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1. Introduction

To work around interoperability problems with legacy servers, many TLS client implementations do not rely on the TLS protocol version negotiation mechanism alone, but will intentionally reconnect using a downgraded protocol if initial handshake attempts fail. Such clients may fall back to connections in which they announce a version as low as TLS 1.0 (or even its predecessor, SSL 3.0) as the highest supported version.

While such fallback retries can be a useful last resort for connections to actual legacy servers, there’s a risk that active attackers could exploit the downgrade strategy to weaken the cryptographic security of connections. Also, handshake errors due to network glitches could similarly be misinterpreted as interaction with a legacy server and result in a protocol downgrade.

All unnecessary protocol downgrades are undesirable (e.g., from TLS 1.2 to TLS 1.1 if both the client and the server actually do support TLS 1.2); they can be particularly harmful when the result is loss of the TLS extension feature by downgrading to SSL 3.0. This document defines a Signaling Cipher Suite Value (SCSV) that can be employed to prevent unintended protocol downgrades between clients and servers that comply with this document, by having the client indicate that the current connection attempt is merely a fallback, and by having the server return a fatal alert if it detects an inappropriate fallback. (The alert does not necessarily indicate an intentional downgrade attack, since network glitches too could result in inappropriate fallback retries.)
The fallback SCSV defined in this document is not a suitable substitute for proper TLS version negotiation. TLS implementations need to properly handle TLS version negotiation and extensibility mechanisms to avoid the security issues and connection delays associated with fallback retries.

This specification applies to implementations of TLS 1.0 [RFC2246], TLS 1.1 [RFC4346], and TLS 1.2 [RFC5246], and to implementations of DTLS 1.0 [RFC4347] and DTLS 1.2 [RFC6347]. (It is particularly relevant if the TLS implementations also include support for predecessor protocol SSL 3.0 [RFC6101].) It can be applied similarly to later protocol versions.

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 [RFC2119].

2. Protocol values

This document defines a new TLS cipher suite value:

\[
\text{TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV} \quad \{0x56, 0x00\}
\]

This is a signaling cipher suite value (SCSV), i.e., it does not actually correspond to a suite of cryptosystems, and it can never be selected by the server in the handshake; rather, its presence in the Client Hello message serves as a backwards-compatible signal from the client to the server.

This document also allocates a new alert value in the TLS Alert Registry [RFC5246]:

\[
\text{enum } \{ \\
\text{\quad inappropriate_fallback(86),} \\
\text{\quad (255)} \\
\text{\quad }\} \text{ AlertDescription;}
\]

This alert is only generated by servers, as described in Section 3. It is always fatal.

3. Server behavior

This section specifies server behavior when receiving the TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV cipher suite from a client in ClientHello.cipher_suites.
If TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV appears in ClientHello.cipher_suites and the highest protocol version supported by the server is higher than the version indicated in ClientHello.client_version, the server MUST respond with a fatal inappropriate_fallback alert (unless it responds with a fatal protocol_version alert because the version indicated in ClientHello.client_version is unsupported). The record layer version number for this alert MUST be set to either ClientHello.client_version (as it would for the Server Hello message if the server was continuing the handshake), or to the record layer version number used by the client.

Otherwise (either TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV does not appear, or it appears and the client’s protocol version is at least the highest protocol version supported by the server), the server proceeds with the handshake as usual.

(A protocol version is supported by the server if, in response to appropriate Client Hello messages, the server would use it for ServerHello.server_version. If a particular protocol version is implemented but completely disabled by server settings, it is not considered supported. For example, if the implementation's highest protocol version is TLS 1.2 but the server operator has disabled this version, a TLS 1.1 Client Hello with TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV does not warrant responding with an inappropriate_fallback alert.)

4. Client behavior

The TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV cipher suite value is meant for use by clients that repeat a connection attempt with a downgraded protocol (perform a "fallback retry") in order to work around interoperability problems with legacy servers.

If a client sends a ClientHello.client_version containing a lower value than the latest (highest-valued) version supported by the client, it SHOULD include the TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV cipher suite value in ClientHello.cipher_suites; see Section 6 for security considerations for this recommendation. (The client SHOULD put TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV after all cipher suites that it actually intends to negotiate.)

As an exception to the above, when a client intends to resume a session and sets ClientHello.client_version to the protocol version negotiated for that session, it MUST NOT include TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV in ClientHello.cipher_suites. (In this case, it is assumed that the client already knows the highest protocol version supported by the server: see [RFC5246], Appendix E.1.)
If a client sets ClientHello.client_version to its highest supported protocol version, it MUST NOT include TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV in ClientHello.cipher_suites.

(A protocol version is supported by the client if the client normally attempts to use it in handshakes. If a particular protocol version is implemented but completely disabled by client settings, it is not considered supported. For example, if the implementation’s highest protocol version is TLS 1.2 but the user has disabled this version, a TLS 1.1 handshake is expected and does not warrant sending TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV.)

Fallback retries could be caused by events such as network glitches, and a client including TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV in ClientHello.cipher_suites may receive an inappropriate_fallback alert in response, indicating that the server supports a higher protocol version. Thus, if a client intends to use retries to work around network glitches, it should then retry with the highest version it supports.

If a client keeps track of the highest protocol version apparently supported by a particular server for use in ClientHello.client_version later, then if the client receives an inappropriate_fallback alert from that server, it must clear the memorized highest supported protocol version. (Without the alert, it is a good idea -- but outside of the scope of this document -- for clients to clear that state after a time-out, since the server’s highest protocol version could change over time.)

For clients that use client-side TLS False Start [false-start], it is important to note that the TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV mechanism cannot protect the first round of application data sent by the client: refer to the Security Considerations in [false-start], Section 6.

5. Operational Considerations

Updating legacy server clusters to simultaneously add support for newer protocol versions and support for TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV can have complications, if the legacy server implementation is not "version-tolerant" (cannot properly handle Client Hello messages for newer protocol versions): fallback retries required for interoperability with old server nodes might be rejected by updated server nodes.

Updating the server cluster in two consecutive steps makes this safe: first, update the server software but leave the highest supported version unchanged (by disabling newer versions in server settings); then, after all legacy (version-intolerant) implementations have been removed, change server settings to allow new protocol versions.
6. Security Considerations

Section 4 does not require client implementations to send TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV in any particular case, it merely recommends it; behavior can be adapted according to the client’s security needs. It is important to remember that omitting TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV enables downgrade attacks, so implementors must take into account whether the protocol version given by ClientHello.client_version still provides an acceptable level of protection. For example, during the initial deployment of a new protocol version (when some interoperability problems may have to be expected), smoothly falling back to the previous protocol version in case of problems may be preferable to potentially not being able to connect at all: so TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV could be omitted for this particular protocol downgrade step.

However, it is strongly recommended to send TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV when downgrading to SSL 3.0 as the CBC cipher suites in SSL 3.0 have weaknesses that cannot be addressed by implementation workarounds like the remaining weaknesses in later (TLS) protocol versions.

