CCITT X.509 (3)

Author(s): CCITT 1987

Last modified November 22, 2002

Summary: Three messages protocol in the recommendations of the CCITT for the CCITT.X.509 standard.

Remark

This protocol presented here is actually a simplified version from [BAN89] and [AN96].

Protocol specification (in common syntax)

```
A, B: principal
Na, Nb: nonce
Ta, Tb: timestamp
Ya, Yb: userdata
Xa, Xb: userdata
PK, SK: principal -> key (keypair)
```

- 1. A -> B : A, {Ta, Na, B, Xa, {Ya}PK(B)}SK(A)
 2. B -> A : B, {Tb, Nb, A, Na, Xb, {Yb}PK(A)}SK(B)
- 3. A \rightarrow B : A, $\{Nb\}SK(A)$

Description of the protocol rules

See CCITT X.509 (1).

Remark

As in the case of CCITT X.509 (1), in the original protocol specification [CCI87], only a hash of the data is signed, for efficiency reasons. Hence the messages specification ought to be:

```
1. A -> B : A, Ta, Na, B, Xa, {Ya}PK(B), {h(Ta, Na, B, Xa, {Ya}PK(B))}SK(A)
2. B -> A : B, Tb, Nb, A, Na, Xb, {Yb}PK(A), {h(B, Tb, Nb, A, Na, Xb, {Yb}}
3. A -> B : A, {Nb}SK(A)
where h is a one-way function.
```

Requirements

The protocol must ensure the confidentiality of Ya and Yb: if A and B follow the protocol, then an attacker should not be able to obtain Ya or Yb.

The protocol must ensure the recipient B of the message 1 that the data Xa and Ya originate from A.

The protocol must ensure the recipient A of the message 2 that the data Xb and Yb originate from B.

References

[BAN89], [CCI87].

Claimed attacks

1. This parallel session attack presented in [BAN89] works if B does not check the timestamp Ta in the first message.

```
Α
                     I(B)
                                  A, \{Ta, Na, B, Xa, \{Ya\}PK(B)\}SK(A)
i.1.
          I(A)
                 ->
                       В
                                  A, \{Ta, Na, B, Xa, \{Ya\}PK(B)\}SK(A)
                                  B, \{Tb, Nb, A, Na, Xb, \{Yb\}PK(A)\}SK(B)
i.2.
           В
                 ->
                     I(A)
                                  A, \{Ta', Na', C, Xa', \{Ya'\}PK(I)\}SK(A)
ii.1.
           Α
                 ->
                       Ι
ii.2.
           Ι
                 ->
                                  I, \{Ti, Nb, A, N'a, Xi, \{Yi\}PK(A)\}SK(I)
                       Α
ii.3.
           Α
                 ->
                       Ι
                             :
                                  A, \{Nb\}SK(A)
ii.3.
          I(A)
                 ->
                       В
                                   A, \{Nb\}SK(A)
```

2. Another attack can be found in [lM90].

See also

CCITT X.509 (1), CCITT X.509 (1c), BAN modified version of CCITT X.509 (3).

Citations

[AN96] Martín Abadi and Roger Needham. Prudent engineering practice for cryptographic protocols. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 22(1):6–15, January 1996.

- [BAN89] Michael Burrows, Martin Abadi, and Roger Needham. A logic of authentication. Technical Report 39, Digital Systems Research Center, february 1989.
- [CCI87] CCITT. The directory authentification framework. Draft Recommendation X.509, 1987. Version 7.
- [lM90] Colin l'Anson and Chris Mitchell. Security defects in the ccitt recomendation x.509 the directory authentication framework. Computer Communication Review, 20(2):30–34, april 1990.