Network Working Group Ed. Internet-Draft Consulting Intended status: Standards Track Hummen Expires: July 21, 2016 Aachen

R. Moskowitz,

HTT

R.

COMSYS, RWTH

January 20,

2016

# HIP Diet EXchange (DEX) draft-moskowitz-hip-dex-05

## Abstract

This document specifies the Host Identity Protocol Diet EXchange (HIP

DEX), a variant of the Host Identity Protocol Version 2 (HIPv2). The

HIP DEX protocol design aims at reducing the overhead of the employed

cryptographic primitives by omitting public-key signatures and hash functions. In doing so, the main goal is to still deliver similar security properties to HIPv2.

The HIP DEX protocol is primarily designed for computation or memory-

constrained sensor/actuator devices. Like HIPv2, it is expected to be used together with a suitable security protocol such as the Encapsulated Security Payload (ESP) for the protection of upper

layer

protocol data. In addition, HIP DEX can also be used as a keying mechanism for security primitives at the MAC layer, e.g., for IEEE 802.15.4 networks.

## 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 http://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 July 21, 2016.

Moskowitz & Hummen 1]

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016

January

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2016 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to <u>BCP 78</u> and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<u>http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info</u>) 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

2	<u>1</u> .	Int	oduction	·	·	• •	·	·	• •	·	·	·	·	·
<u>3</u>	1	<u>.1</u> .	The HIP Diet EXchange (DEX)											
± 5	1	<u>.2</u> .	Memo Structure									•		
≚ 6	<u>2</u> .	Ter	s and Definitions											
<u> </u>	2	<u>.1</u> .	Requirements Terminology									•		
<u> </u>	2	<u>. 2</u> .	Notation											
<u>ĕ</u> 6	2	<u>.3</u> .	Definitions					•						•
⊻ 7	<u>3</u> .	Hos	Identity (HI) and its Structur	е				•						•
- 8	3	<u>.1</u> .	Host Identity Tag (HIT)								•	•		
≚ 8	3	<u>.2</u> .	Generating a HIT from an HI								•	•		
<u>م</u>	<u>4</u> .	Pro	ocol Overview											•
<u>م</u>	4	<u>.1</u> .	Creating a HIP Association											•
≚ 10		4.1	<u>1</u> . HIP Puzzle Mechanism											
11		4.1	2. HIP State Machine											
15		4.1	<u>3</u> . HIP DEX Security Associatio	ns										
16		4.1	4. User Data Considerations .											
<u>16</u>	<u>5</u> .	Рас	et Formats				•				•	•		

16	5.1. Payload Format	·
10	5.2. HIP Parameters	
10	<u>5.2.1</u> . DH_GROUP_LIST	
<u>17</u>	<u>5.2.2</u> . HIP_CIPHER	
<u>17</u>	<u>5.2.3</u> . HOST_ID	
<u>17</u>	5.2.4. HIT_SUITE_LIST	
<u>18</u>	5.2.5. ENCRYPTED_KEY	
<u>18</u>	5.3. HIP Packets	
<u>19</u>	5.3.1. I1 - the HIP Initiator Packet	
<u>20</u>	5.3.2. R1 - the HTP Responder Packet	
<u>21</u>	5.3.3. I2 - the Second HIP Initiator Packet	•
<u>23</u>	5.3.3. 12 - the Second HIP Decemendar Decket	•
<u>24</u>		•
<u>25</u>	<u>5.4</u> . ICMP Messages	•
<u>25</u>	<u>6</u> . Packet Processing	•

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016 [Page 2]

25	<u>6.1</u> .	Solving the Puzzle	
23	<u>6.2</u> .	HIP_MAC Calculation and Verification	
26	6.2	<u>.1</u> . CMAC Calculation	
<u>26</u>	<u>6.3</u> .	HIP DEX KEYMAT Generation	
27	6.4.	Initiation of a HIP Diet EXchange	
<u>30</u>	6.5.	Processing Incoming I1 Packets	
<u>30</u>	6.6.	Processing Incoming R1 Packets	
<u>31</u>	6.7.	Processing Incoming I2 Packets	
<u>34</u>	6.8	Processing Incoming R2 Packets	
<u>37</u>	<u>0.0</u> .	Drococcing Incoming NOTICY Deckets	
<u>38</u>	<u>0.9</u> .		• •
<u>39</u>	<u>6.10</u> .	Processing UPDATE, CLOSE, and CLOSE_ACK Packets	• •
<u>39</u>	<u>6.11</u> .	Handling State Loss	• •
	<u>7</u> . HIP	Policies	• •
39			
<u>39</u> 39	<u>8</u> . Sec	urity Considerations	
39 39 39 40	8. Sec	urity Considerations	· ·
39 39 40 41	8. Sec 9. IAN 10. Ack	urity Considerations	· ·
39       39       40       41       41	8.         Sec           9.         IAN           10.         Ack           11.         Cha	urity Considerations	· · ·
39         39         40         41         41         41	<ul> <li>8. Sec</li> <li>9. IAN</li> <li>10. Ack</li> <li>11. Cha</li> <li>11.1.</li> </ul>	urity Considerations	· · · · ·
39         39         40         41         41         41         41	<ul> <li>8. Sec</li> <li>9. IAN.</li> <li>10. Ack</li> <li>11. Cha</li> <li>11.1.</li> <li>11.2.</li> </ul>	urity Considerations	· · · · · · ·
39           39           40           41           41           41           41           41           41	<ul> <li>8. Sec</li> <li>9. IAN.</li> <li>10. Ack</li> <li>11. Cha</li> <li>11.1.</li> <li>11.2.</li> <li>11.3.</li> </ul>	<pre>urity Considerations</pre>	· · · · · · · · ·
39           39           40           41           41           41           41           41           41           41	<ul> <li>8. Sec</li> <li>9. IAN</li> <li>10. Ack</li> <li>11. Cha</li> <li>11.1.</li> <li>11.2.</li> <li>11.3.</li> <li>11.4.</li> </ul>	<pre>urity Considerations</pre>	· · · · · · · · ·
39           39           40           41           41           41           41           41           42	<ul> <li>8. Sec</li> <li>9. IAN</li> <li>10. Ack</li> <li>11. Cha</li> <li>11.1.</li> <li>11.2.</li> <li>11.3.</li> <li>11.4.</li> <li>11.5.</li> </ul>	<pre>urity Considerations</pre>	· · · · · · · · · · ·
39           39           40           41           41           41           41           41           42           42           42           42	<ul> <li>8. Sec</li> <li>9. IAN</li> <li>10. Ack</li> <li>11. Cha</li> <li>11.1.</li> <li>11.2.</li> <li>11.3.</li> <li>11.4.</li> <li>11.5.</li> <li>11.6</li> </ul>	<pre>urity Considerations</pre>	· · · · · · · · · · ·
39           39           40           41           41           41           41           41           41           42           42           43	<ul> <li>8. Sec</li> <li>9. IAN</li> <li>10. Ack</li> <li>11. Cha</li> <li>11.1.</li> <li>11.2.</li> <li>11.3.</li> <li>11.4.</li> <li>11.5.</li> <li>11.6.</li> </ul>	urity Considerations	· · · · · · · · · · · · ·
39         39         40         41         41         41         41         41         41         42         42         43         43	<ul> <li>8. Sec</li> <li>9. IAN</li> <li>10. Ack</li> <li>11. Cha</li> <li>11.1.</li> <li>11.2.</li> <li>11.3.</li> <li>11.4.</li> <li>11.5.</li> <li>11.6.</li> <li>12. Ref</li> </ul>	urity Considerations	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
39         39         40         41         41         41         41         41         42         42         43         43	<ul> <li>8. Sec</li> <li>9. IAN</li> <li>10. Ack</li> <li>11. Cha</li> <li>11.1.</li> <li>11.2.</li> <li>11.3.</li> <li>11.4.</li> <li>11.5.</li> <li>11.6.</li> <li>12. Ref</li> <li>12.1.</li> </ul>	urity Considerations       .         A Considerations       .         nowledgments       .         ngelog       .         Changes in draft-moskowitz-hip-rg-dex-06       .         Changes in draft-moskowitz-hip-dex-00       .         Changes in draft-moskowitz-hip-dex-01       .         Changes in draft-moskowitz-hip-dex-01       .         Changes in draft-moskowitz-hip-dex-02       .         Changes in draft-moskowitz-hip-dex-03       .         Changes in draft-moskowitz-hip-dex-03       .         Changes in draft-moskowitz-hip-dex-03       .         Normative References       .	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

# 1. Introduction

This document specifies the Host Identity Protocol Diet EXchange (HIP DEX). HIP DEX builds on the Base EXchange (BEX) of the Host Identity Protocol Version 2 (HIPv2) [<u>RFC7401</u>]. HIP DEX preserves the protocol semantics as well as the general packet structure of HIPv2. Hence, it is recommended that [<u>RFC7401</u>] is well-understood before reading this document.

The main differences between HIP BEX and HIP DEX are:

- 1. Minimum collection of cryptographic primitives to reduce the protocol overhead.
  - \* Static Elliptic Curve Diffie-Hellman key pairs for peer authentication and encryption of the session key.

Moskowitz & Hummen	Expires July 21, 2016	[Page
3]		

- \* AES-CTR for symmetric encryption and AES-CMAC for MACing function.
- \* A simple fold function for HIT generation.
- 2. Forfeit of Perfect Forward Secrecy with the dropping of an ephemeral Diffie-Hellman key agreement.
- 3. Forfeit of digital signatures with the removal of a hash function. Reliance on ECDH derived key used in HIP\_MAC to prove ownership of the private key.
- 4. Diffie-Hellman derived key ONLY used to protect the HIP packets. A separate secret exchange within the HIP packets creates the session key(s).
- 5. Optional retransmission strategy tailored to handle the potentially extensive processing time of the employed cryptographic operations on computationally constrained devices.

By eliminating the need for public-key signatures and the ephemeral DH key agreement, HIP DEX reduces the computation, energy, transmission, and memory requirements for public-key cryptography (see [LN08]) in the HIPv2 protocol design. Moreover, by dropping the

cryptographic hash function, HIP DEX affords a more efficient protocol implementation than HIP BEX with respect to the corresponding computation and memory requirements. This makes HIP DEX especially suitable for constrained devices as defined in [RFC7228].

This document focuses on the protocol specifications related to differences between HIP BEX and HIP DEX. Where differences are not called out explicitly, the protocol specification of HIP DEX is the same as defined in [RFC7401].

# **1.1.** The HIP Diet EXchange (DEX)

The HIP Diet EXchange is a two-party cryptographic protocol used to establish a secure communication context between hosts. The first party is called the Initiator and the second party the Responder. The four-packet exchange helps to make HIP DEX DoS resilient. The Initiator and the Responder exchange their static Elliptic Curve Diffie-Hellman (ECDH) keys in the 2nd and 3rd handshake packet. The parties then authenticate each other in the 3rd and 4th handshake packet based on the ECDH-derived keying material. The Initiator and the Responder additionally transmit keying material for the session key in these last two handshake packets. This is to prevent overuse of the static ECDH-derived keying material. Moreover, the Responder

Moskowitz & Hummen 4]

Internet-Draft 2016

> starts a puzzle exchange in the 2nd packet and the Initiator completes this exchange in the 3rd packet before the Responder performs computationally expensive operations or stores any state from the exchange. Given this handshake structure, HIP DEX operationally is very similar to HIP BEX. Moreover, the employed model is also fairly equivalent to 802.11-2007 [IEEE.802-11.2007] Master Key and Pair-wise Transient Key, but handled in a single exchange.