7. IANA Considerations

[[ TO BE REMOVED: The requested registry allocations require Standards Action, i.e., will only be official with the IESG’s Standards Track RFC approval. Since this document is currently an Internet-Draft, IANA so far has in fact not added the cipher suite number and alert number to the respective registries. The values as shown are used in early implementations. ]]

+-----------+-------------------+---------+-----------------+
|   Value   |    Description    | DTLS-OK |    Reference    |
+-----------+-------------------+---------+-----------------+
| 0x56,0x00 | TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV |    Y    | (this document) |
+-----------+-------------------+---------+-----------------+

http://www.iana.org/assignments/tls-parameters

+-------+------------------------+---------+-----------------+
| Value |      Description       | DTLS-OK |    Reference    |
+-------+------------------------+---------+-----------------+
|   86  | inappropriate_fallback |    Y    | (this document) |
+-------+------------------------+---------+-----------------+

http://www.iana.org/assignments/tls-parameters

IANA has added TLS cipher suite number 0x56,0x00 with name TLS_FALLBACK_SCSV to the TLS Cipher Suite registry, and alert number 86 with name inappropriate_fallback to the TLS Alert registry.
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1. Introduction

Traditional TLS [RFC5246] offers a Diffie-Hellman ephemeral (DHE) key exchange mode which provides Forward Secrecy for the connection. The client offers a ciphersuite in the ClientHello that includes DHE, and the server offers the client group parameters generator $g$ and modulus $p$. If the client does not consider the group strong enough (e.g., if $p$ is too small, or if $p$ is not prime, or there are small subgroups that cannot be easily avoided), or if it is unable to process the group for other reasons, the client has no recourse but to terminate the connection.

Conversely, when a TLS server receives a suggestion for a DHE ciphersuite from a client, it has no way of knowing what kinds of DH groups the client is capable of handling, or what the client’s security requirements are for this key exchange session. For example, some widely-distributed TLS clients are not capable of DH groups where $p > 1024$ bits. Other TLS clients may by policy wish to use DHE only if the server can offer a stronger group (and are willing to use a non-PFS key-exchange mechanism otherwise). The server has no way of knowing which type of client is connecting, but must select DH parameters with insufficient knowledge.

Additionally, the DH parameters selected by the server may have a known structure which renders them secure against a small subgroup attack, but a client receiving an arbitrary $p$ and $g$ has no efficient way to verify that the structure of a new group is reasonable for use.

This modification to TLS solves these problems by using a section of the "EC Named Curves" registry to select common DH groups with known structure and defining the use of the "elliptic_curves(10)" extension (described here as "Supported Groups" extension) for clients advertising support for DHE with these groups. This document also provides guidance for compatible peers to take advantage of the additional security, availability, and efficiency offered.

The use of this mechanism by one compatible peer when interacting with a non-compatible peer should have no detrimental effects.

1.1. Requirements Language

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 [RFC2119]. The term "PRIVATE USE" is to be interpreted as described in [RFC5226].

1.2. Vocabulary

The terms "DHE" or "FFDHE" are used in this document to refer to the finite-field-based Diffie-Hellman ephemeral key exchange mechanism in TLS. TLS also supports elliptic-curve-based Diffie-Hellman (ECDHE) ephemeral key exchanges [RFC4492], but this document does not document their use. A registry previously used only by ECDHE-capable implementations is expanded in this document to cover FFDHE groups as well. "FFDHE ciphersuites" is used in this document to refer exclusively to ciphersuites with FFDHE key exchange mechanisms, but note that these suites are typically labeled with a TLS_DHE_ prefix.

2. Named Group Overview

We use previously-unallocated codepoints within the extension currently known as "elliptic_curves" (section 5.1.1. of [RFC4492]) to indicate known finite field groups. The extension’s semantics are expanded from "Supported Elliptic Curves" to "Supported Groups". The semantics of the extension’s data type (enum NamedCurve) is also expanded from "named curve" to "named group".

Additionally, we explicitly relax the requirement about when the Supported Groups extension can be sent. This extension MAY be sent by the client when either FFDHE or ECDHE ciphersuites are listed.

Codepoints in the NamedCurve registry with a high byte of 0x01 (that is, between 256 and 511 inclusive) are set aside for FFDHE groups, though only a small number of them are initially defined and we do not expect many other FFDHE groups to be added to this range. No codepoints outside of this range will be allocated to FFDHE groups. The new code points for the NamedCurve registry are:

```c
enum {
// other already defined elliptic curves (see RFC 4492)
    ffdhe2048(256), ffdhe3072(257), ffdhe4096(258),
    ffdhe6144(259), ffdhe8192(260),
// }
} NamedCurve;
```

These additions to the Named Curve registry are described in detail in Appendix A. They are all safe primes derived from the base of the natural logarithm ("e"), with the high and low 64 bits set to 1 for efficient Montgomery or Barrett reduction.
The use of the base of the natural logarithm here is as a "nothing-up-my-sleeve" number. The goal is to guarantee that the bits in the middle of the modulus are effectively random, while avoiding any suspicion that the primes have secretly been selected to be weak according to some secret criteria. [RFC3526] used pi for this value. See Section 9.5 for reasons that this draft does not reuse pi.

3. Client Behavior

A TLS client that is capable of using strong finite field Diffie-Hellman groups can advertise its capabilities and its preferences for stronger key exchange by using this mechanism.

The compatible client that wants to be able to negotiate strong FFDHE Sends a "Supported Groups" extension (identified by type elliptic_curves(10) in [RFC4492]) in the ClientHello, and include a list of known FFDHE groups in the extension data, ordered from most preferred to least preferred. If the client also supports and wants to offer ECDHE key exchange, it MUST use a single "Supported Groups" extension to include all supported groups (both ECDHE and FFDHE groups). The ordering SHOULD be based on client preference, but see Section 6.1 for more nuance.

A client that offers a "Supported Groups" extension containing an FFDHE group SHOULD also include at least one FFDHE ciphersuite in the Client Hello.

A client that offers a group MUST be able and willing to perform a DH key exchange using that group.

A client that offers one or more FFDHE groups in the "Supported Groups" extension and an FFDHE ciphersuite, and receives an FFDHE ciphersuite from the server SHOULD take the following steps upon receiving the ServerKeyExchange:

For non-anonymous ciphersuites where the offered Certificate is valid and appropriate for the peer, validate the signature over the ServerDHParams. If not valid, terminate the connection.

If the signature over ServerDHPrams is valid, compare the selected dh_p and dh_g with the FFDHE groups offered by the client. If none of the offered groups match, the server is not compatible with this draft. The client MAY decide to continue the connection if the selected group is acceptable under local policy, or it MAY decide to terminate the connection with a fatal insufficient_security(71) alert.
If the client continues (either because the server offered a matching group, or because local policy permits the offered custom group), the client MUST verify that \( dh_{Ys} \) is in the range \( 1 < dh_{Ys} < dh_p - 1 \). If \( dh_{Ys} \) is not in this range, the client MUST terminate the connection with a fatal handshake_failure(40) alert.

If \( dh_{Ys} \) is in range, then the client SHOULD continue with the connection as usual.

3.1. Client Local Policy on Custom Groups

Compatible clients that are willing to accept FFDHE ciphersuites from non-compatible servers may have local policy about what custom FFDHE groups they are willing to accept. This local policy presents a risk to clients, who may accept weakly-protected communications from misconfigured servers.

This draft cannot enumerate all possible safe local policy (the safest may be to simply reject all custom groups), but compatible clients that accept some custom groups from the server MUST do at least cursory checks on group size, and may take other properties into consideration as well.

A compatible client that accepts FFDHE ciphersuites using custom groups from non-compatible servers MUST reject any group with \( |dh_p| < 768 \) bits, and SHOULD reject any group with \( |dh_p| < 1024 \) bits.

A compatible client that rejects a non-compatible server’s custom group may decide to retry the connection while omitting all FFDHE ciphersuites from the ClientHello. A client SHOULD only use this approach if it successfully verified the server’s expected signature over the ServerDHParams, to avoid being forced by an active attacker into a non-preferred ciphersuite.

