Using Generic Security Service Application Program Interface (GSS-API)
    Mechanisms in Simple Authentication and Security Layer (SASL):
                    The GS2 Mechanism Family

Abstract

   This document describes how to use a Generic Security Service
   Application Program Interface (GSS-API) mechanism in the Simple
   Authentication and Security Layer (SASL) framework. This is done by
   defining a new SASL mechanism family, called GS2. This mechanism
   family offers a number of improvements over the previous "SASL/
   GSSAPI" mechanism: it is more general, uses fewer messages for the
   authentication phase in some cases, and supports negotiable use of
   channel binding. Only GSS-API mechanisms that support channel
   binding and mutual authentication are supported.

Status of This Memo

   This is an Internet Standards Track document.

   This document is a product of the Internet Engineering Task Force
   (IETF). It represents the consensus of the IETF community. It has
   received public review and has been approved for publication by the
   Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG). Further information on
   Internet Standards is available in Section 2 of RFC 5741.

   Information about the current status of this document, any errata,
   and how to provide feedback on it may be obtained at
   http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5801.

Copyright Notice

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

   Generic Security Service Application Program Interface (GSS-API)
   [RFC2743] is a framework that provides security services to
   applications using a variety of authentication mechanisms. Simple
   Authentication and Security Layer (SASL) [RFC4422] is a framework to
   provide authentication and security layers for connection-based
   protocols, also using a variety of mechanisms. This document
   describes how to use a GSS-API mechanism as though it were a SASL
   mechanism. This facility is called GS2 -- a moniker that indicates
   that this is the second GSS-API->SASL mechanism bridge. The original
   GSS-API->SASL mechanism bridge was specified by [RFC2222], now
   [RFC4752]; we shall sometimes refer to the original bridge as GS1 in
   this document.

   All GSS-API mechanisms are implicitly registered for use within SASL
   by this specification. The SASL mechanisms defined in this document
   are known as the GS2 family of mechanisms.

   The GS1 bridge failed to gain wide deployment for any GSS-API
   mechanism other than "The Kerberos Version 5 GSS-API Mechanism"
   [RFC1964] [RFC4121], and has a number of problems that led us to
   desire a new bridge. Specifically, a) GS1 was not round-trip
   optimized and b) GS1 did not support channel binding [RFC5056].
   These problems and the opportunity to create the next SASL password-
   based mechanism, "Salted Challenge Response Authentication Mechanism
   (SCRAM) SASL and GSS-API Mechanisms" [RFC5802], as a GSS-API
   mechanism used by SASL applications via GS2, provide the motivation
   for GS2.

   In particular, the current consensus of the SASL community appears to
   be that SASL "security layers" (i.e., confidentiality and integrity
   protection of application data after authentication) are too complex
   and redundant because SASL applications tend to have an option to run
   over a Transport Layer Security (TLS) [RFC5246] channel. Use of SASL
   security layers is best replaced with channel binding to a TLS
   channel.

   GS2 is designed to be as simple as possible. It adds to GSS-API
   security context token exchanges only the bare minimum to support
   SASL semantics and negotiation of use of channel binding.
   Specifically, GS2 adds a small header (a few bytes plus the length of
   the client-requested SASL authorization identity) to the initial GSS-
   API context token and to the application channel binding data. GS2
   uses SASL mechanism negotiation to implement channel binding
   negotiation. Security-relevant GS2 plaintext is protected via the
   use of GSS-API channel binding. Additionally, to simplify the

implementation of GS2 mechanisms for implementors who will not
implement a GSS-API framework, we compress the initial security
context token header required by [RFC2743], Section 3.1.

GS2 does not protect any plaintext exchanged outside GS2, such as
SASL mechanism negotiation plaintext, or application messages
following authentication. But using channel binding to a secure
channel over which all SASL and application plaintext is sent will
cause all that plaintext to be authenticated.

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].

The document uses many terms and function names defined in [RFC2743],
as updated by [RFC5554].

3. Mechanism Name

There are two SASL mechanism names for any GSS-API mechanism used
through this facility. One denotes that the server supports channel
binding. The other denotes that it does not.

The SASL mechanism name for a GSS-API mechanism is that which is
provided by that mechanism when it was specified, if one was
specified. This name denotes that the server does not support
channel binding. Add the suffix "-PLUS" and the resulting name
denotes that the server does support channel binding. SASL
implementations can use the GSS_Inquire_SASLname_for_mech call (see
below) to query for the SASL mechanism name of a GSS-API mechanism.

If the GSS_Inquire_SASLname_for_mech interface is not used, the GS2
implementation needs some other mechanism to map mechanism Object
Identifiers (OIDs) to SASL names internally. In this case, the
implementation can only support the mechanisms for which it knows the
SASL name. If GSS_Inquire_SASLname_for_mech() fails and the GS2
implementation cannot map the OID to a SASL mechanism name via some
other means, then the GS2 implementation MUST NOT use the given GSS-
API mechanism.

