

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Expires: April 9, 2015

K. Bhargavan
A. Delignat-Lavaud
A. Pironti
Inria Paris-Rocquencourt
A. Langley
Google Inc.
M. Ray
Microsoft Corp.
October 6, 2014

**Transport Layer Security (TLS) Session Hash and
Extended Master Secret Extension
draft-ietf-tls-session-hash-02**

Abstract

The Transport Layer Security (TLS) master secret is not cryptographically bound to important session parameters such as the client and server identities. Consequently, it is possible for an active attacker to set up two sessions, one with a client and another with a server, such that the master secrets on the two sessions are the same. Thereafter, any mechanism that relies on the master secret for authentication, including session resumption, becomes vulnerable to a man-in-the-middle attack, where the attacker can simply forward messages back and forth between the client and server. This specification defines a TLS extension that contextually binds the master secret to a log of the full handshake that computes it, thus preventing such attacks.

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 April 9, 2015.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2014 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	2
2.	Requirements Notation	4
3.	The TLS Session Hash	5
4.	The extended master secret	5
4.1.	TLS	5
4.2.	SSL 3.0	6
5.	Extension negotiation	6
5.1.	Extension definition	6
5.2.	Client and Server Behavior	7
6.	Security Considerations	7
7.	IANA Considerations	7
8.	Acknowledgments	7
9.	References	7
9.1.	Normative References	7
9.2.	Informative References	8
	Authors' Addresses	8

[1.](#) Introduction

In TLS [[RFC5246](#)], every session has a "master_secret" computed as:

```
master_secret = PRF(pre_master_secret, "master secret",
                    ClientHello.random + ServerHello.random)
                    [0..47];
```

where the "pre_master_secret" is the result of some key exchange protocol. For example, when the handshake uses an RSA ciphersuite, this value is generated uniformly at random by the client, whereas for DHE ciphersuites, it is the result of a Diffie-Hellman key agreement.

As described in [[TRIPLE-HS](#)], in both the RSA and DHE key exchanges, an active attacker can synchronize two TLS sessions so that they share the same "master_secret". For an RSA key exchange where the client is unauthenticated, this is achieved as follows. Suppose a client, C, connects to a malicious server, A. A then connects to a server, S, and completes both handshakes. For simplicity, assume that C and S only use RSA ciphersuites. (Note that C thinks it is connecting to A and is oblivious of S's involvement.)

1. C sends a "ClientHello" to A, and A forwards it to S.
2. S sends a "ServerHello" to A, and A forwards it to C.
3. S sends a "Certificate", containing its certificate chain, to A. A replaces it with its own certificate chain and sends it to C.
4. S sends a "ServerHelloDone" to A, and A forwards it to C.
5. C sends a "ClientKeyExchange" to A, containing the "pre_master_secret", encrypted with A's public key. A decrypts the "pre_master_secret", re-encrypts it with S's public key and sends it on to S.
6. C sends a "Finished" to A. A computes a "Finished" for its connection with S, and sends it to S.
7. S sends a "Finished" to A. A computes a "Finished" for its connection with C, and sends it to C.

At this point, both connections (between C and A, and between A and S) have new sessions that share the same "pre_master_secret", "ClientHello.random", "ServerHello.random", as well as other session parameters, including the session identifier and, optionally, the session ticket. Hence, the "master_secret" value will be equal for the two sessions and it will be associated both at C and S with the same session ID, even though the server identities on the two connections are different. Moreover, the record keys on the two connections will also be the same.

Similar scenarios can be achieved when the handshake uses a DHE ciphersuite, or an ECDHE ciphersuite with an arbitrary explicit curve. Even if the client or server does not prefer using RSA or DHE, the attacker can force them to use it by offering only RSA or DHE in its hello messages. Other key exchanges may also be vulnerable. If client authentication is used, the attack still works, except that the two sessions now differ on both client and server identities.

Once A has synchronized the two connections, since the keys are the same on the two sides, it can step away and transparently forward messages between C and S, reading and modifying when it desires. In the key exchange literature, such occurrences are called unknown key-share attacks, since C and S share a secret but they both think that their secret is shared only with A. In themselves, these attacks do not break integrity or confidentiality between honest parties, but they offer a useful starting point from which to mount impersonation attacks on C and S.

