Workgroup: QUIC

Internet-Draft: draft-ietf-quic-v2-10

Published: 15 December 2022

Intended Status: Standards Track

Expires: 18 June 2023

Authors: M. Duke

Google LLC

# **QUIC Version 2**

### **Abstract**

This document specifies QUIC version 2, which is identical to QUIC version 1 except for some trivial details. Its purpose is to combat various ossification vectors and exercise the version negotiation framework. It also serves as a template for the minimum changes in any future version of QUIC.

Note that "version 2" is an informal name for this proposal that indicates it is the second standards-track QUIC version. The protocol specified here uses a version number other than 2 in the wire image, in order to minimize ossification risk.

## **About This Document**

This note is to be removed before publishing as an RFC.

The latest revision of this draft can be found at <a href="https://guicwg.org/quic-v2/draft-ietf-quic-v2.html">https://guicwg.org/quic-v2/draft-ietf-quic-v2.html</a>. Status information for this document may be found at <a href="https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-quic-v2/">https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-quic-v2/</a>.

Discussion of this document takes place on the QUIC Working Group mailing list (<a href="mailto:quic@ietf.org">mailto:quic@ietf.org</a>), which is archived at <a href="https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/browse/quic/">https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/browse/quic/</a>. Subscribe at <a href="https://www.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/quic/">https://www.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/quic/</a>.

Source for this draft and an issue tracker can be found at <a href="https://github.com/quicwg/quic-v2">https://github.com/quicwg/quic-v2</a>.

## 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 <a href="https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/">https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/</a>.

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 18 June 2023.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2022 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

(<a href="https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info">https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info</a>) 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 Revised BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Revised BSD License.

### Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Conventions
- 3. Differences with QUIC Version 1
  - 3.1. Version Field
  - 3.2. Long Header Packet Types
  - 3.3. Cryptography changes
    - 3.3.1. Initial Salt
    - 3.3.2. HKDF Labels
    - 3.3.3. Retry Integrity Tag
- <u>4</u>. <u>Version Negotiation Considerations</u>
  - 4.1. Compatible Negotiation Requirements
- 5. TLS Resumption and NEW\_TOKEN Tokens
- Ossification Considerations
- 7. Applicability
- 8. <u>Security Considerations</u>
- 9. IANA Considerations
- <u>10</u> References
  - 10.1. Normative References
  - <u>10.2</u>. <u>Informative References</u>

Appendix A. Sample Packet Protection

- A.1. Keys
- A.2. Client Initial
- A.3. Server Initial
- A.4. Retry
- A.5. ChaCha20-Poly1305 Short Header Packet

Appendix B. Acknowledgments Appendix C. Changelog C.1. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-09 C.2. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-08 C.3. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-07 C.4. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-06 C.5. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-05 C.6. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-04 C.7. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-03 C.8. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-02 C.9. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-01 C.10. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-00 C.11. since draft-duke-quic-v2-02 C.12. since draft-duke-quic-v2-01 C.13. since draft-duke-quic-v2-00 Author's Address

#### 1. Introduction

QUIC version 1[QUIC] has numerous extension points, including the version number that occupies the second through fifth bytes of every long header (see [QUIC-INVARIANTS]). If experimental versions are rare, and QUIC version 1 constitutes the vast majority of QUIC traffic, there is the potential for middleboxes to ossify on the version bytes always being 0x00000001.

In QUIC version 1, Initial packets are encrypted with the version-specific salt as described in <u>Section 5.2</u> of [QUIC-TLS]. Protecting Initial packets in this way allows observers to inspect their contents, which includes the TLS Client Hello or Server Hello messages. Again, there is the potential for middleboxes to ossify on the version 1 key derivation and packet formats.

Finally, [QUIC-VN] provides two mechanisms for endpoints to negotiate the QUIC version to use. The "incompatible" version negotiation method can support switching from any QUIC version to any other version with full generality, at the cost of an additional round-trip at the start of the connection. "Compatible" version negotiation eliminates the round-trip penalty but levies some restrictions on how much the two versions can differ semantically.