3.1. Generating SASL Mechanism Names from GSS-API OIDs

For GSS-API mechanisms whose SASL names are not defined together with
the GSS-API mechanism or in this document, the SASL mechanism name is
concatenation of the string "GS2-" and the Base32 encoding [RFC4648]
(with an uppercase alphabet) of the first 55 bits of the binary SHA-1

hash [FIPS.180-1.1995] string computed over the ASN.1 DER encoding
[CCITT.X690.2002], including the tag and length octets, of the GSS-
API mechanism's Object Identifier. The Base32 rules on padding
characters and characters outside of the Base32 alphabet are not
relevant to this use of Base32. If any padding or non-alphabet
characters are encountered, the name is not a GS2 family mechanism
name. This name denotes that the server does not support channel
binding. Add the suffix "-PLUS" and the resulting name denotes that
the server does support channel binding.

A GS2 mechanism that has a non-OID-derived SASL mechanism name is
said to have a "user-friendly SASL mechanism name".

3.2. Computing Mechanism Names Manually

The hash-derived GS2 SASL mechanism name may be computed manually.
This is useful when the set of supported GSS-API mechanisms is known
in advance. This eliminates the need to implement Base32, SHA-1, and
DER in the SASL mechanism. The computed mechanism name can be used
directly in the implementation, and the implementation need not be
concerned if the mechanism is part of a mechanism family.

3.3. Examples

The OID for the Simple Public-Key GSS-API Mechanism (SPKM-1)
[RFC2025] is 1.3.6.1.5.5.1.1. The ASN.1 DER encoding of the OID,
including the tag and length, is (in hex) 06 07 2b 06 01 05 05 01 01.
The SHA-1 hash of the ASN.1 DER encoding is (in hex) 1c f8 f4 2b 5a
9f 80 fa e9 f8 31 22 6d 5d 9d 56 27 86 61 ad. Convert the first 7
octets to binary, drop the last bit, and re-group them in groups of
5, and convert them back to decimal, which results in these
computations:

hex:
1c f8 f4 2b 5a 9f 80

binary:
00011100 11111000 11110100 00101011 01011010
10011111 1000000

binary in groups of 5:
00011 10011 11100 01111 01000 01010 11010 11010
10011 11110 00000

decimal of each group:
3 19 28 15 8 10 26 26 19 30 0

   base32 encoding:
   D T 4 P I K 2 2 T 6 A

   The last step translates each decimal value using table 3 in Base32
   [RFC4648]. Thus, the SASL mechanism name for the SPKM-1 GSSAPI
   mechanism is "GS2-DT4PIK22T6A".

   The OID for the Kerberos V5 GSS-API mechanism [RFC1964] is
   1.2.840.113554.1.2.2 and its DER encoding is (in hex) 06 09 2A 86 48
   86 F7 12 01 02 02. The SHA-1 hash is 82 d2 73 25 76 6b d6 c8 45 aa
   93 25 51 6a fc ff 04 b0 43 60. Convert the 7 octets to binary, drop
   the last bit, and re-group them in groups of 5, and convert them back
   to decimal, which results in these computations:

   hex:
   82 d2 73 25 76 6b d6

   binary:
   10000010 11010010 01110011 00100101 01110110
   01101011 1101011

   binary in groups of 5:
   10000 01011 01001 00111 00110 01001 01011 10110
   01101 01111 01011

   decimal of each group:
   16 11 9 7 6 9 11 22 13 15 11

   base32 encoding:
   Q L J H G J L W N P L

   The last step translates each decimal value using table 3 in Base32
   [RFC4648]. Thus, the SASL mechanism name for the Kerberos V5 GSS-API
   mechanism would be "GS2-QLJHGJLWNPL" and (because this mechanism
   supports channel binding) "GS2-QLJHGJLWNPL-PLUS". Instead, the next
   section assigns the Kerberos V5 mechanism a non-hash-derived
   mechanism name.

3.4. Grandfathered Mechanism Names

   Some older GSS-API mechanisms were not specified with a SASL GS2
   mechanism name. Using a shorter name can be useful, nonetheless. We
   specify the names "GS2-KRB5" and "GS2-KRB5-PLUS" for the Kerberos V5
   mechanism, to be used as if the original specification documented it,
   see Section 15.

4. SASL Authentication Exchange Message Format

   During the SASL authentication exchange for GS2, a number of messages
   following the following format are sent between the client and
   server. On success, this number is the same as the number of context
   tokens that the GSS-API mechanism would normally require in order to
   establish a security context. On failures, the exchange can be
   terminated early by any party.

   When using a GS2 mechanism the SASL client is always a GSS-API
   initiator and the SASL server is always a GSS-API acceptor. The
   client calls GSS_Init_sec_context and the server calls
   GSS_Accept_sec_context.

   All the SASL authentication messages exchanged are exactly the same
   as the security context tokens of the GSS-API mechanism, except for
   the initial security context token.

