

Group OSCORE - Secure Group Communication for CoAP

draft-ietf-core-oscore-groupcomm-12

Marco Tiloca, RISE
Göran Selander, Ericsson
Francesca Palombini, Ericsson
John Mattsson, Ericsson
Jiye Park, Universität Duisburg-Essen

IETF 111, CoRE WG, July 28th, 2021

Update since the March meeting

- › Version -12 submitted
- › Main updates
 - Recycling of Group IDs in the group (Christian)
 - Security of using an identity public key for both signing and Diffie-Hellman (Ben [1][2])
 - Major changes to the message processing, especially in group mode (John)
 - Clarified security properties

[1] https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/core/ujj_I-LlqW9fq_quh-YqKS0fF0/

[2] <https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/core/YRNXvtiFmHLk5YkXK8-uJg-t3NU/>

Updates from -12

- › **Recycling of Group IDs in a group – Reminder: the Group ID changes when rekeying**
 - It used to be forbidden, to prevent a notification from matching two long-lived observations
- › The Group Manager (GM) retains the Gid obtained by a node when joining, i.e. its “Birth Gid”
 - Before rekeying the group, the GM checks if the new Gid is any current member’s “Birth Gid”
 - If such members are found, the GM removes them from the group and rekeys accordingly
- › Those evicted nodes will ask the GM for the latest keying material
 - Since they are not group members anymore, they receive error responses
 - Eventually, they will re-join the group and thus terminate their observations
- › If any of those nodes re-joins before another rekeying has happened
 - The Group Manager **MUST NOT** rekey the group again upon its joining
- › Recycling Group IDs is safe → A group can live forever

Updates from -12

- › **Security of using an identity key for both signing and Diffie-Hellman [3][4] – #72 #73**
 - If signing keys use Ed25519 (Ed448) they are converted to Curve25519 (Curve448) for DH
 - The computed DH secret is used to generate encryption keys for the pairwise mode
 - Both uses have the same goal and policy: group communication under a Security Context

- › This double-use deviates from common best practices → Security has to be well proven
 - Build on and extend the proof at [5], as focused on (but not limited to) ECIES settings
 - Now proven to be secure specifically in Group OSCORE, see [6] – Thanks to Erik Thormarker!

[3] https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/core/ujj_I-LlqW9fq_quh-YqKS0fF0/

[4] <https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/core/YRNXvtiFmHLk5YkXK8-uJg-t3NU/>

[5] <https://eprint.iacr.org/2011/615.pdf>

[6] <https://eprint.iacr.org/2021/509.pdf>

Updates from -12

› Security of using an identity key for both signing and Diffie-Hellman

- Adapted derivation of pairwise keys, explicitly involving the two peers' public keys (see Section 2.4.1)

```
Pairwise Sender Key    = HKDF(Sender Key, IKM-Sender, info, L)
Pairwise Recipient Key = HKDF(Recipient Key, IKM-Recipient, info, L)

with

IKM-Sender    = Sender Pub Key | Recipient Pub Key | Shared Secret
IKM-Recipient = Recipient Pub Key | Sender Pub Key | Shared Secret
```

› (Cryptographic) security considerations supporting the procedure's correctness


- For ECDSA signing keys, [6] proves that the proof from [5] is applicable also to Group OSCORE
- For EdDSA signing keys, [6] builds a new proof from the one in [5], specific to Group OSCORE
- Dedicated discussion on converting from Ed25519 (Ed448) to Curve25519 (Curve448)

[5] <https://eprint.iacr.org/2011/615.pdf>

[6] <https://eprint.iacr.org/2021/509.pdf>

Updates from -12

› Admitted formats of public keys (see Section 2.3)

- Must provide the full set of information about the public key algorithm
- Relevant examples:
 - › CWT, see *RFC8392*
 - › Unprotected CWT claim set, see *draft-ietf-rats-uccs* 
 - › X.509 certificates, see *RFC7925*
 - › C509 certificates, see *draft-ietf-cose-cbor-encoded-cert*

```
{ /CWT claims list/  
  2: "42-50-31-FF-EF-37-32-39", /sub/  
  8: { /cnf/  
    1: { /COSE_Key/  
      1: 1,  
      -1: 4, /X25519/  
      -2: h'b1a3e89460e88d3a8d54211dc95f0b  
          903ff205eb71912d6db8f4af980d2db83a',  
    }  
  }  
}
```

› All public keys used in the group

- Must have the same single format used in the group
- Must be compatible with the algorithm and related parameters used in the group

Updates from -12

› Now an OSCORE group can work in three ways

- “Group mode” only; “Pairwise mode” only (NEW); both modes
- Group members know what is used in the group – Learned when joining, or at early group discovery

› Consistent revision of the Security Context – Additions to OSCORE (RFC8613)

- (*) Specific to the group mode
- (^) Specific to the pairwise mode
- **Some recently added parameters**

› In group mode

- Encrypt with Signature Encryption Algorithm
- Sign with Signature Algorithm
- 1 common Group Encryption Key derived like a Sender/Recipient Key, through HKDF()

› In pairwise mode

- Encrypt with AEAD Algorithm (RFC 8613)
- Derive pairwise keys with Pairwise Key Agreement Algorithm

| Context Component | New Information Elements |
|------------------------|---|
| Common Context | Group Manager Public Key * Signature Encryption Algorithm * Signature Algorithm * Group Encryption Key ^ Pairwise Key Agreement Algorithm |
| Sender Context | Endpoint’s own public and private key pair ^ Pairwise Sender Keys for the other endpoints |
| Each Recipient Context | Public key of the other endpoint ^ Pairwise Recipient Key of the other endpoint |

Figure 1: Additions to the OSCORE Security Context. The optional elements labeled with * (with ^) are present only if the group uses the group mode (the pairwise mode).