4. Server Behavior

If a compatible TLS server receives a Supported Groups extension from a client that includes any FFDHE group (i.e. any codepoint between 256 and 511 inclusive, even if unknown to the server), and if none of the client-proposed FFDHE groups are known and acceptable to the server, then the server MUST NOT select an FFDHE ciphersuite. In this case, the server SHOULD select an acceptable non-FFDHE ciphersuite from the client’s offered list. If the extension is present with FFDHE groups, none of the client’s offered groups are acceptable by the server, and none of the client’s proposed non-FFDHE ciphersuites are acceptable to the server, the server MUST end the connection with a fatal TLS alert of type insufficient_security(71).
If at least one FFDHE ciphersuite is present in the client ciphersuite list, and the Supported Groups extension is either absent from the ClientHello entirely or contains no FFDHE groups (i.e. no codepoints between 256 and 511 inclusive), then the server knows that the client is not compatible with this document. In this scenario, a server MAY select a non-FFDHE ciphersuite, or MAY select an FFDHE ciphersuite and offer an FFDHE group of its choice to the client as part of a traditional ServerKeyExchange.

A compatible TLS server that receives the Supported Groups extension with FFDHE codepoints in it, and which selects an FFDHE ciphersuite MUST select one of the client’s offered groups. The server indicates the choice of group to the client by sending the group’s parameters as usual in the ServerKeyExchange as described in section 7.4.3 of [RFC5246].

A TLS server MUST NOT select a named FFDHE group that was not offered by a compatible client.

A TLS server MUST NOT select an FFDHE ciphersuite if the client did not offer one, even if the client offered an FFDHE group in the Supported Groups extension.

If a non-anonymous FFDHE ciphersuite is selected, and the TLS client has used this extension to offer an FFDHE group of comparable or greater strength than the server’s public key, the server SHOULD select an FFDHE group at least as strong as the server’s public key. For example, if the server has a 3072-bit RSA key, and the client offers only ffdhe2048 and ffdhe4096, the server SHOULD select ffdhe4096.

When an FFDHE ciphersuite is selected, and the client sends a ClientKeyExchange, the server MUST verify that $1 < dh_Yc < dh_p - 1$. If dh_Yc is out of range, the server MUST terminate the connection with fatal handshake_failure(40) alert.

5. Optimizations

In a key exchange with a successfully negotiated known FFDHE group, both peers know that the group in question uses a safe prime as a modulus, and that the group in use is of size p-1 or (p-1)/2. This allows at least three optimizations that can be used to improve performance.
5.1. Checking the Peer’s Public Key

Peers MUST validate each other’s public key Y (dh_Ys offered by the server or dh_Yc offered by the client) by ensuring that 1 < Y < p-1. This simple check ensures that the remote peer is properly behaved and isn’t forcing the local system into the 2-element subgroup.

To reach the same assurance with an unknown group, the client would need to verify the primality of the modulus, learn the factors of p-1, and test both the generator g and Y against each factor to avoid small subgroup attacks.

5.2. Short Exponents

Traditional Finite Field Diffie-Hellman has each peer choose their secret exponent from the range [2,p-2]. Using exponentiation by squaring, this means each peer must do roughly $2 \times \log_2(p)$ multiplications, twice (once for the generator and once for the peer’s public key).

Peers concerned with performance may also prefer to choose their secret exponent from a smaller range, doing fewer multiplications, while retaining the same level of overall security. Each named group indicates its approximate security level, and provides a lower-bound on the range of secret exponents that should preserve it. For example, rather than doing $2 \times 2 \times 3072$ multiplications for a ffdhe3072 handshake, each peer can choose to do $2 \times 2 \times 275$ multiplications by choosing their secret exponent from the range $[2^{274},2^{275}]$ (that is, a m-bit integer where m is at least 275) and still keep the same approximate security level.

A similar short-exponent approach is suggested in SSH’s Diffie-Hellman key exchange (See section 6.2 of [RFC4419]).

5.3. Table Acceleration

Peers wishing to further accelerate FFDHE key exchange can also pre-compute a table of powers of the generator of a known group. This is a memory vs. time tradeoff, and it only accelerates the first exponentiation of the ephemeral DH exchange (the fixed-base exponentiation). The variable-base exponentiation (using the peer’s public exponent as a base) still needs to be calculated as normal.

6. Operational Considerations
6.1. Preference Ordering

The ordering of named groups in the Supported Groups extension may contain some ECDHE groups and some FFDHE groups. These SHOULD be ranked in the order preferred by the client.

However, the ClientHello also contains list of desired ciphersuites, also ranked in preference order. This presents the possibility of conflicted preferences. For example, if the ClientHello contains a CipherSuite with two choices in order

<TLS_DHE_RSA_WITH_AES_128_CBC_SHA,
TLS_ECDHE_RSA_WITH_AES_128_CBC_SHA> and the Supported Groups
Extension contains two choices in order <secp256r1,ffdhe3072> then there is a clear contradiction. Clients SHOULD NOT present such a contradiction since it does not represent a sensible ordering. A server that encounters such an contradiction when selecting between an ECDHE or FFDHE key exchange mechanism while trying to respect client preferences SHOULD give priority to the Supported Groups extension (in the example case, it should select TLS_ECDHE_RSA_WITH_AES_128_CBC_SHA with secp256r1), but MAY resolve the contradiction any way it sees fit.

More subtly, clients MAY interleave preferences between ECDHE and FFDHE groups, for example if stronger groups are preferred regardless of cost, but weaker groups are acceptable, the Supported Groups extension could consist of:

<ffdhe8192,secp384p1,ffdhe3072,secp256r1>. In this example, with the same CipherSuite offered as the previous example, a server configured to respect client preferences and with support for all listed groups SHOULD select TLS_DHE_RSA_WITH_AES_128_CBC_SHA with ffdhe8192. A server configured to respect client preferences and with support for only secp384p1 and ffdhe3072 SHOULD select TLS_ECDHE_RSA_WITH_AES_128_CBC_SHA with secp384p1.
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8. IANA Considerations

IANA maintains the registry currently known as EC Named Curves (originally defined in [RFC4492] and updated by [RFC7027]) at [1].
This document expands the semantics of this registry slightly, to include groups based on finite fields in addition to groups based on elliptic curves. IANA should add a range designation to that registry, indicating that values from 256-511 (inclusive) are set aside for "Finite Field Diffie-Hellman groups", and that all other entries in the registry are "Elliptic curve groups".

This document allocates five well-defined codepoints in the registry for specific Finite Field Diffie-Hellman groups defined in Appendix A.

In addition, the four highest codepoints in this range (508-511, inclusive) are designated for PRIVATE USE by peers who have privately-developed Finite Field Diffie-Hellman groups that they wish to signal internally.

The updated registry section should be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>DTLS-OK</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>ffdhe2048</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>[this document]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>ffdhe3072</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>[this document]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>ffdhe4096</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>[this document]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>ffdhe6144</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>[this document]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>ffdhe8192</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>[this document]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508-511 (inclusive)</td>
<td>PRIVATE USE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Security Considerations

9.1. Negotiation resistance to active attacks

Because the contents of the Supported Groups extension are hashed in the finished message, an active MITM that tries to filter or omit groups will cause the handshake to fail, but possibly not before getting the peer to do something they would not otherwise have done.

An attacker who impersonates the server can try to do any of the following:

Pretend that a non-compatible server is actually capable of this extension, and select a group from the client’s list, causing the client to select a group it is willing to negotiate. It is unclear how this would be an effective attack.
Pretend that a compatible server is actually non-compatible by negotiating a non-FFDHE ciphersuite. This is no different than MITM ciphersuite filtering.

Pretend that a compatible server is actually non-compatible by negotiating a DHE ciphersuite, with a custom (perhaps weak) group selected by the attacker. This is no worse than the current scenario, and would require the attacker to be able to sign the ServerDHParams, which should not be possible without access to the server’s secret key.