QUIC version 2 is meant to mitigate ossification concerns and exercise the version negotiation mechanisms. The changes provide an example of the minimum set of changes necessary to specify a new QUIC version. However, note that the choice of the version number on the wire is randomly chosen instead of "2", and the two bits that identify each long header packet type are different from version 1; both of these properties are meant to combat ossification and are not strictly required of a new QUIC version.

Any endpoint that supports two versions needs to implement version negotiation to protect against downgrade attacks.

## 2. Conventions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

# 3. Differences with QUIC Version 1

Except for a few differences, QUIC version 2 endpoints **MUST** implement the QUIC version 1 specification as described in [QUIC], [QUIC-TLS], and [QUIC-RECOVERY]. The remainder of this section lists the differences.

### 3.1. Version Field

The Version field of long headers is 0x6b3343cf. This was generated by taking the first four bytes of the sha256sum of "QUICv2 version number".

**RFC Editor's Note:** Please remove the sentence below prior to publication of a final version of this document.

This version number will not change in subsequent versions of this draft, unless there is a behavior change that breaks compatibility.

## 3.2. Long Header Packet Types

All version 2 long header packet types are different. The Type field values are:

\*Initial: 0b01

\*0-RTT: 0b10

\*Handshake: 0b11

\*Retry: 0b00

# 3.3. Cryptography changes

The values below were chosen randomly.

### 3.3.1. Initial Salt

The salt used to derive Initial keys in <u>Section 5.2</u> of [QUIC-TLS] changes to:

initial salt = 0x0dede3def700a6db819381be6e269dcbf9bd2ed9

This is the first 20 bytes of the sha256sum of "QUICv2 salt".

## 3.3.2. HKDF Labels

**RFC Editor's Note:** Please ensure that the strings in quotes are not split up in a line break in this section.

The labels used in [QUIC-TLS] to derive packet protection keys (Section 5.1), header protection keys (Section 5.4), Retry Integrity Tag keys (Section 5.8), and key updates (Section 6.1) change from "quic key" to "quicv2 key", from "quic iv" to "quicv2 iv", from "quic hp" to "quicv2 hp", and from "quic ku" to "quicv2 ku", to meet the guidance for new versions in Section 9.6 of that document.

## 3.3.3. Retry Integrity Tag

The key and nonce used for the Retry Integrity Tag ( $\underline{\text{Section } 5.8}$  of  $\underline{[\text{QUIC-TLS}]}$ ) change to:

secret =

0xc4dd2484d681aefa4ff4d69c2c20299984a765a5d3c31982f38fc74162155e9f key = 0x8fb4b01b56ac48e260fbcbcead7ccc92 nonce = 0xd86969bc2d7c6d9990efb04a

The secret is the sha256sum of "QUICv2 retry secret". The key and nonce are derived from this secret with the labels "quicv2 key" and "quicv2 iv", respectively.

## 4. Version Negotiation Considerations

QUIC version 2 is not intended to deprecate version 1. Endpoints that support version 2 might continue support for version 1 to maximize compatibility with other endpoints. In particular, HTTP clients often use Alt-Svc [RFC7838] to discover QUIC support. As this mechanism does not currently distinguish between QUIC versions, HTTP servers SHOULD support multiple versions to reduce the probability of incompatibility and the cost associated with QUIC version negotiation or TCP fallback. For example, an origin advertising support for "h3" in Alt-Svc should support QUIC version 1 as it was the original QUIC version used by HTTP/3, and therefore some clients will only support that version.

Any QUIC endpoint that supports QUIC version 2 **MUST** send, process, and validate the version\_information transport parameter specified in [QUIC-VN] to prevent version downgrade attacks.

Note that version 2 meets the [QUIC-VN] definition of a compatible version with version 1, and version 1 is compatible with version 2. Therefore, servers can use compatible negotiation to switch a connection between the two versions. Endpoints that support both versions **SHOULD** support compatible version negotiation to avoid a round trip.