HIP DEX does not have the option to encrypt the Host Identity of the Initiator in the 3rd packet. The Responder's Host Identity also is not protected. Thus, contrary to HIPv2, there is no attempt at anonymity.

Data packets start to flow after the 4th packet. The 3rd and 4th HIP

packets may carry data payload in the future. However, the details of this may be defined later.

An existing HIP association can be updated with the update mechanism defined in [RFC7401]. Likewise, the association can be torn down with the defined closing mechanism for HIPv2 if it is no longer needed. HIP DEX thereby omits the HIP\_SIGNATURE parameters of the original HIPv2 specification.

Finally, HIP DEX is designed as an end-to-end authentication and key establishment protocol. As such, it can be used in combination with Encapsulated Security Payload (ESP) [RFC7402] as well as with other end-to-end security protocols. In addition, HIP DEX can also be

# used

as a keying mechanism for security primitives at the MAC layer, e.g.,

for IEEE 802.15.4 networks [IEEE.802-15-4.2011]. It is worth mentioning that the HIP DEX base protocol does not cover all the fine-grained policy control found in Internet Key Exchange Version 2 (IKEv2) [RFC5996] that allows IKEv2 to support complex gateway policies. Thus, HIP DEX is not a replacement for IKEv2.

# **1.2.** Memo Structure

The rest of this memo is structured as follows. <u>Section 2</u> defines the central keywords, notation, and terms used throughout this document. <u>Section 3</u> defines the structure of the Host Identity and its various representations. <u>Section 4</u> gives an overview of the HIP Diet EXchange protocol. Sections <u>5</u> and <u>6</u> define the detailed packet formats and rules for packet processing. Finally, Sections <u>7</u>, <u>8</u>, and

9 discuss policy, security, and IANA considerations, respectively.

Moskowitz & Hummen 5]

#### **2**. Terms and Definitions

## **2.1.** Requirements Terminology

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119 [RFC2119].

## 2.2. Notation

- [x] indicates that x is optional.
- {x} indicates that x is encrypted.
- X(y) indicates that y is a parameter of X.
- <x>i indicates that x exists i times.
- --> signifies "Initiator to Responder" communication (requests).
- <-- signifies "Responder to Initiator" communication (replies).
- $\mid$  signifies concatenation of information e.g., X  $\mid$  Y is the concatenation of X and Y.

FOLD (X, K) denotes the partitioning of X into n K-bit segments and

the iterative folding of these segments via XOR. I.e.,  $X = x_1$ ,  $x_2$ , ...,  $x_n$ , where  $x_i$  is of length K and the last segment  $x_n$  is padded to length K by appending 0 bits. FOLD then is computed as FOLD(X, K) = t\_n, where t\_i = t\_i-1 XOR x\_i and t\_1 = x\_1.

Ltrunc (M(x), K) denotes the lowest order K bits of the result of the MAC function M on the input x.

## 2.3. Definitions

- HIP Diet Exchange (DEX): The ECDH-based HIP handshake for establishing a new HIP association.
- Host Identity (HI): The static ECDH public key that represents the identity of the host. In HIP DEX, a host proves ownership of the private key belonging to its HI by creating a HIP\_MAC with the derived ECDH key (c.f. Section 3).
- Host Identity Tag (HIT): A shorthand for the HI in IPv6 format. It is generated by folding the HI (c.f. <u>Section 3</u>).

Moskowitz & Hummen 6]

Internet-Draft HIP Diet EXchange (DEX) January
2016
HIT Suite: A HIT Suite groups all algorithms that are required to
 generate and use an HI and its HIT. In particular, these
 algorithms are: 1) ECDH and 2) FOLD.
HIP association: The shared state between two peers after
completion

of the HIP DEX handshake.

Initiator: The host that initiates the HIP DEX handshake. This role

is typically forgotten once the handshake is completed.

Responder: The host that responds to the Initiator in the HIP DEX handshake. This role is typically forgotten once the handshake

is

completed.

Responder's HIT Hash Algorithm (RHASH): In HIP DEX, RHASH is redefined as CMAC. Still, note that CMAC is a message authentication code and not a cryptographic hash function. Thus, a mapping from CMAC(x,y) to RHASH(z) must be defined where RHASH is used. Moreover, RHASH has different security properties in

#### HIP

DEX and is not used for HIT generation.

Length of the Responder's HIT Hash Algorithm (RHASH\_len): The natural output length of RHASH in bits.

CKDF: CMAC-based Key Derivation Function.

## 3. Host Identity (HI) and its Structure

In this section, the properties of the Host Identity and Host Identity Tag are discussed, and the exact format for them is defined.

In HIP, the public key of an asymmetric key pair is used as the Host Identity (HI). Correspondingly, the host itself is defined as the entity that holds the private key of the key pair. See the HIP architecture specification [I-D.ietf-hip-rfc4423-bis] for more details on the difference between an identity and the corresponding identifier.

HIP DEX implementations MUST support the Elliptic Curve Diffie-Hellman (ECDH) [<u>RFC6090</u>] key exchange for generating the HI as defined in <u>Section 5.2.3</u>. No additional algorithms are supported at this time.

A compressed encoding of the HI, the Host Identity Tag (HIT), is used

in the handshake packets to represent the HI. The DEX Host Identity Tag (HIT) is different from the BEX HIT in two ways:

o The HIT suite ID MUST only be a DEX HIT ID (see Section 5.2.4).

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016 [Page 7]

o The DEX HIT is not generated via a cryptographic hash. Rather, it

is a compression of the HI.

Due to the latter property, an attacker may be able to find a collision with a HIT that is in use. Hence, policy decisions such

as

access control MUST NOT be based solely on the HIT. Instead, the HI of a host SHOULD be considered.

Carrying HIs and HITs in the header of user data packets would increase the overhead of packets. Thus, it is not expected that these parameters are carried in every packet, but other methods are used to map the data packets to the corresponding HIs. In some cases, this allows to use HIP DEX without any additional headers in the user data packets. For example, if ESP is used to protect data traffic, the Security Parameter Index (SPI) carried in the ESP header

can be used to map the encrypted data packet to the correct HIP DEX association.

# **3.1**. Host Identity Tag (HIT)

With HIP DEX, the HIT is a 128-bit value - a compression of the HI prepended with a specific prefix. There are two advantages of using a hashed encoding over the actual variable-sized public key in protocols. First, the fixed length of the HIT keeps packet sizes manageable and eases protocol coding. Second, it presents a consistent format for the protocol, independent of the underlying identity technology in use.

The structure of the HIT is based on <u>RFC 7343</u> [<u>RFC7343</u>], called Overlay Routable Cryptographic Hash Identifiers (ORCHIDs), and consists of three parts: first, an IANA assigned prefix to distinguish it from other IPv6 addresses. Second, a four-bit encoding of the algorithms that were used for generating the HI and the compressed representation of the HI. Third, a 96-bit hashed representation of the HI. In contrast to HIPv2, HIP DEX employs

HITS

that are NOT generated by means of a cryptographic hash. Instead, the HI is compressed to 96 bits as defined in the following section.

## 3.2. Generating a HIT from an HI

The HIT does not follow the exact semantics of an ORCHID as there is no hash function in HIP DEX. Still, its structure is strongly aligned with the ORCHID design. The same IPv6 prefix used in HIPv2 is used for HIP DEX. The HIP DEX HIT suite (see <u>Section 9</u>) is used for the four bits of the Orchid Generation Algorithm (OGA) field in the ORCHID. The hash representation in an ORCHID is replaced with FOLD(HI,96). Moskowitz & Hummen 8]

2016

## 4. Protocol Overview

This section gives a simplified overview of the HIP DEX protocol operation and does not contain all the details of the packet formats or the packet processing steps. Section 5 and Section 6 describe these aspects in more detail and are normative in case of any conflicts with this section. Importantly, the information given in this section focuses on the differences between the HIPv2 and HIP DEX

protocol specifications.

# **4.1.** Creating a HIP Association

By definition, the system initiating a HIP Diet EXchange is the Initiator, and the peer is the Responder. This distinction is typically forgotten once the handshake completes, and either party can become the Initiator in future communications.

The HIP Diet EXchange serves to manage the establishment of state between an Initiator and a Responder. The first packet, I1, initiates the exchange, and the last three packets, R1, I2, and R2, constitute an authenticated Diffie-Hellman [DH76] key exchange for the Master Key SA generation. This Master Key SA is used by the Initiator and the Responder to wrap secret keying material in the I2 and R2 packets. Based on the exchanged keying material, the peers then derive a Pair-wise Key SA if cryptographic keys are needed, e.g., for ESP-based protection of user data.

The Initiator first sends a trigger packet, I1, to the Responder. This packet contains the HIT of the Initiator and the HIT of the Responder, if it is known. Moreover, the I1 packet initializes the negotiation of the Diffie-Hellman group that is used for generating the the Master Key SA. Therefore, the I1 packet contains a list of Diffie-Hellman Group IDs supported by the Initiator. Note that in some cases it may be possible to replace this trigger packet by some other form of a trigger, in which case the protocol starts with the Responder sending the R1 packet. In such cases, another mechanism

to

convey the Initiator's supported DH Groups (e.g., by using a default group) must be specified.

The second packet, R1, starts the actual authenticated Diffie-Hellman

key exchange. It contains a puzzle - a cryptographic challenge that the Initiator must solve before continuing the exchange. The level of difficulty of the puzzle can be adjusted based on level of trust with the Initiator, current load, or other factors. In addition, the

R1 contains the Responder's Diffie-Hellman parameter and lists of cryptographic algorithms supported by the Responder. Based on these lists, the Initiator can continue, abort, or restart the handshake with a different selection of cryptographic algorithms.

Moskowitz & Hummen 9]

Internet-Draft 2016

In the I2 packet, the Initiator MUST display the solution to the received puzzle. Without a correct solution, the I2 packet is discarded. The I2 also contains a key wrap parameter that carries a secret keying material of the Initiator. This keying material is only half the final session key. The packet is authenticated by the sender (Initiator) via a MAC.

The R2 packet acknowledges the receipt of the I2 packet and completes

the handshake. The R2 contains a key wrap parameter that carries the

rest of the keying material of the Responder. The packet is authenticated by the sender (Responder) via a MAC.

The HIP DEX handshake is illustrated below. The terms "ENC(DH, x)" and "ENC(DH, y)" refer to the random values x and y that are wrapped based on the Master Key SA (indicated by ENC and DH). Note that x and y each constitute half the final session key material. The packets also contain other parameters that are not shown in this figure.

Initiator		Responder
	I1:	
	R1: puzzle, HI	remain stateless
solve puzzle perform ECDH encrypt x		
	I2: solution, HI, ENC(DH,x), mac	
	/	check puzzle perform ECDH check mac decrypt x encrypt y
	R2: ENC(DH,y), mac	
check mac decrypt y	<	

#### 4.1.1. HIP Puzzle Mechanism

The purpose of the HIP puzzle mechanism is to protect the Responder from a number of denial-of-service threats. It allows the Responder to delay state creation until receiving the I2 packet. Furthermore, the puzzle allows the Responder to use a fairly cheap calculation to Moskowitz & Hummen 10]

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016

January

Internet-Draft 2016

> check that the Initiator is "sincere" in the sense that it has churned enough CPU cycles in solving the puzzle.