An attacker who impersonates the client can try to do the following:

Pretend that a compatible client is not compatible (e.g., by not offering the Supported Groups extension, or by replacing the Supported Groups extension with one that includes no FFDHE groups). This could cause the server to negotiate a weaker DHE group during the handshake, or to select a non-FFDHE ciphersuite, but it would fail to complete during the final check of the Finished message.

Pretend that a non-compatible client is compatible (e.g., by adding the Supported Groups extension, or by adding FFDHE groups to the extension). This could cause the server to select a particular named group in the ServerKeyExchange, or to avoid selecting an FFDHE ciphersuite. The peers would fail to compute the final check of the Finished message.

Change the list of groups offered by the client (e.g., by removing the stronger of the set of groups offered). This could cause the server to negotiate a weaker group than desired, but again should be caught by the check in the Finished message.

9.2. Group strength considerations

TLS implementations using FFDHE key exchange should consider the strength of the group they negotiate. The strength of the selected group is one of the factors that define the connection's resilience against attacks on the session’s confidentiality and integrity, since the session keys are derived from the DHE handshake.

While attacks on integrity must generally happen while the session is in progress, attacks against session confidentiality can happen significantly later, if the entire TLS session is stored for offline analysis. Therefore, FFDHE groups should be selected by clients and servers based on confidentiality guarantees they need. Sessions which need extremely long-term confidentiality should prefer stronger groups.
[ENISA] provides rough estimates of group resistance to attack, and recommends that forward-looking implementations ("future systems") should use FFDHE group sizes of at least 3072 bits. ffdhe3072 is intended for use in these implementations.

Other sources (e.g., [NIST]) estimate the security levels of the DLOG problem to be slightly more difficult than [ENISA]. This document’s suggested minimum exponent sizes in Appendix A for implementations that use the short exponents optimization (Section 5.2) are deliberately conservative to account for the range of these estimates.

9.3. Finite-Field DHE only

Note that this document specifically targets only finite field-based Diffie-Hellman ephemeral key exchange mechanisms. It does not cover the non-ephemeral DH key exchange mechanisms, nor does it address elliptic curve DHE (ECDHE) key exchange, which is defined in [RFC4492].

Measured by computational cost to the TLS peers, ECDHE appears today to offer much a stronger key exchange mechanism than FFDHE.

9.4. Deprecating weak groups

Advances in hardware or in finite field cryptanalysis may cause some of the negotiated groups to not provide the desired security margins, as indicated by the estimated work factor of an adversary to discover the premaster secret (and may therefore compromise the confidentiality and integrity of the TLS session).

Revisions of this document should mark known-weak groups as explicitly deprecated for use in TLS, and should update the estimated work factor needed to break the group, if the cryptanalysis has changed. Implementations that require strong confidentiality and integrity guarantees should avoid using deprecated groups and should be updated when the estimated security margins are updated.

9.5. Choice of groups

Other lists of named finite field Diffie-Hellman groups [STRONGSWAN-IKE] exist. This draft chooses to not reuse them for several reasons:

Using the same groups in multiple protocols increases the value for an attacker with the resources to crack any single group.
The IKE groups include weak groups like MODP768 which are unacceptable for secure TLS traffic.

Mixing group parameters across multiple implementations leaves open the possibility of some sort of cross-protocol attack. This shouldn't be relevant for ephemeral scenarios, and even with non-ephemeral keying, services shouldn't share keys; however, using different groups avoids these failure modes entirely.

9.6. Timing attacks

Any implementation of finite field Diffie-Hellman key exchange should use constant-time modular-exponentiation implementations. This is particularly true for those implementations that ever re-use DHE secret keys (so-called "semi-static" ephemeral keying) or share DHE secret keys across a multiple machines (e.g., in a load-balancer situation).

9.7. Replay attacks from non-negotiated FFDHE

[SECURE-RESUMPTION], [CROSS-PROTOCOL], and [SSL3-ANALYSIS] all show a malicious peer using a bad FFDHE group to maneuver a client into selecting a pre-master secret of the peer’s choice, which can be replayed to another server using a non-FFDHE key exchange, and can then be bootstrapped to replay client authentication.

To prevent this attack (barring the fixes proposed in [SESSION-HASH]), a client would need not only to implement this draft, but also to reject non-negotiated FFDHE ciphersuites whose group structure it cannot afford to verify. Such a client would need to abort the initial handshake and reconnect to the server in question without listing any FFDHE ciphersuites on the subsequent connection.

This tradeoff may be too costly for most TLS clients today, but may be a reasonable choice for clients performing client certificate authentication, or who have other reason to be concerned about server-controlled pre-master secrets.

9.8. Forward Secrecy

One of the main reasons to prefer FFDHE ciphersuites is Forward Secrecy, the ability to resist decryption even if when the endpoint’s long-term secret key (usually RSA) is revealed in the future.

This property depends on both sides of the connection discarding their ephemeral keys promptly. Implementations should wipe their
FFDHE secret key material from memory as soon as it is no longer needed, and should never store it in persistent storage.

Forward secrecy also depends on the strength of the Diffie-Hellman group; using a very strong symmetric cipher like AES256 with a forward-secret ciphersuite, but generating the keys with a much weaker group like dhe2048 simply moves the adversary’s cost from attacking the symmetric cipher to attacking the dh_Ys or dh_Yc ephemeral keyshares.

If the goal is to provide forward secrecy, attention should be paid to all parts of the ciphersuite selection process, both key exchange and symmetric cipher choice.

9.9. False Start

Clients capable of TLS False Start [FALSE-START] may receive a proposed FFDHE group from a server that is attacker-controlled. In particular, the attacker can modify the ClientHello to strip the proposed FFDHE groups, which may cause the server to offer a weaker FFDHE group than it should, and this will not be detected until receipt of the server’s Finished message. This could cause a client using the False Start protocol modification to send data encrypted under a weak key agreement.

Clients should have their own classification of FFDHE groups that are "cryptographically strong" in the same sense described in the description of symmetric ciphers in [FALSE-START], and SHOULD offer at least one of these in the initial handshake if they contemplate using the False Start protocol modification with an FFDHE ciphersuite.

Compatible clients performing a full handshake MUST NOT use the False Start protocol modification if the server selects an FFDHE ciphersuite but sends a group that is not cryptographically strong from the client’s perspective.

10. Privacy Considerations

10.1. Client fingerprinting

This extension provides a few additional bits of information to distinguish between classes of TLS clients (see e.g. [PANOPTICLICK]). To minimize this sort of fingerprinting, clients SHOULD support all named groups at or above their minimum security threshold. New named groups SHOULD NOT be added to the registry without consideration of the cost of browser fingerprinting.
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Appendix A. Named Group Registry

Each description below indicates the group itself, its derivation, its expected strength (estimated roughly from guidelines in [ECRYPTII]), and whether it is recommended for use in TLS key exchange at the given security level. It is not recommended to add further finite field groups to the NamedCurves registry; any attempt to do so should consider Section 10.1.

The primes in these finite field groups are all safe primes, that is, a prime $p$ is a safe prime when $q = (p-1)/2$ is also prime. Where $e$ is the base of the natural logarithm, and square brackets denote the floor operation, the groups which initially populate this registry are derived for a given bitlength $b$ by finding the lowest positive integer $X$ that creates a safe prime $p$ where:

$$p = 2^b - 2^{(b-64)} + \{[2^{(b-130)} e] + X \} \times 2^{64} - 1$$

New additions of FFDHE groups to this registry may use this same derivation (e.g., with different bitlengths) or may choose their parameters in a different way, but must be clear about how the parameters were derived.

New additions of FFDHE groups MUST use a safe prime as the modulus to enable the inexpensive peer verification described in Section 5.1.

