

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Expires: September 2009

A. Brusilovsky  
I. Faynberg  
Z. Zeltsan  
Alcatel-Lucent

S. Patel  
Google, Inc.

April 2009

## **Password-Authenticated Diffie-Hellman Exchange (PAK)**

[draft-brusilovsky-pak-10.txt](#)

### Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted to IETF in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [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/1id-abstracts.txt>.

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

This Internet-Draft will expire in September, 2009.

### Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2009 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents in effect on the date of publication of this document (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>). Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document.



## Abstract

This document proposes to add mutual authentication, based on human-memorizable password, to the basic unauthenticated Diffie-Hellman key exchange. The proposed algorithm is called Password-authenticated Key exchange (PAK). PAK allows two parties to authenticate themselves while performing the Diffie-Hellman exchange.

The protocol is secure against all passive and active attacks. In particular, it does not allow either type of attackers to obtain any information that would enable an off-line dictionary attack on the password. PAK provides Forward Secrecy.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction
  2. Conventions
  3. Password-Authenticated Key exchange
  4. Selection of parameters
    - 4.1 General considerations
    - 4.2 OTASP and WLAN Diffie-Hellman parameters and key expansion functions
  5. Security considerations
  6. IANA considerations
  7. Acknowledgments
  8. References
    - 8.1 Normative references
    - 8.2 Informative references
- Authors' and contributors' addresses

## 1. Introduction

PAK has the following advantages:

- It provides a secure authenticated key exchange protocol.
- It is secure against offline dictionary attacks when passwords are used.
- It ensures Forward Secrecy.
- It is proved to be as secure as the Diffie-Hellman solution.

The PAK protocol [[BMP00](#)], [[MP05](#)], [[X.1035](#)] has been proven to be as secure as the Diffie-Hellman [[RFC2631](#)], [[DH76](#)] in the random oracle model [[BR93](#)].

That is,

PAK retains its security when used with low-entropy passwords. Therefore, it can be seamlessly integrated into existing applications, requiring secure authentication based on such low-entropy shared secrets.

## 2. Conventions

- A is an identity of Alice
- B is an identity of Bob
- $R_a$  is a secret random exponent selected by A
- $R_b$  is a secret random exponent selected by B
- $X_{ab}$  denotes a value (X presumably computed by A) as derived by B
- $Y_{ba}$  denotes a value (Y presumably computed by B) as derived by A
- $a \bmod b$  denotes the least non-negative remainder when a is divided by b;
- $H_i(u)$  denotes an agreed-on function (e.g., based on SHA-1, SHA-256, etc.) computed over a string u; The various  $H()$  act as independent random functions.  $H_1(u)$  and  $H_2(u)$  are the key derivation functions.  $H_3(u)$ ,  $H_4(u)$ , and  $H_5(u)$  are the hash functions.
- $s|t$  denotes concatenation of the strings s and t;
- $^$  denotes exponentiation;
- multiplication, division, and exponentiation are performed over  $(\mathbb{Z}_p)^*$ ; in other words:
  - 1)  $a*b$  always means  $a*b \pmod p$
  - 2)  $a/b$  always means  $a * x \pmod p$ , where x is the multiplicative inverse of b modulo p
  - 3)  $a^b$  means  $a^b \pmod p$ .

## 3. Password Authenticated Key exchange

Diffie-Hellman key agreement requires that both the sender and recipient of a message create their own secret random numbers and exchange the exponentiation of their respective numbers.

PAK has two parties, Alice (A) and Bob (B), sharing a secret password PW that satisfies the following conditions:

- $H_1(A|B|PW) \neq 0$
- $H_2(A|B|PW) \neq 0$ .

The global Diffie-Hellman publicly-known constants, a prime p and a generator g, are carefully selected so that:

1. A safe prime  $p$  is large enough to make the computation of discrete logarithms infeasible and
2. Powers of  $g$  modulo  $p$  cover the entire range of  $p-1$  integers from 1 to  $p-1$ . (References demonstrate working example of selections).