Suppose C tries to resume its session on a new connection with A. A can then resume its session with S on a new connection and forward the abbreviated handshake messages unchanged between C and S. Since the abbreviated handshake only relies on the master secret for authentication, and does not mention client or server identities, both handshakes complete successfully, resulting in the same session keys and the same handshake log. A still knows the connection keys and can send messages to both C and S.

Critically, on the new connection, even the handshake log is the same on C and S, thus defeating any man-in-the-middle protection scheme that relies on the uniqueness of finished messages, such as the secure renegotiation indication extension [RFC5746] or TLS channel bindings [RFC5929]. [TRIPLE-HS] describes several exploits based on such session synchronization attacks. In particular, it describes a man-in-the-middle attack that circumvents the protections of [RFC5746] to break client-authenticated TLS renegotiation after session resumption. Similar attacks apply to application-level authentication mechanisms that rely on channel bindings [RFC5929] or on key material exported from TLS [RFC5705].

The underlying protocol issue is that since the master secret is not guaranteed to be unique across sessions, it cannot be used on its own as an authentication credential. This specification introduces a TLS extension that computes the "master_secret" value from the log of the handshake that computes it, so that different handshakes will, by construction, create different master secrets.

2. Requirements Notation

This document uses the same notation and terminology used in the TLS Protocol specification [RFC5246].

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].

3. The TLS Session Hash

When a full handshake takes place, we define

```
session_hash = Hash(handshake_messages)
```

where "handshake_messages" refers to all handshake messages sent or received, starting at client hello up to and including the Client Key Exchange message, including the type and length fields of the handshake messages. This is the concatenation of all the exchanged Handshake structures, as defined in [Section 7.4 of \[RFC5246\]](#).

The hash function "Hash" is defined by the ciphersuite in TLS 1.2. In all previous versions of TLS and in SSL 3.0, this function computes the concatenation of MD5 and SHA1.

There is no "session_hash" for resumed handshakes, as they do not lead to the creation of a new session.

Implementation note: As described in [Section 4](#), the "session_hash" is used in the extended master secret computation. Hence, it must be possible to compute the session_hash before the master secret is computed. In SSL 3.0, the master secret is first needed in the Client's CertificateVerify message. Hence, it is widespread implementation practice to compute the master secret as soon as the "pre_master_secret" is available, typically immediately before or after sending the Client Key Exchange message. The definition of "session_hash" given in this document requires minimal patches to such implementations in order to implement the extended master secret extension. Our definition is also compatible with the common implementation practice of keeping running hashes of the handshake log.

4. The extended master secret

4.1. TLS

When the extended master secret extension is negotiated in a TLS session, the "master_secret" is computed as

```
master_secret = PRF(pre_master_secret, "extended master secret",
                    session_hash)
                    [0..47];
```

The extended master secret computation differs from the [\[RFC5246\]](#) in the following ways:

- o The "extended master secret" label is used instead of "master secret";
- o The "session_hash" is used instead of the "ClientHello.random" and "ServerHello.random".

The "session_hash" depends upon a handshake log that includes "ClientHello.random" and "ServerHello.random", in addition to ciphersuites, client and server certificates. Consequently, the extended master secret depends upon the choice of all these session parameters.

Our proposed design reflects the recommendation that keys should be bound to the security contexts that compute them [[sp800-108](#)]. The technique of mixing a hash of the key exchange messages into master key derivation is already used in other well-known protocols such as SSH [[RFC4251](#)].

[4.2.](#) SSL 3.0

SSL 3.0 does not define a PRF function, instead it defines a custom algorithm to compute the master secret. When the extended master secret extension is negotiated in SSL 3.0, the master secret is computed as

```
master_secret =  
    MD5(pre_master_secret + SHA('A' + pre_master_secret +  
        session_hash)) +  
    MD5(pre_master_secret + SHA('BB' + pre_master_secret +  
        session_hash)) +  
    MD5(pre_master_secret + SHA('CCC' + pre_master_secret +  
        session_hash));
```

That is, the "session_hash" replaces the concatenation of "ClientHello.random" and "ServerHello.random".