### 4.1. Compatible Negotiation Requirements

Compatible version negotiation between versions 1 and 2 follow the same requirements in either direction. This section uses the terms "original version" and "negotiated version" from [QUIC-VN].

If the server sends a Retry packet, it **MUST** use the original version. The client ignores Retry packets using other versions. The client **MUST NOT** use a different version in the subsequent Initial packet that contains the Retry token. The server **MAY** encode the QUIC version in its Retry token to validate that the client did not switch versions, and drop the packet if it switched, to enforce client compliance.

QUIC version 2 uses the same transport parameters to authenticate the Retry as QUIC version 1. After switching to a negotiated version after a Retry, the server MUST include the relevant transport parameters to validate that the server sent the Retry and the connection IDs used in the exchange, as described in <a href="Section 7.3">Section 7.3</a> of <a href="QUIC">[QUIC]</a>.

The server cannot send CRYPTO frames until it has processed the client's transport parameters. The server **MUST** send all CRYPTO frames using the negotiated version.

The client learns the negotiated version by observing the first long header Version field that differs from the original version. If the client receives a CRYPTO frame from the server in the original version, that indicates that the negotiated version is equal to the original version.

Before the server is able to process transport parameters from the client, it might need to respond to Initial packets from the client. For these packets, the server uses the original version.

Once the client has learned the negotiated version, it **SHOULD** send subsequent Initial packets using that version. The server **MUST NOT** discard its original version Initial receive keys until it

successfully processes a Handshake packet with the negotiated version.

Both endpoints **MUST** send Handshake and 1-RTT packets using the negotiated version. An endpoint **MUST** drop packets using any other version. Endpoints have no need to generate the keying material that would allow them to decrypt or authenticate such packets.

The client **MUST NOT** send 0-RTT packets using the negotiated version, even after processing a packet of that version from the server. Servers can accept 0-RTT and then process 0-RTT packets from the original version.

# 5. TLS Resumption and NEW\_TOKEN Tokens

TLS session tickets and NEW\_TOKEN tokens are specific to the QUIC version of the connection that provided them. Clients MUST NOT use a session ticket or token from a QUIC version 1 connection to initiate a QUIC version 2 connection, or vice versa.

Servers MUST validate the originating version of any session ticket or token and not accept one issued from a different version. A rejected ticket results in falling back to a full TLS handshake, without 0-RTT. A rejected token results in the client address remaining unverified, which limits the amount of data the server can send.

After compatible version negotiation, any resulting session ticket maps to the negotiated version rather than original one.

## 6. Ossification Considerations

QUIC version 2 provides protection against some forms of ossification. Devices that assume that all long headers will encode version 1, or that the version 1 Initial key derivation formula will remain version-invariant, will not correctly process version 2 packets.

However, many middleboxes, such as firewalls, focus on the first packet in a connection, which will often remain in the version 1 format due to the considerations above.

Clients interested in combating middlebox ossification can initiate a connection using version 2 if they are either reasonably certain the server supports it, or are willing to suffer a round-trip penalty if they are incorrect. In particular, a server that issues a session ticket for version 2 indicates an intent to maintain version 2 support while the ticket remains valid, even if support cannot be guaranteed.

## 7. Applicability

This version of QUIC provides no change from QUIC version 1 relating to the capabilities available to applications. Therefore, all Application Layer Protocol Negotiation (ALPN) ([RFC7301]) codepoints specified to operate over QUIC version 1 can also operate over this version of QUIC. In particular, both the "h3" [HTTP/3] and "doq" [RFC9250] ALPNs can operate over QUIC version 2.

Unless otherwise stated, all QUIC extensions defined to work with version 1 also work with version 2.

## 8. Security Considerations

QUIC version 2 introduces no changes to the security or privacy properties of QUIC version 1.

