

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Informational  
Expires: 10 December 2020

M. Vucinic  
Inria  
G. Selander  
J. Mattsson  
Ericsson AB  
D. Garcia  
Odin Solutions S.L.  
8 June 2020

Requirements for a Lightweight AKE for OSCORE  
draft-ietf-lake-reqs-04

## Abstract

This document compiles the requirements for a lightweight authenticated key exchange protocol for OSCORE. This draft has completed a working group last call (WGLC) in the LAKE working group. Post-WGLC, the requirements are considered sufficiently stable for the working group to proceed with its work. It is not currently planned to publish this draft as an RFC.

## Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

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."

This Internet-Draft will expire on 10 December 2020.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 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 (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights

and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the [Trust Legal Provisions](#) and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Problem description . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.1.</a>	AKE for OSCORE . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.2.</a>	Credentials . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">2.2.1.</a>	Initial Focus . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">2.3.</a>	Mutual Authentication . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">2.4.</a>	Confidentiality . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">2.5.</a>	Cryptographic Agility and Negotiation Integrity . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">2.6.</a>	Cryptographic Strength . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">2.7.</a>	Identity Protection . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">2.8.</a>	Auxiliary Data . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">2.9.</a>	Extensibility . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">2.10.</a>	Availability . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">2.11.</a>	Lightweight . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">2.11.1.</a>	LoRaWAN . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">2.11.2.</a>	6TiSCH . . . . .	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">2.11.3.</a>	NB-IoT . . . . .	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">2.11.4.</a>	Discussion and Summary of Benchmarks . . . . .	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">2.11.5.</a>	AKE frequency . . . . .	<a href="#">20</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">21</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Privacy Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">21</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">21</a>
	Acknowledgments . . . . .	<a href="#">21</a>
	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">21</a>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">25</a>

## [1.](#) Introduction

OSCORE [[RFC8613](#)] is a lightweight communication security protocol providing end-to-end security on application layer for constrained IoT settings (cf. [[RFC7228](#)]). OSCORE lacks a matching authenticated key exchange protocol (AKE). The intention with the LAKE WG [[LAKE-WG](#)] is to create a simple yet secure AKE for implementation in embedded devices supporting OSCORE.

To ensure that the AKE is efficient for the expected applications of

OSCORE, we list the relevant public specifications of technologies where OSCORE is included:

- \* The IETF 6TiSCH WG charter identifies the need to "secur[e] the join process and mak[e] that fit within the constraints of high latency, low throughput and small frame sizes that characterize IEEE802.15.4 TSCH". OSCORE protects the join protocol as described in 6TiSCH Minimal Security [[I-D.ietf-6tisch-minimal-security](#)].
- \* The IETF LPWAN WG charter identifies the need to improve the transport capabilities of LPWA networks such as NB-IoT and LoRa whose "common traits include ... frame sizes ... [on] the order of tens of bytes transmitted a few times per day at ultra-low speeds". The application of OSCORE is described in [[I-D.ietf-lpwan-coap-static-context-hc](#)].
- \* OMA Specworks LwM2M version 1.1 [[LwM2M](#)] defines bindings to two challenging radio technologies where OSCORE is planned to be deployed: LoRaWAN and NB-IoT.
- \* Open Connectivity Foundation (OCF) plans to use OSCORE for end-to-end security of unicast messages [[OCF](#)].

This document compiles the requirements for the AKE for OSCORE. It summarizes the security requirements that are expected from such an AKE, as well as the main characteristics of the environments where the solution is envisioned to be deployed. The solution will presumably be useful in other scenarios as well since a low security overhead improves the overall performance.

## [2.](#) Problem description

### [2.1.](#) AKE for OSCORE

The rationale for designing this protocol is that OSCORE is lacking a matching AKE. OSCORE was designed for lightweight RESTful operations for example by minimizing the overhead, and applying the protection to the application layer, thereby limiting the data being encrypted

and integrity protected for the other endpoint. Moreover, OSCORE was tailored for use with lightweight primitives that are likely to be implemented in the device, specifically CoAP [[RFC7252](#)], CBOR [[RFC7049](#)] and COSE [[RFC8152](#)]. The same properties should apply to the AKE.

In order to be suitable for OSCORE, at the end of the AKE protocol run the two parties must agree on (see [Section 3.2 of \[RFC8613\]](#)):

- \* A shared secret (OSCORE Master Secret) with Perfect Forward Secrecy (PFS, see [Section 2.4](#)) and a good amount of randomness. (The term "good amount of randomness" is borrowed from [[HKDF](#)] to signify not necessarily uniformly distributed randomness.)
- \* OSCORE Sender IDs of peer endpoints, arbitrarily short.
  - Sender IDs are expected to be unique for a given Master Secret, more precisely the quartet (Master Secret, Master Salt, ID Context, Sender ID) must be unique, see [Section 3.3. of \[RFC8613\]](#).

- \* COSE algorithms to use with OSCORE

COSE provides the crypto primitives for OSCORE. The AKE shall specify how it provides COSE algorithms to OSCORE. It is strongly recommended that COSE is reused by the AKE, for identification of credentials and algorithms, as extension point for new schemes, and to avoid duplicated implementation of crypto wrapper.

The AKE cannot rely on messages being exchanged in both directions after the AKE has completed, because CoAP/OSCORE requests may not have a response [[RFC7967](#)]. Furthermore, there is no assumption of dependence between CoAP client/server and AKE initiator/responder roles, and an OSCORE context may be used with CoAP client and server roles interchanged as is done, for example, in [[LwM2M](#)].