   The client and server MAY send GSS-API error tokens (tokens output by
   GSS_Init_sec_context() or GSS_Accept_sec_context() when the major
   status code is other than GSS_S_COMPLETE or GSS_S_CONTINUE_NEEDED).
   As this indicates an error condition, after sending the token, the
   sending side should fail the authentication.

   The initial security context token is modified as follows:

   o The initial context token header (see Section 3.1 of [RFC2743])
      MUST be removed if present. If the header is not present, the
      client MUST send a "gs2-nonstd-flag" flag (see below). On the
      server side, this header MUST be recomputed and restored prior to
      passing the token to GSS_Accept_sec_context, except when the "gs2-
      nonstd-flag" is sent.

   o A GS2 header MUST be prefixed to the resulting initial context
      token. This header has the form "gs2-header" given below in ABNF
      [RFC5234].

   The figure below describes the permissible attributes, their use, and
   the format of their values. All attribute names are single US-ASCII
   letters and are case sensitive.

```
  UTF8-1-safe    = %x01-2B / %x2D-3C / %x3E-7F
                     ;; As UTF8-1 in RFC 3629 except
                     ;; NUL, "=", and ",".
  UTF8-2         = <as defined in RFC 3629 (STD 63)>
  UTF8-3         = <as defined in RFC 3629 (STD 63)>
  UTF8-4         = <as defined in RFC 3629 (STD 63)>
  UTF8-char-safe = UTF8-1-safe / UTF8-2 / UTF8-3 / UTF8-4

  saslname       = 1*(UTF8-char-safe / "=2C" / "=3D")
  gs2-authzid    = "a=" saslname
                     ;; GS2 has to transport an authzid since
                     ;; the GSS-API has no equivalent
  gs2-nonstd-flag = "F"
                     ;; "F" means the mechanism is not a
                     ;; standard GSS-API mechanism in that the
                     ;; RFC 2743, Section 3.1 header was missing
  cb-name        = 1*(ALPHA / DIGIT / "." / "-")
                     ;; See RFC 5056, Section 7.
  gs2-cb-flag    = ("p=" cb-name) / "n" / "y"
                     ;; GS2 channel binding (CB) flag
                     ;; "p" -> client supports and used CB
                     ;; "n" -> client does not support CB
                     ;; "y" -> client supports CB, thinks the server
                     ;;            does not
  gs2-header = [gs2-nonstd-flag ","] gs2-cb-flag "," [gs2-authzid] ","
                     ;; The GS2 header is gs2-header.
```

   When the "gs2-nonstd-flag" flag is present, the client did not find/
   remove a token header ([RFC2743], Section 3.1) from the initial token
   returned by GSS_Init_sec_context. This signals to the server that it
   MUST NOT re-add the data that is normally removed by the client.

   The "gs2-cb-flag" signals the channel binding mode. One of "p", "n",
   or "y" is used. A "p" means the client supports and used a channel
   binding, and the name of the channel binding type is indicated. An
   "n" means that the client does not support channel binding. A "y"
   means the client supports channel binding, but believes the server
   does not support it, so it did not use a channel binding. See the
   next section for more details.

   The "gs2-authzid" holds the SASL authorization identity. It is
   encoded using UTF-8 [RFC3629] with three exceptions:

   o The NUL character is forbidden as required by section 3.4.1 of
      [RFC4422].

   o The server MUST replace any "," (comma) in the string with "=2C".

o The server MUST replace any "=" (equals) in the string with "=3D".

Upon receipt of this value, the server verifies its correctness
according to the used SASL protocol profile. Failed verification
results in a failed authentication exchange.

5. Channel Bindings

GS2 supports channel binding to external secure channels, such as
TLS. Clients and servers may or may not support channel binding;
therefore, the use of channel binding is negotiable. However, GS2
does not provide security layers; therefore, it is imperative that
GS2 provide integrity protection for the negotiation of channel
binding.

Use of channel binding is negotiated as follows:

o Servers that support the use of channel binding SHOULD advertise
   both the non-PLUS and PLUS-variant of each GS2 mechanism name. If
   the server cannot support channel binding, it SHOULD advertise
   only the non-PLUS-variant. If the server would never succeed in
   the authentication of the non-PLUS-variant due to policy reasons,
   it MUST advertise only the PLUS-variant.

o If the client supports channel binding and the server does not
   appear to (i.e., the client did not see the -PLUS name advertised
   by the server), then the client MUST NOT use an "n" gs2-cb-flag.

o Clients that support mechanism negotiation and channel binding
   MUST use a "p" gs2-cb-flag when the server offers the PLUS-variant
   of the desired GS2 mechanism.

o If the client does not support channel binding, then it MUST use
   an "n" gs2-cb-flag. Conversely, if the client requires the use of
   channel binding then it MUST use a "p" gs2-cb-flag. Clients that
   do not support mechanism negotiation never use a "y" gs2-cb-flag,
   they use either "p" or "n" according to whether they require and
   support the use of channel binding or whether they do not,
   respectively.

