

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: August 23, 2012

K. Wierenga
Cisco Systems, Inc.
E. Lear
Cisco Systems GmbH
S. Josefsson
SJD AB
February 20, 2012

A SASL and GSS-API Mechanism for SAML
draft-ietf-kitten-sasl-saml-09.txt

Abstract

Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML) has found its usage on the Internet for Web Single Sign-On. Simple Authentication and Security Layer (SASL) and the Generic Security Service Application Program Interface (GSS-API) are application frameworks to generalize authentication. This memo specifies a SASL mechanism and a GSS-API mechanism for SAML 2.0 that allows the integration of existing SAML Identity Providers with applications using SASL and GSS-API.

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 August 23, 2012.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2012 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.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	3
1.1.	Terminology	4
1.2.	Applicability	4
2.	Authentication flow	6
3.	SAML SASL Mechanism Specification	9
3.1.	Initial Response	9
3.2.	Authentication Request	10
3.3.	Outcome and parameters	11
4.	SAML GSS-API Mechanism Specification	12
4.1.	GSS-API Principal Name Types for SAML	13
5.	Examples	14
5.1.	XMPP	14
5.2.	IMAP	18
6.	Security Considerations	22
6.1.	Man in the middle and Tunneling Attacks	22
6.2.	Binding SAML subject identifiers to Authorization Identities	22
6.3.	User Privacy	22
6.4.	Collusion between RPs	22
6.5.	GSS-API specific security considerations	22
7.	IANA Considerations	24
7.1.	IANA mech-profile	24
7.2.	IANA OID	24
8.	References	25
8.1.	Normative References	25
8.2.	Informative References	26
Appendix A.	Acknowledgments	28
Appendix B.	Changes	29
	Authors' Addresses	30

1. Introduction

Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML) 2.0

[[OASIS.saml-core-2.0-os](#)] is a set of specifications that provide various means for a user to be identified to a relying party (RP) through the exchange of (typically signed) assertions issued by an identity provider (IdP). It includes a number of protocols, protocol bindings [[OASIS.saml-bindings-2.0-os](#)], and interoperability profiles [[OASIS.saml-profiles-2.0-os](#)] designed for different use cases.

Simple Authentication and Security Layer (SASL) [[RFC4422](#)] is a generalized mechanism for identifying and authenticating a user and for optionally negotiating a security layer for subsequent protocol interactions. SASL is used by application protocols like IMAP [[RFC3501](#)], POP [[RFC1939](#)] and XMPP [[RFC6120](#)]. The effect is to make modular authentication, so that newer authentication mechanisms can be added as needed. This memo specifies just such a mechanism.

The Generic Security Service Application Program Interface (GSS-API) [[RFC2743](#)] provides a framework for applications to support multiple authentication mechanisms through a unified programming interface. This document defines a pure SASL mechanism for SAML, but it conforms to the new bridge between SASL and the GSS-API called GS2 [[RFC5801](#)]. This means that this document defines both a SASL mechanism and a GSS-API mechanism. The GSS-API interface is OPTIONAL for SASL implementers, and the GSS-API considerations can be avoided in environments that use SASL directly without GSS-API.

As currently envisioned, this mechanism enables interworking between SASL and SAML in order to assert the identity of the user and other attributes to relying parties. As such, while servers (as relying parties) will advertise SASL mechanisms (including SAML), clients will select the SAML SASL mechanism as their SASL mechanism of choice.

The SAML mechanism described in this memo aims to re-use the Web Browser SSO profile defined in [section 4.1](#) of the SAML profiles 2.0 specification [[OASIS.saml-profiles-2.0-os](#)] to the maximum extent and therefore does not establish a separate authentication, integrity and confidentiality mechanism. The mechanism assumes a security layer, such as Transport Layer Security (TLS [[RFC5246](#)]), will continue to be used. This specification is appropriate for use when a browser instance is available. In the absence of a browser instance, SAML profiles that don't require a browser such as the Enhanced Client or Proxy profile (as defined in [section 4.2](#) of the SAML profiles 2.0 specification [[OASIS.saml-profiles-2.0-os](#)]) may be used, but that is outside the scope of this specification.

Figure 1 describes the interworking between SAML and SASL: this document requires enhancements to the Relying Party (the SASL server) and to the Client, as the two SASL communication end points, but no changes to the SAML Identity Provider are necessary. To accomplish this goal some indirect messaging is tunneled within SASL, and some use of external methods is made.




Figure 1: Interworking Architecture

1.1. 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].

The reader is assumed to be familiar with the terms used in the SAML 2.0 specification [[OASIS.saml-core-2.0-os](#)].

