Internet-Draft David Chadwick PKIX WG University of Salford

Intended Category: Standards Track

Expires: 8 October 2002 8 April 2002

LDAPv3 DN strings for use with PKIs <draft-ietf-pkix-dnstrings-00.txt>

#### STATUS OF THIS MEMO

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all the provisions of Section 10 of RFC2026 [1].

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 expires on 8 October 2002.

Comments and suggestions on this document are encouraged. Comments on this document should be sent to the LDAPEXT working group discussion list:

ietf-pkix@imc.org

or directly to the authors.

## ABSTRACT

RFC 2253 [2] standardises a set of strings that can be used to represent attribute types in LDAP distinguished names. This list is does not cover the full set of attribute types used in the distinguished names of issuers and subjects in public key certificates. This document standardises the strings needed for these additional attribute types.

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 [3].

### 1. Introduction

RFC 2253 standardises a set of strings for a limited number of attribute types that can be used in the LDAP encoding of  $\rm X.500$  distinguished names. These are

#### String X.500 AttributeType

CN commonName

localityName

ST stateOrProvinceName 0 organizationName

OU organizationalUnitName

countryName STREET streetAddress domainComponent

UID userid

The revision of RFC 2253 [5] states that additional attribute types should be represented by their object identifiers.

RFC 3039 [4] lists the following attribute types that may be used to create subject and issuer distinguished names:

countryName;

commonName;

surname;

givenName;

pseudonym;

serialNumber;

organizationName;

organizationalUnitName;

stateOrProvinceName

localityName and

postalAddress.

The observant reader will notice that the serial Number, pseudonym, and postalAddress attribute types are missing from the RFC 2253 set and consequently do not have standardised strings for use in LDAP distinguished names.

Other examples are... [to be added by members of the PKIX group]

### 2. Additional LDAP String Definitions

This document defines the following additional strings that SHOULD be used to represent their respective attribute types in LDAP distinguished names, as given in the following table:

> String X.500 AttributeType

serialNumber ADDR

serialNumber postalAddress

Pseudo pseudonym

[other strings to be added by members of PKIX group]

Note. The strings are case insensitive as far as LDAPv3 is concerned

### 3. Security Considerations

The following security considerations are specific to the handling of distinguished names. LDAP security considerations are discussed in [6] and other documents comprising the LDAP Technical Specification [7].

## 4. Acknowledgements

None at present

#### 5. Copyright

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (date). All Rights Reserved.

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to the Internet Society or other Internet organizations, except as needed for the purpose of developing Internet standards in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the Internet Standards process must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by the Internet Society or its successors or assigns.

This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIMS 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.

#### 6. References

- [1] S. Bradner. "The Internet Standards Process -- Revision 3", RFC 2026, October 1996.
- [2] Wahl, M., Kille, S., Howes, T. "Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (v3): UTF-8 String Representation of Distinguished Names", RFC2253, December 1997.
- [3] S.Bradner. "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", RFC 2119, March 1997.
- [4] Santesson, S., Polk, W., Barzin, P., Nystrom, M. "Internet X.509 Public Key Infrastructure Qualified Certificates Profile", RFC 3039, Jan 2001
- [5] K. Zeilenga. "LDAP: String Representation of Distinguished Names". <draft-ietf-ldapbis-dn-07.txt>,1 March 2002
- [6] J. Sermersheim (editor), "LDAP: The Protocol", <draft-ietfldapbis-protocol-xx.txt>, a work in progress.
- [7] K. Zeilenga (editor), "LDAP: Technical Specification Road Map", <draft-ietf-ldapbis-roadmap-xx.txt>, a work in progress.

# 7. Authors Address

David Chadwick IS Institute University of Salford Salford M5 4WT

# England

Email: d.w.chadwick@salford.ac.uk

Tel: +44 161 295 5351