A.1. ffdhe2048

The 2048-bit group has registry value 256, and is calculated from the following formula:

The modulus is: $p = 2^{2048} - 2^{1984} + \{[2^{1918} e] + 560316 \} \times 2^{64} - 1$

The hexadecimal representation of $p$ is:
The generator is: \( g = 2 \)

The group size is: \( q = (p-1)/2 \)

The hexadecimal representation of \( q \) is:

\begin{verbatim}
7FFFFFFF FFFFFFFF D6FC2A2C 515DA54D 57EE2B10 139E9E78
EC5CE2C1 E7169B4A D4F09B20 8A3219FD E649CEE7 124D9F7C
BE97F1B1 B1863AEC 7B40D901 576230BD 69EFE8F6 6AEFE2B80
9219F8F8 AF3373E8 42B12BAA 9EF68D79 DAA89AF 3F6BE494
CC278638 707345BB F15344ED 79F7F439 0EF8AC50 9B56F39A
98566527 A41D3C8D 5E0558C1 59927DB0 E88454A5 D69471FD
DCBF6D5B 806FBA34 0E7AA15A E1CA6F9A 572B76F3 B1B95D8C
85833DE4 770536B8 4F017E70 E6FBF176 601A0266 941A17B0
C8B97F4E 7AC2C1FF C7278919 777940C1 E1FF1D8D A637D6B9
9DDAFE5E 17611002 E2C778C1 B8B41D9 6379A513 60977F2D
4435A11C 3094E24B FF777777 FF777777
\end{verbatim}

The estimated symmetric-equivalent strength of this group is 103 bits.

Peers using ffdhe2048 that want to optimize their key exchange with a short exponent (Section 5.2) should choose a secret key of at least 225 bits.

A.2.  ffdhe3072

The 3072-bit prime has registry value 257, and is calculated from the following formula:

The modulus is: \( p = 2^{3072} - 2^{3008} + ([2^{2942} * e] + 2625351) * 2^{64} - 1 \)

The hexadecimal representation of \( p \) is:

\begin{verbatim}
FF777777 FF777777 FF777777 FF777777 FF777777 FF777777 FF777777 FF777777
A9924732 A2BB4A9A AFDC5620 273D3CF1
D8B9C583 CE2D3695 A9E13641 146433FB CC939DCE 249B3EF9
7D2E3636 630C75D8 F681B202 AEC4617A D3DF1ED5 D5FD6561
243F51F5 5F066ED0 85636555 3DED1AF3 B557135E 7F57C935
984F0C70 E0E6B7B7 E2A689DA F3EE8721 DF158A1 36ADE735
30ACCA4F 483A79A0 BC0AB182 B324FB61 D108A94B B2C8E3FB
B96ADAB7 60D7F468 1D4F2A3E DE39D6F4 AE56EDE7 6372BB19
0B07A7C8 EE0A6D70 9E02FCE1 CDF7E2EC C03404CD 28342F61
9172FE9C E98583F8 8E4F1232 EEF28183 C3FE3B1B 4C6FAF73
3BB5FBCB 2EC22005 C58EF183 7D1683B2 C6F34A26 C1B2EFFA
886B4238 61285C97 FF777777 FF777777
\end{verbatim}
The generator is: \( g = 2 \)

The group size is: \( q = (p-1)/2 \)

The hexadecimal representation of \( q \) is:

```
88b4238 611F4CDF DE355B3B 6519035B BC34F4DE F99C0238
```

The estimated symmetric-equivalent strength of this group is 125 bits.

Peers using ffdhe3072 that want to optimize their key exchange with a short exponent (Section 5.2) should choose a secret key of at least 275 bits.
A.3. ffdhe4096

The 4096-bit group has registry value 258, and is calculated from the following formula:

The modulus is: \( p = 2^{4096} - 2^{4032} + \{2^{3966} \times e\} + 5736041 \times 2^{64} - 1 \)

The hexadecimal representation of \( p \) is:

```
FFFFFFFF FFFFFFFF ADF85458 A2BB4A9A AFDC5620 273D3CF1
D8B9C583 CE2D3695 A9E13641 146433FB CC939DCE 249B3EF9
7D2FE363 630C75D8 F681B202 AEC4617A D3DF1ED5 D5FD6561
2433F51F 5F066ED0 85636555 3DED1AF3 B557135E 7F57C935
984F0C70 E0E68B77 E2A689DA F3EFE872 1DF158A1 36ADE735
30AACC4F 483A797A BC0AB182 B324FB61 D108A94B B2C8E3FB
B96ADAB7 60DF468 1D4F42A3 DE39DF4 AE56ED7 6372BB19
0B07A7C8 EE0A6D70 9E02FEC1 CDF7E2EC C03404CD 28342F61
9172FE9C E98583FF 8E4F1232 EEF28183 C3FE3B1B 4C6FAD73
3BB5FCBC 2EC22005 C58EF183 7D1683B2 C6F34A26 C1B2EFFFFA
886B4238 611FCFDC DE355B3B 6519035B BC34F4DE F99C0238
61B46FC9 D6E6C907 7AD91D26 91F7F7EE 598CB0FA C186D91C
AEFE1309 85139270 B4130C93 BC437944 F4FD4452 E2D74DD3
64F2E21E 71F54BFF 5CAE82AB 9C9DF69E E86D2BC5 22363A0D
ABCS2197 9B0DEADA 1DBF9A42 D5C4484E 0ABC0D6B FA53DDEF
3C1B20EE 3DF59D7C 25E41D2B 669E1E91 6E6F52C3 164DF4FB
7930E9E4 E58857B6 AC7D5F42 D69F6D18 7763CF1D 55034004
87F55BA5 7E31CC7A 7135C886 EFB4318A ED6A1E01 2D9E6832
A907600A 918130C4 6DC778F9 71AD0038 092999A3 33CB8B7A
1A1DB93D 7140003C 2A4ECEA9 F9800ACC 0A8291CD CEC97DCF
8EC9B55A 7F88A46B 4DB5A851 F44182E1 C68A007E 5E655F6A
FFFFFFFF FFFFFFFF
```

The generator is: \( g = 2 \)

The group size is: \( q = (p-1)/2 \)

The hexadecimal representation of \( q \) is:

```
Gillmor                 Expires December 3, 2015               [Page 20]
The estimated symmetric-equivalent strength of this group is 150 bits.

Peers using ffdhe4096 that want to optimize their key exchange with a short exponent (Section 5.2) should choose a secret key of at least 325 bits.

A.4.  ffdhe6144

The 6144-bit group has registry value 259, and is calculated from the following formula:

The modulus is:  

\[ p = 2 \times 6144 - 2 \times 6080 + \lfloor 2 \times 6014 \times e \rfloor + 15705020 \times 2^{64} - 1 \]

The hexadecimal representation of p is:

7FFFFFFFF FFFFFFFF D6FC2A2C 515DA54D 57EE2B10 139E9E78
EC5CE2C1 E7169B4A D4F09B20 8A3219FD E649CEE7 124D9F7C
BE97F1B1 B1863AEC 7B40D901 576230BD 69EF8F6A EAEFEB2B0
9219FA8F AF833768 42B1B2AA 9EF68D79 DAAB89AF 3FABE49A
CC278638 707345BB F15344ED 79F7F439 0EF8AC50 9B56F39A
98566527 A41D3CBD 5E0558C1 59927DB0 EB8454A5 D96471FD
DCB56D5B B06BFA34 0EA7A151 EF1CA6FA 572B76F3 B1B95D8C
8583D3E4 770536B8 4F017E70 E6FBF176 601A0266 941A17B0
C8B97F4E 74C2C1FF C7278919 777940C1 E1FF1D8D A637D6B9
9DAAFE5E 17611002 E2C778C1 BE8B41D9 6379A513 60D977FD
4435A11C 308FE7EE 6F1AAD9D B28C81AD DE1A7A6F 7CCE011C
30DA37E4 EB736483 BD6C8E93 48FBFBF7 2CC6587D 60C36C8E
577F0984 C289C938 5A098649 DE21BCA2 7A7EA229 716BA6E9
B279710F 38FAA5FF AE574155 CE4EFB4F 743695E2 911B1D06
D5E290CB CD86F56D 0EDFCDD1 6AE22427 055E6635 FD29EEF7
98D09077 1FEACEBE 12F20E95 B34F0F78 B737A961 8B26FA7D
BC9874F2 72C42BB4 563EAAF1 6B4FB68C 3BB1E78E AA81A002
43FAADD2 BF18E63D 389AE443 77DA18C5 76B50F00 96CF3419
5483B005 48C09862 36E3BC7C B8D6801C 0494CCD1 99E5C5BD
0D0EDC9E B8A0001E 15276754 FCC68566 054148E6 E764BEE7
C764DAAD 3FC45235 A6DADB28 FA20C170 E345003F 2F32AF85
7FFFFFFFF FFFFFFFF
The generator is: \( g = 2 \)

The group size is: \( q = (p-1)/2 \)

The hexadecimal representation of \( q \) is:

\[ \text{FFFFFFFF FFFFFFFF} \]
the estimated symmetric-equivalent strength of this group is 175 bits.

Peers using ffdhe6144 that want to optimize their key exchange with a short exponent (Section 5.2) should choose a secret key of at least 375 bits.

A.5.  ffdhe8192

The 8192-bit group has registry value 260, and is calculated from the following formula:

\[ p = 2^{8192} - 2^{8128} + \{[2^{8062} * e] + 10965728\} * 2^{64} - 1 \]
The hexadecimal representation of p is:

```
FFFFFFFF FFFFFFFF ADF85458 A2BB4A9A AFDC5620 273D3CF1
D8B9C583 CE2D3655 85636555 3DEDA1F3 B557135E 7F5C7935
984F0C70 E0E689DA F3EFE872 1DF158A1 36ADE735
30AACAF4 834A79A7 BC0AB182 B324F6B1 D108A94B B2C8E3FB
B96DABD 6D7F468 1D4F4A23 DE394DF4 AE56ED7E 6372BB19
0B07A7C8 EE0A6D70 9E02FCE1 CDF7E2EC C03404CD 28342F61
9172FE9C E98583FF 8E4F1232 EEF28183 C3F3E3B1 4C6FD73D
3B5FBC2 2EC22D05 C58E183 7D1683B2 C6F3A426 C12EFEFA
886B2438 611FCDFC DE355B3B 6519035B BC34F4DE F99C0238
61646FC9 D666C907 7A9D1D26 91F7F7EE 598C80FA C180D91C
AEEF61309 85139270 B4130C93 BC347944 F4FD4452 E2D74DD3
64F2E21E 71F54BFF 5CAE82AB 9C90F69E E86D2BC5 22363A0D
```

The hexadecimal representation of p is:

```
FFFFFFFF FFFFFFFF ADF85458 A2BB4A9A AFDC5620 273D3CF1
D8B9C583 CE2D3655 85636555 3DEDA1F3 B557135E 7F5C7935
984F0C70 E0E689DA F3EFE872 1DF158A1 36ADE735
30AACAF4 834A79A7 BC0AB182 B324F6B1 D108A94B B2C8E3FB
B96DABD 6D7F468 1D4F4A23 DE394DF4 AE56ED7E 6372BB19
0B07A7C8 EE0A6D70 9E02FCE1 CDF7E2EC C03404CD 28342F61
9172FE9C E98583FF 8E4F1232 EEF28183 C3F3E3B1 4C6FD73D
3B5FBC2 2EC22D05 C58E183 7D1683B2 C6F3A426 C12EFEFA
886B2438 611FCDFC DE355B3B 6519035B BC34F4DE F99C0238
61646FC9 D666C907 7A9D1D26 91F7F7EE 598C80FA C180D91C
AEEF61309 85139270 B4130C93 BC347944 F4FD4452 E2D74DD3
64F2E21E 71F54BFF 5CAE82AB 9C90F69E E86D2BC5 22363A0D
```

The generator is: $g = 2$

Gillmor                  Expires December 3, 2015                [Page 24]
The group size is: q = (p-1)/2

The hexadecimal representation of q is:

7FFFFFFFF FIFFF02A2 C515DA54D 57EE2B10 139E9E78
EC5CEC1 E7169B4A D4F09B20 8A3219FD E649CEEE 1249DF7C
BE97F1B1 B1863AEC 7B40D901 576230BD 69EF8F6A EAEFEB2B0
9219FA8F AF833768 42B1B2A9 9EF68D79 DAA99AF 3FABE49A
CC27836F 757345BB F15344ED 79F7F439 0EF8AC00 9B56739A
98566527 A41D35CD 5E0558C1 59927DB0 E8845A45 D96471FD
DCB56D5B 0B6BFA34 0EA7A151 EF1CA6FA 572B76F3 B1B95DB6
8583D3E4 770536B8 4F017E70 E6FBF176 601A0266 941A17B0
C8B9F74E 74C215FC C728919 77940C11 E1FF1D8D A637DB69
9DAAFE5E 17611002 E2C778C1 BE8B41D9 6379A513 6D977F7D
443A511C 3D9F7E5E 6F1AD95D B28C81AD DE1A7A6F 7CCE011C
3D0A37E4 EB736483 BD6C8E93 48FB7F67 2CC6587D 60C36CBE
577FF094 C289C938 5A009B64 E21BC2A 7A7EA229 716BAE9F
B279710F 38FAA5FF AE574155 CE4EBF4F 743695E2 911B1D06
D5E290CB CD68F56D 00EFCD21 6AE22427 0556E835 FD29EEF7
9E0D9077 1FEACBEB 12F20E95 B34F0F7B B737A961 8B26FA7D
BC9874F2 72C422BD 563EFA17 6B4F6B68 3BB1E788 AA81A002
43FAAAD2 BF18E63D 389AE443 77DA18C5 76B50F00 96CF3419
5483B005 48C09862 36E3BC7C BD6801C4 049C4CD1 99E5C5BD
0D0E9C9E B8A0001E 15276754 FCC68566 054184E8 E764BEE7
C764DAD3 3FC45235 A6DAD428 FA20C170 E345003F 2F06EC81
05FEB25B 28B163D3 2733EB96 1C29951D 11D22221 657A9F53
1DDA2A19 4DBB12B4 48BDEEB2 58E07EA6 59C7461A 6380E1D
66D6832B FE67F63B CD8FAE1F 27250209 9C40A3FD A67EAD3B
D29238FB D404B4B8 52C29917 6DB1A06C 50077849 1AB288F1
8556F067 3FD949C6 0C1811E1 AC31C6DE 003BECDA
3B1F2725 CA595DE0 CA63328F 3BE57CC9 77556011 95140DFB
59D39CE0 91308B41 05746D4C 23D33E5F 7C4848D3 A3169ABC
6B9581B1 3573B3AF 31946918 8AB15423 2B8E8416 DC219AC5
724F9A91 E44AD8C8 C667969B E6677A07 F64E8C08 63139582
29D9DBDC EE35C06B 1FEAA547 4D608F34 B15349A3 6A1B80E0
D20E8A8B BC9C664D 5207194E 67FA3555 IB568026 7B06641C
0F212D1B ECA8D732 7ED91FE7 64A84EA1 B43F5B4 E668E2F
05C658DE FB258877 C35B18A1 51D5C414 AAAD9B7A 3E499332
E5960787 600DE9B1 149C441C E95782F2 A282563 C5BA3141
14236505 1AE1FAFB 2CB06600 237EC128 AA0FE346 4E435811
5DB84C3C B520703A 28D45489 848B1FF7 E01B8F36 1C137296
28D5348F 07211E7E 4CFF418B 286090BD B1240B66 D6CD4ACF
EAD0C0CA 446CE050 50FF183A D2BB1114 C1FC06AE 1F97D22B
8F7E467D 5D427FF4 5B42AEEF 39565337 6F697DD5 FDF2C518
7D7D5F0E 2EB8D43F 178AF87C 60F437F E53DFF2 9833BF86
CBE88EA4 FB04215E 84117283 54FA30A7 008F154A 41C7FC46
6B46545D EB321267 7FFFFFFF FFFFFF00

Gillmor                 Expires December 3, 2015               [Page 25]
The estimated symmetric-equivalent strength of this group is 192 bits.

Peers using ffdhe8192 that want to optimize their key exchange with a short exponent (Section 5.2) should choose a secret key of at least 400 bits.
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1. Introduction

RC4 is a stream cipher described in [SCH], which is widely supported, and often preferred, by TLS servers. However, RC4 has long been known to have a variety of cryptographic weaknesses, e.g. [PAU], [MAN], [FLU]. Recent cryptanalysis results [ALF] exploit biases in the RC4 keystream to recover repeatedly encrypted plaintexts.

These recent results are on the verge of becoming practically exploitable; currently they require $2^{26}$ sessions or $13 \times 2^{30}$ encryptions. As a result, RC4 can no longer be seen as providing a sufficient level of security for TLS sessions.

This document requires that TLS ([RFC5246], [RFC4346], [RFC2246]) clients and servers never negotiate the use of RC4 cipher suites.

1.1. Requirements Language

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 [RFC2119].

2. Changes to TLS

Because of the deficiencies noted in Section 1:

- TLS clients MUST NOT include RC4 cipher suites in the ClientHello message.
- TLS servers MUST NOT select an RC4 cipher suite when a TLS client sends such a cipher suite in the ClientHello message.
If the TLS client only offers RC4 cipher suites, the TLS server MUST terminate the handshake. The TLS server MAY send the insufficient_security fatal alert in this case.

Appendix A lists the RC4 cipher suites defined for TLS.

3. Acknowledgements

This document was inspired by discussions with Magnus Nystrom, Eric Rescorla, Joseph Salowey, Yaron Sheffer, Nagendra Modadugu and others on the TLS mailing list.

4. IANA Considerations

This memo includes no request to IANA.

5. Security Considerations

This document helps maintain the security guarantees of the TLS protocol by prohibiting the use of the RC4-based cipher suites (listed in Appendix A), which do not provide a sufficiently high level of security.

6. References

6.1. Normative References


6.2. Informative References

Appendix A.  RC4 Cipher Suites

The following cipher suites defined for TLS use RC4:

- TLS_RSA_EXPORT_WITH_RC4_40_MD5
- TLS_RSA_WITH_RC4_128_MD5
- TLS_RSA_WITH_RC4_128_SHA
- TLS_DH_anon_EXPORT_WITH_RC4_40_MD5
- TLS_DH_anon_WITH_RC4_128_MD5
- TLS_KRB5_WITH_RC4_128_SHA
- TLS_KRB5_WITH_RC4_128_MD5
- TLS_KRB5_EXPORT_WITH_RC4_40_SHA
- TLS_KRB5_EXPORT_WITH_RC4_40_MD5
- TLS_PSK_WITH_RC4_128_SHA
- TLS_DHE_PSK_WITH_RC4_128_SHA
- TLS_RSA_PSK_WITH_RC4_128_SHA
- TLS_ECDH_ECDSA_WITH_RC4_128_SHA
- TLS_ECDHE_ECDSA_WITH_RC4_128_SHA
- TLS_ECDH_RSA_WITH_RC4_128_SHA
Internet-Draft        Prohibiting RC4 Cipher Suites         October 2014

  o  TLS_ECDHE_RSA_WITH_RC4_128_SHA
  o  TLS_ECDH_anon_WITH_RC4_128_SHA
  o  TLS_ECDHE_PSK_WITH_RC4_128_SHA
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1.  Introduction

In TLS [RFC5246], every session has a "master_secret" computed as:

    master_secret = PRF(pre_master_secret, "master secret",
                       ClientHello.random + ServerHello.random)
                       [0..47]);

where the "pre_master_secret" is the result of some key exchange