1.2. Applicability

Because this mechanism transports information that should not be controlled by an attacker, the SAML mechanism MUST only be used over

channels protected by TLS, or over similar integrity protected and authenticated channels. In addition, when TLS is used the client MUST successfully validate the server certificate ([[RFC5280](#)], [[RFC6125](#)])

Note: An Intranet does not constitute such an integrity protected and authenticated channel!

2. Authentication flow

While SAML itself is merely a markup language, its common use case these days is with HTTP [[RFC2616](#)] or HTTPS [[RFC2818](#)] and HTML [[W3C.REC-html401-19991224](#)]. What follows is a typical flow:

1. The browser requests a resource of a Relying Party (RP) (via an HTTP request).
2. The Relying Party redirects the browser via an HTTP redirect (as described in [Section 10.3 of \[RFC2616\]](#)) to the Identity Provider (IdP) or an IdP discovery service. When it does so, it includes the following parameters: (1) an authentication request that contains the name of resource being requested, (2) a browser cookie, and (3) a return URL as specified in [Section 3.1](#) of the SAML profiles 2.0 specification [[OASIS.saml-profiles-2.0-os](#)].
3. The user authenticates to the IdP and perhaps authorizes the release of user attributes to the Relying Party.
4. In its authentication response, the IdP redirects (via an HTTP redirect) the browser back to the RP with an authentication assertion (stating that the IdP vouches that the subject has successfully authenticated), optionally along with some additional attributes.
5. The Relying Party now has sufficient identity information to approve access to the resource or not, and acts accordingly. The authentication is concluded.

When considering this flow in the context of SASL, we note that while the Relying Party and the client both must change their code to implement this SASL mechanism, the IdP can remain untouched. The Relying Party already has some sort of session (probably a TCP connection) established with the client. However, it may be necessary to redirect a SASL client to another application or handler. The steps are as follows:

1. The SASL server (Relying Party) advertises support for the SASL SAML20 mechanism to the client
2. The client initiates a SASL authentication with SAML20 and sends a domain name that allows the SASL server to determine the appropriate IdP
3. The SASL server transmits an authentication request encoded using a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) as described in [RFC 3986](#) [[RFC3986](#)] and an HTTP redirect to the IdP corresponding to the

domain

4. The SASL client now sends an empty response, as authentication continues via the normal SAML flow and the SASL server will receive the answer to the challenge out-of-band from the SASL conversation.
5. At this point the SASL client MUST construct a URL containing the content received in the previous message from the SASL server. This URL is transmitted to the IdP either by the SASL client application or an appropriate handler, such as a browser.
6. Next the user authenticates to the IdP. The manner in which the end user is authenticated to the IdP and any policies surrounding such authentication is out of scope for SAML and hence for this draft. This step happens out of band from SASL.
7. The IdP will convey information about the success or failure of the authentication back to the the SASL server (Relying Party) in the form of an Authentication Statement or failure, using a indirect response via the client browser or the handler (and with an external browser client control should be passed back to the SASL client). This step happens out of band from SASL.
8. The SASL Server sends an appropriate SASL response to the client, along with an optional list of attributes

Please note: What is described here is the case in which the client has not previously authenticated. It is possible that the client already holds a valid SAML authentication token so that the user does not need to be involved in the process anymore, but that would still be external to SASL. This is classic Web Single Sign-On, in which the Web Browser client presents the authentication token (cookie) to the RP without renewed user authentication at the IdP.

With all of this in mind, the flow appears as follows in Figure 2:




Figure 2: Authentication flow

3. SAML SASL Mechanism Specification

This section specifies the details of the SAML SASL mechanism. See [section 5 of \[RFC4422\]](#) for what is described here.

The name of this mechanism is "SAML20". The mechanism is capable of transferring an authorization identity (via the "gs2-header"). The mechanism does not offer a security layer.

The mechanism is client-first. The first mechanism message from the client to the server is the "initial-response". As described in [\[RFC4422\]](#), if the application protocol does not support sending a client-response together with the authentication request, the server will send an empty server-challenge to let the client begin. The second mechanism message is from the server to the client, containing the SAML "authentication-request". The third mechanism message is from client to the server, and is the fixed message consisting of "=" (i.e., an empty response). The fourth mechanism message is from the server to the client, indicating the SASL mechanism outcome.

3.1. Initial Response

A client initiates a "SAML20" authentication with SASL by sending the GS2 header followed by the authentication identifier (message 2 in Figure 2) and is defined as follows:

```
initial-response = gs2-header Idp-Identifier
IdP-Identifier = domain ; domain name with corresponding IdP
```

The "gs2-header" is used as follows:

- The "gs2-nonstd-flag" MUST NOT be present.
- The "gs2-cb-flag" MUST be set to "n" because channel binding [\[RFC5056\]](#) data cannot be integrity protected by the SAML negotiation. (Note: In theory channel binding data could be inserted in the SAML flow by the client and verified by the server, but that is currently not supported in SAML.)
- The "gs2-authzid" carries the optional authorization identity as specified in [\[RFC5801\]](#) (not to be confused with the IdP-Identifier).