o The client generates the chan_bindings input parameter for
   GSS_Init_sec_context as described below.

o Upon receipt of the initial authentication message, the server
   checks the gs2-cb-flag in the GS2 header and constructs a
   chan_bindings parameter for GSS_Accept_sec_context as described
   below. If the client channel binding flag was "y" and the server
   did advertise support for channel bindings (by advertising the

PLUS-variant of the mechanism chosen by the client), then the
server MUST fail authentication. If the client channel binding
flag was "p" and the server does not support the indicated channel
binding type, then the server MUST fail authentication.

o If the client used an "n" gs2-cb-flag and the server requires the
   use of channel binding, then the server MUST fail authentication.

```
FLAG CLIENT CB SUPPORT   SERVER CB SUPPORT DISPOSITION
---- -----------------   ----------------- -----------

n    no support          N/A               If server disallows
                                           non-channel-bound
                                           authentication, then
                                           fail

y    Yes, not required   No                Authentication may
                                           succeed; CB not used

y    Yes, not required   Yes               Authentication must fail

p    Yes                 Yes               Authentication may
                                           succeed, with CB used

p    Yes                 No                Authentication will fail

N/A  Yes, required       No                Client does not even try
```

For more discussion of channel bindings, and the syntax of the
channel binding data for various security protocols, see [RFC5056].

5.1. Content of GSS-CHANNEL-BINDINGS Structure

The calls to GSS_Init_sec_context and GSS_Accept_sec_context take a
chan_bindings parameter. The value is a GSS-CHANNEL-BINDINGS
structure [RFC5554].

The initiator-address-type and acceptor-address-type fields of the
GSS-CHANNEL-BINDINGS structure MUST be set to 0. The initiator-
address and acceptor-address fields MUST be the empty string.

The application-data field MUST be set to the gs2-header, excluding
the initial [gs2-nonstd-flag ","] part, concatenated with, when a
gs2-cb-flag of "p" is used, the application's channel binding data.

5.2. Default Channel Binding

   A default channel binding type agreement process for all SASL
   application protocols that do not provide their own channel binding
   type agreement is provided as follows.

   'tls-unique' is the default channel binding type for any application
   that doesn't specify one.

   Servers MUST implement the "tls-unique" [RFC5929] channel binding
   type, if they implement any channel binding. Clients SHOULD
   implement the "tls-unique" channel binding type, if they implement
   any channel binding. Clients and servers SHOULD choose the highest-
   layer/innermost end-to-end TLS channel as the channel to which to
   bind.

   Servers MUST choose the channel binding type indicated by the client,
   or fail authentication if they don't support it.

6. Examples

   Example #1: a one round-trip GSS-API context token exchange, no
   channel binding, optional authzid given.

        C: Request authentication exchange
        S: Empty Challenge
        C: n,a=someuser,<initial context token with standard
                        header removed>
        S: Send reply context token as is
        C: Empty message
        S: Outcome of authentication exchange

   Example #2: a one and one half round-trip GSS-API context token
   exchange, no channel binding.

        C: Request authentication exchange
        S: Empty Challenge
        C: n,,<initial context token with standard
                        header removed>
        S: Send reply context token as is
        C: Send reply context token as is
        S: Outcome of authentication exchange

Example #3: a two round-trip GSS-API context token exchange, no
channel binding, no standard token header.

```
C: Request authentication exchange
S: Empty Challenge
C: F,n,,<initial context token without
                    standard header>
S: Send reply context token as is
C: Send reply context token as is
S: Send reply context token as is
C: Empty message
S: Outcome of authentication exchange
```

Example #4: using channel binding, optional authzid given.

```
C: Request authentication exchange
S: Empty Challenge
C: p=tls-unique,a=someuser,<initial context token with standard
                        header removed>
S: Send reply context token as is
...
```

Example #5: using channel binding.

```
C: Request authentication exchange
S: Empty Challenge
C: p=tls-unique,,<initial context token with standard
                        header removed>
S: Send reply context token as is
...
```

Example #6: using non-standard channel binding (requires out-of-band
negotiation).

```
C: Request authentication exchange
S: Empty Challenge
C: p=tls-server-end-point,,<initial context token with standard
                        header removed>
S: Send reply context token as is
...
```

Example #7: client supports channel bindings but server does not,
optional authzid given.

        C: Request authentication exchange
        S: Empty Challenge
        C: y,a=someuser,<initial
                        context token with standard header removed>
        S: Send reply context token as is
        ...

   GSS-API authentication is always initiated by the client. The SASL
   framework allows either the client or the server to initiate
   authentication. In GS2, the server will send an initial empty
   challenge (zero-byte string) if it has not yet received a token from
   the client. See Section 3 of [RFC4422].