protocol. For example, when the handshake uses an RSA ciphersuite,
this value is generated uniformly at random by the client, whereas for DHE ciphersuites, it is the result of a Diffie-Hellman key agreement.

As described in [TRIPLE-HS], in both the RSA and DHE key exchanges, an active attacker can synchronize two TLS sessions so that they share the same "master_secret". For an RSA key exchange where the client is unauthenticated, this is achieved as follows. Suppose a client C connects to a server A. C does not realize that A is malicious and that A connects in the background to an honest server S and completes both handshakes. For simplicity, assume that C and S only use RSA ciphersuites.

1. C sends a "ClientHello" to A, and A forwards it to S.
2. S sends a "ServerHello" to A, and A forwards it to C.
3. S sends a "Certificate", containing its certificate chain, to A. A replaces it with its own certificate chain and sends it to C.
4. S sends a "ServerHelloDone" to A, and A forwards it to C.
5. C sends a "ClientKeyExchange" to A, containing the "pre_master_secret", encrypted with A’s public key. A decrypts the "pre_master_secret", re-encrypts it with S’s public key and sends it on to S.
6. C sends a "Finished" to A. A computes a "Finished" for its connection with S, and sends it to S.
7. S sends a "Finished" to A. A computes a "Finished" for its connection with C, and sends it to C.

At this point, both connections (between C and A, and between A and S) have new sessions that share the same "pre_master_secret", "ClientHello.random", "ServerHello.random", as well as other session parameters, including the session identifier and, optionally, the session ticket. Hence, the "master_secret" value will be equal for the two sessions and it will be associated both at C and S with the same session ID, even though the server identities on the two connections are different. Recall that C only sees A’s certificate and is unaware of A’s connection with S. Moreover, the record keys on the two connections will also be the same.

The above scenario shows that TLS does not guarantee that the master secrets and keys used on different connections will be different. Even if client authentication is used, the scenario still works,
except that the two sessions now differ on both client and server identities.

A similar scenario can be achieved when the handshake uses a DHE ciphersuite. Note that even if the client or server does not prefer using RSA or DHE, the attacker can force them to use it by offering only RSA or DHE in its hello messages. Handshakes using ECDHE ciphersuites are also vulnerable if they allow arbitrary explicit curves or use curves with small subgroups. Against more powerful adversaries, other key exchanges, such as SRP and PSK, have also been shown to be vulnerable [VERIFIED-BINDINGS].

Once A has synchronized the two connections, since the keys are the same on the two sides, it can step away and transparently forward messages between C and S, reading and modifying when it desires. In the key exchange literature, such occurrences are called unknown key-share attacks, since C and S share a secret but they both think that their secret is shared only with A. In themselves, these attacks do not break integrity or confidentiality between honest parties, but they offer a useful starting point from which to mount impersonation attacks on C and S.

Suppose C tries to resume its session on a new connection with A. A can then resume its session with S on a new connection and forward the abbreviated handshake messages unchanged between C and S. Since the abbreviated handshake only relies on the master secret for authentication, and does not mention client or server identities, both handshakes complete successfully, resulting in the same session keys and the same handshake log. A still knows the connection keys and can send messages to both C and S.

Critically, on the new connection, even the handshake log is the same on C and S, thus defeating any man-in-the-middle protection scheme that relies on the uniqueness of finished messages, such as the secure renegotiation indication extension [RFC5746] or TLS channel bindings [RFC5929]. [TRIPLE-HS] describes several exploits based on such session synchronization attacks. In particular, it describes a man-in-the-middle attack, called the "triple handshake", that circumvents the protections of [RFC5746] to break client-authenticated TLS renegotiation after session resumption. Similar attacks apply to application-level authentication mechanisms that rely on channel bindings [RFC5929] or on key material exported from TLS [RFC5705].

The underlying protocol issue leading to these attacks is that the TLS master secret is not guaranteed to be unique across sessions, since it is not context-bound to the full handshake that generated it. If we fix this problem in the initial master secret computation,
all these attacks can be prevented. This specification introduces a TLS extension that changes the way the "master_secret" value is computed in a full handshake by including the log of the handshake messages, so that different sessions will, by construction, have different master secrets. This prevents the attacks described in [TRIPLE-HS] and documented in Section 2.11 of [RFC7457].

2. Requirements Notation

This document uses the same notation and terminology used in the TLS Protocol specification [RFC5246].

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].

3. The TLS Session Hash

When a full TLS handshake takes place, we define

\[
\text{session\_hash} = \text{Hash}(\text{handshake\_messages})
\]

where "handshake\_messages" refers to all handshake messages sent or received, starting at the ClientHello up to and including the ClientKeyExchange message, including the type and length fields of the handshake messages. This is the concatenation of all the exchanged Handshake structures, as defined in Section 7.4 of [RFC5246].

For TLS 1.2, the "Hash" function is the one defined in Section 7.4.9 of [RFC5246] for the Finished message computation. For all previous versions of TLS, the "Hash" function computes the concatenation of MD5 and SHA1.

There is no "session\_hash" for resumed handshakes, as they do not lead to the creation of a new session.

4. The Extended Master Secret

When the extended master secret extension is negotiated in a full handshake, the "master\_secret" is computed as

\[
\text{master\_secret} = \text{PRF} \left( \text{pre\_master\_secret}, \text{"extended master secret"}, \text{session\_hash} \right) [0..47] ;
\]

The extended master secret computation differs from the [RFC5246] in the following ways:
The "extended master secret" label is used instead of "master secret";
The "session_hash" is used instead of the "ClientHello.random" and "ServerHello.random".

The "session_hash" depends upon a handshake log that includes "ClientHello.random" and "ServerHello.random", in addition to ciphersuites, key exchange information, and certificates (if any) from the client and server. Consequently, the extended master secret depends upon the choice of all these session parameters.