Domain name is specified in [\[RFC1035\]](#). A domain name is either a "traditional domain name" as described in [\[RFC1035\]](#) or an "internationalized domain name" as described in [\[RFC5890\]](#). Clients

and servers MUST treat the IdP-Identifier as a domain name slot [[RFC5890](#)]. They also SHOULD support internationalized domain names (IDNs) in the Idp-Identifier field; if they do so, all of the domain name's labels MUST be A-labels or NR-LDH labels [[RFC5890](#)], if necessary internationalized labels MUST be converted from U-labels to A-labels by using the Punycode encoding [[RFC3492](#)] for A-labels prior to sending them to the SASL-server as described in the protocol specification for Internationalized Domain Names in Applications [[RFC5891](#)].

3.2. Authentication Request

The SASL Server transmits to the SASL client a URI that redirects the SAML client to the IdP (corresponding to the domain that the user provided), with a SAML authentication request as one of the parameters (message 3 in Figure 2) in the following way:

authentication-request = URI

URI is specified in [[RFC3986](#)] and is encoded according to [Section 3.4](#) (HTTP Redirect) of the SAML bindings 2.0 specification [[OASIS.saml-bindings-2.0-os](#)]. The SAML authentication request is encoded according to [Section 3.4](#) (Authentication Request) of the SAML core 2.0 specification [[OASIS.saml-core-2.0-os](#)]. Should the client support Internationalized Resource Identifiers (IRIs) [[RFC3987](#)] it MUST first convert the IRI to a URI before transmitting it to the server [[RFC5890](#)].

Note: The SASL server may have a static mapping of domain to corresponding IdP or alternatively a DNS-lookup mechanism could be envisioned, but that is out-of-scope for this document.

Note: While the SASL client MAY sanity check the URI it received, ultimately it is the SAML IdP that will be validated by the SAML client which is out-of-scope for this document.

The client then sends the authentication request via an HTTP GET (sent over a server-authenticated TLS channel) to the IdP, as if redirected to do so from an HTTP server and in accordance with the Web Browser SSO profile, as described in [section 3.1](#) of SAML profiles 2.0 specification [[OASIS.saml-profiles-2.0-os](#)] (message 5 and 6 in Figure 2).

The client handles both user authentication to the IdP and confirmation or rejection of the authentication of the RP (out-of-scope for this document).

After all authentication has been completed by the IdP, the IdP will send a redirect message to the client in the form of a URI corresponding to the Relying Party as specified in the authentication request ("AssertionConsumerServiceURL") and with the SAML response as one of the parameters (message 7 in Figure 2).

Please note: this means that the SASL server needs to implement a SAML Relying Party. Also, the SASL server needs to correlate the session it has with the SASL client with the appropriate SAML authentication result. It can do so by comparing the ID of the SAML authentication request it has issued with the one it receives in the SAML authentication statement.

3.3. Outcome and parameters

The SASL server (in its capacity as a SAML Relying Party) now validates the SAML authentication response it received from the SAML client via HTTP or HTTPS.

The outcome of that validation by the SASL server constitutes a SASL mechanism outcome, and therefore (as stated in [\[RFC4422\]](#)) SHALL be used to set state in the server accordingly, and it SHALL be used by the server to report that state to the SASL client as described in [\[RFC4422\] Section 3.6](#) (message 8 in Figure 2).

4. SAML GSS-API Mechanism Specification

This section and its sub-sections are not required for SASL implementors, but this section **MUST** be observed to implement the GSS-API mechanism discussed below.

This section specifies a GSS-API mechanism that when used via the GS2 bridge to SASL behaves like the SASL mechanism defined in this document. Thus, it can loosely be said that the SAML SASL mechanism is also a GSS-API mechanism. The SAML user takes the role of the GSS-API Initiator and the SAML Relying Party takes the role of the GSS-API Acceptor. The SAML Identity Provider does not have a role in GSS-API, and is considered an internal matter for the SAML mechanism. The messages are the same, but

- a) the GS2 header on the client's first message and channel binding data is excluded when SAML is used as a GSS-API mechanism, and
- b) the [RFC2743 section 3.1](#) initial context token header is prefixed to the client's first authentication message (context token).

The GSS-API mechanism OID for SAML is OID-TBD (IANA to assign: see IANA considerations).

SAML20 security contexts **MUST** have the `mutual_state` flag (`GSS_C_MUTUAL_FLAG`) set to `TRUE`. SAML does not support credential delegation, therefore SAML security contexts **MUST** have the `deleg_state` flag (`GSS_C_DELEG_FLAG`) set to `FALSE`.