The mandatory version negotiation mechanism guards against downgrade attacks, but downgrades have no security implications, as the version properties are identical.

Support for QUIC version 2 can help an observer to fingerprint both client and server devices.

## 9. IANA Considerations

This document requests that IANA add the following entry to the QUIC version registry maintained at <a href="https://www.iana.org/assignments/quic/quic.xhtml#quic-versions">https://www.iana.org/assignments/quic/quic.xhtml#quic-versions</a>>.

Value: 0x6b3343cf
Status: permanent

Specification: This Document
Change Controller: IETF

Contact: QUIC WG
Value: 0x709a50c4
Status: provisional

Specification: This Document
Change Controller: IETF

Contact: QUIC WG

Note: QUIC v2 draft codepoint

### 10. References

### 10.1. Normative References

## [QUIC-RECOVERY]

Iyengar, J., Ed. and I. Swett, Ed., "QUIC Loss
Detection and Congestion Control", RFC 9002, D0I
10.17487/RFC9002, May 2021, <a href="https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9002">https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9002</a>.

- [QUIC-TLS] Thomson, M., Ed. and S. Turner, Ed., "Using TLS to Secure QUIC", RFC 9001, DOI 10.17487/RFC9001, May 2021, <a href="https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9001">https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9001</a>.
- [QUIC-VN] Schinazi, D. and E. Rescorla, "Compatible Version Negotiation for QUIC", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-quic-version-negotiation-13, 6 November 2022, <a href="https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-quic-version-negotiation-13">https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-quic-version-negotiation-13</a>.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate
   Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/
   RFC2119, March 1997, <a href="https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2119">https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2119</a>.

### 10.2. Informative References

- [QUIC-INVARIANTS] Thomson, M., "Version-Independent Properties of QUIC", RFC 8999, DOI 10.17487/RFC8999, May 2021, <a href="https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8999">https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8999</a>.
- [RFC7301] Friedl, S., Popov, A., Langley, A., and E. Stephan,
   "Transport Layer Security (TLS) Application-Layer
   Protocol Negotiation Extension", RFC 7301, DOI 10.17487/
   RFC7301, July 2014, <a href="https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7301">https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7301</a>>.
- [RFC9250] Huitema, C., Dickinson, S., and A. Mankin, "DNS over Dedicated QUIC Connections", RFC 9250, DOI 10.17487/ RFC9250, May 2022, <a href="https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9250">https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9250</a>.

## Appendix A. Sample Packet Protection

This section shows examples of packet protection so that implementations can be verified incrementally. Samples of Initial packets from both client and server plus a Retry packet are defined. These packets use an 8-byte client-chosen Destination Connection ID of 0x8394c8f03e515708. Some intermediate values are included. All values are shown in hexadecimal.

# A.1. Keys

The labels generated during the execution of the HKDF-Expand-Label function (that is, HkdfLabel.label) and part of the value given to the HKDF-Expand function in order to produce its output are:

client in: 00200f746c73313320636c69656e7420696e00 server in: 00200f746c7331332073657276657220696e00 quicv2 key: 001010746c73313320717569637632206b657900 quicv2 iv: 000c0f746c7331332071756963763220697600 quicv2 hp: 00100f746c7331332071756963763220687000 The initial secret is common: initial\_secret = HKDF-Extract(initial\_salt, cid) = 2062e8b3cd8d52092614b8071d0aa1fb 7c2e3ac193f78b280e72d8f5751f6aba The secrets for protecting client packets are: client\_initial\_secret = HKDF-Expand-Label(initial\_secret, "client in", "", 32) = 14ec9d6eb9fd7af83bf5a668bc17a7e2 83766aade7ecd0891f70f9ff7f4bf47b key = HKDF-Expand-Label(client\_initial\_secret, "quicv2 key", "", 16) = 8b1a0bc121284290a29e0971b5cd045d iv = HKDF-Expand-Label(client\_initial\_secret, "quicv2 iv", "", 12)