The puzzle mechanism enables a Responder to immediately reject an I2 packet if it does not contain a valid puzzle solution. To verify the

puzzle solution, the Responder only has to compute a single CMAC operation. After a successful puzzle verification, the Responder can

securely create session-specific state and perform CPU-intensive operations such as a Diffie-Hellman key generation. By varying the difficulty of the puzzle, the Responder can frustrate CPU or memory targeted DoS attacks. Under normal network conditions, the puzzle difficulty SHOULD be zero, thus effectively reverting the puzzle mechanism to a cookie-based DoS protection mechanism. Without setting the puzzle difficulty to zero under normal network conditions, potentially scarce computation resources at the

#### Initiator

would be churned unnecessarily.

Conceptually, the puzzle mechanism in HIP DEX is the same as in HIPv2. Hence, this document refers to Sections <u>4.1.1</u> and <u>4.1.2</u> in [<u>RFC7401</u>] for more detailed information about the employed mechanism.

Notably, the only difference between the puzzle mechanism in HIP DEX and HIPv2 is that HIP DEX uses CMAC instead of a hash function for solving and verifying a puzzle. The implications of this change on the puzzle implementation are discussed in Section 6.1.

# 4.1.2. HIP State Machine

The HIP DEX state machine has the same states as the HIPv2 state machine (see 4.4. in [RFC7401]). However, HIP DEX features a retransmission strategy with an optional reception acknowledgement for the I2 packet. The goal of this additional acknowledgement is

to

reduce premature I2 retransmissions in case of devices with low computation resources [HWZ13]. As a result, there are minor changes regarding the transitions in the HIP DEX state machine. The following section documents these differences compared to HIPv2.

#### 4.1.2.1. HIP DEX Retransmission Mechanism

retransmission strategy of HIPv2 (see <u>Section 4.4.3. in [RFC7401]</u>). This strategy is based on a timeout that is set to a value larger than the worst-case anticipated round-trip time (RTT). For each received I1 or I2 packet, the Responder sends an R1 or R2 packet, respectively. This design trait enables the Responder to remain stateless until the reception and successful processing of the I2 packet. The Initiator stops retransmitting I1 or I2 packets after

the reception of the corresponding R1 or R2. If the Initiator did not receive an R1 packet after I1\_RETRIES\_MAX tries, it stops I1

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016 [Page 11]

retransmissions. Likewise, it stops retransmitting the I2 packet after I2\_RETRIES\_MAX unsuccessful tries.

For repeatedly received I2 packets, the Responder SHOULD NOT perform operations related to the Diffie-Hellman key exchange or the keying material wrapped in the ENCRYPTED\_KEY parameters. Instead, it SHOULD

# re-use the previously established state to re-create the corresponding R2 packet in order to prevent unnecessary computation overhead.

The potentially high processing time of an I2 packet at a (resourceconstrained) Responder may cause premature retransmissions if the time required for I2 transmission and processing exceeds the RTTbased retransmission timeout. Thus, the Initiator should also take the processing time of the I2 packet at the Responder into account for retransmission purposes. To this end, the Responder MAY notify the Initiator about the anticipated delay once the puzzle solution was successfully verified and if the remaining I2 packet processing incurs a high processing delay. The Responder MAY therefore send a NOTIFY packet (see Section 5.3.6. in [RFC7401]) to the Initiator before the Responder commences the ECDH operation. The NOTIFY

#### packet

serves as an acknowledgement for the I2 packet and consists of a NOTIFICATION parameter with Notify Message Type I2\_ACKNOWLEDGEMENT (see <u>Section 5.2.19</u>. in [RFC7401]). The NOTIFICATION parameter contains the anticipated remaining processing time for the I2 packet in milliseconds as two-octet Notification Data. This processing time

can, e.g., be estimated by measuring the computation time of the ECDH

key derivation operation at Responder boot-up. After the I2 processing has finished, the Responder sends the regular R2 packet.

When the Initiator receives the NOTIFY packet, it sets the I2 retransmission timeout to the I2 processing time indicated in the NOTIFICATION parameter plus half the RTT-based timeout value. In doing so, the Initiator MUST NOT set the retransmission timeout to a higher value than allowed by a local policy. This is to prevent unauthenticated NOTIFY packets from maliciously delaying the handshake beyond a well-defined upper bound in case of a lost R2 packet. At the same time, this extended retransmission timeout enables the Initiator to defer I2 retransmissions until the point in time when the Responder should have completed its I2 packet processing and the network should have delivered the R2 packet according to the employed worst-case estimates.

#### 4.1.2.2. HIP State Processes

HIP DEX clarifies or introduces the following new transitions.

Moskowitz & Hummen 12]

Internet-Draft	HIP Diet	EXchange	(DEX)	January
2016				

System behavior in state I2-SENT, Table 1. +------+ | Trigger | Action | Receive NOTIFY, | Set I2 retransmission timer to value in | process | I2\_ACKNOWLEDGEMENT Notification Data plus | 1/2 RTT-based timeout value and stay at T | I2-SENT | Timeout | Increment trial counter | If counter is less than I2\_RETRIES\_MAX, | send I2, reset timer to RTT-based timeout, | and stay at I2-SENT | If counter is greater than I2\_RETRIES\_MAX, | go to E-FAILED 

Table 1: I2-SENT - Waiting to finish the HIP Diet EXchange

## 4.1.2.3. Simplified HIP State Diagram

The following diagram shows the major state transitions. Transitions

based on received packets implicitly assume that the packets are successfully authenticated or processed.

Moskowitz & Hummen 13] Expires July 21, 2016

```
Internet-Draft HIP Diet EXchange (DEX) January
2016
               +--+ +------
+
       recv I1, send R1 | |
                     | V V
               +----+ recv I2, send R2
      +-----+ UNASSOCIATED |-----+
 datagram | +--+
              +----+
                               to send, | | | Alg. not supported,
 send I1 | | | send I1
  . v | v
  . +----+ recv I2, send R2
 +---->| I1-SENT |-----+
   +-----+ | |
      | recv R1, | recv I2, send R2 | | |
      v send I2
               V V V
 +----+
                           +---+
 | +--->| I2-SENT |-----+ +------| R2-SENT |<---+
 | | +----+
                          +----+ |
                   | | | | recv R2 | data or |
                                  | |recv R1, | | EC timeout|
                                  | |send I2 +--|-----+ | receive I2,|
        | | +----+ | send R2|
 | +---->| ESTABLISHED |<----+
 1
             +----+
                                   | | | receive I2, send R2 |
 +----+ | +-----+
 +----+
 1
```

| no packet sent/received| +---+ | for UAL min, send CLOSE| | |timeout | v v ((UAL+MSL) | +----+ |retransmit | +--|-----| CLOSING |-+CLOSE | +----+ Т +----+ | | +-----++ +-----|--|recv CLOSE, recv CLOSE\_ACK | +-----+ |send CLOSE\_ACK or timeout | recv CLOSE, | | (UAL+MSL) send CLOSE\_ACK v v +----+ receive I2, send R2 +-----+ CLOSED |-----+ +---+ ^ | | recv CLOSE, send CLOSE\_ACK| | | timeout (UAL+2MSL) +-+ +-----

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016 [Page 14]

Internet-Draft HIP Diet EXchange (DEX) January 2016

#### **4.1.3. HIP DEX Security Associations**

HIP DEX establishes two Security Associations (SA), one for the Diffie-Hellman derived key, or Master Key, and one for the session key, or Pair-wise Key.

### 4.1.3.1. Master Key SA

The Master Key SA is used to authenticate HIP packets and to encrypt selected HIP parameters in the HIP DEX packet exchanges. Since only little data is protected by this SA, it can be long-lived with no need for rekeying.

The Master Key SA contains the following elements:

- o Source HIT
- o Destination HIT
- o HIP\_Encrypt Key
- o HIP\_MAC Key

The HIP\_Encrypt and HIP\_MAC keys are extracted from the Diffie-Hellman derived key as described in <u>Section 6.3</u>. Their length is determined by the HIP\_CIPHER.

## 4.1.3.2. Pair-wise Key SA

The Pair-wise Key SA is used to authenticate and to encrypt user data. It is refreshed (or rekeyed) using an UPDATE packet exchange. The Pair-wise Key SA elements are defined by the data transform (e.g.

ESP\_TRANSFORM [RFC7402]).

The keys for the Pair-wise Key SA are derived based on the wrapped keying material exchanged in the ENCRYPTED\_KEY parameter (see <u>Section 5.2.5</u>) of the I2 and R2 packets. Specifically, the exchanged

keying material of the two peers is concatenated. This concatenation

forms the input to a Key Derivation Function (KDF). If the data transform does not specify its own KDF, the key derivation function defined in <u>Section 6.3</u> is used. Even though this input is randomly distributed, a KDF Extract phase may be needed to get the proper length for the input to the KDF Expand phase.

Moskowitz & Hummen 15]

Internet-Draft 2016

## **4.1.4.** User Data Considerations

The User Data Considerations in Section 4.5. of [RFC7401] also apply to HIP DEX. There is only one difference between HIPv2 and HIP DEX. Loss of state due to system reboot may be a critical performance issue for resource-constrained devices. Thus, implementors MAY choose to use non-volatile, secure storage for HIP states in order for them to survive a system reboot. This will limit state loss during reboots to only those situations with an SA timeout.

# 5. Packet Formats

## 5.1. Payload Format

HIP DEX employs the same fixed HIP header and payload structure as HIPv2. As such, the specifications in Section 5.1 of [RFC7401] also apply to HIP DEX.

## 5.2. HIP Parameters

The HIP parameters carry information that is necessary for establishing and maintaining a HIP association. For example, the peer's public keys as well as the signaling for negotiating ciphers and payload handling are encapsulated in HIP parameters. Additional information, meaningful for end-hosts or middleboxes, may also be included in HIP parameters. The specification of the HIP parameters and their mapping to HIP packets and packet types is flexible to allow HIP extensions to define new parameters and new protocol behavior.

In HIP packets, HIP parameters are ordered according to their numeric

type number and encoded in TLV format.

HIP DEX reuses the HIP parameters of HIPv2 defined in Section 5.2. of

[RFC7401] where possible. Still, HIP DEX further restricts and/or extends the following existing parameter types:

- o DH\_GROUP\_LIST and HOST\_ID are restricted to ECC-based suites.
- o HIP\_CIPHER is restricted to AES-128-CTR and NULL-ENCRYPT.
- o HIT\_SUITE\_LIST is limited to the HIT suite ECDH/FOLD.
- o RHASH and RHASH\_len are redefined to CMAC for the PUZZLE, SOLUTION, and HIP\_MAC parameters (see Section 6.1 and Section 6.2).