The mutual authentication property of this mechanism relies on successfully comparing the TLS server identity with the negotiated target name. Since the TLS channel is managed by the application outside of the GSS-API mechanism, the mechanism itself is unable to confirm the name while the application is able to perform this comparison for the mechanism. For this reason, applications **MUST** match the TLS server identity with the target name, as discussed in [\[RFC6125\]](#). More precisely, to pass identity validation the client uses the securely negotiated `targ_name` as the reference identifier and match it to the DNS-ID of the server certificate, and **MUST** reject the connection if there is a mismatch. For compatibility with deployed certificate hierarchies, the client **MAY** also perform a comparison with the CN-ID when there is no DNS-ID present. Wildcard matching is permitted. The `targ_name` reference identifier is a "traditional domain names" thus the comparison is made using case-insensitive ASCII comparison.

The SAML mechanism does not support per-message tokens or `GSS_Pseudo_random`.

4.1. GSS-API Principal Name Types for SAML

SAML supports standard generic name syntaxes for acceptors such as GSS_C_NT_HOSTBASED_SERVICE (see [\[RFC2743\], Section 4.1](#)). SAML supports only a single name type for initiators: GSS_C_NT_USER_NAME. GSS_C_NT_USER_NAME is the default name type for SAML. The query, display, and exported name syntaxes for SAML principal names are all the same. There are no SAML-specific name syntaxes -- applications should use generic GSS-API name types such as GSS_C_NT_USER_NAME and GSS_C_NT_HOSTBASED_SERVICE (see [\[RFC2743\], Section 4](#)). The exported name token does, of course, conform to [\[RFC2743\], Section 3.2](#).

5. Examples

5.1. XMPP

Suppose the user has an identity at the SAML IdP `saml.example.org` and a Jabber Identifier (JID) `somenode@example.com`, and wishes to authenticate his XMPP connection to `xmpp.example.com`. The authentication on the wire would then look something like the following:

Step 1: Client initiates stream to server:

```
<stream:stream xmlns='jabber:client'
xmlns:stream='http://etherx.jabber.org/streams'
to='example.com' version='1.0'>
```

Step 2: Server responds with a stream tag sent to client:

```
<stream:stream
xmlns='jabber:client' xmlns:stream='http://etherx.jabber.org/streams'
id='some_id' from='example.com' version='1.0'>
```

Step 3: Server informs client of available authentication mechanisms:

```
<stream:features>
  <mechanisms xmlns='urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:xmpp-sasl'>
    <mechanism>DIGEST-MD5</mechanism>
    <mechanism>PLAIN</mechanism>
    <mechanism>SAML20</mechanism>
  </mechanisms>
</stream:features>
```

Step 4: Client selects an authentication mechanism and provides the initial client response containing the according to the definition in [Section 4](#) of BASE64 [RFC4648] encoded gs2-header and domain:

```
<auth xmlns='urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:xmpp-sasl' mechanism='SAML20'>
biwsZXhhbXBsZS5vcmc</auth>
```

The decoded string is: `n,,example.org`

Step 5: Server sends a BASE64 encoded challenge to client in the form of an HTTP Redirect to the SAML IdP corresponding to example.org (<https://saml.example.org>) with the SAML Authentication Request as specified in the redirection url:

```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Qmxjbk5wYzNSBGJuUWlEUW9nSUNBZ0lGTlFubUZ0WlZGMVlXehBabWxsY2ow
aWVHMxdjQzVsZUdGdGNHeGxMbU52YlNjZ1FXeHNiM2REY21waGRHVTlJblJ5
ZFdVaUlDOctEUW9nUEh0aGJXehdPbEpsY1hwbGMzUmxaRUyxZEodVEyOXVh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UkJkWFJvYmtOdmJuUmx1SFerSUEwS1BD0XpZVzFzY0RwQmRYUm9ibEpsY1hw
bGMzUSs=
```

The decoded challenge is:

https://saml.example.org/SAML/Browser?SAMLRequest=PHNhbWxwOkF1dGhuUmVxdWVzdCB4bWxuc2pZbW1scD0idXJuOm9hc2lzOm5hbWVzOnRjOlNBTUw6Mi4wOmFzc2VydGlvbiI+DQogICAgIElEPSJfYmVjNDI0ZmE1MTAzNDI4OT A5YTMwZmYxZTMxMTY4MzI3Zjc5NDc0OTg0IiBwZXJzaW9uPSIyLjAiDQogICAgSXNzdWVJbnN0YW50PSIyMDA3L TEyL TEwVDEwOjM5OjM0WiIgRm9yY2VBdXRobj0iZmFsc2UiDQogICAgSXNQYXNzaXZlPSJmYWxzZSINCiAgICBQcm90b2NvbEJpbmRpbmc9InVybjpvYXNpczpuYW1lczp0YzptQU1M0jIuMDpiaW5kaW5nczpIVFRQLVBPU1QiDQogICAgQXNzZXJ0aW9uQ29uc3VtZXJTZXJ2aWNlVVMpQ0KICAgICAgICAiaHR0cHM6Ly94bXBwLmV4YW1wbGUuY29tL1NBTUwvQXNzZXJ0aW9uQ29uc3VtZXJTZXJ2aWNlIj4NCiA8c2FtbDpJc3N1ZXIgeG1sbnM6c2FtbD0idXJuOm9hc2lzOm5hbWVzOnRjOlNBTUw6Mi4wOmFzc2VydGlvbiI+DQogICAgIGh0dHBz0i8veG1wcC5leGFtcGxlLmNvbQ0KIDwvc2FtbDpJc3N1ZXI+DQogPHNhbWxwOk5hbWVJRFBvbGljeSB4bWxuc2pZbW1scD0idXJuOm9hc2lzOm5hbWVzOnRjOlNBTUw6Mi4wOmByb3RvY29sIg0KICAgICBGB3JtYXQ9InVybjpvYXNpczpuYW1lczp0YzptQU1M0jIuMDpuYW1lawQtZm9ybWF0OnBlcnNpc3RlbnQiDQogICAgIFNQTmFtZVF1YWxpZmllcj0ieG1wcC5leGFtcGxlLmNvbSIgQWxs3dDcmVhdGU9InRydWUiIC8+DQogPHNhbWxwOlJlcXVlc3RlZEF1dGhuQ29udGV4dA0KICAgICB4bWxuc2pZbW1scD0idXJuOm9hc2lzOm5hbWVzOnRjOlNBTUw6Mi4wOmByb3RvY29sIiANCiAgICAgICAgQ29tcGFyaXNvb0iZXhhY3QiPg0KICA8c2FtbDpBdXRobkNvbnRleHRDbGFzc1JlZg0KICAgICAgG1sbnM6c2FtbD0idXJuOm9hc2lzOm5hbWVzOnRjOlNBTUw6Mi4wOmFzc2VydGlvbiI+DQogICAgICAgICAgIHVybjpvYXNpczpuYW1lczp0YzptQU1M0jIuMDphYzpjbgFzc2VzOlBhc3N3b3JkUHJvdGVjdGVkVHJhbnNwb3J0DQogIDwvc2FtbDpBdXRobkNvbnRleHRDbGFzc1JlZj4NCiA8L3NhbWxwOlJlcXVlc3RlZEF1dGhuQ29udGV4dD4gDQo8L3NhbWxwOkF1dGhuUmVxdWVzdD4=

Where the decoded SAMLRequest looks like:


```
<samlp:AuthnRequest xmlns:samlp="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:protocol"
  ID="_bec424fa5103428909a30ff1e31168327f79474984" Version="2.0"
  IssueInstant="2007-12-10T11:39:34Z" ForceAuthn="false"
  IsPassive="false"
  ProtocolBinding="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:bindings:HTTP-POST"
  AssertionConsumerServiceURL=
    "https://xmpp.example.com/SAML/AssertionConsumerService">
  <saml:Issuer xmlns:saml="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:assertion">
    https://xmpp.example.com
  </saml:Issuer>
  <samlp:NameIDPolicy xmlns:samlp="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:protocol"
    Format="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:nameid-format:persistent"
    SPNameQualifier="xmpp.example.com" AllowCreate="true" />
  <samlp:RequestedAuthnContext
    xmlns:samlp="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:protocol"
    Comparison="exact">
    <saml:AuthnContextClassRef
      xmlns:saml="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:assertion">
      urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:ac:classes>PasswordProtectedTransport
    </saml:AuthnContextClassRef>
  </samlp:RequestedAuthnContext>
</samlp:AuthnRequest>
```

Note: the server can use the request ID
(_bec424fa5103428909a30ff1e31168327f79474984) to correlate the SASL
session with the SAML authentication.

Step 5 (alternative): Server returns error to client if no SAML
Authentication Request can be constructed:

```
<failure xmlns='urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:xmpp-sasl'>
  <temporary-auth-failure/>
</failure>
</stream:stream>
```

Step 6: Client sends the empty response to the challenge encoded as a
single =:

```
<response xmlns='urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:xmpp-sasl'>
  =
</response>
```

The following steps between brackets are out of scope for this

document but included to better illustrate the entire flow.

[The client now sends the URL to a browser instance for processing. The browser engages in a normal SAML authentication flow (external to SASL), like redirection to the Identity Provider (<https://saml.example.org>), the user logs into <https://saml.example.org>, and agrees to authenticate to xmpp.example.com. A redirect is passed back to the client browser who sends the AuthN response to the server, containing the subject-identifier as an attribute. If the AuthN response doesn't contain the JID, the server maps the subject-identifier received from the IdP to a JID]

Step 7: Server informs client of successful authentication:

```
<success xmlns='urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:xmpp-sasl'/>
```

Step 7 (alt): Server informs client of failed authentication:

```
<failure xmlns='urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:xmpp-sasl'>
  <not-authorized/>
</failure>
</stream:stream>
```

Please note: line breaks were added to the base64 for clarity.