Moreover, the AKE must support transport over CoAP. When transported over CoAP, the AKE must support the traversal of CoAP intermediaries,

as required by the 6TiSCH network formation setting [[I-D.ietf-6tisch-minimal-security](#)].

Since the AKE messages most commonly will be encapsulated in CoAP, the AKE must not duplicate functionality provided by CoAP, or at least not duplicate functionality in such a way that it adds non-negligible extra costs in terms of code size, code maintenance, etc. It is therefore assumed that the AKE is being transported in a protocol that provides reliable transport, that can preserve packet ordering and handle message duplication [[RFC7252](#)], that can perform fragmentation [[RFC7959](#)] and protect against denial of service attacks as provided by the CoAP Echo option [[I-D.ietf-core-echo-request-tag](#)].

The AKE may use other transport than CoAP. In this case the underlying layers must correspondingly handle message loss, reordering, message duplication, fragmentation, and denial of service protection.

## [2.2.](#) Credentials

IoT deployments differ from one another in terms of what credentials can be supported. Currently many systems use pre-shared keys (PSKs) provisioned out of band, for various reasons. PSKs are sometimes used in a first deployment because of their perceived simplicity. The use of PSKs allows for protection of communication without major additional security processing, and also enables the use of symmetric crypto algorithms only, reducing the implementation and computational effort in the endpoints.

However, PSK-based provisioning has inherent weaknesses. There has been reports of massive breaches of PSK provisioning systems [[massive-breach](#)], and as many systems use PSKs without Perfect Forward Secrecy (PFS, see [Section 2.4](#)) they are vulnerable to passive pervasive monitoring. The security of these systems can be improved by adding PFS through an AKE authenticated by the provisioned PSK.

Shared keys can alternatively be established in the endpoints using an AKE protocol authenticated with asymmetric public keys instead of symmetric secret keys. Raw public keys (RPK) can be provisioned with the same scheme as PSKs, which allows for a more relaxed trust model

since RPKs need not be secret. The corresponding private keys are assumed to be provisioned to the party being authenticated beforehand (e.g. in factory or generated on-board).

As a third option, by using a public key infrastructure and running an asymmetric key AKE with public key certificates instead of RPKs, key provisioning can be omitted, leading to a more automated ("zero-touch") bootstrapping procedure. The root CA keys are assumed to be provisioned beforehand. Public key certificates are important for several IoT settings, e.g., facility management with a large number of devices from many different manufacturers.

These steps provide an example of a migration path in limited scoped steps from simple to more robust security bootstrapping and provisioning schemes where each step improves the overall security and/or simplicity of deployment of the IoT system, although not all steps are necessarily feasible for the most constrained settings.

In order to allow for these different schemes, the AKE must support PSK- (shared between two nodes), RPK- and certificate-based authentication. These are also the schemes for which CoAP is designed (see [Section 9 of \[RFC7252\]](#)).

Multiple public key authentication credential types may need to be supported for RPK and certificate-based authentication. In case of a Diffie-Hellman key exchange both the use of signature based public keys (for compatibility with existing ecosystem) and static DH public keys (for reduced message size) is expected.

To further minimize the bandwidth consumption it is required to support transporting certificates and raw public keys by reference rather than by value. Considering the wide variety of deployments, the AKE must support different schemes for transporting and identifying credentials. While there are many existing mechanisms for doing so, ranging from PSK to raw public key by reference to x5chain of in-band certificates [[I-D.ietf-cose-x509](#)], what is appropriate for a given deployment will depend on the nature of that deployment. In order to provide a clear initial effort,

[Section 2.2.1](#) lists a set of credential types of immediate relevance; the mechanism for selecting credential scheme is presumed to enable future extensibility if needed.

The use of RPKs may be appropriate for the authentication of the AKE initiator but not for the AKE responder. The AKE must support different credentials for authentication in different directions of the AKE run, e.g. certificate-based authentication for the initiating endpoint and RPK-based authentication for the responding endpoint.

Assuming that both signature public keys and static DH public keys are in use, then also the case of mixed credentials need to be supported with one endpoint using a static DH public key and the other using a signature public key. The AKE shall support negotiation of public key credential mix and that both initiator and responder can verify the variant that was executed.

#### [2.2.1](#). Initial Focus

As illustrated above, the setting is much more diverse in terms of credentials and trust anchors than that of the unconstrained web. In order to deliver a timely result, there is a need to initially focus on what is considered most important at the time of writing: RPK (by reference and value) and certificate by reference. Information about validity of a certificate may be omitted from the AKE if available over unconstrained links. The case of transporting certificate validation information over the AKE may be specified in the initial phase if there is a lightweight solution that matches existing standards and tools.

A subsequent extension beyond the initial focus may be inevitable to maintain a homogenous deployment without having to implement a mix of AKE protocols, for example, to support the migration path described

above. The AKE needs to make clear the scope of cases analysed in the initial phase, and that a new analysis is required for additional cases.

The initial scope as described in this subsection does not cover all credentials as detailed previously in [Section 2.2](#): an AKE which is extensible but does not include PSK ECDHE would be conformant with the requirements for the initial scope. A solution to the

requirements for the initial scope is intended to be a deliverable of the LAKE WG.

### [2.3.](#) Mutual Authentication

The AKE must provide mutual authentication during the protocol run. At the end of the AKE protocol, each endpoint shall have freshly authenticated the other's credential. In particular, both endpoints must agree on a fresh session identifier, and the roles and credentials of both endpoints.