Initially, Alice (A) selects a secret random exponent  $R_a$  and computes  $g^{R_a}$ ;

Bob (B) selects a secret random exponent  $R_b$  and computes  $g^{R_b}$ .

For efficiency purposes, short exponents could be used for  $R_a$  and  $R_b$  provided they have a certain minimum size. Then:

- A --> B:  $\{A, X = H1(A|B|PW) \cdot (g^{R_a})\}$  (The above precondition on  $PW$  ensures that  $X \neq 0$ );

Bob

receives  $Q$  (presumably  $Q = X$ ), verifies that  $Q \neq 0$  (if  $Q = 0$ , Bob aborts the procedure);  
divides  $Q$  by  $H1(A|B|PW)$  to get  $X_{ab}$ , the recovered value of  $g^{R_a}$ ;

- B --> A:  $\{Y = H2(A|B|PW) \cdot (g^{R_b}), S1 = H3(A|B|PW|X_{ab}|g^{R_b}|(X_{ab})^{R_b})\}$   
(The above precondition on  $PW$  ensures that  $Y \neq 0$ )

Alice

verifies that  $Y \neq 0$ ;  
divides  $Y$  by  $H2(A|B|PW)$  to get  $Y_{ba}$ , the recovered value of  $g^{R_b}$   
and computes  $S1' = H3(A|B|PW|g^{R_a}|Y_{ba}|(Y_{ba})^{R_a})$ ;  
authenticates Bob by checking whether  $S1'$  equals the received  $S1$ ;  
if authenticated, then sets key  $K = H5(A|B|PW|g^{R_a}|Y_{ba}|(Y_{ba})^{R_a})$

- A --> B:  $S2 = H4(A|B|PW|g^{Ra}|Yba|(Yba)^{Ra})$

Bob

Computes  $S2' = H4(A|B|PW|Xab|g^{Rb}|(Xab)^{Rb})$  and authenticates Alice by checking whether  $S2'$  equals the received

$S2$ ;

if authenticated then sets  $K = H5(A|B|PW|Xab|g^{Rb}|(Xab)^{Rb})$

If any of the above verifications fails, the protocol halts; otherwise, both parties have authenticated each other and established the key.

#### [4.](#) Selection of parameters

This section provides guidance on selection of the PAK parameters. First, it addresses general considerations, then it reports on specific implementations.

##### [4.1](#) General considerations

In general implementations, the parameters must be selected to meet algorithm requirements of [\[BMP00\]](#).

##### [4.2](#) OTASP and WLAN Diffie-Hellman parameters and key expansion functions

[\[OTASP\]](#), [\[TIA 683\]](#), and [\[WLAN\]](#) pre-set public parameters  $p$  and  $g$  to their "published" values. This is necessary to protect against an attacker sending bogus  $p$  and  $g$  values tricking the legitimate user to engage in improper Diffie-Hellman exponentiation and leaking some information about the password.

According to [\[OTASP\]](#), [\[TIA 683\]](#), and [\[WLAN\]](#),  $g$  shall be set to 00001101, and  $p$  to the following 1024-bit prime number (Most-significant-bit first):

0xFFFFFFFF	0xFFFFFFFF	0xC90FDAA2	0x2168C234	0xC4C6628B
0x80DC1CD1	0x29024E08	0x8A67CC74	0x020BBEA6	0x3B139B22
0x514A0879	0x8E3404DD	0xEF9519B3	0xCD3A431B	0x302B0A6D
0xF25F1437	0x4FE1356D	0x6D51C245	0xE485B576	0x625E7EC6
0xF44C42E9	0xA637ED6B	0x0BFF5CB6	0xF406B7ED	0xEE386BFB
0x5A899FA5	0xAE9F2411	0x7C4B1FE6	0x49286651	0xECE65381
0xFFFFFFFF	0xFFFFFFFF			

In addition, if short exponents [MP05] are used for Diffie-Hellman parameters  $R_a$  and  $R_b$ , then they should have a minimum size of 384 bits. The independent

random functions  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  should each output 1152 bits assuming prime  $p$  is 1024 bits

long and session keys  $K$  are 128 bits long.  $H_3$ ,  $H_4$ , and  $H_5$  each output 128 bits.