5.2. IMAP

The following describes an IMAP exchange. Lines beginning with 'S:' indicate data sent by the server, and lines starting with 'C:' indicate data sent by the client. Long lines are wrapped for readability.


```
S: * OK IMAP4rev1
C: . CAPABILITY
S: * CAPABILITY IMAP4rev1 STARTTLS
S: . OK CAPABILITY Completed
C: . STARTTLS
S: . OK Begin TLS negotiation now
C: . CAPABILITY
S: * CAPABILITY IMAP4rev1 AUTH=SAML20
S: . OK CAPABILITY Completed
C: . AUTHENTICATE SAML20
S: +
C: biwsZXhhbXBsZS5vcmc
S: + aHR0cHM6Ly9zYW1sLmV4YW1wbGUub3JnL1NBTVwvQnJvd3Nlcj9TQU1M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C:
S: . OK Success (tls protection)
```


The decoded challenge is:

```
https://saml.example.org/SAML/Browser?SAMLRequest=PHNhbWxwOkF1dGhuUmVxdWVzdCB4bWxuczpZYW1scD0idXJuOm9hc2lzOm5hbWVzOnRjO1NBTUw6Mi4wOnByb3RvY29sIg0KICAgIElEPSJfYmVjNDI0ZmE1MTAzNDI4OTA5YTMwZmYxZTMxMTY4MzI3Zjc5NDc0Tg0IiBWZXJzaW9uPSIyLjAiDQogICAgSXNzdWVJbnN0YW50PSIyMDA3LTEyLTEwVDEwOjM5M0jM0WiIgRm9yY2VBdXRobj0iZmFsc2UiDQogICAgSXNQYXNzaXZlPSJmYWxzZSINCiAgICBQcm90b2NvbEJpbmRpbmc9InVybjpvYXNpczpuYW1lc3p0YzptQU1MOjIuMDpiaW5kaw5nczplVFRQLVBPU1QidQogICAgQXNzZXJ0aW9uQ29uc3VtZXJTZXJ2aWNlVWJMPQ0KICAgICAgICAgIAHR0cHM6Ly9tYWlsLmV4YVw1wGUuY29tL1NBTUwvQXNzZXJ0aW9uQ29uc3VtZXJTZXJ2aWNlIj4NCiA8c2FtbDpJc3N1ZXIgeG1sbnM6c2FtbD0idXJuOm9hc2lzOm5hbWVzOnRjO1NBTUw6Mi4wOmFzc2VydGlvbiI+DQogICAgIGh0dHBzO0i8veG1wcC5leGFtcGxlLmNvbQ0KIDwvc2FtbDpJc3N1ZXI+DQogPHNhbWxwOk5hbWVJRFBvbGljeSB4bWxuczpZYW1scD0idXJuOm9hc2lzOm5hbWVzOnRjO1NBTUw6Mi4wOnByb3RvY29sIg0KICAgICBGB3JtYXQ9InVybjpvYXNpczpuYW1lc3p0YzptQU1MOjIuMDpuYW1laWQtZm9ybWFO0nBlcnNpc3RlbnQiDQogICAgIFNQTMFtZVF1YWxpZmllcj0ieG1wcC5leGFtcGxlLmNvbSIgQWxs3b3dDcmVhdGU9InRydWUiIC8+DQogPHNhbWxwO1JlcXVlc3RlZEF1dGhuQ29udGV4dA0KICAgICB4bWxuczpZYW1scD0idXJuOm9hc2lzOm5hbWVzOnRjO1NBTUw6Mi4wOnByb3RvY29sIiANCiAgICAgICAgICAgQ29tcGFyaXNvbjo0iZXhhY3QiPg0KICA8c2FtbDpBdXRobjNvbRleHRDbGFzc1JlZg0KICAgICAgG1sbnM6c2FtbD0idXJuOm9hc2lzOm5hbWVzOnRjO1NBTUw6Mi4wOmFzc2VydGlvbiI+DQogICAgICB1cm46b2FzaXM6bmFtZXM6dGM6U0FNTDoyLjA6YWM6Y2xhc3Nlc3pQYXNzd29yZFB3b3RlY3RlZFRyYW5zcG9ydA0KICA8L3NhbWw6QXV0aG5Db250ZXh0Q2xhc3NSZWY+DQogPC9zYW1scDpSZXF1ZXN0ZWRBdXRobjNvbRleHQ+IA0KPC9zYW1scDpBdXRobjJlcXVlc3Q+
```