Updates from -12

› Now an OSCORE group can work in three ways

- “Group mode” only; “Pairwise mode” only (NEW); both modes
- Group members know what is used in the group – Learned when joining, or at early group discovery

› Consistent revision of the External AAD

- Some recently added parameters

› Removed some parameters

- Capabilities and properties of algorithms
- Now embedded in the public keys

› Added Group Manager public key

- More accurate “group description” covered by the external_aad
- Prevents a “group cloning attack”, discussed in the security considerations

```
external_aad = bstr .cbor aad_array
```

```
aad_array = [  
  oscore_version : uint,  
  algorithms : [alg_aead : int / tstr / null,  
                alg_signature_enc : int / tstr / null,  
                alg_signature : int / tstr / null,  
                alg_pairwise_key_agreement : int / tstr / null],  
  request_kid : bstr,  
  request_piv : bstr,  
  options : bstr,  
  request_kid_context : bstr,  
  OSCORE_option: bstr,  
  sender_public_key: bstr,  
  gm_public_key: bstr / null  
]
```


Updates from -12

› In group mode, the countersignature is separately encrypted

- Encrypt COSE plaintext → Sign the COSE ciphertext → Encrypt the countersignature separately
- Group privacy: not possible to track a user across two groups, unless the tracker is a member of both

› Countersignature encryption

- $ENC_COUNTERSIGNATURE = SIGNATURE \text{ XOR } KEYSTREAM$
- KEYSTREAM derived on a per-message basis from the new **Group Encryption Key**

› Keystream derivation

- $KEYSTREAM = HKDF(\text{salt}, IKM, \text{info}, \text{length})$
 - › salt : Partial IV used to protect the message
 - › IKM : Group Encryption Key
 - › info : [Sender ID of the Partial IV generator; Group ID; True/False (req/resp); length]
 - › length : Same length as the countersignature

› Receiver side: verify the countersignature first, then decrypt the COSE ciphertext

Updates from -12

› In group mode, admit also encryption-only algorithms

- Expected registration as COSE algorithms
- Some applications may not desire/afford both a signature and an integrity Tag in each message
- Source authentication still ensured, thanks to the signature and what is covered by the external_aad

| | | |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Ciphertext w/ Tag | Countersignature encrypted by keystream | CoAP payload (enc+auth alg) |
| Ciphertext w/o Tag | Countersignature encrypted by keystream | CoAP payload (enc-only alg) |

› Even with encryption-only algorithms, i.e. without integrity Tag, we still want to ...

- Admit external signature checkers and always verify group membership when receiving a message
- But a group member might leave, become external signature checker and inject re-signed messages
- Other nodes would believe the sender to still be a group member – They still have its public key!

Therefore ...

Updates from -12

- › **Stricter management of group keying material, including group rekeying**
 - If a node leaves, the GM must rekey the group
 - Rekeying messages must specify the “stale Sender IDs” of the current key generation
 - › Sender IDs earlier relinquished due to a change requested by the owning node; or
 - › Sender IDs belonging to a leaving node
- › **The rekeyed group members obtain the stale Sender IDs**
 - They delete the associated public keys used in the group
 - They delete the associated Recipient Contexts in the group
 - They rely on their owned public keys to assert the group membership of sender endpoints
- › **A group member may miss a group rekeying instance**
 - The GM allows to retrieve an aggregate set of stale Sender IDs for the most recent key generations
- › **Detailed mechanics for achieving this are out of scope for Group OSCORE**
 - The GM defined in *draft-ietf-ace-key-groupcomm-oscore* provides these functionalities

Updates from -12

› **New Section 8.5 on external signature checkers**

- Guidelines on message processing and corner cases

› **Removed three Appendices**

- “No Verification of Signatures in Group Mode” – Can’t be considered secure
- “Example Values with COSE Capabilities” – Moot (see admitted formats of public keys)
- “Parameter Extensibility for Future COSE Algorithms” – Moot (see admitted formats of public keys)

› **Extended security considerations**

- Revised considerations on the group mode, emphasizing its security properties
- New Section 10.8 about the prevented “group cloning attack”
- More cryptographic considerations, on using the same key pair for signing and for Diffie-Hellman

Next steps

- › Improve security considerations
 - Mostly on the group mode, based on the latest changes
- › Double-check that the few open Github issues are well addressed
- › Submit v -13
 - If no further issues arise, it should be ready for a 2nd WGLC

Thank you!

Comments/questions?

<https://github.com/core-wg/oscore-groupcomm>