[5.](#) Extension negotiation

[5.1.](#) Extension definition

This document defines a new TLS extension, "extended_master_secret" (with extension type 0x0017), which is used to signal both client and server to use the extended master secret computation. The "extension_data" field of this extension is empty. Thus, the entire encoding of the extension is 00 17 00 00.

If client and server agree on this extension and a full handshake takes place, both client and server MUST use the extended master secret derivation algorithm, as defined in [Section 4](#).

5.2. Client and Server Behavior

In its ClientHello message, a client implementing this document MUST send the "extended_master_secret" extension.

If a server receives the "extended_master_secret" extension, it MUST include the "extended_master_secret" extension in its ServerHello message.

Implementation note: if the server decides to proceed with resumption, the extension does not have any effect. Requiring the extension to be included anyway makes the extension negotiation logic easier, because it does not depend on whether resumption is accepted or not. Moreover, a client may find useful to learn that the server supports this extension anyway.

6. Security Considerations

This entire document is about security, see [\[TRIPLE-HS\]](#) for more details.

7. IANA Considerations

IANA has added the extension code point 23 (0x0017), which has been used for prototype implementations, for the "extended_master_secret" extension to the TLS ExtensionType values registry as specified in TLS [\[RFC5246\]](#).

8. Acknowledgments

The triple handshake attacks were originally discovered by Antoine Delignat-Lavaud, Karthikeyan Bhargavan, and Alfredo Pironti, and were further developed by the miTLS team: Cedric Fournet, Pierre-Yves Strub, Markulf Kohlweiss, Santiago Zanella-Beguelin. Many of the ideas in this draft emerged from discussions with Martin Abadi, Ben Laurie, Eric Rescorla, Martin Rex, Brian Smith.

9. References

9.1. Normative References

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

- [RFC5246] Dierks, T. and E. Rescorla, "The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.2", [RFC 5246](#), August 2008.

9.2. Informative References

- [RFC5746] Rescorla, E., Ray, M., Dispensa, S., and N. Oskov, "Transport Layer Security (TLS) Renegotiation Indication Extension", [RFC 5746](#), February 2010.
- [RFC5705] Rescorla, E., "Keying Material Exporters for Transport Layer Security (TLS)", [RFC 5705](#), March 2010.
- [RFC5929] Altman, J., Williams, N., and L. Zhu, "Channel Bindings for TLS", [RFC 5929](#), July 2010.
- [RFC4251] Ylonen, T. and C. Lonvick, "The Secure Shell (SSH) Protocol Architecture", [RFC 4251](#), January 2006.
- [TRIPLE-HS]
Bhargavan, K., Delignat-Lavaud, A., Fournet, C., Pironti, A., and P. Strub, "Triple Handshakes and Cookie Cutters: Breaking and Fixing Authentication over TLS", IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, pages 98-113 , 2014.
- [sp800-108]
Chen, L., "NIST Special Publication 800-108: Recommendation for Key Derivation Using Pseudorandom Functions", Unpublished draft , 2009.

Authors' Addresses

Karthikeyan Bhargavan
Inria Paris-Rocquencourt
23, Avenue d'Italie
Paris 75214 CEDEX 13
France

Email: karthikeyan.bhargavan@inria.fr

Antoine Delignat-Lavaud
Inria Paris-Rocquencourt
23, Avenue d'Italie
Paris 75214 CEDEX 13
France

Email: antoine.delignat-lavaud@inria.fr

Alfredo Pironti
Inria Paris-Rocquencourt
23, Avenue d'Italie
Paris 75214 CEDEX 13
France

Email: alfredo.pironti@inria.fr

Adam Langley
Google Inc.
1600 Amphitheatre Parkway
Mountain View, CA 94043
USA

Email: agl@google.com

Marsh Ray
Microsoft Corp.
1 Microsoft Way
Redmond, WA 98052
USA

Email: maray@microsoft.com