In addition, HIP DEX introduces the following new parameter:

Moskowitz & Hummen 16]

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016

Internet-Draft 2016	HIP	Diet EXchar	nge (DEX)	January
+ +   TLV 	+   Type	-+	-+	
++   ENCRYPTED_KEY       +	643 	variable 	Encrypted contain   session key exchar	er for the nge

## 5.2.1. DH\_GROUP\_LIST

The DH\_GROUP\_LIST parameter contains the list of supported DH Group IDs of a host. It is defined in <u>Section 5.2.6 of [RFC7401]</u>. With HIP DEX, the DH Group IDs are restricted to:

Group		KDF	Value
NIST P-256 [RFC	25903]	CKDF	7
NIST P-384 RFC	5903]	CKDF	8
NIST P-521 [RFC	25903]	CKDF	9
SECP160R1 SEC	CG]	CKDF	10

The ECDH groups 7 - 9 are defined in [RFC5903] and [RFC6090]. ECDH group 10 is covered in [SECG] and Appendix D of [RFC7401]. Any ECDH used with HIP MUST have a co-factor of 1.

# 5.2.2. HIP\_CIPHER

The HIP\_CIPHER parameter contains the list of supported cipher algorithms to be used for encrypting the contents of the ENCRYPTED and ENCRYPTED\_KEY parameters. The HIP\_CIPHER parameter is defined

in

Section 5.2.8 of [RFC7401]. With HIP DEX, the Suite IDs are limited to:

Suite ID Value

RESERVED	Θ	
NULL-ENCRYPT	1	([ <u>RFC2410</u> ])
AES-128-CTR	5	([ <u>RFC3686</u> ])

Mandatory implementation: AES-128-CTR. Implementors SHOULD support NULL-ENCRYPT ([<u>RFC2410</u>]) for testing/debugging purposes but MUST NOT offer or accept this value unless explicitly configured for testing/ debugging of HIP.

## 5.2.3. HOST\_ID

The HOST\_ID parameter conveys the Host Identity (HI) along with optional information about a host. It is defined in <u>Section 5.2.9</u>

[RFC7401].

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016 [Page 17]

Internet-Draft 2016

HIP DEX uses the public portion of a host's static ECDH key-pair as the HI. Correspondingly, HIP DEX limits the HI algorithms to the following profile:

Algorithm profiles Value

ECDH 11 [RFC6090] (REQUIRED)

HIP DEX HIs are serialized equally to the ECC-based HIs in  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{HIPv2}}$  (see

<u>Section 5.2.9. of [RFC7401]</u>). The Group ID of the HIP DEX HI is encoded in the "ECC curve" field of the HOST\_ID parameter. The supported DH Group IDs are defined in Section 5.2.1.

# 5.2.4. HIT\_SUITE\_LIST

The HIT\_SUITE\_LIST parameter contains a list of the supported HIT suite IDs of the Responder. Based on the HIT\_SUITE\_LIST, the Initiator can determine which source HIT Suite IDs are supported by the Responder. The HIT\_SUITE\_LIST parameter is defined in Section 5.2.10 of [RFC7401].

The following HIT Suite IDs are defined for HIP DEX, and the relationship between the four-bit ID value used in the OGA ID field and the eight-bit encoding within the HIT\_SUITE\_LIST ID field is clarified:

HIT Suite Four-bit ID Eight-bit encoding

ECDH/FOLD 8 0x80

Note that the HIP DEX HIT Suite ID allows the peers to distinguish a HIP DEX handshake from a HIPv2 handshake. The Responder MUST

respond

with a HIP DEX HIT suite ID when the HIT of the Initiator is a HIP DEX HIT.

5.2.5. ENCRYPTED\_KEY

Moskowitz & Hummen 18]

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016
0 1 2 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 I Type Length Encrypted value 1 / / / / +----+ Padding 

Type643Lengthlength in octets, excluding Type, Length, and<br/>PaddingEncryptedThe value is encrypted using an encryption

algorithm value as defined in the HIP\_CIPHER parameter.

The  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{ENCRYPTED}_\mathsf{KEY}}$  parameter encapsulates a random value that is later

used in the session key creation process (see <u>Section 6.3</u>). This random value MUST have a length of at least 64 bit. The puzzle

value

#I and the puzzle solution #J (see [RFC7401]) are used as the initialization vector (IV) for the encryption process. To this end, the IV is computed as FOLD(I | J, 128). The AES-CTR counter is a 16 bit value that is initialized to zero with the first use.

Once this encryption process is completed, the "encrypted value" data

field is ready for inclusion in the Parameter. If necessary, additional Padding for 8-byte alignment is then added according to the rules of TLV Format in [RFC7401].

## 5.3. HIP Packets

HIP DEX uses the same eight basic HIP packets as HIPv2 (see <u>Section 5.3 of [RFC7401]</u>). Four of them are for the HIP handshake (I1, R1, I2, and R2), one is for updating an association (UPDATE), one is for sending notifications (NOTIFY), and two are for closing the association (CLOSE and CLOSE\_ACK). There are some differences regarding the HIP parameters that are included in the handshake packets concerning HIP BEX and HIP DEX. This section covers these differences for the DEX packets. Packets not discussed here, follow the structure defined in [RFC7401].

An important difference between packets in HIP BEX and HIP DEX is that the DIFFIE\_HELLMAN and the HIP\_SIGNATURE parameters are not included in HIP DEX. Thus, the R1 packet is completely unprotected and can be spoofed. As a result, negotiation parameters contained

in

the R1 packet have to be re-included in later, protected packets in

order to detect and prevent potential downgrading attacks. Moreover,

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016 [Page 19]

Internet-Draft HIP Diet EXchange (DEX)

2016

the I2, R2, UPDATE, NOTIFY, CLOSE, and CLOSE\_ACK packets are not covered by a signature and purely rely on the HIP\_MAC parameter for packet authentication. The processing of these packets is changed accordingly.

In the future, an optional upper-layer payload MAY follow the HIP header. The Next Header field in the header indicates if there is additional data following the HIP header.

# 5.3.1. I1 - the HIP Initiator Packet

The HIP header values for the I1 packet:

Header: Packet Type = 1SRC HIT = Initiator's HIT DST HIT = Responder's HIT, or NULL

```
IP ( HIP ( DH_GROUP_LIST ) )
```

Valid control bits: none

The I1 packet contains the fixed HIP header and the Initiator's DH GROUP LIST. The Initiator's HIT Suite ID MUST be of a HIP DEX type as defined in Section 5.2.4.

Regarding the Responder's HIT, the Initiator may receive this HIT either from a DNS lookup of the Responder's FQDN, from some other repository, or from a local table. The Responder's HIT also MUST be of a HIP DEX type. If the Initiator does not know the Responder's HIT, it may attempt to use opportunistic mode by using NULL (all zeros) as the Responder's HIT. See Section 4.1.8 of [RFC7401] for detailed information about the "HIP Opportunistic Mode".

As a compression of the employed HIs, the Initiator's and the Responder's HITs both determine the DH group ID that must be used in order to successfully conclude the triggered handshake. HITs, however, only include the OGA ID identifying a HIP DEX HIT. They do not include information about the specific DH group ID of the corresponding HI. To inform the Responder about its employed and

its

otherwise supported DH Group IDs, the Initiator therefore includes the DH\_GROUP\_LIST parameter in the I1 packet. This parameter MUST include the DH group ID that corresponds to the currently employed Initiator HIT as the first list element. With HIP DEX, the DH\_GROUP\_LIST parameter MUST only include ECDH groups defined in Section 5.2.1.

Moskowitz & Hummen 20]

Internet-Draft HIP Diet EXchange (DEX) January 2016

Since this packet is so easy to spoof even if it were protected, no attempt is made to add to its generation or processing cost. As a result, the DH\_GROUP\_LIST in the I1 packet is not protected.

Implementations MUST be able to handle a storm of received I1 packets, discarding those with common content that arrive within a small time delta.

#### 5.3.2. R1 - the HIP Responder Packet

The HIP header values for the R1 packet:

```
Header:
Packet Type = 2
SRC HIT = Responder's HIT
DST HIT = Initiator's HIT
IP ( HIP ( [ R1_COUNTER, ]
PUZZLE,
DH_GROUP_LIST,
HIP_CIPHER,
HOST_ID,
HIT_SUITE_LIST,
TRANSPORT_FORMAT_LIST,
[ <, ECHO_REQUEST_UNSIGNED >i ])
```

Valid control bits: A

If the Responder's HI is an anonymous one, the A control MUST be set.

The Initiator's HIT MUST match the one received in the I1 packet if the R1 is a response to an I1. If the Responder has multiple HIs, the Responder's HIT MUST match the Initiator's request. If the Initiator used opportunistic mode, the Responder may select among its

HIs as described below. See <u>Section 4.1.8 of [RFC7401]</u> for detailed information about the "HIP Opportunistic Mode".

The R1 packet generation counter is used to determine the currently valid generation of puzzles. The value is increased periodically, and it is RECOMMENDED that it is increased at least as often as solutions to old puzzles are no longer accepted.

The Puzzle contains a Random value #I and the puzzle difficulty K. The difficulty K indicates the number of lower-order bits, in the puzzle CMAC result, that MUST be zeros (see [<u>RFC7401</u>]). Responders SHOULD set K to zero by default and only increase the puzzle difficulty to protect against a DoS attack targeting the HIP DEX handshake. A puzzle difficulty of zero effectively turns the puzzle Moskowitz & Hummen 21]

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016

2016

mechanism into a return-routablility test and is strongly encouraged during normal operation in order to conserve energy resources as well

as to prevent unnecessary handshake delay in case of a resourceconstrained Initiator.

The DH\_GROUP\_LIST parameter contains the Responder's order of preference based on which it chose the ECDH key contained in the HOST ID parameter (see below). This allows the Initiator to determine whether its own DH\_GROUP\_LIST in the I1 packet was manipulated by an attacker. There is a further risk that the Responder's DH\_GROUP\_LIST was manipulated by an attacker, as the R1 packet cannot be authenticated in HI DEX. Thus, this parameter is repeated in the R2 packet to allow for a final, cryptographically secured validation.

The HIP\_CIPHER contains the encryption algorithms supported by the Responder to protect the key exchange, in the order of preference. All implementations MUST support the AES-CTR [RFC3686].

The HIT\_SUITE\_LIST parameter is an ordered list of the Responder's supported and preferred HIT Suites. It enables a Responder to notifv

the Initiator about other available HIT suites than the one used in the current handshake. Based on the received HIT\_SUITE\_LIST, the Initiator MAY decide to abort the current handshake and initiate a new handshake with a different mutually supported HIT suite. This mechanism can, e.g., be used to move from an initial HIP DEX handshake to a HIP BEX handshake for peers supporting both protocol variants.

