

NETWORK WORKING GROUP
Internet-Draft
Updates: [4120](#) (if approved)
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: February 13, 2009

L. Zhu
Microsoft Corporation
August 12, 2008

Additional Kerberos Naming Constraints
draft-ietf-krb-wg-naming-07

Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, each author represents that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which he or she is aware have been or will be disclosed, and any of which he or she becomes aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [Section 6 of 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/ietf/lid-abstracts.txt>.

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

This Internet-Draft will expire on February 13, 2009.

Abstract

This document defines new naming constraints for well-known Kerberos principal name and well-known Kerberos realm names.

Internet-Draft

Kerberos Naming

August 2008

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Conventions Used in This Document	3
3.	Definitions	3
3.1.	Well-known Kerberos Principal Names	3
3.2.	Well-known Kerberos Realm Names	4
4.	Security Considerations	6
5.	Acknowledgements	6
6.	IANA Considerations	6
7.	References	7
7.1.	Normative References	7
7.2.	Informative References	7
	Author's Address	7
	Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements	8

1. Introduction

Occasionally protocol designers need to designate a Kerberos principal name or a Kerberos realm name to have special meanings, other than identifying a particular instance. An example is that the the anonymous principal name and the anonymous realm name are defined for the Kerberos anonymity support [[ANON](#)]. This anonymity name pair conveys no more meaning than that the client's identity is not disclosed. In the case of the anonymity support, it is critical that deployed Kerberos implementations that do not support anonymity **MUST** fail the authentication if the anonymity name pair is used, therefore no access is granted accidentally to a principal who's name happens to match with that of the anonymous identity.

However Kerberos as defined in [[RFC4120](#)] does not have such reserved names. As such, protocol designers have resolved to use exceedingly-unlikely-to-have-been-used names to avoid collision. Even if a registry were setup to avoid collision for new implementations, there is no guarantee for deployed implementations to prevent accidental reuse of names that can lead to access being granted unexpectedly.

The Kerberos realm name in [[RFC4120](#)] has a reserved name space although no specific name is defined and the criticality of unknown reserved realm names is not specified.

This document is to remedy these issues by defining well-known Kerberos names and the protocol behavior when a well-known name is used but not supported.

2. Conventions Used in This Document

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](#)].

3. Definitions

In this section, well-known names are defined for both the Kerberos principal name and the Kerberos realm name.

3.1. Well-known Kerberos Principal Names

A new name type KRB_NT_WELLKNOWN is defined for well-known principal names. The Kerberos principal name is defined in [Section 6.2 of \[RFC4120\]](#).

Zhu

Expires February 13, 2009

[Page 3]

Internet-Draft

Kerberos Naming

August 2008

KRB_NT_WELLKNOWN

11

A well-known principal name MUST have at least two or more KerberosString components, and the first component must be the string literal "WELLKNOWN".

If a well-known principal name is used as the client principal name or the server principal name but not supported, the Authentication Service (AS) [\[RFC4120\]](#) and the application server MUST reject the authentication attempt. Similarly, the Ticket Granting Service (TGS) [\[RFC4120\]](#) MAY reject the authentication attempt if a well-known principal name is used as the client principal name but not supported, and SHOULD reject the authentication attempt if a well-known principal name is used as the server principal name but not supported. These rules were designed to allow incremental updates and ease migration. More specifically, if a well-known principal is accepted in one realm, it is desirable to allow the cross-realm TGT to work when not all of the realms in the cross-realm authentication path are updated; if the server principal with an identically-named well-known name was created before the KDC is updated, it might be acceptable to allow authentication to work within a reasonably-limited time window. However unless otherwise specified, if a well-known principal name is used but not supported in any other places of Kerberos messages, authentication MUST fail. The error code is KRB_AP_ERR_PRINCIPAL_UNKNOWN, and there is no accompanying error data defined in this document for this error.

KRB_AP_ERR_PRINCIPAL_UNKNOWN 82

-- A well-known Kerberos principal name is used but not

-- supported.

3.2. Well-known Kerberos Realm Names

[Section 6.1 of \[RFC4120\]](#) defines the "other" style realm name, a new realm type WELLKNOWN is defined as a name of type "other", with the NAMETYPE part filled in with the string literal "WELLKNOWN".

other: WELLKNOWN:realm-name

This name type is designated for well-known Kerberos realms.