Where the decoded SAMLRequest looks like:


```
<samlp:AuthnRequest xmlns:samlp="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:protocol"
  ID="_bec424fa5103428909a30ff1e31168327f79474984" Version="2.0"
  IssueInstant="2007-12-10T11:39:34Z" ForceAuthn="false"
  IsPassive="false"
  ProtocolBinding="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:bindings:HTTP-POST"
  AssertionConsumerServiceURL=
    "https://mail.example.com/SAML/AssertionConsumerService">
  <saml:Issuer xmlns:saml="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:assertion">
    https://xmpp.example.com
  </saml:Issuer>
  <samlp:NameIDPolicy xmlns:samlp="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:protocol"
    Format="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:nameid-format:persistent"
    SPNameQualifier="xmpp.example.com" AllowCreate="true" />
  <samlp:RequestedAuthnContext
    xmlns:samlp="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:protocol"
    Comparison="exact">
    <saml:AuthnContextClassRef
      xmlns:saml="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:assertion">
      urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:ac:classes:PasswordProtectedTransport
    </saml:AuthnContextClassRef>
  </samlp:RequestedAuthnContext>
</samlp:AuthnRequest>
```


6. Security Considerations

This section addresses only security considerations associated with the use of SAML with SASL applications. For considerations relating to SAML in general, the reader is referred to the SAML specification and to other literature. Similarly, for general SASL Security Considerations, the reader is referred to that specification.

6.1. Man in the middle and Tunneling Attacks

This mechanism is vulnerable to man-in-the-middle and tunneling attacks unless a client always verifies the server identity before proceeding with authentication (see [[RFC6125](#)]). Typically TLS is used to provide a secure channel with server authentication.

6.2. Binding SAML subject identifiers to Authorization Identities

As specified in [[RFC4422](#)], the server is responsible for binding credentials to a specific authorization identity. It is therefore necessary that only specific trusted IdPs be allowed. This is typical part of SAML trust establishment between Relying Parties and IdP.

6.3. User Privacy

The IdP is aware of each Relying Party that a user logs into. There is nothing in the protocol to hide this information from the IdP. It is not a requirement to track the visits, but there is nothing that prohibits the collection of information. SASL server implementers should be aware that SAML IdPs will be able to track - to some extent - user access to their services.

6.4. Collusion between RPs

It is possible for Relying Parties to link data that they have collected on the users. By using the same identifier to log into every Relying Party, collusion between Relying Parties is possible. In SAML, targeted identity was introduced. Targeted identity allows the IdP to transform the identifier the user typed in to a Relying Party specific opaque identifier. This way the Relying Party would never see the actual user identifier, but a randomly generated identifier.

6.5. GSS-API specific security considerations

Security issues inherent in GSS-API ([RFC 2743](#)) and GS2 ([RFC 5801](#)) apply to the SAML GSS-API mechanism defined in this document. Further, and as discussed in [section 4](#), proper TLS server identity

verification is critical to the security of the mechanism.

7. IANA Considerations

7.1. IANA mech-profile

The IANA is requested to register the following SASL profile:

SASL mechanism profile: SAML20

Security Considerations: See this document

Published Specification: See this document

For further information: Contact the authors of this document.

Owner/Change controller: the IETF

Intended usage: COMMON

Note: None

7.2. IANA OID

The IANA is further requested to assign a new entry for this GSS mechanism in the sub-registry for SMI Security for Mechanism Codes, whose prefix is `iso.org.dod.internet.security.mechanisms` (1.3.6.1.5.5) and to reference this specification in the registry.

8. References

8.1. Normative References

- [OASIS.saml-bindings-2.0-os]
Cantor, S., Hirsch, F., Kemp, J., Philpott, R., and E. Maler, "Bindings for the OASIS Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML) V2.0", OASIS Standard saml-bindings-2.0-os, March 2005.
- [OASIS.saml-core-2.0-os]
Cantor, S., Kemp, J., Philpott, R., and E. Maler, "Assertions and Protocol for the OASIS Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML) V2.0", OASIS Standard saml-core-2.0-os, March 2005.
- [OASIS.saml-profiles-2.0-os]
Hughes, J., Cantor, S., Hodges, J., Hirsch, F., Mishra, P., Philpott, R., and E. Maler, "Profiles for the OASIS Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML) V2.0", OASIS Standard OASIS.saml-profiles-2.0-os, March 2005.
- [RFC1035] Mockapetris, P., "Domain names - implementation and specification", STD 13, [RFC 1035](#), November 1987.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC2616] Fielding, R., Gettys, J., Mogul, J., Frystyk, H., Masinter, L., Leach, P., and T. Berners-Lee, "Hypertext Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.1", [RFC 2616](#), June 1999.
- [RFC2743] Linn, J., "Generic Security Service Application Program Interface Version 2, Update 1", [RFC 2743](#), January 2000.
- [RFC2818] Rescorla, E., "HTTP Over TLS", [RFC 2818](#), May 2000.
- [RFC3492] Costello, A., "Punycode: A Bootstring encoding of Unicode for Internationalized Domain Names in Applications (IDNA)", [RFC 3492](#), March 2003.
- [RFC3986] Berners-Lee, T., Fielding, R., and L. Masinter, "Uniform Resource Identifier (URI): Generic Syntax", STD 66, [RFC 3986](#), January 2005.
- [RFC3987] Duerst, M. and M. Suignard, "Internationalized Resource Identifiers (IRIs)", [RFC 3987](#), January 2005.