The HOST\_ID parameter depends on the received DH\_GROUP\_LIST parameter

and the Responder HIT in the I1 packet. Specifically, if the I1 contains a Responder HIT, the Responder verifies that this HIT matches the required DH group based on the received DH\_GROUP\_LIST parameter. In case of a positive result, the Responder selects the corresponding HOST\_ID for inclusion in the R1 packet. Likewise, if the Responder HIT in the I1 packet is NULL (i.e., during an opportunistic handshake), the Responder chooses its HOST\_ID

# according

to the Initiator's employed DH group as indicated in the received DH\_GROUP\_LIST parameter and sets the source HIT in the R1 packet accordingly. If the Responder however does not support the DH group required by the Initiator or if the Responder HIT in the I1 packet does not match the required DH group, the Responder selects the mutually preferred and supported DH group based on the DH\_GROUP\_LIST parameter in the I1 packet. The Responder then includes the corresponding ECDH key in the HOST\_ID parameter. This parameter

### also

indicates the selected DH group. Moreover, the Responder sets the source HIT in the R2 packet based on the destination HIT from the I1 packet. Based on the deviating DH group ID in the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{HOST\_ID}}$  parameter,

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016 [Page 22]

```
2016
   the Initiator then SHOULD abort the current handshake and initiate a
   new handshake with the mutually supported DH group as far as local
   policies (see Section 7) permit.
  The TRANSPORT_FORMAT_LIST parameter is an ordered list of the
   Responder's supported and preferred transport format types. The
list
   allows the Initiator and the Responder to agree on a common type for
   payload protection. Currently, the only transport format defined is
   IPsec ESP [RFC7402].
  The ECHO_REQUEST_UNSIGNED parameters contain data that the sender
  wants to receive unmodified in the corresponding response packet in
   the ECHO_RESPONSE_UNSIGNED parameter. The R1 packet may contain
zero
  or more ECHO_REQUEST_UNSIGNED parameters.
5.3.3. I2 - the Second HIP Initiator Packet
  The HIP header values for the I2 packet:
    Header:
       Type = 3
       SRC HIT = Initiator's HIT
       DST HIT = Responder's HIT
    IP ( HIP ( [R1_COUNTER,]
                SOLUTION,
                HIP_CIPHER,
                ENCRYPTED_KEY,
                HOST_ID,
                TRANSPORT_FORMAT_LIST,
                HIP MAC,
                [<, ECHO_RESPONSE_UNSIGNED>i )] )
  Valid control bits: A
  The HITs MUST match the ones used in the R1 packet.
   If the Initiator's HI is an anonymous one, the A control bit MUST be
   set.
   If present in the R1 packet, the Initiator MUST include an
unmodified
   copy of the R1_COUNTER parameter into the I2 packet.
   The Solution contains the Random #I from the R1 packet and the
   computed #J value. The low-order #K bits of the RHASH(I | ... | J)
   MUST be zero.
```

Internet-Draft HIP Diet EXchange (DEX)

January

Moskowitz & Hummen 23]

2016

The HIP\_CIPHER contains the single encryption transform selected by the Initiator that it uses to encrypt the ENCRYPTED and ENCRYPTED\_KEY

parameters. The chosen cipher MUST correspond to one of the ciphers offered by the Responder in the R1. All implementations MUST support

the AES-CTR transform [RFC3686].

The HOST\_ID parameter contains the Initiator HI corresponding to the Initiator HIT.

The ENCRYPTED\_KEY parameter contains an Initiator generated random value that MUST be uniformly distributed. This random value is encrypted with the Master Key SA using the HIP\_CIPHER encryption algorithm.

The ECHO\_RESPONSE\_UNSIGNED parameter(s) contain the unmodified **O**paque

data copied from the corresponding echo request parameter(s). This parameter can also be used for two-factor password authentication as shown in Appendix A.

The TRANSPORT\_FORMAT\_LIST parameter contains the single transport format type selected by the Initiator. The chosen type MUST correspond to one of the types offered by the Responder in the R1 packet. Currently, the only transport format defined is the ESP transport format [RFC7402].

The MAC is calculated over the whole HIP envelope, excluding any parameters after the HIP\_MAC parameter as described in Section 6.2. The Responder MUST validate the HIP\_MAC parameter.

#### 5.3.4. R2 - the Second HIP Responder Packet

The HIP header values for the R2 packet:

```
Header:
  Packet Type = 4
  SRC HIT = Responder's HIT
  DST HIT = Initiator's HIT
IP ( HIP ( DH_GROUP_LIST,
           HIP_CIPHER,
           ENCRYPTED_KEY,
           HIT_SUITE_LIST,
           TRANSPORT_FORMAT_LIST,
           HIP_MAC)
```

Valid control bits: none

The HITs used MUST match the ones used in the I2 packet.

Moskowitz & Hummen 24]

Internet-Draft 2016

> The Responder repeats the DH\_GROUP\_LIST, HIP\_CIPHER, HIT\_SUITE\_LIST, and TRANSPORT\_FORMAT\_LIST parameters in the R2 packet. These parameters MUST be the same as included in the R1 packet. The parameter are re-included here because the R2 packet is MACed and thus cannot be altered by an attacker. For verification purposes, the Initiator re-evaluates the selected suites and compares the results against the chosen ones. If the re-evaluated suites do not match the chosen ones, the Initiator acts based on its local policy.

The ENCRYPTED\_KEY parameter contains an Responder generated random value that MUST be uniformly distributed. This random value is encrypted with the Master Key SA using the HIP\_CIPHER encryption algorithm.

The MAC is calculated over the whole HIP envelope, excluding any parameters after the HIP\_MAC, as described in <u>Section 6.2</u>. The Initiator MUST validate the HIP\_MAC parameter.

### **5.4.** ICMP Messages

When a HIP implementation detects a problem with an incoming packet, and it either cannot determine the identity of the sender of the packet or does not have any existing HIP association with the sender of the packet, it MAY respond with an ICMP packet. Any such reply MUST be rate-limited as described in [RFC4443]. In most cases, the ICMP packet has the Parameter Problem type (12 for ICMPv4, 4 for ICMPv6), with the Pointer field pointing to the field that caused

the

ICMP message to be generated. The problem cases specified in Section 5.4. of [RFC7401] also apply to HIP DEX.

## 6. Packet Processing

Due to the adopted protocol semantics and the inherited general packet structure, the packet processing in HIP DEX only differs from HIPv2 in very few places. Here, we focus on these differences and refer to Section 6 in [RFC7401] otherwise.

The processing of outgoing and incoming application data remains the same as in HIP BEX (see Sections 6.1 and 6.2 in [RFC7401]).

## 6.1. Solving the Puzzle

The procedures for solving and verifying a puzzle in HIP DEX are strongly based on the corresponding procedures in HIPv2. The only exceptions are that HIP DEX does not use pre-computation of R1 packets and that RHASH is set to CMAC. As a result, the pre-computation step in in Section 6.3 of [RFC7401] is skipped in HIP DEX.

Moskowitz & Hummen 25]

Internet-Draft HIP Diet EXchange (DEX) January 2016

Moreover, the Initiator solves a puzzle by computing: Ltrunc( CMAC( I, HIT-I | HIT-R | J ), K ) == 0

Similarly, the Responder verifies a puzzle by computing: V := Ltrunc( CMAC( I, HIT-I | HIT-R | J ), K )

Apart from these modifications, the procedures defined in Section 6.3

of [RFC7401] also apply for HIP DEX.

# 6.2. HIP\_MAC Calculation and Verification

The following subsections define the actions for processing the HIP\_MAC parameter.

### 6.2.1. CMAC Calculation

The HIP\_MAC calculation uses RHASH, i.e., CMAC, as the underlying cryptographic function. The scope of the calculation for HIP\_MAC is:

CMAC: { HIP header | [ Parameters ] }

where Parameters include all HIP parameters of the packet that is being calculated with Type values ranging from 1 to (HIP\_MAC's Type value - 1) and exclude parameters with Type values greater or equal to HIP\_MAC's Type value.

During HIP\_MAC calculation, the following applies:

- o In the HIP header, the Checksum field is set to zero.
- o In the HIP header, the Header Length field value is calculated to the beginning of the HIP\_MAC parameter.

The parameter order is described in Section 5.2.1 of [RFC7401].

The CMAC calculation and verification process is as follows:

Packet sender:

1. Create the HIP packet, without the HIP\_MAC or any other parameter

with greater Type value than the HIP\_MAC parameter has.

- 2. Calculate the Header Length field in the HIP header.
- 3. Compute the CMAC using either HIP-gl or HIP-lg integrity key retrieved from KEYMAT as defined in Section 6.3.

Moskowitz & Hummen 26]

- 4. Add the HIP\_MAC parameter to the packet and any parameter with greater Type value than the HIP\_MAC's that may follow.
- 5. Recalculate the Length field in the HIP header.

Packet receiver:

- 1. Verify the HIP header Length field.
- 2. Remove the HIP\_MAC parameter, as well as all other parameters that follow it with greater Type value, saving the contents if they will be needed later.
- Recalculate the HIP packet length in the HIP header and clear 3. the Checksum field (set it to all zeros).
  - 4. Compute the CMAC using either HIP-ql or HIP-lq integrity key as defined in Section 6.3 and verify it against the received CMAC.
  - 5. Set Checksum and Header Length fields in the HIP header to original values. Note that the Checksum and Length fields contain incorrect values after this step.

## 6.3. HIP DEX KEYMAT Generation

The HIP DEX KEYMAT process is used to derive the keys for the Master Key SA as well as for the Pair-wise Key SA. The keys for the Master Key SA are based from the Diffie-Hellman derived key, Kij, produced during the HIP DEX handshake. The Initiator generates Kij during the

creation of the I2 packet and the Responder generates Kij once it receives the I2 packet. Hence, I2, R2, UPDATE, CLOSE, and CLOSE\_ACK packets can contain authenticated and/or encrypted information.

The keys of the Pair-wise Key SA are not directly used in the HIP DEX

handshake. Instead, these keys are made available as payload protection keys. Some payload protection mechanisms have their own Key Derivation Function, and if so this mechanism SHOULD be used. Otherwise, the HIP DEX KEYMAT process MUST be used to derive the

#### keys

of the Pair-wise Key SA based on the concatenation of the random values that are contained in the exchanged ENCRYPTED\_KEY parameters.

The HIP DEX KEYMAT process consists of two components, CKDF-Extract and CKDF-Expand. The Extract function compresses a non-uniformly distributed key, as is the output of a Diffie-Hellman key derivation,

to extract the key entropy into a fixed length output. The Expand function takes either the output of the Extract function or directly uses a uniformly distributed key and expands the length of the key,

repeatedly distributing the key entropy, to produce the keys needed.

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016 [Page 27]

Internet-Draft 2016	HIP Diet EXchang	e (DEX)	January			
The key derivation for the Master Key SA employs both the Extract and Expand phases, whereas the Pair-wise Key SA MAY need both the Extract and Expand phases if the key is longer than 128 bits. Otherwise, it only requires the Expand phase.						
The CKDF-Extract function is the following operation:						
CKDF-Extract(I, IKM	, info) -> PRK					
where						
I Random IKM Input Hellman	#I from the PUZZ keying material,	LE parameter i.e., either the D	iffie-			
derive of the the HI info sort(H PRK a pseu   denote	ed key or the concatenation of the random value e ENCRYPTED_KEY parameters in the same order as ITs with sort(HIT-I   HIT-R) HIT-I   HIT-R)   "CKDF-Extract" udorandom key (of RHASH_len/8 octets) es the concatenation					
The pseudorandom key	PRK is calculated	as follows:				
PRK = CMAC(I,	IKM   info)					

The CKDF-Expand function is the following operation:

Moskowitz & Hummen 28]

```
CKDF-Expand(PRK, info, L) -> OKM
```

```
where
```

PRK	a pseudorandom key of at least RHASH_len/8 octets
	(either the output from the extract step or the
	concatenation of the random values of the
	ENCRYPTED_KEY parameters in the same order as the
	HITs with sort(HIT-I   HIT-R))
info	sort(HIT-I   HIT-R)   "CKDF-Expand"
L	length of output keying material in octets
	(<= 255*RHASH_len/8)
	denotes the concatenation

The output keying material OKM is calculated as follows:

Ν	=	ceil(L/RHASH_len/8)
Т	=	$T(1)   T(2)   T(3)   \dots   T(N)$
OKM	=	first L octets of T

# where

```
T(0) = empty string (zero length)

T(1) = CMAC(PRK, T(0) | info | 0x01)

T(2) = CMAC(PRK, T(1) | info | 0x02)

T(3) = CMAC(PRK, T(2) | info | 0x03)

...
```

(where the constant concatenated to the end of each T(n) is a single octet.)

sort(HIT-I | HIT-R) is defined as the network byte order concatenation of the two HITs, with the smaller HIT preceding the larger HIT, resulting from the numeric comparison of the two HITs interpreted as positive (unsigned) 128-bit integers in network byte order.