7. Authentication Conditions

   Authentication MUST NOT succeed if any one of the following
   conditions are true:

   o If GSS_Init/Accept_sec_context returns anything other than
      GSS_S_CONTINUE_NEEDED or GSS_S_COMPLETE.

   o If the client's initial GS2 header does not match the ABNF.

   o In particular, if the initial character of the client message is
      anything except "F", "p", "n", or "y".

   o If the client's GS2 channel binding flag was "y" and the server
      supports channel bindings.

   o If the client's GS2 channel binding flag was "p" and the server
      does not support the indicated channel binding.

   o If the client requires use of channel binding and the server did
      not advertise support for channel binding.

   o If authorization of client principal (i.e., src_name in
      GSS_Accept_sec_context) to requested authzid failed.

   o If the client is not authorized to the requested authzid or an
      authzid could not be derived from the client's initiator principal
      name.

8. GSS-API Parameters

   GS2 does not use any GSS-API per-message tokens. Therefore, the per-
   message token ret_flags from GSS_Init_sec_context() and
   GSS_Accept_sec_context() are irrelevant; implementations SHOULD NOT
   set the per-message req_flags.

   The mutual_req_flag MUST be set. Clients MUST check that the
   corresponding ret_flag is set when the context is fully established,
   else authentication MUST fail.

   Use or non-use of deleg_req_flag and anon_req_flag is an
   implementation-specific detail. SASL and GS2 implementors are
   encouraged to provide programming interfaces by which clients may
   choose to delegate credentials and by which servers may receive them.
   SASL and GS2 implementors are encouraged to provide programming
   interfaces that provide a good mapping of GSS-API naming options.

9. Naming

   There is no requirement that any particular GSS-API name-types be
   used. However, typically, SASL servers will have host-based acceptor
   principal names (see [RFC2743], Section 4.1) and clients will
   typically have username initiator principal names (see [RFC2743],
   Section 4.2). When a host-based acceptor principal name is used
   ("service@hostname"), "service" is the service name specified in the
   protocol's profile and "hostname" is the fully qualified host name of
   the server.

10. GSS_Inquire_SASLname_for_mech Call

   We specify a new GSS-API utility function to allow SASL
   implementations to more efficiently identify the GSS-API mechanism to
   which a particular SASL mechanism name refers.

      Inputs:

      o desired_mech OBJECT IDENTIFIER

      Outputs:

      o major_status INTEGER

      o minor_status INTEGER

      o sasl_mech_name UTF-8 STRING -- SASL name for this
         mechanism; caller must release with
         GSS_Release_buffer()

     o mech_name UTF-8 STRING -- name of this mechanism, possibly
        localized; caller must release with GSS_Release_buffer()

     o mech_description UTF-8 STRING -- possibly localized
        description of this mechanism; caller must release with
        GSS_Release_buffer()

     Return major_status codes:

     o GSS_S_COMPLETE indicates successful completion, and that
        output parameters holds correct information.

     o GSS_S_BAD_MECH indicates that a desired_mech was unsupported
        by the GSS-API implementation.

     o GSS_S_FAILURE indicates that the operation failed for reasons
        unspecified at the GSS-API level.

     The GSS_Inquire_SASLname_for_mech call is used to get the SASL
     mechanism name for a GSS-API mechanism. It also returns a name
     and description of the mechanism in user-friendly form.

     The output variable sasl_mech_name will hold the IANA registered
     mechanism name for the GSS-API mechanism, or if none is
     registered, a mechanism name computed from the OID as described
     in Section 3.1 of this document.

10.1. gss_inquire_saslname_for_mech

   The C binding for the GSS_Inquire_SASLname_for_mech call is as
   follows.

   As mentioned in [RFC2744], routines may return GSS_S_FAILURE,
   indicating an implementation-specific or mechanism-specific error
   condition, further details of which are reported via the minor_status
   parameter.

```
OM_uint32 gss_inquire_saslname_for_mech(
  OM_uint32      *minor_status,
  const gss_OID  desired_mech,
  gss_buffer_t   sasl_mech_name,
  gss_buffer_t   mech_name,
  gss_buffer_t   mech_description
);
```

Purpose:

Output the SASL mechanism name of a GSS-API mechanism.
It also returns a name and description of the mechanism in a
user-friendly form.

Parameters:

minor_status   Integer, modify
                    Mechanism-specific status code.

desired_mech   OID, read
                    Identifies the GSS-API mechanism to query.

sasl_mech_name   buffer, character-string, modify, optional
                    Buffer to receive SASL mechanism name.
                    The application must free storage associated
                    with this name after use with a call to
                    gss_release_buffer().

mech_name   buffer, character-string, modify, optional
                    Buffer to receive human-readable mechanism name.
                    The application must free storage associated
                    with this name after use with a call to
                    gss_release_buffer().

mech_description   buffer, character-string, modify, optional
                    Buffer to receive description of mechanism.
                    The application must free storage associated
                    with this name after use with a call to
                    gss_release_buffer().

Function value: GSS status code:

GSS_S_COMPLETE   Successful completion.