Since the protocol may be initiated by different endpoints, it shall not be necessary to determine beforehand which endpoint takes the role of initiator of the AKE.

The mutual authentication guarantees of the AKE shall at least guarantee the following properties:

- \* The AKE shall provide Key Compromise Impersonation (KCI) resistance [[KCI](#)].
- \* The AKE shall protect against identity misbinding attacks [[Misbinding](#)]. Note that the identity may be directly related to a public key such as for example the public key itself, a hash of the public key, or data unrelated to a key.
- \* The AKE shall protect against reflection attacks, but need not protect against attacks when more than two parties legitimately share keys (cf. the Selfie attack on TLS 1.3 [[Selfie](#)]) as that setting is out of scope.

Replayed messages shall not affect the security of an AKE session.

As often is the case, it is expected that an AKE fulfilling these goals would have at least three flights of messages (with each flight potentially consisting of one or more messages, depending on the AKE design and the mapping to OSCORE).

### [2.4.](#) Confidentiality



The shared secret established by the AKE must be known only to the two authenticated endpoints.

A passive network attacker should never learn any session keys, even if it knows both endpoints' long-term keys.

An active attacker who has compromised the initiator or responder credential shall still not be able to compute past session keys (Perfect Forward Secrecy, PFS). These properties can be achieved, e.g., with an ephemeral Diffie-Hellman key exchange.

PFS may also be achieved in other ways, for example, using hash-based ratcheting or with a nonce exchange followed by appropriately derived new session keys provided that state can be kept in the form of a session counter. Note that OSCORE specifies a method for session key update involving a nonce exchange (see [Appendix B in \[RFC8613\]](#)).

The AKE shall provide a mechanism to use the output of one handshake to optimize future handshakes, e.g., by generating keying material which can be used to authenticate a future handshake, thus avoiding the need for public key authentication in that handshake.

The AKE should give recommendations for frequency of re-keying potentially dependent on the amount of data.

To mitigate against bad random number generators the AKE shall provide recommendations for randomness, for example to use [\[I-D.irtf-cfrg-randomness-improvements\]](#).

## [2.5.](#) Cryptographic Agility and Negotiation Integrity

Motivated by long deployment lifetimes, the AKE is required to support cryptographic agility, including the modularity of COSE crypto algorithms and negotiation of preferred crypto algorithms for OSCORE and the AKE.

- \* The protocol shall support both pre-shared key and asymmetric key authentication. PAKE, post-quantum and "hybrid" (simultaneously more than one) key exchange is out of scope, but may be supported in a later version.
- \* The protocol shall allow negotiation of elliptic curves for Diffie-Hellman operations and signature-based authentication.

- \* The AKE shall support negotiation of all COSE algorithms [[IANA-COSE-Algorithms](#)] to be used in OSCORE. The AKE shall support negotiation of algorithms used in the AKE. It is strongly recommended that the AKE algorithms are identified using [[IANA-COSE-Algorithms](#)] to reduce unnecessary complexity of a combined OSCORE/AKE implementation.
- \* A successful negotiation shall result in the most preferred algorithms of one of the parties which are supported by the other.
- \* The AKE may choose different sets of symmetric crypto algorithms (AEAD, MAC, etc.) for AKE and for OSCORE. In particular, the length of the MAC for the AKE may be required to be larger than for OSCORE.

The AKE negotiation must provide strong integrity guarantees against active attackers. At the end of the AKE protocol, both endpoints must agree on both the crypto algorithms that were proposed and those that were chosen. In particular, the protocol must protect against downgrade attacks.

## [2.6.](#) Cryptographic Strength

The AKE shall establish a key with a target security level [[keylength](#)] of  $\geq 127$  bits. This level was chosen to include X25519 and applies to the strength of authentication, the established keys, and the protection for the negotiation of all cryptographic parameters.

## [2.7.](#) Identity Protection

In general, it is necessary to transport identities as part of the AKE run in order to provide authentication of an entity not identified beforehand. In the case of constrained devices, the identity may contain sensitive information on the manufacturer of the device, the batch, default firmware version, etc. Protecting identifying information from passive and active attacks is important from a privacy point of view, but needs to be balanced with the other requirements, including security and lightwightness.

In the case of public key identities, the AKE is required to protect the identity of one of the peers against active attackers and the identity of the other peer against passive attackers. SIGMA-I and SIGMA-R differ in this respect. SIGMA-I protects the identity of the initiator against active attackers and the identity of the responder against passive attackers. For SIGMA-R, the properties of the roles

are reversed at the cost of an additional flight.

It is not required to protect the PSK identifier, and it may thus be sent in the first flight. Protection of PSK identifier in many cases require extra flights of the AKE.

Other identifying information may also need to be transported in plain text, for example, identifiers to allow correlation between AKE messages, and cipher suites. Mechanisms to encrypt these kind of parameters, such as using pre-configured public keys typically adds to message overhead.

## [2.8.](#) Auxiliary Data

In order to reduce round trips and the number of flights, and in some cases also streamline processing, certain security features may be integrated into the AKE by transporting "auxiliary data" together with the AKE messages.

One example is the transport of third-party authorization information from initiator to responder or vice versa. Such a scheme could enable the party receiving the authorization information to make a decision about whether the party being authenticated is also authorized before the protocol is completed, and if not then discontinue the protocol before it is complete, thereby saving time, message processing and data transmission.

Another, orthogonal, example is the embedding of a certificate enrolment request or a newly issued certificate in the AKE.