The secrets for protecting server packets are:

hp = HKDF-Expand-Label(client\_initial\_secret, "quicv2 hp", "", 16)

= 91f73e2351d8fa91660e909f

= 45b95e15235d6f45a6b19cbcb0294ba9

### A.2. Client Initial

The client sends an Initial packet. The unprotected payload of this packet contains the following CRYPTO frame, plus enough PADDING frames to make a 1162-byte payload:

060040f1010000ed0303ebf8fa56f12939b9584a3896472ec40bb863cfd3e86804fe3a47f06a2b69484c00000413011302010000c000000010000e000000b6578616d706c652e636f6dff01000100000a00080006001d0017001800100007000504616c706e000500050100000000003300260024001d00209370b2c9caa47fbabaf4559fedba753de171fa71f50f1ce15d43e994ec74d748002b00033020304000d0010000e0403050306030203080408050806002d00020101001c00024001003900320408ffffffffffffffffff55048000fffff07048000ffff0801100104800075300901100f088394c8f03e51570806048000ffff

The unprotected header indicates a length of 1182 bytes: the 4-byte packet number, 1162 bytes of frames, and the 16-byte authentication tag. The header includes the connection ID and a packet number of 2:

d36b3343cf088394c8f03e5157080000449e00000002

Protecting the payload produces output that is sampled for header protection. Because the header uses a 4-byte packet number encoding, the first 16 bytes of the protected payload is sampled and then applied to the header as follows:

a18b2faa745b6fe189cf772a9f84cbfc

d76b3343cf088394c8f03e5157080000 449ea0c95e82ffe67b6abcdb4298b485 dd04de806071bf03dceebfa162e75d6c 96058bdbfb127cdfcbf903388e99ad04 9f9a3dd4425ae4d0992cfff18ecf0fdb 5a842d09747052f17ac2053d21f57c5d 250f2c4f0e0202b70785b7946e992e58 a59ac52dea6774d4f03b55545243cf1a 12834e3f249a78d395e0d18f4d766004 f1a2674802a747eaa901c3f10cda5500 cb9122faa9f1df66c392079a1b40f0de 1c6054196a11cbea40afb6ef5253cd68 18f6625efce3b6def6ba7e4b37a40f77 32e093daa7d52190935b8da58976ff33 12ae50b187c1433c0f028edcc4c2838b 6a9bfc226ca4b4530e7a4ccee1bfa2a3 d396ae5a3fb512384b2fdd851f784a65 e03f2c4fbe11a53c7777c023462239dd 6f7521a3f6c7d5dd3ec9b3f233773d4b 46d23cc375eb198c63301c21801f6520 bcfb7966fc49b393f0061d974a2706df 8c4a9449f11d7f3d2dcbb90c6b877045 636e7c0c0fe4eb0f697545460c806910 d2c355f1d253bc9d2452aaa549e27a1f ac7cf4ed77f322e8fa894b6a83810a34 b361901751a6f5eb65a0326e07de7c12 16ccce2d0193f958bb3850a833f7ae43 2b65bc5a53975c155aa4bcb4f7b2c4e5 4df16efaf6ddea94e2c50b4cd1dfe060 17e0e9d02900cffe1935e0491d77ffb4 fdf85290fdd893d577b1131a610ef6a5 c32b2ee0293617a37cbb08b847741c3b 8017c25ca9052ca1079d8b78aebd4787 6d330a30f6a8c6d61dd1ab5589329de7 14d19d61370f8149748c72f132f0fc99 f34d766c6938597040d8f9e2bb522ff9 9c63a344d6a2ae8aa8e51b7b90a4a806 105fcbca31506c446151adfeceb51b91 abfe43960977c87471cf9ad4074d30e1 0d6a7f03c63bd5d4317f68ff325ba3bd 80bf4dc8b52a0ba031758022eb025cdd 770b44d6d6cf0670f4e990b22347a7db 848265e3e5eb72dfe8299ad7481a4083 22cac55786e52f633b2fb6b614eaed18 d703dd84045a274ae8bfa73379661388 d6991fe39b0d93debb41700b41f90a15 c4d526250235ddcd6776fc77bc97e7a4 17ebcb31600d01e57f32162a8560cacc 7e27a096d37a1a86952ec71bd89a3e9a 30a2a26162984d7740f81193e8238e61 f6b5b984d4d3dfa033c1bb7e4f0037fe bf406d91c0dccf32acf423cfa1e70710 10d3f270121b493ce85054ef58bada42 310138fe081adb04e2bd901f2f13458b 3d6758158197107c14ebb193230cd115 7380aa79cae1374a7c1e5bbcb80ee23e 06ebfde206bfb0fcbc0edc4ebec30966 1bdd908d532eb0c6adc38b7ca7331dce 8dfce39ab71e7c32d318d136b6100671 a1ae6a6600e3899f31f0eed19e3417d1 34b90c9058f8632c798d4490da498730 7cba922d61c39805d072b589bd52fdf1 e86215c2d54e6670e07383a27bbffb5a ddf47d66aa85a0c6f9f32e59d85a44dd 5d3b22dc2be80919b490437ae4f36a0a e55edf1d0b5cb4e9a3ecabee93dfc6e3 8d209d0fa6536d27a5d6fbb17641cde2 7525d61093f1b28072d111b2b4ae5f89 d5974ee12e5cf7d5da4d6a31123041f3 3e61407e76cffcdcfd7e19ba58cf4b53 6f4c4938ae79324dc402894b44faf8af bab35282ab659d13c93f70412e85cb19 9a37ddec600545473cfb5a05e08d0b20 9973b2172b4d21fb69745a262ccde96b

