Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Updates: draft-ietf-tls-certificate-compression (if approved)
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: September 10, 2020

J. Preuss Mattsson
G. Selander
Ericsson AB
S. Raza
J. Hoeglund
RISE AB
M. Furuhed
Nexus Group

March 09, 2020

CBOR Certificate Algorithm for TLS Certificate Compression
draft-mattsson-tls-cbor-cert-compress-00

Abstract

Certificate chains often take up the majority of the bytes transmitted in TLS handshakes. Large handshakes can cause problems, particularly in constrained IoT environments. RFC 7925 defines a TLS certificate profile for constrained IoT. General purpose compression algorithms can in many cases not compress RFC 7925 profiled certificates at all. By using the fact that the certificates are profiled, the CBOR certificate compression algorithms can in many cases compress RFC 7925 profiled certificates with over 50%. This document specifies the CBOR certificate compression algorithm for use with TLS Certificate Compression in TLS 1.3 and DTLS 1.3.

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 September 10, 2020.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

As stated in [I-D.ietf-tls-certificate-compression], certificate chains often take up the majority of the bytes transmitted in TLS handshakes. Large handshakes negatively affect latency, but can also result in that the handshake cannot be completed [I-D.ietf-emu-eaptlscert]. To reduce handshake sizes, [I-D.ietf-tls-certificate-compression] specifies a mechanism for lossless compression of certificate chains in TLS 1.3 and defines three general purpose compression algorithms.

Large handshakes is particularly a problem for constrained IoT environments [RFC7228] [I-D.ietf-lake-reqs]. [RFC7925] defines a X.509 certificate profile for constrained IoT. The certificate profile in [RFC7925] is defined for TLS/DTLS 1.2 but works also for

TLS 1.3 [RFC8446] and DTLS 1.3 [I-D.ietf-tls-dtls13]. For such profiled IoT certificates, general purpose compression algorithms such as zlib are however far from optimal and the general purpose compression algorithms defined in [I-D.ietf-tls-certificate-compression] can in many cases not compress

RFC 7925 profiled certificates at all. [I-D.raza-ace-cbor-certificates] therefore defines a CBOR [RFC7049] compression algorithm for RFC 7925 profiled certificates. The algorithm works for all RFC 7925 profiled certificates and provide significant reduction in size, in many cases over 50%.

This document specifies the CBOR certificate compression algorithm [I-D.raza-ace-cbor-certificates] for use with TLS Certificate Compression [I-D.ietf-tls-certificate-compression]. TLS Certificate Compression can be used in TLS 1.3 [RFC8446] and DTLS 1.3 [I-D.ietf-tls-dtls13].

2. Notational 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. CBOR Certificate Compression Algorithm

This document specifies the CBOR certificate compression algorithm specified in Section 3 of [I-D.raza-ace-cbor-certificates] for use with TLS Certificate Compression [I-D.ietf-tls-certificate-compression]. TLS Certificate Compression can be used in TLS 1.3 [RFC8446] and DTLS 1.3 [I-D.ietf-tls-dtls13].

The CBOR Certificate compression algorithm takes as input a RFC 7925 profiled X.509 certificate. The output of the CBOR compression algorithm is a CBOR Sequence [I-D.ietf-cbor-sequence], i.e. a sequence of concatenated CBOR encoded CBOR data items [RFC7049]. Compressed certificates can be analysed with any CBOR decoder and be validated against the CDDL specification defined in Section 3 of [I-D.raza-ace-cbor-certificates].

The algorithm works for all RFC 7925 profiled certificates and provide significant reduction in size, in many cases over 50%. An example compression of a RFC 7925 profiled certificate is given below.

	RFC 7925	zlib	CBOR Certificate
Certificate Size	314	295	136

4. Security Considerations

The security considerations in [I-D.ietf-tls-certificate-compression] and [I-D.raza-ace-cbor-certificates] apply.

5. IANA Considerations

This document registers the following entry in the "Certificate Compression Algorithm IDs" registry under the "Transport Layer Security (TLS) Extensions" heading.

Algorithm Number	Description	Reference
TBD	CBOR Certificate	[this document]

6. References

6.1. Normative References

[I-D.ietf-cbor-sequence]
Bormann, C., "Concise Binary Object Representation (CBOR) Sequences", draft-ietf-cbor-sequence-02 (work in progress), September 2019.

[I-D.ietf-tls-certificate-compression]
Ghedini, A. and V. Vasiliev, "TLS Certificate Compression", draft-ietf-tls-certificate-compression-10

(work in progress), January 2020.

[I-D.ietf-tls-dtls13]
Rescorla, E., Tschofenig, H., and N. Modadugu, "The Datagram Transport Layer Security (DTLS) Protocol Version 1.3", draft-ietf-tls-dtls13-34 (work in progress), November 2019.

[I-D.raza-ace-cbor-certificates]
Raza, S., Hoglund, J., Selander, G., Mattsson, J., and M. Furuhed, "CBOR Profile of X.509 Certificates", draft-raza-ace-cbor-certificates-03 (work in progress), December 2019.

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>.

[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>.

[RFC7925] Tschofenig, H., Ed. and T. Fossati, "Transport Layer Security (TLS) / Datagram Transport Layer Security (DTLS) Profiles for the Internet of Things", RFC 7925, DOI 10.17487/RFC7925, July 2016, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7925>.

[RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>.

[RFC8446] Rescorla, E., "The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.3", RFC 8446, DOI 10.17487/RFC8446, August 2018, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8446>.

6.2. Informative References

[I-D.ietf-emu-eaptlscert]
Sethi, M., Mattsson, J., and S. Turner, "Handling Large

Certificates and Long Certificate Chains in TLS-based EAP Methods", draft-ietf-emu-eaptlscert-01 (work in progress), March 2020.

[I-D.ietf-lake-reqs]
Vucinic, M., Selander, G., Mattsson, J., and D. Garcia-Carillo, "Requirements for a Lightweight AKE for OSCORE", draft-ietf-lake-reqs-01 (work in progress), February 2020.

[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>.

Acknowledgments

The authors want to thank TBD for their valuable comments and feedback.

Authors' Addresses

John Preuss Mattsson
Ericsson AB

Email: john.mattsson@ericsson.com

Goeran Selander
Ericsson AB

Email: goran.selander@ericsson.com

Shahid Raza
RISE AB

Email: shahid.raza@ri.se

Joel Hoeglund
RISE AB

Email: joel.hoglund@ri.se

Martin Furuhed
Nexus Group

Email: martin.furuhed@nexusgroup.com