For example, the auxiliary data in the first two messages of the AKE may transport authorization related information as in [\[I-D.selander-ace-ake-authz\]](#) followed by a Certificate Signing Request (CSR) in the auxiliary data of the third message.

The AKE must support the transport of such auxiliary data together with the protocol messages. The auxiliary data field must not contain data that violates the AKE security properties. The auxiliary data field must only be used with security analysed protocols.

The auxiliary data may contain privacy sensitive information. The auxiliary data must be protected to the same level as AKE data in the same flight. For example, for a SIGMA-I AKE it is expected that the 3 flights will provide the following protection of the auxiliary data:

- \* Auxiliary data in the first flight is unprotected

- \* Auxiliary data in the second flight is confidentiality protected against passive attackers and integrity protected against active attackers
- \* Auxiliary data in the third flight is confidentiality and integrity protected against active attackers

## [2.9.](#) Extensibility

It is desirable that the AKE supports some kind of extensibility, in particular, the ability to later include new AKE modes such as PAKE support. COSE provides an extension mechanism for new algorithms, new certificate formats, ways to identify credentials, etc.

The main objective with this work is to create a simple yet secure AKE. The AKE should avoid having multiple ways to express the same thing. If the underlying encodings offered by CBOR offer multiple possibility the AKE should be strongly opinionated, and clearly specify which one will be used.

While remaining extensible, the AKE should avoid optional mechanisms which introduce code paths that are less well tested.

The AKE should avoid mechanisms where an initiator takes a guess at the policy, and when it receives a negative response, must guess, based upon what it has tried, what to do next.

## [2.10.](#) Availability

Jamming attacks, cutting cables etc. leading to long term loss of availability may not be possible to mitigate, but an attacker temporarily injecting messages or disturbing the communication shall

not have a similar impact.

### 2.11. Lightweight

We target an AKE which is efficiently deployable in 6TiSCH multi-hop networks, LoRaWAN networks and NB-IoT networks. (For an overview of low-power wide area networks, see e.g. [[RFC8376](#)].) The desire is to optimize the AKE to be 'as lightweight as reasonably achievable' in these environments, where 'lightweight' refers to:

- \* resource consumption, measured by bytes on the wire, wall-clock time and number of round trips to complete, or power consumption
- \* the amount of new code required on end systems which already have an OSCORE stack

These properties need to be considered in the context of the use of an existing CoAP/OSCORE stack in the targeted networks and technologies. Some properties are difficult to evaluate for a given protocol, for example, because they depend on the radio conditions or other simultaneous network traffic. Additionally, these properties are not independent. Therefore the properties listed here should be taken as input for identifying plausible protocol metrics that can be more easily measured and compared between protocols.

Per 'bytes on the wire', it is desirable for the AKE messages to fit into the MTU size of these protocols; and if not possible, within as few frames as possible, since using multiple MTUs can have significant costs in terms of time and power. Note that the MTU size depends on radio technology and its characteristics, including data rates, number of hops, etc. Example benchmarks are given further down in this section.

Per 'time', it is desirable for the AKE message exchange(s) to complete in a reasonable amount of time, both for a single uncongested exchange and when multiple exchanges are running in an interleaved fashion, like e.g. in a "network formation" setting when multiple devices connect for the first time. This latency may not be a linear function depending on congestion and the specific radio technology used. As these are relatively low data rate networks, the latency contribution due to computation is in general not expected to

be dominant.

Per 'round-trips', it is desirable that the number of completed request/response message exchanges required before the initiating endpoint can start sending protected traffic data is as small as possible, since this reduces completion time. See [Section 2.11.4](#) for a discussion about the trade-off between message size and number of flights.

Per 'power', it is desirable for the transmission of AKE messages and crypto to draw as little power as possible. The best mechanism for doing so differs across radio technologies. For example, NB-IoT uses licensed spectrum and thus can transmit at higher power to improve coverage, making the transmitted byte count relatively more important than for other radio technologies. In other cases, the radio transmitter will be active for a full MTU frame regardless of how much of the frame is occupied by message content, which makes the byte count less sensitive for the power consumption as long as it fits into the MTU frame. The power consumption thus increases with AKE message size and the largest impact is on average under poor network conditions. Note that listening for messages to receive can in many cases be a large contribution to the power consumption, for which there are separate techniques to handle, e.g., time slots, discontinuous reception, etc. but this is not considered in scope of the AKE design.

Per 'new code', it is desirable to introduce as little new code as

possible onto OSCORE-enabled devices to support this new AKE. These devices have on the order of 10s of kB of memory and 100 kB of storage on which an embedded OS; a COAP stack; CORE and AKE libraries; and target applications would run. It is expected that the majority of this space is available for actual application logic, as opposed to the support libraries. In a typical OSCORE implementation COSE encrypt and signature structures will be available, as will support for COSE algorithms relevant for IoT enabling the same algorithms as is used for OSCORE (e.g. COSE algorithm no. 10 = CCM\* used by 6TiSCH). The use of those, or CBOR or CoAP, would not add to the footprint.

While the large variety of settings and capabilities of the devices and networks makes it challenging to produce exact values of some these dimensions, there are some key benchmarks that are tractable for security protocol engineering and which have a significant impact.