### A.3. Server Initial

The server sends the following payload in response, including an ACK frame, a CRYPTO frame, and no PADDING frames:

020000000000600405a020000560303ee fce7f7b37ba1d1632e96677825ddf739 88cfc79825df566dc5430b9a045a1200 130100002e00330024001d00209d3c94 0d89690b84d08a60993c144eca684d10 81287c834d5311bcf32bb9da1a002b00 020304

The header from the server includes a new connection ID and a 2-byte packet number encoding for a packet number of 1:

d16b3343cf0008f067a5502a4262b50040750001

As a result, after protection, the header protection sample is taken starting from the third protected byte:

sample = 6f05d8a4398c47089698baeea26b91eb

mask = 4dd92e91ea

header = dc6b3343cf0008f067a5502a4262b5004075d92f

The final protected packet is then:

dc6b3343cf0008f067a5502a4262b500 4075d92faaf16f05d8a4398c47089698 baeea26b91eb761d9b89237bbf872630 17915358230035f7fd3945d88965cf17 f9af6e16886c61bfc703106fbaf3cb4c fa52382dd16a393e42757507698075b2 c984c707f0a0812d8cd5a6881eaf21ce da98f4bd23f6fe1a3e2c43edd9ce7ca8 4bed8521e2e140

#### A.4. Retry

This shows a Retry packet that might be sent in response to the Initial packet in <u>Appendix A.2</u>. The integrity check includes the client-chosen connection ID value of 0x8394c8f03e515708, but that value is not included in the final Retry packet:

cf6b3343cf0008f067a5502a4262b574 6f6b656ec8646ce8bfe33952d9555436 65dcc7b6

# A.5. ChaCha20-Poly1305 Short Header Packet

This example shows some of the steps required to protect a packet with a short header. This example uses AEAD\_CHACHA20\_POLY1305.

In this example, TLS produces an application write secret from which a server uses HKDF-Expand-Label to produce four values: a key, an IV, a header protection key, and the secret that will be used after keys are updated (this last value is not used further in this example).