The AS and the application server MUST reject the authentication attempt if a well-known realm name is used as the client realm or the server realm but not supported. The TGS [\[RFC4120\]](#) MAY reject the authentication attempt if a well-known realm name is used as the client realm but not supported, and SHOULD reject the authentication attempt if a well-known realm name is used as the server realm but not supported. Unless otherwise specified, if a well-known realm

Zhu

Expires February 13, 2009

[Page 4]

Internet-Draft

Kerberos Naming

August 2008

name is used but not supported in any other places of Kerberos messages, authentication MUST fail. The error code is KRB_AP_ERR_REALM_UNKNOWN, and there is no accompanying error data defined in this document for this error.

KRB_AP_ERR_REALM_UNKNOWN 83
-- A well-known Kerberos realm name is used but not
-- supported.

Unless otherwise specified, all principal names involving a well-known realm name are reserved, and if a reserved principal name is used but not supported, and if the authentication is rejected, the error code MUST be KRB_AP_ERR_PRINCIPAL_RESERVED.

KRB_AP_ERR_PRINCIPAL_RESERVED 84
-- A reserved Kerberos principal name is used but not
-- supported.

There is no accompanying error data defined in this document for this error.

According to [Section 3.3.3.2 of \[RFC4120\]](#), the TGS MUST add the name

of the previous realm into the transited field of the returned ticket. Typically well-known realms are defined to carry special meanings, and they are not used to refer to intermediate realms in the client's authentication path. Consequently, unless otherwise specified, the TGS MUST NOT encode a well-known Kerberos realm name into the transited field [RFC4120] of a ticket, and parties checking the transited realm path MUST reject a transited realm path that includes a well known realm. In the case of KDCs checking the transited realm path, this means that the TRANSITED-POLICY-CHECKED flag MUST NOT be set in the resulting ticket. Aside from the hierarchical meaning of a null subfield, the DOMAIN-X500-COMPRESS encoding for transited realms [RFC4120] treats realm names as strings, although it is optimized for domain style and X.500 realm names, hence the DOMAIN-X500-COMPRESS encoding can be used when the client realm or the server realm is reserved or when a reserved realm is in the transited field. However, if the client's realm is a well-known realm, the abbreviation forms [RFC4120] that build on the preceding name cannot be used at the start of the transited encoding. The null-subfield form (e.g., encoding ending with ",") [RFC4120] could not be used next to a well-known realm, including potentially at the beginning and end where the client and server realm names, respectively, are filled in.

[4.](#) Security Considerations

It is possible to have name collision with well-known names because Kerberos as defined in [RFC4120] does not reserve names that have special meanings, consequently care MUST be taken to avoid accidental reuse of names. If a well-known name is not supported, authentication MUST fail as specified in [Section 3](#). Otherwise, access can be granted unintentionally, resulting in a security weakness. Consider for example, a KDC that supports this specification but not the anonymous authentication described in [ANON]. Assume further that the KDC allows a principal to be created named identically to the anonymous principal. If that principal were created and given access to resources, then anonymous users might inadvertently gain access to those resources if the KDC supports anonymous authentication at some future time. Similar issues may

occur with other well-known names. By requiring KDCs reject authentication with unknown well-known names, we minimize these concerns.

If a well-known name was created before the KDC is updated to conform to this specification, it SHOULD be renamed. The provisioning code that manages account creation MUST be updated to disallow creation of principals with unsupported well-known names.

5. Acknowledgements

The initial document was mostly based on the author's conversation with Clifford Newman and Sam Hartman.

Jeffery Hutzelman, Ken Raeburn, and Stephen Hanna provided helpful suggestions for improvements to early revisions of this document.

6. IANA Considerations

This document provides the framework for defining well-known Kerberos names and Kerberos realms. A new IANA registry should be created to contain well-known Kerberos names and Kerberos realms that are defined based on this document. The evaluation policy is "Specification Required".

7. References

Zhu Expires February 13, 2009 [Page 6]

Internet-Draft Kerberos Naming August 2008

7.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC4120] Neuman, C., Yu, T., Hartman, S., and K. Raeburn, "The Kerberos Network Authentication Service (V5)", [RFC 4120](#), July 2005.

[7.2.](#) Informative References

[ANON] Zhu, L., Leach, P. and K. Jaganathan, "Kerberos Anonymity Support", [draft-ietf-krb-wg-anon](#), work in progress.

Author's Address

Larry Zhu
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond, WA 98052
US

Email: lzhu@microsoft.com

Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2008).

This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in [BCP 78](#), and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY, THE IETF TRUST AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Intellectual Property

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at <http://www.ietf.org/ipr>.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at ietf-ipr@ietf.org.