#### [2.11.1.](#) LoRaWAN

Reflecting deployment reality as of now, we focus on the European regulation as described in ETSI EN 300 220. LoRaWAN employs unlicensed radio frequency bands in the 868 MHz ISM band. For LoRaWAN the most relevant metric is the Time-on-Air, which determines the period before the next communication can occur and also which can be used as an indicator to calculate energy consumption. LoRaWAN is legally required to use a duty cycle with values such as 0.1%, 1% and 10% depending on the sub-band that is being used, leading to a payload split into fragments interleaved with unavailable times. For Europe, the duty cycle is 1% (or smaller). Although there are

exceptions from the use of duty cycle, the use of an AKE for providing end-to-end security on application layer needs to comply with the duty cycle.

#### [2.11.1.1.](#) Bytes on the wire

LoRaWAN has a variable MTU depending on the Spreading Factor (SF). The higher the spreading factor, the higher distances can be achieved and/or better reception. If the coverage and distance allows it, with SF7 - corresponding to higher data rates - the maximum payload is 222 bytes. For a SF12 - and low data rates - the maximum payload

is 51 bytes on data link layer.

The size and number of packets impact the Time-on-Air (ToA). The benchmark used here is based on SF12 and a packet size of 51 bytes [LoRaWAN]. The use of larger packets depend on good radio conditions which are not always present. Some libraries/providers only support 51-bytes packet size.

#### 2.11.1.2. Time

The time it takes to send a message over the air in LoRaWAN can be calculated as a function of the different parameters of the communication. These are the Spreading Factor (SF), the message size, the channel, bandwidth, coding rate, etc. An important feature of LoRaWAN is the duty cycle limitation due to the use of the ISM band. The duty cycle is evaluated in a 1-hour sliding window. It is legal for a device to transmit a burst for a total of up to 36 seconds ToA on a 1%-duty-cycle sub-band, but the device must then pause the transmission for the rest of the hour [lorawan-duty-cycle]. In order to avoid extreme waiting times, the AKE needs to complete before the duty cycle limit is exhausted, also taking into account potential retransmissions and allowing additional air time for lower level MAC frames and application data. As a challenging but realistic example we assume each message is retransmitted 2 times and allow a factor 2-3 for additional air time. With these assumptions it is required with a ToA of 4-6 seconds for the uplink protocol messages to ensure that the entire burst stays within the 36 seconds duty cycle.

It should be noted that some libraries/providers enforce the duty cycle limitation through a stop-and-wait operation, which restricts the number of bytes to the size of the packets after which duty cycle waiting times are incurred.

#### 2.11.1.3. Round trips and number of flights

Considering the duty cycle of LoRaWAN and associated unavailable times, the round trips and number of LoRaWAN packets needs to be



reduced as much as possible.

#### [2.11.1.4.](#) Power

The calculation of the power consumption in LoRaWAN is dependent on several factors, such as the spreading factor used and the length of the messages sent, both having a clear dependency with the time it takes to transmit the messages. The communication model (inherent to the different LoRaWAN classes of devices) also has an impact on the energy consumption, but overall the Time-on-Air is an important indication of the performance.

#### [2.11.2.](#) 6TiSCH

6TiSCH operates in the 2.4 GHz unlicensed frequency band and uses hybrid Time Division/Frequency Division multiple access (TDMA/FDMA). Nodes in a 6TiSCH network form a mesh. The basic unit of communication, a cell, is uniquely defined by its time and frequency offset in the communication schedule matrix. Cells can be assigned for communication to a pair of nodes in the mesh and so be collision-free, or shared by multiple nodes, for example during network formation. In case of shared cells, some collision-resolution scheme such as slotted-Aloha is employed. Nodes exchange frames which are at most 127-bytes long, including the link-layer headers. To preserve energy, the schedule is typically computed in such a way that nodes switch on their radio below 1% of the time ("radio duty cycle"). A 6TiSCH mesh can be several hops deep. In typical use cases considered by the 6TiSCH working group, a network that is 2-4 hops deep is commonplace; a network which is more than 8 hops deep is not common.

##### [2.11.2.1.](#) Bytes on the wire

Increasing the number of bytes on the wire in a protocol message has an important effect on the 6TiSCH network in case the fragmentation is triggered. More fragments contribute to congestion of shared cells (and concomitant error rates) in a non-linear way.

The available size for key exchange messages depends on the topology of the network, whether the message is traveling uplink or downlink, and other stack parameters. A key performance indicator for a 6TiSCH network is "network formation", i.e. the time it takes from switching on all devices, until the last device has executed the AKE and securely joined. As a benchmark, given the size limit on the frames

and taking into account the different headers (including link-layer security), for a 6TiSCH network 5 hops deep, the maximum CoAP payload size to avoid fragmentation is 47/45 bytes (uplink/downlink) [[AKE-for-6TiSCH](#)].

#### [2.11.2.2.](#) Time

Given the slotted nature of 6TiSCH, the number of bytes in a frame has insignificant impact on latency, but the number of frames has. The relevant metric for studying AKE is the network formation time, which implies parallel AKE runs among nodes that are attempting to join the network. Network formation time directly affects the time installers need to spend on site at deployment time.

#### [2.11.2.3.](#) Round trips and number of flights

Given the mesh nature of the 6TiSCH network, and given that each message may travel several hops before reaching its destination, it is highly desirable to minimize the number of round trips to reduce latency.

#### [2.11.2.4.](#) Power

From the power consumption point of view, it is more favorable to send a small number of large frames than a larger number of short frames.