More information on instantiating random functions using hash functions can be found in [BR93]. We use the FIPS 180 SHA-1 hashing function below to instantiate the random function as done in [WLAN], however, SHA-256 can also be used:

$$H_1(z): \text{SHA-1}(1|1|z) \bmod 2^{128} \mid \text{SHA-1}(1|2|z) \bmod 2^{128} \mid \dots \mid \text{SHA-1}(1|9|z) \bmod 2^{128}$$
$$H_2(z): \text{SHA-1}(2|1|z) \bmod 2^{128} \mid \text{SHA-1}(2|2|z) \bmod 2^{128} \mid \dots \mid \text{SHA-1}(2|9|z) \bmod 2^{128}$$

H3(z): SHA-1(3|len(z)|z|z) mod  $2^{128}$   
H4(z): SHA-1(4|len(z)|z|z) mod  $2^{128}$   
H5(z): SHA-1(5|len(z)|z|z) mod  $2^{128}$

In order to create 1152 output bits for H1 and H2, nine calls to SHA-1 are made and the 128 least-significant bits of each output are used. The input payload of each call to SHA-1 consists of:

- a) 32 bits of function type which for H1 is set to 1 and for H2 is set to 2;
- b) a 32 bit counter value, which is incremented from 1 to 9 for each call to SHA-1;
- c) the argument z [for (A|B|PW)].

The functions H3, H4, and H5 require only one call to the SHA-1 hashing function and their respective payloads consist of:

- a) 32 bits of function type (e.g. 3 for H3);
- b) a 32 bit value for the bit length of the argument z;
- c) the actual argument repeated twice.

Finally, the 128 least-significant bits of the output are used.

## 5. Security considerations

Those are as follows:

### - Identifiers

Any protocol that uses PAK must specify a method for producing a single representation of identity strings.

### - Shared secret

PAK involves the use of a shared secret. Protection of the shared values and managing (limiting) their exposure over time is essential, and it can be achieved using well-known security policies and measures.

If a single secret is shared among more than two entities (e.g., Alice, Bob, and Mallory), then Mallory can represent himself as Alice to Bob without Bob being any the wiser.

### - Selection of Diffie-Hellman parameters

The parameters, p and g, must be carefully selected in order not to compromise the shared secret. Only previously agreed upon values for parameters p and g should be used in the PAK protocol. This is necessary to



protect against an attacker sending bogus  $p$  and  $g$  values and thus tricking the other communicating party in an improper Diffie-Hellman exponentiation. Both parties also need to randomly select a new exponent each time the key agreement protocol is executed. If both parties re-use the same values, then Forward Secrecy property is lost.

In addition, if short exponents  $R_a$  and  $R_b$  are used then they should have a minimum size of 384 bits (assuming that 128-bit session keys are used). Historically, the developers, who strived for 128-bit security (and thus selected 256-bit exponents) added 128 bits to the exponents to ensure the security reductions proofs. This should explain how an "odd" length of 384

has

been arrived at.

- Protection against attacks

a) There is a potential attack, the so-called discrete logarithm attack on the

multiplicative group of congruencies modulo  $p$ , in which an adversary can construct a table of discrete logarithms to be used as a "dictionary". A sufficiently large prime,  $p$ , must be selected to protect against such an attack. A proper 1024-bit value for  $p$  and an appropriate value for  $g$  are published in [[WLAN](#)] and [TIA 683]. For the moment, this is what has been implemented; however, a larger prime (i.e., one that is 2048-bit long or even larger) will definitely provide better protection. It is important to note that once this is done, the generator must be changed, too, so this task must be approached with extreme care.

b) An on-line password attack can be launched by an attacker by repeatedly guessing the password and attempting to authenticate. The implementers of PAK should consider employing mechanisms (such as lockouts) for preventing such attacks.