GSS_S_BAD_MECH   The desired_mech OID is unsupported.
```

11.  GSS_Inquire_mech_for_SASLname Call

   To allow SASL clients to more efficiently identify to which GSS-API
   mechanism a particular SASL mechanism name refers, we specify a new
   GSS-API utility function for this purpose.

      Inputs:

      o  sasl_mech_name UTF-8 STRING -- SASL name of mechanism.

      Outputs:

      o  major_status INTEGER

      o  minor_status INTEGER

      o  mech_type OBJECT IDENTIFIER -- must be explicit mechanism,
         and not "default" specifier.  Caller should treat as read-only
         and should not attempt to release.

      Return major_status codes:

      o  GSS_S_COMPLETE indicates successful completion, and that output
         parameters holds correct information.

      o  GSS_S_BAD_MECH indicates that no supported GSS-API mechanism
         had the indicated sasl_mech_name.

      o  GSS_S_FAILURE indicates that the operation failed for reasons
         unspecified at the GSS-API level.

   The GSS_Inquire_mech_for_SASLname call is used to get the GSS-API
   mechanism OID associated with a SASL mechanism name.

11.1.  gss_inquire_mech_for_saslname

   The C binding for the GSS_Inquire_mech_for_SASLname call is as
   follows.

   As mentioned in [RFC2744], routines may return GSS_S_FAILURE,
   indicating an implementation-specific or mechanism-specific error
   condition, further details of which are reported via the minor_status
   parameter.