#### [2.11.3.](#) NB-IoT

3GPP has specified Narrow-Band IoT (NB-IoT) for support of infrequent data transmission via user plane and via control plane. NB-IoT is built on cellular licensed spectrum at low data rates for the purpose of supporting:

- \* operations in extreme coverage conditions,
- \* device battery life of 10 years or more,
- \* low device complexity and cost, and
- \* a high system capacity of millions of connected devices per square kilometer.

NB-IoT achieves these design objectives by:

- \* Reduced baseband processing, memory and RF enabling low complexity device implementation.

- \* A lightweight setup minimizing control signaling overhead to optimize power consumption.
- \* In-band, guard-band, and stand-alone deployment enabling efficient use of spectrum and network infrastructure.

#### [2.11.3.1.](#) Bytes on the wire

The number of bytes on the wire in a protocol message has a direct effect on the performance for NB-IoT. In contrast to LoRaWAN and 6TiSCH, the NB-IoT radio bearers are not characterized by a fixed sized PDU. Concatenation, segmentation and reassembly are part of the service provided by the NB-IoT radio layer. As a consequence, the byte count has a measurable impact on time and energy consumption for running the AKE.

#### [2.11.3.2.](#) Time

Coverage significantly impacts the available bit rate and thereby the time for transmitting a message, and there is also a difference between downlink and uplink transmissions (see [Section 2.11.3.4](#)). The transmission time for a message is essentially proportional to the number of bytes.

Since NB-IoT is operating in licensed spectrum, in contrast to e.g. LoRaWAN, the packets on the radio interface can be transmitted back-to-back, so the time before sending OSCORE protected data is limited by the number of round trips/flights of the AKE and not by a duty cycle.

#### [2.11.3.3.](#) Round trips and number of flights

As indicated in [Section 2.11.3.2](#), the number of frames and round-trips is one limiting factor for protocol completion time.

#### [2.11.3.4.](#) Power

Since NB-IoT is operating in licensed spectrum, the device is allowed to transmit at a relatively high power, which has a large impact on the energy consumption.

The benchmark for NB-IoT energy consumption is based on the same computational model as was used by 3GPP in the design of this radio layer [[NB-IoT-battery-life-evaluation](#)]. The device power consumption is assumed to be 500mW for transmission and 80mW for reception. Power consumption for "light sleep" (~ 3mW) and "deep sleep" (~ 0.015mW) are negligible in comparison. The bitrates (uplink/downlink) are assumed to be 28/170 kbps for good coverage and 0,37/2,5 kbps for bad coverage.

The results [[AKE-for-NB-IoT](#)] show a high per-byte energy consumption for uplink transmissions, in particular in bad coverage. Given that the application decides about the device being initiator or responder in the AKE, the protocol cannot be tailored for a particular message being uplink or downlink. To perform well in both kind of applications the overall number of bytes of the protocol needs to be as low as possible.

#### [2.11.4.](#) Discussion and Summary of Benchmarks

The difference between uplink and downlink performance must not be engineered into the protocol since it cannot be assumed that a particular protocol message will be sent uplink or downlink.

For NB-IoT the byte count on the wire has a measurable impact on time and energy consumption for running the AKE, so the number of bytes in the messages needs to be as low as possible.

While "as small protocol messages as possible" does not lend itself to a sharp boundary threshold, "as few flights as possible" does and is relevant in all settings above.

The penalty is high for not fitting into the frame sizes of 6TiSCH and LoRaWAN networks. Fragmentation is not defined within these

technologies so requires fragmentation scheme on a higher layer in the stack. With fragmentation increases the number of frames per message, each with its associated overhead in terms of power consumption and latency. Additionally the probability for errors increases, which leads to retransmissions of frames or entire messages that in turn increases the power consumption and latency.

There are trade-offs between "few messages" and "few frames"; if overhead is spread out over more messages such that each message fits into a particular frame this may reduce the overall power consumption. For example, with a frame size of 50 bytes, two 60-byte messages will fragment into 4 frames in total, whereas three 40-byte messages fragment into 3 frames in total. On the other hand, a smaller message has less probability to collide with other messages and incur retransmission.

While it may be possible to engineer such a solution for a particular radio technology and AKE protocol, optimizing for a specific scenario may not be optimal for other settings. It is expected that specific scenarios are evaluated in the design phase to ensure that the AKE is fit for purpose. But in order to start the design work some general criteria for the AKE performance need to be formulated that takes into account the differences in the expected deployments.

There are benefits in terms of fewer flights/round trips for NB-IoT ([Section 2.11.3.3](#)) and 6TiSCH ([Section 2.11.2.3](#)). An AKE protocol complying with the requirements of this memo is expected to have at least 3 messages. With a 3-message AKE, the initiator is able to derive the OSCORE security context after receiving message 2, rendering the AKE essentially one round trip before traffic data can be exchanged, which is ideal.

If the AKE has 3 messages then optimal performance for 6TiSCH is when each message fits into as few frames as possible, ideally 1 frame per message.

For LoRaWAN, optimal performance is determined by the duty cycle which puts a limit to ToA or, for certain libraries/providers, the number of packets (see [Section 2.11.1.2](#)). If the AKE has 3 messages and each message fits into a 51 byte packet then this is optimal for the latter case. The same assumption incurs a ToA for uplink messages in the interval of 4-6 seconds at SF12 both for a device-

initiated and infrastructure-initiated AKE, which complies with the challenging example stated in [Section 2.11.1.2](#).

One avenue to good performance is therefore to target message sizes which avoids fragmentation or with as few fragments as possible. For the LoRaWAN benchmark, the limit for fragmentation is 51 bytes at link layer. For the 6TiSCH benchmark, messages less than or equal to 45 bytes at CoAP payload layer need not be fragmented.