- [RFC4422] Melnikov, A. and K. Zeilenga, "Simple Authentication and Security Layer (SASL)", [RFC 4422](#), June 2006.
- [RFC5056] Williams, N., "On the Use of Channel Bindings to Secure Channels", [RFC 5056](#), November 2007.
- [RFC5246] Dierks, T. and E. Rescorla, "The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.2", [RFC 5246](#), August 2008.
- [RFC5280] Cooper, D., Santesson, S., Farrell, S., Boeyen, S., Housley, R., and W. Polk, "Internet X.509 Public Key Infrastructure Certificate and Certificate Revocation List (CRL) Profile", [RFC 5280](#), May 2008.
- [RFC5801] Josefsson, S. and N. Williams, "Using Generic Security Service Application Program Interface (GSS-API) Mechanisms in Simple Authentication and Security Layer (SASL): The GS2 Mechanism Family", [RFC 5801](#), July 2010.
- [RFC5890] Klensin, J., "Internationalized Domain Names for Applications (IDNA): Definitions and Document Framework", [RFC 5890](#), August 2010.
- [RFC5891] Klensin, J., "Internationalized Domain Names in Applications (IDNA): Protocol", [RFC 5891](#), August 2010.
- [RFC6125] Saint-Andre, P. and J. Hodges, "Representation and Verification of Domain-Based Application Service Identity within Internet Public Key Infrastructure Using X.509 (PKIX) Certificates in the Context of Transport Layer Security (TLS)", [RFC 6125](#), March 2011.
- [W3C.REC-html401-19991224]
Hors, A., Raggett, D., and I. Jacobs, "HTML 4.01 Specification", World Wide Web Consortium Recommendation REC-html401-19991224, December 1999, <<http://www.w3.org/TR/1999/REC-html401-19991224>>.

8.2. Informative References

- [RFC1939] Myers, J. and M. Rose, "Post Office Protocol - Version 3", STD 53, [RFC 1939](#), May 1996.
- [RFC3501] Crispin, M., "INTERNET MESSAGE ACCESS PROTOCOL - VERSION 4rev1", [RFC 3501](#), March 2003.
- [RFC4648] Josefsson, S., "The Base16, Base32, and Base64 Data Encodings", [RFC 4648](#), October 2006.

- [RFC6120] Saint-Andre, P., "Extensible Messaging and Presence Protocol (XMPP): Core", [RFC 6120](#), March 2011.

[Appendix A](#). Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Scott Cantor, Joe Hildebrand, Josh Howlett, Leif Johansson, Thomas Lenggenhager, Diego Lopez, Hank Mauldin, RL 'Bob' Morgan, Stefan Plug and Hannes Tschofenig for their review and contributions.

[Appendix B](#). Changes

This section to be removed prior to publication.

- o 09 Fixed text per IESG review
- o 08 Fixed text per Gen-Art review
- o 07 Fixed text per comments Alexey Melnikov
- o 06 Fixed text per AD comments
- o 05 Fixed references per ID-nits
- o 04 Added request for IANA assignment, few text clarifications
- o 03 Number of cosmetic changes, fixes per comments Alexey Melnikov
- o 02 Changed IdP URI to domain per Joe Hildebrand, fixed some typos
- o 00 WG -00 draft. Updates GSS-API section, some fixes per Scott Cantor
- o 01 Added authorization identity, added GSS-API specifics, added client supplied IdP
- o 00 Initial Revision.

Authors' Addresses

Klaas Wierenga
Cisco Systems, Inc.
Haarlerbergweg 13-19
Amsterdam, Noord-Holland 1101 CH
Netherlands

Phone: +31 20 357 1752
Email: klaas@cisco.com

Eliot Lear
Cisco Systems GmbH
Richtistrasse 7
Wallisellen, ZH CH-8304
Switzerland

Phone: +41 44 878 9200
Email: lear@cisco.com

Simon Josefsson
SJD AB
Hagagatan 24
Stockholm 113 47
SE

Email: simon@josefsson.org
URI: <http://josefsson.org/>