The initial keys are drawn sequentially in the order that is determined by the numeric comparison of the two HITs, with the comparison method described in the previous paragraph. HOST\_g denotes the host with the greater HIT value, and HOST\_l the host

#### with

the lower HIT value.

The drawing order for initial keys:

1. HIP-gl encryption key for HOST\_g's outgoing HIP packets

2. HIP-gl integrity (CMAC) key for HOST\_g's outgoing HIP packets

Moskowitz & Hummen 29]

Internet-Draft	HIP Diet	EXchange	(DEX)	January
2016				

3. HIP-lg encryption key for HOST\_l's outgoing HIP packets

4. HIP-lg integrity (CMAC) key for HOST\_l's outgoing HIP packets

The number of bits drawn for a given algorithm is the "natural" size of the keys. For the mandatory algorithms, the following sizes apply:

AES 128 or 256 bits

If other key sizes are used, they must be treated as different encryption algorithms and defined separately.

### 6.4. Initiation of a HIP Diet EXchange

The initiation of a HIP DEX handshake proceeds as described in <u>Section 6.6 of [RFC7401]</u>. The I1 packet contents are specified in Section 5.3.1.

# 6.5. Processing Incoming I1 Packets

I1 packets in HIP DEX are handled almost identical to HIPv2 (see <u>Section 6.7 of [RFC7401]</u>). The main differences are that the Responder SHOULD select a HIP DEX HIT Suite in the R1 response. Moreover, as R1 packets are neither covered by a signature nor incur the overhead of generating an ephemeral Diffie-Hellman key-pair,

pre-

computation of an R1 is only marginally beneficial, but would incur additional memory resources at the Responder. Hence, the R1 precomputation SHOULD be omitted in HIP DEX.

Correspondingly, the modified conceptual processing rules for responding to an I1 packet are as follows:

1. The Responder MUST check that the Responder's HIT in the received

I1 packet is either one of its own HITs or NULL. Otherwise, it must drop the packet.

- If the Responder is in ESTABLISHED state, the Responder MAY respond to this with an R1 packet, prepare to drop an existing HIP security association with the peer, and stay at ESTABLISHED state.
- 3. If the Responder is in I1-SENT state, it MUST make a comparison between the sender's HIT and its own (i.e., the receiver's) HIT. If the sender's HIT is greater than its own HIT, it should drop the I1 packet and stay at I1-SENT. If the sender's HIT is smaller than its own HIT, it SHOULD send the R1 packet and stay

Moskowitz & Hummen 30]

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016

Internet-Draft 2016

at I1-SENT. The HIT comparison is performed as defined in Section 6.3.

4. If the implementation chooses to respond to the I1 packet with an

R1 packet, it creates a new R1 according to the format described in <u>Section 5.3.2</u>. It chooses the HI based on the destination

HIT

and the DH\_GROUP\_LIST in the I1 packet. If the implementation does not support the DH group required by the Initiator or if

the

destination HIT in the I1 packet does not match the required DH group, it selects the mutually preferred and supported DH group based on the DH\_GROUP\_LIST parameter in the I1 packet. The implementation includes the corresponding ECDH public key in the HOST\_ID parameter. If no suitable DH Group ID was contained in the DH\_GROUP\_LIST in the I1 packet, it sends an R1 packet with any suitable ECDH public key.

5. If the received Responder's HIT in the I1 packet is not NULL,

the

Responder's in the R1 packet HIT MUST match the destination HIT in the I1 packet. Otherwise, the Responder MUST select a HIT with the same HIT Suite as the Initiator's HIT. If this HIT Suite is not supported by the Responder, it SHOULD select a REQUIRED HIT Suite from <u>Section 5.2.10 of [RFC7401]</u>, which is currently RSA/DSA/SHA-256. Other than that, selecting the HIT

is

a local policy matter.

6. The Responder expresses its supported HIP transport formats in the TRANSPORT\_FORMAT\_LIST as described in <u>Section 5.2.11 of</u> [RFC7401]. The Responder MUST provide at least one payload transport format type.

7. The Responder sends the R1 packet to the source IP address of the

I1 packet.

Note that only steps 4 and 5 have been changed with regard to the processing rules of HIPv2. The considerations about R1 management (except pre-computation) and malformed I1 packets in Sections 6.7.1 and 6.7.2 of [RFC7401] likewise apply to HIP DEX.

# 6.6. Processing Incoming R1 Packets

R1 packets in HIP DEX are handled identically to HIPv2 (see <u>Section 6.8 in [RFC7401]</u>) with the following exceptions: HIP DEX uses

ECDH public keys as HIs and does not employ signatures.

The modified conceptual processing rules for responding to an R1

packet are as follows:

Moskowitz & Hummen 31]

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016

Internet-Draft 2016

- 1. A system receiving an R1 MUST first check to see if it has sent an I1 packet to the originator of the R1 packet (i.e., it has a HIP association that is in state I1-SENT and that is associated with the HITs in the R1). Unless the I1 packet was sent in opportunistic mode (see Section 4.1.8 of [RFC7401]), the IP addresses in the received R1 packet SHOULD be ignored by the R1 processing and, when looking up the right HIP association, the received R1 packet SHOULD be matched against the associations using only the HITs. If a match exists, the system should process the R1 packet as described below.
- Otherwise, if the system is in any state other than I1-SENT or I2-SENT with respect to the HITs included in the R1 packet, it SHOULD silently drop the R1 packet and remain in the current state.

3. If the HIP association state is I1-SENT or I2-SENT, the received

Initiator's HIT MUST correspond to the HIT used in the original I1 packet. Also, the Responder's HIT MUST correspond to the

one

used in the I1 packet, unless this packet contained a NULL HIT.

- If the HIP association state is I1-SENT, and multiple valid R1 packets are present, the system MUST select from among the R1 packets with the largest R1 generation counter.
- 5. The system MUST check that the Initiator's HIT Suite is contained in the HIT\_SUITE\_LIST parameter in the R1 packet (i.e., the Initiator's HIT Suite is supported by the

Responder).

If the HIT Suite is supported by the Responder, the system proceeds normally. Otherwise, the system MAY stay in state I1-SENT and restart the HIP DEX handshake by sending a new I1 packet with an Initiator HIT that is supported by the Responder and hence is contained in the HIT\_SUITE\_LIST in the R1 packet. The system MAY abort the handshake if no suitable source HIT is available. The system SHOULD wait for an acceptable time span to allow further R1 packets with higher R1 generation counters or different HIT and HIT Suites to arrive before restarting or aborting the HIP DEX handshake.

6. The system MUST check that the DH Group ID in the HOST\_ID parameter in the R1 matches the first DH Group ID in the Responder's DH\_GROUP\_LIST in the R1 packet, and also that this Group ID corresponds to a value that was included in the Initiator's DH\_GROUP\_LIST in the I1 packet. If the DH Group ID of the HOST\_ID parameter does not express the Responder's best choice, the Initiator can conclude that the DH\_GROUP\_LIST in

the

I1 or R1 packet was adversely modified. In such a case, the Initiator MAY send a new I1 packet; however, it SHOULD NOT

Moskowitz & Hummen 32]

Internet 2016	t-Draft		HIP [	Diet	EXc	hange	(DEX)			Ja	anuary	
packet.	change	its	preference	in	the	DH_GRO	OUP_LIST	in	the	new	I1	

Alternatively, the Initiator MAY abort the HIP DEX handshake. Moreover, if the DH Group ID indicated in the HOST\_ID parameter does not match the DH Group ID of the HI employed by the Initiator, the system SHOULD wait for an acceptable time span

allow further R1 packets with different DH Group IDs to arrive before restarting or aborting the HIP DEX handshake. When restarting the handshake, the Initiator MUST consult local policies (see <u>Section 7</u>) regarding the use of another, mutually supported DH group for the subsequent handshake with the Responder.

7. If the HIP association state is I2-SENT, the system MAY reenter

state I1-SENT and process the received R1 packet if it has a larger R1 generation counter than the R1 packet responded to previously.

8. The R1 packet may have the A-bit set - in this case, the system MAY choose to refuse it by dropping the R1 packet and returning to state UNASSOCIATED. The system SHOULD consider dropping the R1 packet only if it used a NULL HIT in the I1 packet. If the A-bit is set, the Responder's HIT is anonymous and SHOULD NOT

be

to

stored permanently.

- 9. The system SHOULD attempt to validate the HIT against the received Host Identity by using the received Host Identity to construct a HIT and verify that it matches the Sender's HIT.
- 10. The system MUST store the received R1 generation counter for future reference.
- 11. The system attempts to solve the puzzle in the R1 packet. The system MUST terminate the search after exceeding the remaining lifetime of the puzzle. If the puzzle is not successfully solved, the implementation MAY either resend the I1 packet within the retry bounds or abandon the HIP base exchange.
- 12. The system computes standard Diffie-Hellman keying material according to the public value and Group ID provided in the HOST\_ID parameter. The Diffie-Hellman keying material Kij is used for key extraction as specified in Section 6.3.
- 13. The system selects the HIP\_CIPHER ID from the choices presented in the R1 packet and uses the selected values subsequently when generating and using encryption keys, and when sending the I2 packet. If the proposed alternatives are not acceptable to the system, it may either resend an I1 packet within the retry bounds or abandon the HIP base exchange.

Moskowitz & Hummen 33]

14. The system chooses one suitable transport format from the TRANSPORT\_FORMAT\_LIST and includes the respective transport format parameter in the subsequent I2 packet.

15. The system initializes the remaining variables in the associated  $% \left( {{{\left[ {{{\left[ {{{\left[ {{{c}} \right]}} \right]}_{{{\rm{c}}}}}}}} \right]_{{{\rm{c}}}}} \right)} \right)$ 

state, including Update ID counters.

- 16. The system prepares and sends an I2 packet as described in Section 5.3.3.
- 17. The system SHOULD start a timer whose timeout value SHOULD be larger than the worst-case anticipated RTT, and MUST increment
- а

trial counter associated with the I2 packet. The sender SHOULD retransmit the I2 packet upon a timeout and restart the timer, up to a maximum of I2\_RETRIES\_MAX tries.

- 18. If the system is in state I1-SENT, it SHALL transition to state I2-SENT. If the system is in any other state, it remains in
- the

in

current state.