```
OM_uint32 gss_inquire_mech_for_saslname(
  OM_uint32          *minor_status,
  const gss_buffer_t  sasl_mech_name,
  gss_OID            *mech_type
);
```

      Purpose:

      Output GSS-API mechanism OID of mechanism associated with given
      sasl_mech_name.

      Parameters:

      minor_status   Integer, modify
                          Mechanism-specific status code.

      sasl_mech_name   buffer, character-string, read
                          Buffer with SASL mechanism name.

      mech_type   OID, modify, optional
                          Actual mechanism used. The OID returned via
                          this parameter will be a pointer to static
                          storage that should be treated as read-only.
                          In particular, the application should not attempt
                          to free it. Specify NULL if not required.

      Function value: GSS status code:

      GSS_S_COMPLETE   Successful completion.

      GSS_S_BAD_MECH   There is no GSS-API mechanism known
                        as sasl_mech_name.

12. Security Layers

   GS2 does not support SASL security layers. Applications that need
   integrity or confidentiality protection can use either channel
   binding to a secure external channel or another SASL mechanism that
   does provide security layers.

13. Interoperability with the SASL GSSAPI Mechanism

   The Kerberos V5 GSS-API [RFC1964] mechanism is currently used in SASL
   under the name GSSAPI, see [RFC4752]. The Kerberos V5 mechanism may
   also be used with the GS2 family. This causes an interoperability
   problem, which is discussed and resolved below.

13.1. The Interoperability Problem

   The SASL "GSSAPI" mechanism is not wire compatible with the Kerberos
   V GSS-API mechanism used as a SASL GS2 mechanism.

   If a client (or server) only support Kerberos V5 under the "GSSAPI"
   name, and the server (or client) only support Kerberos V5 under the
   GS2 family, the mechanism negotiation will fail.

13.2. Resolving the Problem

   If the Kerberos V5 mechanism is supported under GS2 in a server, the
   server SHOULD also support Kerberos V5 through the "GSSAPI"
   mechanism, to avoid interoperability problems with older clients.

   Reasons for violating this recommendation may include security
   considerations regarding the absent features in the GS2 mechanism.
   The SASL "GSSAPI" mechanism lacks support for channel bindings, which
   means that using an external secure channel may not be sufficient
   protection against active attackers (see [RFC5056] and [MITM]).

13.3. Additional Recommendations

   If the application requires SASL security layers, then it MUST use
   the SASL "GSSAPI" mechanism [RFC4752] instead of "GS2-KRB5" or "GS2-
   KRB5-PLUS".

   If the application can use channel binding to an external channel,
   then it is RECOMMENDED that it select Kerberos V5 through the GS2
   mechanism rather than the "GSSAPI" mechanism.

14. GSS-API Mechanisms That Negotiate Other Mechanisms

   A GSS-API mechanism that negotiates other mechanisms will interact
   badly with the SASL mechanism negotiation. There are two problems.
   The first is an interoperability problem and the second is a security
   concern. The problems are described and resolved below.

14.1. The Interoperability Problem

   If a client implements GSS-API mechanism X, potentially negotiated
   through a GSS-API mechanism Y, and the server also implements GSS-API
   mechanism X negotiated through a GSS-API mechanism Z, the
   authentication negotiation will fail.

14.2. Security Problem

   If a client's policy is to first prefer GSSAPI mechanism X, then non-
   GSSAPI mechanism Y, then GSSAPI mechanism Z, and if a server supports
   mechanisms Y and Z but not X, then if the client attempts to
   negotiate mechanism X by using a GSS-API mechanism that negotiates
   other mechanisms (such as Simple and Protected GSS-API Negotiation
   (SPNEGO) [RFC4178]), it may end up using mechanism Z when it ideally
   should have used mechanism Y. For this reason, the use of GSS-API
   mechanisms that negotiate other mechanisms is disallowed under GS2.

14.3. Resolving the Problems

   GSS-API mechanisms that negotiate other mechanisms MUST NOT be used
   with the GS2 SASL mechanism. Specifically, SPNEGO [RFC4178] MUST NOT
   be used as a GS2 mechanism. To make this easier for SASL
   implementations, we assign a symbolic SASL mechanism name to the
   SPNEGO GSS-API mechanism, "SPNEGO". SASL client implementations MUST
   NOT choose the SPNEGO mechanism under any circumstances.

   The GSS_C_MA_MECH_NEGO attribute of GSS_Inquire_attrs_for_mech
   [RFC5587] can be used to identify such mechanisms.

15. IANA Considerations

   The IANA has registered a SASL mechanism family as per [RFC4422]
   using the following information.

      Subject: Registration of SASL mechanism family GS2-*
      SASL mechanism prefix: GS2-
      Security considerations: RFC 5801
      Published specification: RFC 5801
      Person & email address to contact for further information:
        Simon Josefsson <simon@josefsson.org>
      Intended usage: COMMON
      Owner/Change controller: iesg@ietf.org
      Note: Compare with the GSSAPI and GSS-SPNEGO mechanisms.

   The IANA is advised that SASL mechanism names starting with "GS2-"
   are reserved for SASL mechanisms that conform to this document. The
   IANA has placed a statement to that effect in the SASL Mechanisms
   registry.

   The IANA is further advised that GS2 SASL mechanism names MUST NOT
   end in "-PLUS" except as a version of another mechanism name simply
   suffixed with "-PLUS".

   The SASL names for the Kerberos V5 GSS-API mechanism [RFC4121]
   [RFC1964] used via GS2 SHALL be "GS2-KRB5" and "GS2-KRB5-PLUS".

   The SASL names for the SPNEGO GSS-API mechanism used via GS2 SHALL be
   "SPNEGO" and "SPNEGO-PLUS". As described in Section 14, the SASL
   "SPNEGO" and "SPNEGO-PLUS" MUST NOT be used. These names are
   provided as a convenience for SASL library implementors.

16. Security Considerations

   Security issues are also discussed throughout this memo.

   The security provided by a GS2 mechanism depends on the security of
   the GSS-API mechanism. The GS2 mechanism family depends on channel
   binding support, so GSS-API mechanisms that do not support channel
   binding cannot be successfully used as SASL mechanisms via the GS2
   bridge.

   Because GS2 does not support security layers, it is strongly
   RECOMMENDED that channel binding to a secure external channel be
   used. Successful channel binding eliminates the possibility of man-
   in-the-middle (MITM) attacks, provided that the external channel and
   its channel binding data are secure and that the GSS-API mechanism
   used is secure. Authentication failure because of channel binding

failure may indicate that an MITM attack was attempted, but note that