For the initial focus cases ([Section 2.2.1](#)), i.e. RPK (by reference and value) and certificate by reference, it is required that the AKE shall perform optimally with respect to the available criteria for the radio technologies.

To determine with certainty what are the minimal number of fragments for an AKE under different assumptions requires to design and analyse the AKE, which is clearly beyond the requirements phase. However, by means of an example we have reason to believe that an AKE with 3 messages can be designed to support RPK by reference in 3 fragments. Thus the ideal number of fragments is expected for RPK by reference.

While such performance may not be possible for the other initial focus cases, it is expected that if one of the peers send RPK by value or certificate by reference, then one additional fragment is sufficient, thus in total a maximum of 5 fragments. Alternatively, for the LoRaWAN challenge ([Section 2.11.1.2](#)), it is expected that the duty cycle for a burst can be complied with for RPK by value and certificate by reference, assuming that each message only needs to be retransmitted at most once (i.e. good AKE performance for RPK by value and certificate by reference in not too poor radio environments).

#### [2.11.5](#). AKE frequency

One question that has been asked in the context of lightwightness is: - How often is the AKE executed? While it may be impossible to give a precise answer there are other perspectives to this question.

1. For some use cases, already one execution of the AKE is heavy, for example, because

- \* there are a number of parallel executions of the AKE which loads down the network, such as in a network formation setting, or
  - \* the duty cycle makes the completion time long for even one run of the protocol.
2. If a device reboots it may not be able to recover the security context, e.g. due to lack of persistent storage, and is required to establish a new security context for which an AKE is preferred. Reboot frequency may be difficult to predict in general.
  3. To limit the impact of a key compromise, BSI, NIST and ANSSI and other organizations recommend in other contexts frequent renewal of keys by means of Diffie-Hellman key exchange. This may be a symmetric key authenticated key exchange, where the symmetric key is obtained from a previous asymmetric key based run of the AKE.

To summarize, even if it we are unable to give precise numbers for AKE frequency, a lightweight AKE:

- \* reduces the time for network formation and AKE runs in challenging radio technologies,
- \* allows devices to quickly re-establish security in case of reboots, and

- \* enables support for recommendations of frequent key renewal.

### [3.](#) Security Considerations

This document compiles the requirements for an AKE and provides some related security considerations.

The AKE must provide the security properties expected of IETF protocols, e.g., providing mutual authentication, confidentiality, and negotiation integrity as is further detailed in the requirements.

### [4.](#) Privacy Considerations

In the privacy properties for the AKE, the transport over CoAP needs to be considered.

## 5. IANA Considerations

None.

## Acknowledgments

The authors want to thank Richard Barnes, Dominique Barthel, Karthik Bhargavan, Stephen Farrell, Ivaylo Petrov, Eric Rescorla, Michael Richardson, Jesus Sanchez-Gomez, Claes Tidestav, Hannes Tschofenig and Christopher Wood for providing valuable input.

## Informative References

- [RFC7228] Bormann, C., Ersue, M., and A. Keranen, "Terminology for Constrained-Node Networks", [RFC 7228](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7228, May 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7228>>.
- [RFC7049] Bormann, C. and P. Hoffman, "Concise Binary Object Representation (CBOR)", [RFC 7049](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7049, October 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7049>>.
- [RFC7252] Shelby, Z., Hartke, K., and C. Bormann, "The Constrained Application Protocol (CoAP)", [RFC 7252](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7252, June 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7252>>.
- [RFC7959] Bormann, C. and Z. Shelby, Ed., "Block-Wise Transfers in the Constrained Application Protocol (CoAP)", [RFC 7959](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7959, August 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7959>>.

- [RFC7967] Bhattacharyya, A., Bandyopadhyay, S., Pal, A., and T. Bose, "Constrained Application Protocol (CoAP) Option for No Server Response", [RFC 7967](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7967, August 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7967>>.



- [RFC8152] Schaad, J., "CBOR Object Signing and Encryption (COSE)", [RFC 8152](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8152, July 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8152>>.
- [RFC8613] Selander, G., Mattsson, J., Palombini, F., and L. Seitz, "Object Security for Constrained RESTful Environments (OSCORE)", [RFC 8613](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8613, July 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8613>>.
- [RFC8376] Farrell, S., Ed., "Low-Power Wide Area Network (LPWAN) Overview", [RFC 8376](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8376, May 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8376>>.
- [I-D.ietf-6tisch-minimal-security]  
Vucinic, M., Simon, J., Pister, K., and M. Richardson, "Constrained Join Protocol (CoJP) for 6TiSCH", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, [draft-ietf-6tisch-minimal-security-15](#), 10 December 2019, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-6tisch-minimal-security-15.txt>>.
- [I-D.ietf-lpwan-coap-static-context-hc]  
Minaburo, A., Toutain, L., and R. Andreasen, "LPWAN Static Context Header Compression (SCHC) for CoAP", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, [draft-ietf-lpwan-coap-static-context-hc-14](#), 26 May 2020, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-lpwan-coap-static-context-hc-14.txt>>.
- [I-D.ietf-cose-x509]  
Schaad, J., "CBOR Object Signing and Encryption (COSE): Header parameters for carrying and referencing X.509 certificates", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, [draft-ietf-cose-x509-06](#), 9 March 2020, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-cose-x509-06.txt>>.
- [I-D.ietf-core-echo-request-tag]  
Amsuess, C., Mattsson, J., and G. Selander, "CoAP: Echo, Request-Tag, and Token Processing", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, [draft-ietf-core-echo-request-tag-09](#), 9 March 2020, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-core-echo-request-tag-09.txt>>.