- Recommendations on  $H()$  functions

The independent random functions  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  should output 1152 bits each, assuming prime  $p$  is 1024 bits long and session keys  $K$  are 128 bits long.

The

random functions  $H_3$ ,  $H_4$ , and  $H_5$  should output 128 bits.

An example of secure implementation of PAK is provided in [Plan 9].

## **6. IANA considerations**

No IANA considerations at this time

## **7. Acknowledgments**

The authors are grateful for the thoughtful comments received from Shehryar Qutub, Yaron Sheffer, and Ray Perlner. Special thanks go to Alfred Hoenes, Tim Polk, and Jim Schaad for the careful reviews and invaluable help in preparing the final version of this document.

## **8. References**

### **8.1 Normative references**

- [X.1035] ITU-T Recommendation X.1035 (2007), Password-authenticated key exchange (PAK) protocol
- [TIA 683] Over-the-Air Service Provisioning of Mobile Stations in Spread Spectrum Systems, TIA TIA-683-D

### **8.2 Informative references**

- [Plan 9] Plan 9 ? An open source operating system, which implements PAK <http://netlib.bell-labs.com/plan9dist/>
- [BMP00] V. Boyko, P. MacKenzie, S. Patel, Provably secure password authentication and key exchange using Diffie-Hellman, Proc. of Eurocrypt 2000.
- [BR93] M. Bellare and P. Rogaway, Random Oracles are Practical: A Paradigm for Designing Efficient Protocols, Proc. Of the fifth annual conference on computer and communications security, 1993.
- [DH76] W. Diffie and M.E. Hellman, New directions in cryptography, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory 22 (1976), 644-654.
- [FIPS180] NIST Federal Information Processing Standards, Publication FIPS 180-3, 2008
- [IEEE1363] IEEE P1363.2, April 24, 2002, The PAK suite: Protocols for Password-Authentication Key Exchange, P. MacKenzie
- [MP05] P. MacKenzie, S. Patel, Hard Bits of the Discrete Log with Applications to Password Authentication, CT-RSA 2005.

[OTASP] Over-the-Air Service Provisioning of Mobile Stations in Spread Spectrum Systems, 3GPP2 C.S0016-C v. 1.0 5, 3GPP2, 10/2004.

[RFC2631] IETF [RFC 2631](#), E. Rescorla, Diffie-Hellman Key Agreement Method, Standards track, 1999

[WLAN]  
X.S0028-0, Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN) Interworking, 3GPP2  
v.1.0, 3GPP2, 4/2005

## Authors' and Contributors' Addresses

Alec Brusilovsky  
Alcatel-Lucent  
Room 9B-226, 1960 Lucent Lane  
Naperville, IL 60566-7217 U S  
Tel: +1 630 979 5490  
Email: [abrusilovsky@alcatel-lucent.com](mailto:abrusilovsky@alcatel-lucent.com)

Igor Faynberg  
Alcatel-Lucent  
Room 2D-144, 600 Mountain Avenue  
Murray Hill, NJ 07974  
Tel: +1 908 582 2626  
Email: [faynberg@alcatel-lucent.com](mailto:faynberg@alcatel-lucent.com)

Sarvar Patel  
Google, Inc.  
76 Ninth Avenue  
New York, NY 10011  
Tel: +1 212 565 5907  
Email: [sarvar@google.com](mailto:sarvar@google.com)

Zachary Zeltsan  
Alcatel-Lucent  
Room 2D-150, 600 Mountain Avenue  
Murray Hill, NJ 07974  
Tel: +1 908 582 2359  
Email: [zeltsan@alcatel-lucent.com](mailto:zeltsan@alcatel-lucent.com)

## 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](mailto:ietf-ipr@ietf.org).