a real MITM attacker would likely attempt to close the connection to
the client or simulate network partition; thus, MITM attack detection
is heuristic.

Use of channel binding will also protect the SASL mechanism
negotiation -- if there is no MITM, then the external secure channel
will have protected the SASL mechanism negotiation.

The channel binding data MAY be sent (by the actual GSS-API mechanism
used) without confidentiality protection and knowledge of it is
assumed to provide no advantage to an MITM (who can, in any case,
compute the channel binding data independently). If the external
channel does not provide confidentiality protection and the GSS-API
mechanism does not provide confidentiality protection for the channel
binding data, then passive attackers (eavesdroppers) can recover the
channel binding data, see [RFC5056].

When constructing the input_name_string for GSS_Import_name with the
GSS_C_NT_HOSTBASED_SERVICE name type, the client SHOULD NOT
canonicalize the server's fully qualified domain name using an
insecure or untrusted directory service, such as the Domain Name
System [RFC1034] without DNS Security (DNSSEC) [RFC4033].

SHA-1 is used to derive SASL mechanism names, but no traditional
cryptographic properties are required -- the required property is
that the truncated output for distinct inputs are different for
practical input values. GS2 does not use any other cryptographic
algorithm. Therefore, GS2 is "algorithm agile", or, as agile as the
GSS-API mechanisms that are available for use in SASL applications
via GS2.

GS2 does not protect against downgrade attacks of channel binding
types. Negotiation of channel binding type was intentionally left
out of scope for this document.

The security considerations of SASL [RFC4422], the GSS-API [RFC2743],
channel binding [RFC5056], any external channels (such as TLS,
[RFC5246], channel binding types (see the IANA channel binding type
registry), and GSS-API mechanisms (such as the Kerberos V5 mechanism
[RFC4121] [RFC1964]), also apply.

17. Acknowledgements

   The history of GS2 can be traced to the "GSSAPI" mechanism originally
   specified by RFC 2222. This document was derived from [SASL-GSSAPI],
   which was prepared by Alexey Melnikov with significant contributions
   from John G. Myers, although the majority of this document has been
   rewritten by the current authors.

   Contributions of many members of the SASL mailing list are gratefully
   acknowledged. In particular, ideas and feedback from Pasi Eronen,
   Sam Hartman, Jeffrey Hutzelman, Alexey Melnikov, and Tom Yu improved
   the document and the protocol. Other suggestions to the documents
   were made by Spencer Dawkins, Ralph Droms, Adrian Farrel, Robert
   Sparks, and Glen Zorn.

18. References

18.1. Normative References

   [FIPS.180-1.1995]
             National Institute of Standards and Technology, "Secure
             Hash Standard", FIPS PUB 180-1, April 1995,
             <http://www.itl.nist.gov/fipspubs/fip180-1.htm>.

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

   [RFC2743] Linn, J., "Generic Security Service Application Program
             Interface Version 2, Update 1", RFC 2743, January 2000.

   [RFC3629] Yergeau, F., "UTF-8, a transformation format of ISO
             10646", STD 63, RFC 3629, November 2003.

   [RFC4422] Melnikov, A. and K. Zeilenga, "Simple Authentication and
             Security Layer (SASL)", RFC 4422, June 2006.

   [RFC4648] Josefsson, S., "The Base16, Base32, and Base64 Data
             Encodings", RFC 4648, October 2006.

   [RFC5056] Williams, N., "On the Use of Channel Bindings to Secure
             Channels", RFC 5056, November 2007.

   [RFC5234] Crocker, D. and P. Overell, "Augmented BNF for Syntax
             Specifications: ABNF", STD 68, RFC 5234, January 2008.

   [RFC5554] Williams, N., "Clarifications and Extensions to the
              Generic Security Service Application Program Interface
              (GSS-API) for the Use of Channel Bindings", RFC 5554,
              May 2009.

   [CCITT.X690.2002]
              International Telephone and Telegraph Consultative
              Committee, "ASN.1 encoding rules: Specification of basic
              encoding Rules (BER), Canonical encoding rules (CER) and
              Distinguished encoding rules (DER)", CCITT Recommendation
              X.690, July 2002.

   [RFC5929] Altman, J., Williams, N., and L. Zhu, "Channel Bindings
              for TLS", RFC 5929, July 2010.

18.2. Informative References

   [RFC1034] Mockapetris, P., "Domain names - concepts and facilities",
              STD 13, RFC 1034, November 1987.

   [RFC1964] Linn, J., "The Kerberos Version 5 GSS-API Mechanism",
              RFC 1964, June 1996.

   [RFC2025] Adams, C., "The Simple Public-Key GSS-API Mechanism
              (SPKM)", RFC 2025, October 1996.

   [RFC2222] Myers, J., "Simple Authentication and Security Layer
              (SASL)", RFC 2222, October 1997.

   [RFC2744] Wray, J., "Generic Security Service API Version 2 :
              C-bindings", RFC 2744, January 2000.

   [RFC4033] Arends, R., Austein, R., Larson, M., Massey, D., and S.
              Rose, "DNS Security Introduction and Requirements",
              RFC 4033, March 2005.

   [RFC4121] Zhu, L., Jaganathan, K., and S. Hartman, "The Kerberos
              Version 5 Generic Security Service Application Program
              Interface (GSS-API) Mechanism: Version 2", RFC 4121,
              July 2005.

   [RFC4178] Zhu, L., Leach, P., Jaganathan, K., and W. Ingersoll, "The
              Simple and Protected Generic Security Service Application
              Program Interface (GSS-API) Negotiation Mechanism",
              RFC 4178, October 2005.

   [RFC4752]   Melnikov, A., "The Kerberos V5 ("GSSAPI") Simple
               Authentication and Security Layer (SASL) Mechanism",
               RFC 4752, November 2006.

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

   [RFC5587]   Williams, N., "Extended Generic Security Service Mechanism
               Inquiry APIs", RFC 5587, July 2009.

   [RFC5802]   Menon-Sen, A., Melnikov, A., Newman, C., and N. Williams,
               "Salted Challenge Response Authentication Mechanism
               (SCRAM) SASL and GSS-API Mechanisms", RFC 5802, July 2010.

   [MITM]   Asokan, N., Niemi, V., and K. Nyberg, "Man-in-the-Middle
               in Tunnelled Authentication", in 11th Security
               Protocols Workshop, 2002.

   [SASL-GSSAPI]
               Melnikov, A., "The Kerberos V5 ("GSSAPI") SASL mechanism",
               Work in Progress, March 2005.

Authors' Addresses

   Simon Josefsson
   SJD AB
   Hagagatan 24
   Stockholm 113 47
   SE

   EMail: simon@josefsson.org
   URI: http://josefsson.org/

   Nicolas Williams
   Oracle
   5300 Riata Trace Ct
   Austin, TX 78727
   USA

   EMail: Nicolas.Williams@oracle.com