[I-D.irtf-cfrg-randomness-improvements]

Cremers, C., Garratt, L., Smyshlyaev, S., Sullivan, N., and C. Wood, "Randomness Improvements for Security Protocols", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, [draft-irtf-cfrg-randomness-improvements-12](http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-irtf-cfrg-randomness-improvements-12), 5 May 2020, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-irtf-cfrg-randomness-improvements-12.txt>>.

[I-D.selander-ace-ake-authz]

Selander, G., Mattsson, J., Vucinic, M., Richardson, M., and A. Schellenbaum, "Lightweight Authorization for Authenticated Key Exchange.", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, [draft-selander-ace-ake-authz-01](http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-selander-ace-ake-authz-01), 9 March 2020, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-selander-ace-ake-authz-01.txt>>.

[AKE-for-6TiSCH]

"AKE for 6TiSCH", March 2019, <<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1wLoIexMLG3U9iY05hzGzKjkvi-VDndQBbYRNsmULh-k>>.

[AKE-for-NB-IoT]

"AKE for NB-IoT", March 2019, <<https://github.com/EricssonResearch/EDHOC/blob/master/docs/NB%20IoT%20power%20consumption.xlsx>>.

[NB-IoT-battery-life-evaluation]

"On mMTC, NB-IoT and eMTC battery life evaluation", January 2017, <[http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg\\_ran/WG1\\_RL1/TSGR1\\_AH/NR\\_AH\\_1701/Docs//R1-1701044.zip](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_AH/NR_AH_1701/Docs//R1-1701044.zip)>.

[HKDF]

Krawczyk, H., "Cryptographic Extraction and Key Derivation: The HKDF Scheme", May 2010, <<https://eprint.iacr.org/2010/264.pdf>>.

[IANA-COSE-Algorithms]

"COSE Algorithms", March 2020, <<https://www.iana.org/assignments/cose/cose.xhtml#algorithms>>.

[LwM2M]

"OMA SpecWorks LwM2M", August 2018, <[https://www.openmobilealliance.org/release/LightweightM2M/V1\\_1-20180710-A/OMA-TS-LightweightM2M\\_Transport-V1\\_1-20180710-A.pdf](https://www.openmobilealliance.org/release/LightweightM2M/V1_1-20180710-A/OMA-TS-LightweightM2M_Transport-V1_1-20180710-A.pdf)>.

Internet-Draft

Reqs-LAKE-for-OSCORE

June 2020

- [OCF] "OSCORE:OCF Status and Comments", March 2020,  
<<https://github.com/t2trg/2020-03-ocf-oscore/blob/master/slides/Joint-OCF-IRTF-T2TRG-call-on-OSCORE-20200318.pdf>>.
- [LoRaWAN] "LoRaWAN Regional Parameters v1.0.2rB", February 2017,  
<<https://loro-alliance.org/resource-hub/lorawantm-regional-parameters-v102rb>>.
- [LAKE-WG] "LAKE WG", March 2020,  
<<https://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/lake/about/>>.
- [KCI] Hlauschek, C., Gruber, M., Fankhauser, F., and C. Schanes,  
"Prying open Pandoras box:KCI attacks against TLS", August 2015,  
<<https://www.usenix.org/system/files/conference/woot15/woot15-paper-hlauschek.pdf>>.
- [Misbinding]  
Sethi, M., Peltonen, A., and T. Aura, "Misbinding Attacks on Secure Device Pairing and Bootstrapping", Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security , May 2019,  
<<https://arxiv.org/pdf/1902.07550.pdf>>.
- [Selfie] Drucker, N. and S. Gueron, "Selfie:Reflections on TLS 1.3 with PSK", March 2019, <<https://eprint.iacr.org/2019/347>>.
- [massive-breach]  
"Sim card database hack gave US and UK spies access to billions of cellphones", February 2015,  
<<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/feb/19/nsa-gchq-sim-card-billions-cellphones-hacking>>.
- [lorawan-duty-cycle]  
Saelens, M., Hoebeke, J., Shahid, A., and E. De Poorter, "Impact of EU duty cycle and transmission power limitations for sub-GHz LPWAN SRDs an overview and future challenges. EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking. 2019. 10.1186/s13638-019-1502-5.", 2019,  
<<https://jwcn-urasipjournals.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/>

[s13638-019-1502-5](#)>.

Vucinic, et al.

Expires 10 December 2020

[Page 24]

---

Internet-Draft

Reqs-LAKE-for-OSCORE

June 2020

[keylength]

Lenstra, A., "Key Lengths:Contribution to The Handbook of Information Security", 2018,  
<<https://infoscience.epfl.ch/record/164539/files/NPDF-32.pdf>>.

#### Authors' Addresses

Malisa Vucinic  
Inria

Email: [malisa.vucinic@inria.fr](mailto:malisa.vucinic@inria.fr)

Goeran Selander  
Ericsson AB

Email: [goran.selander@ericsson.com](mailto:goran.selander@ericsson.com)

John Preuss Mattsson  
Ericsson AB

Email: [john.mattsson@ericsson.com](mailto:john.mattsson@ericsson.com)

Dan Garcia-Carrillo  
Odin Solutions S.L.

Email: [dgarcia@odins.es](mailto:dgarcia@odins.es)

