RFC4120	Encoded X.509 Distinguished name [RFC2253]
7	nt-smtp-name	RFC4120	Name in form of SMTP email name (e.g., user@example.com)
10	nt-enterprise	RFC4120	Enterprise name - may be

11	nt-wellknown	RFC6111	mapped to principal name Well-known principal name
12	nt-srv-hst-domain	RFC5179	Domain-based names

5.6. Pre-authentication and typed data

Registry name: Pre-authentication and typed data

Assignment policy: General registration procedure

Valid values: Signed 32-bit integers

This document requests that IANA modify the existing Kerberos Pre-authentication and typed data registry to be consistent with the procedures in this document.

The name prefix for pre-authentication type numbers is "pa-". The name prefix for typed data numbers is "td-". Pre-authentication and typed data numbers are in the same registry, but a pre-authentication number may be also be assigned to a related typed data number.

6. Named bit assignments

Assignments for named bits require standards action, due to their scarcity: assigning bit numbers greater than 31 could require significant changes to implementations. Names for named bit assignments must be unique within a given named bit registry, and typically do not have name prefixes that identify which registry they belong to.

6.1. AP-REQ options

Registry name: AP-REQ options

Assignment policy: Standards action

Valid values: ASN.1 bit numbers 0 through 31

6.2. KDC-REQ options

Registry name: KDC-REQ options

Assignment policy: Standards action

Valid values: ASN.1 bit numbers 0 through 31

6.3. Ticket flags

Registry name: Ticket flags

Assignment policy: Standards action

Valid values: ASN.1 bit numbers 0 through 31

7. Numbers that will not be registered

ASN.1 application tag numbers (which are always equal to the "msg-type" field in Kerberos messages where they appear) will not be registered. Any Kerberos protocol change that requires a new application tag number will be a sufficiently major change that the specification of the change MUST define a new ASN.1 module and MUST be Standards Track.

Transited encoding values will not be registered. There is only one transited encoding type for the Kerberos protocol. The interoperability concerns inherent to the cross-realm operation of Kerberos mean that specifications of new transited encoding types are very unlikely. Any specification of new transited encoding types MUST be Standards Action.

Protocol version number (pvno) values will not be registered. The location of the "pvno" value in Kerberos messages is not in a place that implementations can meaningfully use to distinguish among different variants of the Kerberos protocol.

8. Contributors

Sam Hartman proposed the text of the expert review guidelines. Love

Hornquist Astrand wrote a previous document ([draft-lha-krb-wg-some-numbers-to-iana-00](#)) with the same goals as this document.

9. Acknowledgments

Thanks to Tom Petch for providing useful feedback on previous versions of this document.

10. Security Considerations

Assignments of new Kerberos protocol parameter values can have security implications. In cases where the assignment policy calls for expert review, the reviewer is responsible for evaluating whether adequate documentation exists concerning the security considerations for the requested assignment. For assignments that require IETF review or standards action, the normal IETF processes ensure adequate treatment of security considerations.

11. IANA Considerations

This document requests that IANA create several registries for Kerberos protocol parameters:

- o Address types
- o Authorization data types
- o Error codes
- o Key usages
- o Name types
- o AP-REQ options
- o KDC-REQ options
- o Ticket flags

authentication data and typed data" registry to contain an additional reference to this document, and to transform existing names in that registry to the lowercase-and-hyphens style.

12. Open issues

Do we make a registry for application tag numbers (equal to message type numbers)? We've said that we would replace the entire ASN.1 module in that case, but Nico's recent proposal doesn't do that, and if we want to accommodate that sort of proposal, it would probably be best to establish a registry. (It should require standards action for registrations.)

Do transited encodings need a registry? They would probably require standards action, even if there were a registry.

13. References

13.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC3961] Raeburn, K., "Encryption and Checksum Specifications for Kerberos 5", [RFC 3961](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3961, February 2005, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3961>>.
- [RFC4120] Neuman, C., Yu, T., Hartman, S., and K. Raeburn, "The Kerberos Network Authentication Service (V5)", [RFC 4120](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4120, July 2005, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4120>>.
- [RFC5226] Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 5226](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5226, May 2008, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5226>>.

13.2. Informative References

- [RFC1510] Kohl, J. and C. Neuman, "The Kerberos Network Authentication Service (V5)", [RFC 1510](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC1510, September 1993, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1510>>.

Author's Address

Tom Yu
MIT Kerberos Consortium
77 Massachusetts Ave
Cambridge, Massachusetts
USA

Email: tlyu@mit.edu

Yu

Expires October 1, 2017

[Page 9]