Note that step 4 from the original processing rules of HIPv2 (signature verification) has been removed in the above processing rules for HIP DEX. Moreover, step 7 of the HIPv2 processing rules has been adapted to account for the fact that HIP DEX uses ECDH public keys as HIS. The considerations about malformed R1 packets

Sections 6.8.1 of [RFC7401] also apply to HIP DEX.

# 6.7. Processing Incoming I2 Packets

The processing of I2 packets follows similar rules as HIPv2 (see <u>Section 6.9 of [RFC7401]</u>). The main differences to HIPv2 are that HIP DEX introduces a new session key exchange via the ENCRYPTED\_KEY parameter as well as an I2 reception acknowledgement for retransmission purposes. Moreover, with HIP DEX the Initiator is responsible for triggering retransmissions, whereas the Responder merely replies to received I2 packets.

The modified HIP DEX conceptual processing rules for responding to an

I2 packet are:

- The system MAY perform checks to verify that the I2 packet corresponds to a recently sent R1 packet. Such checks are implementation dependent. See <u>Appendix A in [RFC7401]</u> for a description of an example implementation.
- The system MUST check that the Responder's HIT corresponds to one of its own HITs and MUST drop the packet otherwise.

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016 34]

- 3. The system MUST further check that the Initiator's HIT Suite is supported. The Responder SHOULD silently drop I2 packets with unsupported Initiator HITs.
  - 4. If the system's state machine is in the R2-SENT state, the system MUST check to see if the newly received I2 packet is similar to the one that triggered moving to R2-SENT. If so, it MUST retransmit a previously sent R2 packet and reset the R2-SENT timer. The system SHOULD re-use the previously established state to re-create the corresponding R2 packet in order to prevent unnecessary computation overhead.
  - 5. If the system's state machine is in the I2-SENT state, the system MUST make a comparison between its local and sender's HITs (similarly as in Section 6.3). If the local HIT is

smaller

2016

than the sender's HIT, it should drop the I2 packet, use the peer Diffie-Hellman key, ENCRYPTED\_KEY keying material and

nonce

#I from the R1 packet received earlier, and get the local Diffie-Hellman key, ENCRYPTED\_KEY keying material, and nonce #J from the I2 packet sent to the peer earlier. Otherwise, the system should process the received I2 packet and drop any previously derived Diffie-Hellman keying material Kij and ENCRYPTED\_KEY keying material it might have generated upon sending the I2 packet previously. The peer Diffie-Hellman key, ENCRYPTED\_KEY, and the nonce #J are taken from the just arrived I2 packet. The local Diffie-Hellman key, ENCRYPTED\_KEY keying material, and the nonce #I are the ones that were sent earlier in the R1 packet.

- 6. If the system's state machine is in the I1-SENT state, and the HITs in the I2 packet match those used in the previously sent
- I1

for

Τ2

packet, the system uses this received I2 packet as the basis

the HIP association it was trying to form, and stops retransmitting I1 packets (provided that the I2 packet passes the additional checks below).

- 7. If the system's state machine is in any state other than R2-SENT, the system SHOULD check that the echoed R1 generation counter in the I2 packet is within the acceptable range if the counter is included. Implementations MUST accept puzzles from the current generation and MAY accept puzzles from earlier generations. If the generation counter in the newly received
  - packet is outside the accepted range, the I2 packet is stale (and perhaps replayed) and SHOULD be dropped.

8. The system MUST validate the solution to the puzzle as described

in <u>Section 6.1</u>.

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016 35]

January

- 9. The I2 packet MUST have a single value in the HIP\_CIPHER parameter, which MUST match one of the values offered to the Initiator in the R1 packet.
- 10. The system MUST derive Diffie-Hellman keying material Kij based on the public value and Group ID in the HOST\_ID parameter.

This

keying material is used to derive the keys of the Master Key SA as described in <u>Section 6.3</u>. If the Diffie-Hellman Group ID is unsupported, the I2 packet is silently dropped. If the processing time for the derivation of the Diffie-Hellman keying material Kij is likely to cause premature I2 retransmissions by the Initiator, the system MAY send a NOTIFY packet before starting the key derivation process. The NOTIFY packet

### contains

Τ2

a NOTIFICATION parameter with Notify Message Type I2\_ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. The NOTIFICATION parameter indicates the anticipated remaining processing time for the I2 packet in milliseconds as two-octet Notification Data.

- 11. The implementation SHOULD also verify that the Initiator's HIT in the I2 packet corresponds to the Host Identity sent in the
  - packet. (Note: some middleboxes may not be able to make this verification.)
- 12. The system MUST process the TRANSPORT\_FORMAT\_LIST parameter. Other documents specifying transport formats (e.g., [<u>RFC7402</u>]) contain specifications for handling any specific transport selected.
- 13. The system MUST verify the HIP\_MAC according to the procedures in Section 6.2.
- 14. If the checks above are valid, then the system proceeds with further I2 processing; otherwise, it discards the I2 and its state machine remains in the same state.
- 15. The I2 packet may have the A-bit set in this case, the system MAY choose to refuse it by dropping the I2 and the state
- machine returns to state UNASSOCIATED. If the A-bit is set, the Initiator's HIT is anonymous and should not be stored permanently.
  - 16. The system MUST decrypt the keying material from the ENCRYPTED\_KEY parameter. This keying material is a partial input to the key derivation process for the Pair-wise Key SA (see Section 6.3).

17. The system initializes the remaining variables in the associated

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016 [Page 36]
- 18. Upon successful processing of an I2 packet when the system's state machine is in state UNASSOCIATED, I1-SENT, I2-SENT, or R2-SENT, an R2 packet is sent as described in <u>Section 5.3.4</u> and the system's state machine transitions to state R2-SENT.
- 19. Upon successful processing of an I2 packet when the system's state machine is in state ESTABLISHED, the old HIP association is dropped and a new one is installed, an R2 packet is sent as described in <u>Section 5.3.4</u>, and the system's state machine transitions to R2-SENT.
- 20. Upon the system's state machine transitioning to R2-SENT, the system starts a timer. The state machine transitions to ESTABLISHED if some data has been received on the incoming HIP association, or an UPDATE packet has been received (or some other packet that indicates that the peer system's state machine

has moved to ESTABLISHED). If the timer expires (allowing for

а

maximal amount of retransmissions of I2 packets), the state machine transitions to ESTABLISHED.

Note that steps 11 (encrypted HOST\_ID) and 15 (signature verification) from the original processing rules of HIPv2 have been removed in the above processing rules for HIP DEX. Moreover, step 10

of the HIPv2 processing rules has been adapted to account for optional extension of the retransmission mechanism. Step 16 has been

added to the processing rules. The considerations about malformed  $\ensuremath{\mbox{I2}}$ 

packets in Sections 6.9.1 of [RFC7401] also apply to HIP DEX.

# 6.8. Processing Incoming R2 Packets

R2 packets in HIP DEX are handled identically to HIPv2 (see <u>Section 6.10 of [RFC7401]</u>) with the following exceptions: HIP DEX introduces a new session key exchange via the ENCRYPTED\_KEY

parameter

and does not employ signatures.

The modified conceptual processing rules for responding to an R2 packet are as follows:

- 1. If the system is in any other state than I2-SENT, the R2 packet is silently dropped.
- 2. The system MUST verify that the HITs in use correspond to the HITs that were received in the R1 packet that caused the transition to the I2-SENT state.
- 3. The system MUST verify the HIP\_MAC according to the procedures

2016

in

Section 6.2.

Moskowitz & Hummen 37]

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016

- 4. The system MUST re-evaluate the DH\_GROUP\_LIST, HIP\_CIPHER, HIT\_SUITE\_LIST, and TRANSPORT\_FORMAT\_LIST parameters in the R2 packet and compare the results against the chosen suites.
- 5. If any of the checks above fail, there is a high probability of an ongoing man-in-the-middle or other security attack. The system SHOULD act accordingly, based on its local policy.
- The system MUST decrypt the keying material from the 6. ENCRYPTED\_KEY parameter. This keying material is a partial

input

to the key derivation process for the Pair-wise Key SA (see Section 6.3).

7. Upon successful processing of the R2 packet, the state machine transitions to state ESTABLISHED.

Note that step 4 (signature verification) from the original processing rules of HIPv2 has been replaced with a negotiation reevaluation in the above processing rules for HIP DEX. Moreover, step

6 has been added to the processing rules.

## 6.9. Processing Incoming NOTIFY Packets

Processing of NOTIFY packets is OPTIONAL. If processed, any errors in a received NOTIFICATION parameter SHOULD be logged. Received errors MUST be considered only as informational, and the receiver SHOULD NOT change its HIP state purely based on the received NOTIFY packet.

If a NOTIFY packet is received in state I2-SENT, this packet may be an I2 reception acknowledgement of the optional retransmission mechanism extension and SHOULD be processed. The following steps define the conceptual processing rules for such incoming NOTIFY packets in state I2-SENT:

1. The system MUST verify that the HITs in use correspond to the HITs that were received in the R1 packet that caused the transition to the I2-SENT state. If this check fails, the

#### NOTIFY

packet SHOULD be dropped silently.

If the NOTIFY packet contains a NOTIFICATION parameter with 2. Notify Message Type I2\_ACKNOWLEDGEMENT, the system SHOULD set

the

I2 retransmission timer to the I2 processing time indicated in the NOTIFICATION parameter plus half the RTT-based timeout

value.

The system MUST NOT set the retransmission timeout to a higher value than allowed by a local policy. Moreover, the system SHOULD reset the I2 retransmission timer to the RTT-based

timeout

value after the next I2 retransmission.

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016 [Page 38]

### 6.10. Processing UPDATE, CLOSE, and CLOSE\_ACK Packets

UPDATE, CLOSE, and CLOSE\_ACK packets are handled similarly in HIP DEX

as in HIP BEX (see Sections 6.11, 6.12, 6.14, and 6.15 of [RFC7401]).

The only difference is the that the HIP\_SIGNATURE is never present and, therefore, is not required to be processed by the receiving party.

# 6.11. Handling State Loss

Implementors MAY choose to use non-volatile, secure storage for HIP states in order for them to survive a system reboot. If no secure storage capabilities are available, the system SHOULD delete the corresponding HIP state, including the keying material. If the implementation does drop the state (as RECOMMENDED), it MUST also drop the peer's R1 generation counter value, unless a local policy explicitly defines that the value of that particular host is stored. An implementation MUST NOT store a peer's R1 generation counters by default, but storing R1 generation counter values, if done, MUST be configured by explicit HITs.

## 7. HIP Policies

There are a number of variables that will influence the HIP exchanges

that each host must support. All HIP DEX implementations SHOULD provide for an ACL of Initiator's HI to Responder's HI. This ACL SHOULD also include preferred transform and local lifetimes. Wildcards SHOULD also be supported for this ACL.

The value of #K used in the HIP R1 must be chosen with care. Values of #K that are too high will exclude clients with weak CPUs because these devices cannot solve the puzzle within a reasonable amount of time. #K should only be raised if a Responder is under high load, i.e., it cannot process all incoming HIP handshakes any more. If a Responder is not under high load, #K SHOULD be 0.