### secret

= 9ac312a7f877468ebe69422748ad00a1 5443f18203a07d6060f688f30f21632b

key = HKDF-Expand-Label(secret, "quicv2 key", "", 32)

= 3bfcddd72bcf02541d7fa0dd1f5f9eee a817e09a6963a0e6c7df0f9a1bab90f2

iv = HKDF-Expand-Label(secret, "quicv2 iv", "", 12)

= a6b5bc6ab7dafce30ffff5dd

hp = HKDF-Expand-Label(secret, "quicv2 hp", "", 32)

= d659760d2ba434a226fd37b35c69e2da 8211d10c4f12538787d65645d5d1b8e2

ku = HKDF-Expand-Label(secret, "quicv2 ku", "", 32)

= c69374c49e3d2a9466fa689e49d476db 5d0dfbc87d32ceeaa6343fd0ae4c7d88

The following shows the steps involved in protecting a minimal packet with an empty Destination Connection ID. This packet contains a single PING frame (that is, a payload of just 0x01) and has a packet number of 654360564. In this example, using a packet number of length 3 (that is, 49140 is encoded) avoids having to pad the payload of the packet; PADDING frames would be needed if the packet number is encoded on fewer bytes.

pn = 654360564 (decimal)

nonce = a6b5bc6ab7dafce328ff4a29

unprotected header = 4200bff4

payload plaintext = 01

payload ciphertext = 0ae7b6b932bc27d786f4bc2bb20f2162ba

The resulting ciphertext is the minimum size possible. One byte is skipped to produce the sample for header protection.

sample = e7b6b932bc27d786f4bc2bb20f2162ba

mask = 97580e32bf header = 5558b1c6

The protected packet is the smallest possible packet size of 21 bytes.

packet = 5558b1c60ae7b6b932bc27d786f4bc2bb20f2162ba

# Appendix B. Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Christian Huitema, Lucas Pardue, Kyle Rose, Anthony Rossi, Zahed Sarker, David Schinazi, Tatsuhiro Tsujikawa, and Martin Thomson for their helpful suggestions.

# Appendix C. Changelog

**RFC Editor's Note:** Please remove this section prior to publication of a final version of this document.

# C.1. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-09

\*Added note for provisional IANA registration

# C.2. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-08

\*Updated IANA considerations in accordance with new constants

# C.3. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-07

\*Generated new constants and test vectors

# C.4. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-06

\*Clients **MUST NOT** use TLS resumption tickets across versions

\*Servers **SHOULD** support multiple versions

\*Clients **SHOULD** check path support for QUIC independently by version

\*Minor editorial changes

# C.5. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-05

\*Servers **MUST** use the negotiated version in Initials with CRYPTO frames.

\*Clarified when clients "learn" the negotiated version as required in the VN draft.

\*Comments from SECDIR review.

## C.6. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-04

\*Clarified 0-RTT handling

\*Editorial comments from Zahed Sarker.

## C.7. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-03

\*a v2 session ticket is an indication of v2 support

\*a v1-only extension is theoretically possible

\*editorial fixes

# C.8. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-02

\*Editorial comments from Lucas Pardue

## C.9. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-01

\*Ban use of NEW\_TOKEN tokens across versions

\*version-info transport parameter required for all v2 endpoints

\*Explicitly list known ALPN compatibility

# C.10. since draft-ietf-quic-v2-00

\*Expanded requirements for compatible version negotiation

\*Added test vectors

\*Greased the packet type codepoints

\*Random version number

\*Clarified requirement to use QUIC-VN

\*Banned use of resumption tokens across versions

# C.11. since draft-duke-quic-v2-02

\*Converted to adopted draft

\*Deleted references to OUIC improvements

\*Clarified status of QUIC extensions

# C.12. since draft-duke-quic-v2-01

\*Made the final version number TBD.

\*Added ALPN considerations

# C.13. since draft-duke-quic-v2-00

\*Added provisional versions for interop

\*Change the v1 Retry Tag secret

\*Change labels to create full key separation

#### Author's Address

Martin Duke

Google LLC

Email: <a href="martin.h.duke@gmail.com">martin.h.duke@gmail.com</a>