

Attested TLS Token Binding

Giri Mandyam

draft-mandyam-tokbind-attest

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-mandyam-tokbind-attest/>

Recap

- Bearer tokens are still applicable, but client must prove possession of a private key on every TLS connection to a server
- Current specification requires signing of payload that includes
 - Exported Key Material (RFC 5705)
 - Tokbind.type and Tokbind.KeyParameters
- User agent (browser) could maintain private keys associated with TLS token binding
 - Problem: User agents are usually implemented in user space; private keys may be vulnerable
 - Attacker that obtains private key and bearer token can impersonate client
 - Problem not much better for native applications
 - Many OS's use open source libraries such as OpenSSL to implement secure socket connection
 - Private keys may still be stored in user space

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-mandyam-tokbind-attest/>

Remote Attestation (recap)

- Describes the process by which software executing on a device provides an assertion to a relying party about the integrity of its platform
 - The platform in question is the one controlling the tokbind private key
- The attestation can be based on several criteria, including ‘health’ measurements of platform
 - An assessment of the operating system kernel
 - Enumeration of 3rd-party applications installed in environment where credential is stored
 - Suspicious events such as protected memory access
- Attestation data is formed by combining these indications into a compact data structure that can be sent to a relying party
 - Attestation data is used to form an attestation statement, which is the actual message sent to the relying party
 - Attestation statement should be cryptographically-verifiable (signed and/or encrypted)

Tokbind Impact

- Inclusion of an attestation in the tokbind message enabled through a protocol extension
 - Sec. 3.4, draft-ietf-tokbind-protocol: “One of the possible uses of extensions envisioned at the time of this writing is attestation ...”
- Current I.-D. proposes a pairing of attestation type and attestation data for extension
- Initial types are currently
 - TCG – TPM v1.2 specifications
 - Android Keystore
 - Registry for future attestation extensions

Tokbind Impact (cont.)

- All current proposed attestations involve signing of the EKM
- Verification procedures leverage heavily from Webauthn procedures
 - <https://w3c.github.io/webauthn/#android-key-attestation>
 - <https://w3c.github.io/webauthn/#tpm-attestation>
 - Primary differences
 - Webauthn attestation signature over clientData | | AuthData
 - Webauthn requires transmission of signing algm. in addition to attestation data and cert
 - Current I.-D. leverages algm. field in certificate

TLS Handshake Impact

- Current TokBind specs do not provide a means for client/server to advertise extension capabilities
 - Could allow for server to suppress client extensions for which it has no interest
- I.-D. now proposes new TLS extension codepoint “token_binding_with_extensions”
- Client Hello includes list of supported extensions
- Server Hello includes list that is a subset of Client Hello list
 - Client can only send extensions that Server lists in its Hello

Open Questions

- Should there even be an extensions negotiation mechanism?
 - Can server just ignore tokbind.extensions that it doesn't support/care about?
- Should supported attestation types be advertised?
- Should supported attestation trust anchors be advertised?
- Are the current list of initial supported extensions sufficient?
- Are the verification procedures accurate?

Recommendations to WG (in order)

- Answer open questions
- Adopt I.-D. as standards-track
- Co-editors are welcomed