## 8. Security Considerations

HIP DEX closely resembles HIPv2. As such, the security considerations discussed in Section 8 of [RFC7401] similarly apply

to

HIP DEX. HIP DEX, however, replaces the SIGMA-based authenticated Diffie-Hellman key exchange of HIPv2 with an exchange of random keying material that is encrypted by a Diffie-Hellman derived key. Both the Initiator and Responder contribute to this keying material. As a result, the following additional security considerations apply to HIP DEX:

Moskowitz & Hummen 39]

Internet-Draft 2016

o The strength of the keys for the Pair-wise Key SA is based on the quality of the random keying material generated by the Initiator and the Responder. Since the Initiator is expected to be a

### sensor

or an actuator device, there is a natural concern about the quality of its random number generator.

o HIP DEX lacks the Perfect Forward Secrecy (PFS) property of HIPv2.

Consequently, if an HI is compromised, all HIP connections protected with that HI are compromised.

- o The puzzle mechanism using CMAC may need further study regarding the level of difficulty.
- o The HIP DEX HIT generation may present new attack opportunities.
- o The R1 packet is unauthenticated and offers an adversary a new attack vector against the Initiator. This is mitigated by only processing a received R1 packet when the Initiator has previously sent a corresponding I1 packet. Moreover, the Responder repeats the DH\_GROUP\_LIST, HIP\_CIPHER, HIT\_SUITE\_LIST, and TRANSPORT\_FORMAT\_LIST parameters in the R2 packet in order to enable the Initiator to verify that these parameters have not

been

modified by an attacker in the unprotected R1 packet.

The optional retransmission extension of HIP DEX is based on a  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{NOTIFY}}$ 

packet that the Responder can use to inform the Initiator about the reception of an I2 packet. The Responder, however, cannot protect the authenticity of this packet as it did not yet set up the Master Key SA. Hence, an eavesdropping adversary may send spoofed

## reception

acknowledgements for an overheard I2 packet and signal an arbitrary I2 processing time to the Initiator. The adversary can, e.g., indicate a lower I2 processing time than actually required by the Responder in order to cause premature retransmissions. To protect against this attack, the Initiator SHOULD set the NOTIFY-based timeout value to the maximum indicated packet processing time in

#### case

of conflicting NOTIFY packets. This allows the legitimate Responder to extend the retransmission timeout to the intended length. The adversary, however, can still arbitrarily delay the protocol handshake beyond the Responder's actual I2 processing time. To

#### limit

the extend of such a maliciously induced handshake delay, this specification additionally requires the Initiator not to set the NOTIFY-based timeout value higher than allowed by a local policy.

#### 9. IANA Considerations

The following changes to the "Host Identity Protocol (HIP) Parameters" registries have been made:

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016 [Page 40]

January

2016

- HIT Suite ID This document defines the new HIT Suite "ECDH/FOLD" (see Section 5.2.4).
- Parameter Type This document defines the new HIP parameter "ENCRYPTED\_KEY" with type number 643 (see Section 5.2.5).
- HIP Cipher ID This document defines the new HIP Cipher ID "AES-128-CTR" (see Section 5.2.2).
- HI Algorithm This document defines the new HI Algorithm "ECDH" (see Section 5.2.3).
- ECC Curve Label This document specifies a new algorithm-specific subregistry named "ECDH Curve Label". The values for this subregistry are defined in Section 5.2.1.

### 10. Acknowledgments

The drive to put HIP on a cryptographic 'Diet' came out of a number of discussions with sensor vendors at IEEE 802.15 meetings. David McGrew was very helpful in crafting this document.

## **11**. Changelog

This section summarizes the changes made from draft-moskowitz-hiprg-

dex-05, which was the first stable version of the draft. Note that the draft was renamed after draft-moskowitz-hip-rg-dex-06.

11.1. Changes in draft-moskowitz-hip-rg-dex-06

o A major change in the ENCRYPT parameter to use AES-CTR rather than

AES-CBC.

11.2. Changes in draft-moskowitz-hip-dex-00

o Draft name change. HIPRG ended in IRTF, HIP DEX is now individual

submission.

- o Added the change section.
- o Added a Definitions section.
- o Changed I2 and R2 packets to reflect use of AES-CTR for ENCRYPTED\_KEY parameter.
- o Cleaned up KEYMAT Generation text.

Moskowitz & Hummen 41]

- o Added Appendix with C code for the ECDH shared secret generation on an 8 bit processor.
- 11.3. Changes in draft-moskowitz-hip-dex-01
  - o Numerous editorial changes.
  - o New retransmission strategy.
  - o New HIT generation mechanism.
  - o Modified layout of ENCRYPTED\_KEY parameter.
  - o Clarify to use puzzle difficulty of zero under normal network conditions.
- o Align inclusion directive of R1\_COUNTER with HIPv2 (from SHOULD
  to
  MUST)
  - MUST).
  - o Align inclusion of TRANSPORT\_FORMAT\_LIST with HIPv2 (added to R1 and I2).
  - o HIP\_CIPHER, HIT\_SUITE\_LIST, and TRANSPORT\_FORMAT\_LIST must now be echoed in R2 packet.
  - o Added new author.
- 11.4. Changes in draft-moskowitz-hip-dex-02
  - o Introduced formal definition of FOLD function.
  - o Clarified use of CMAC for puzzle computation in section "Solving the Puzzle".
  - o Several editorial changes.
- 11.5. Changes in draft-moskowitz-hip-dex-03
  - o Addressed HI crypto agility.

o Clarified purpose of secret exchanged via  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{ENCRYPTED\_KEY}}$  parameter.

- o Extended the IV in the ENCRYPTED\_KEY parameter.
- o Introduced forward-references to HIP DEX KEYMAT process and improved KEYMAT section.

Moskowitz & Hummen 42]

Moskowitz & Hummen Expires July 21, 2016

- o Replaced <u>Appendix A</u> on "C code for ECC point multiplication" with short discussion in introduction.
- o Updated references.
- o Further editorial changes.
- 11.6. Changes in draft-moskowitz-hip-dex-04
  - o Improved retransmission extension.
  - o Updated and strongly revised packet processing rules.
  - o Updated security considerations.
  - o Updated IANA considerations.
  - o Move the HI Algorithm for ECDH to a value of 11.
  - o Many editorial changes.

#### **12**. References

# **12.1.** Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.
- [RFC2410] Glenn, R. and S. Kent, "The NULL Encryption Algorithm and Its Use With IPsec", RFC 2410, November 1998.
- [RFC3686] Housley, R., "Using Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) Counter Mode With IPsec Encapsulating Security Payload (ESP)", RFC 3686, January 2004.
- [RFC4443] Conta, A., Deering, S., and M. Gupta, "Internet Control Message Protocol (ICMPv6) for the Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", RFC 4443, March 2006.
- [RFC7343] Laganier, J. and F. Dupont, "An IPv6 Prefix for Overlay Routable Cryptographic Hash Identifiers Version 2 (ORCHIDv2)", <u>RFC 7343</u>, September 2014.
- [RFC7401] Moskowitz, R., Heer, T., Jokela, P., and T. Henderson, "Host Identity Protocol Version 2 (HIPv2)", <u>RFC 7401</u>, April 2015.

Moskowitz & Hummen 43]

Internet-Draft HIP Diet EXchange (DEX) January 2016

[RFC7402] Jokela, P., Moskowitz, R., and J. Melen, "Using the Encapsulating Security Payload (ESP) Transport Format with

the Host Identity Protocol (HIP)", RFC 7402, April 2015.

### **12.2.** Informative References

- [DH76] Diffie, W. and M. Hellman, "New Directions in Cryptography", IEEE Transactions on Information Theory vol. IT-22, number 6, pages 644-654, Nov 1976.
- [HWZ13] Hummen, R., Wirtz, H., Ziegeldorf, J., Hiller, J., and K. Wehrle, "Tailoring End-to-End IP Security Protocols to

the

Internet of Things", in Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Network Protocols (ICNP 2013), October

### 2013.

[I-D.ietf-hip-rfc4423-bis]

Moskowitz, R. and M. Komu, "Host Identity Protocol Architecture", <u>draft-ietf-hip-rfc4423-bis-13</u> (work in progress), December 2015.

[IEEE.802-11.2007]

"Information technology - Telecommunications and information exchange between systems - Local and metropolitan area networks - Specific requirements - Part 11: Wireless LAN Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer (PHY) Specifications", IEEE Standard 802.11, June 2007, <<u>http://standards.ieee.org/getieee802/</u> download/802.11-2007.pdf>.

[IEEE.802-15-4.2011]

"Information technology - Telecommunications and information exchange between systems - Local and metropolitan area networks - Specific requirements - Part 15.4: Wireless Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer (PHY) Specifications for Low-Rate Wireless Personal Area Networks (WPANs)", IEEE Standard 802.15.4, September 2011, <<u>http://standards.ieee.org/getieee802/</u> download/802.15.4-2011.pdf>.

- [LN08] Liu, A. and H. Ning, "TinyECC: A Configurable Library for Elliptic Curve Cryptography in Wireless Sensor Networks", in Proceedings of International Conference on Information Processing in Sensor Networks (IPSN 2008), April 2008.
- [RFC5903] Fu, D. and J. Solinas, "Elliptic Curve Groups modulo a Prime (ECP Groups) for IKE and IKEv2", <u>RFC 5903</u>, June 2010.

Moskowitz & Hummen 44]

Internet-Draft 2016	HIP Diet EXchange (DEX)	January
[RFC5996]	Kaufman, C., Hoffman, P., Nir, Y., and P. "Internet Key Exchange Protocol Version 2 5996, September 2010.	Eronen, (IKEv2)", <u>RFC</u>
[RFC6090] Elliptic	McGrew, D., Igoe, K., and M. Salter, "Fund	lamental

Curve Cryptography Algorithms", <u>RFC 6090</u>, February 2011. [RFC7228] Bormann, C., Ersue, M., and A. Keranen, "Terminology for

- Constrained-Node Networks", <u>RFC 7228</u>, May 2014.
- [SECG] SECG, "Recommended Elliptic Curve Domain Parameters", SEC 2 , 2000, <<u>http://www.secg.org/</u>>.

Moskowitz & Hummen 45]

<u>Appendix A</u>. Password-based two-factor authentication during the HIP DEX handshake

January

HIP DEX allows to identify authorized connections based on a twofactor authentication mechanism. With two-factor authentication, devices that are authorized to communicate with each other are required to be pre-provisioned with a shared (group) key. The Initiator uses this pre-provisioned key to encrypt the ECHO\_RESPONSE\_UNSIGNED in the I2 packet. Upon reception of the I2, the Responder verifies that its challenge in the ECHO\_REQUEST\_UNSIGNED parameter in the R1 packet has been encrypted with the correct key. If verified successfully, the Responder proceeds with the handshake. Otherwise, it silently drops the I2 packet.

Note that there is no explicit signaling in the HIP DEX handshake for

this behavior. Thus, knowledge of two-factor authentication must be configured externally prior to the handshake.

Authors' Addresses

Robert Moskowitz (editor) HTT Consulting Oak Park, MI USA

EMail: rgm@htt-consult.com

Rene Hummen Chair of Communication and Distributed Systems, RWTH Aachen Ahornstrasse 55 Aachen 52074 Germany

EMail: hummen@comsys.rwth-aachen.de URI: http://www.comsys.rwth-aachen.de/team/rene-hummen/ Moskowitz & Hummen 46]