This design reflects the recommendation that keys should be bound to the security contexts that compute them [SP800-108]. The technique of mixing a hash of the key exchange messages into master key derivation is already used in other well-known protocols such as SSH [RFC4251].

Clients and servers SHOULD NOT accept handshakes that do not use the extended master secret, especially if they rely on features like compound authentication that fall into the vulnerable cases described in Section 6.1.

5. Extension Negotiation

5.1. Extension Definition

This document defines a new TLS extension, "extended_master_secret" (with extension type 0x0017), which is used to signal both client and server to use the extended master secret computation. The "extension_data" field of this extension is empty. Thus, the entire encoding of the extension is 00 17 00 00 (in hexadecimal.)

Although this document refers only to TLS, the extension proposed here can also be used with Datagram TLS (DTLS) [RFC6347].

If the client and server agree on this extension, and a full handshake takes place, both client and server MUST use the extended master secret derivation algorithm, as defined in Section 4. All other cryptographic computations remain unchanged.

5.2. Client and Server Behavior: Full Handshake

In the following, we use the phrase "abort the handshake" as shorthand for terminating the handshake by sending a fatal "handshake_failure" alert.
In all handshakes, a client implementing this document MUST send the "extended_master_secret" extension in its ClientHello.

If a server implementing this document receives the "extended_master_secret" extension, it MUST include the extension in its ServerHello message.

If both the ClientHello and ServerHello contain the extension, the new session uses the extended master secret computation.

If the server receives a ClientHello without the extension, it SHOULD abort the handshake if it does not wish to interoperate with legacy clients. If it chooses to continue the handshake, then it MUST NOT include the extension in the ServerHello.

If a client receives a ServerHello without the extension, it SHOULD abort the handshake if it does not wish to interoperate with legacy servers.

If the client and server choose to continue a full handshake without the extension, they MUST use the standard master secret derivation for the new session. In this case, the new session is not protected by the mechanisms described in this document. So, implementers should follow the guidelines in Section 5.4 to avoid dangerous usage scenarios. In particular, the master secret derived from the new session should not be used for application-level authentication.

5.3. Client and Server Behavior: Abbreviated Handshake

The client SHOULD NOT offer an abbreviated handshake to resume a session that does not use an extended master secret. Instead, it SHOULD offer a full handshake.

If the client chooses to offer an abbreviated handshake even for such sessions, in order to support legacy insecure resumption, then the current connection is not protected by the mechanisms in this document. So, the client should follow the guidelines in Section 5.4 to avoid dangerous usage scenarios. In particular, renegotiation is no longer secure on this connection, even if the client and server support the renegotiation indication extension [RFC5746].

When offering an abbreviated handshake, the client MUST send the "extended_master_secret" extension in its ClientHello.

If a server receives a ClientHello for an abbreviated handshake offering to resume a known previous session, it behaves as follows:
If the original session did not use the "extended_master_secret" extension but the new ClientHello contains the extension, then the server MUST NOT perform the abbreviated handshake. Instead, it SHOULD continue with a full handshake (as described in Section 5.2) to negotiate a new session.

If the original session used the "extended_master_secret" extension but the new ClientHello does not contain the extension, the server MUST abort the abbreviated handshake.

If neither the original session nor the new ClientHello uses the extension, the server SHOULD abort the handshake. If it continues with an abbreviated handshake in order to support legacy insecure resumption, the connection is no longer protected by the mechanisms in this document, and the server should follow the guidelines in Section 5.4.

If the new ClientHello contains the extension and the server chooses to continue the handshake, then the server MUST include the "extended_master_secret" extension in its ServerHello message.

If a client receives a ServerHello that accepts an abbreviated handshake, it behaves as follows:

If the original session did not use the "extended_master_secret" extension but the new ServerHello contains the extension, the client MUST abort the handshake.

If the original session used the extension but the new ServerHello does not contain the extension, the client MUST abort the handshake.

If the client and server continue the abbreviated handshake, they derive the connection keys for the new session as usual from the master secret of the original session.

5.4. Interoperability Considerations

To allow interoperability with legacy clients and servers, a TLS peer may decide to accept full handshakes that use the legacy master secret computation. If so, they need to differentiate between sessions that use legacy and extended master secrets by adding a flag to the session state.

If a client or server chooses to continue with a full handshake without the extended master secret extension, then the new session becomes vulnerable to the man-in-the-middle key synchronization attack described in Section 1. Hence, the client or server MUST NOT
export any key material based on the new master secret for any subsequent application-level authentication. In particular, it MUST disable [RFC5705] and any EAP protocol relying on compound authentication [COMPOUND-AUTH].

If a client or server chooses to continue an abbreviated handshake to resume a session that does not use the extended master secret, then the current connection becomes vulnerable to a man-in-the-middle handshake log synchronization attack as described in Section 1. Hence, the client or server MUST NOT use the current handshake's "verify_data" for application-level authentication. In particular, the client MUST disable renegotiation and any use of the "tls-unique" channel binding [RFC5929] on the current connection.

If the original session uses an extended master secret, but the ClientHello or ServerHello in the abbreviated handshake does not include the extension, it MAY be safe to continue the abbreviated handshake since it is protected by the extended master secret of the original session. This scenario may occur, for example, when a server that implements this extension establishes a session, but the session is subsequently resumed at a different server that does not support the extension. Since such situations are unusual and likely to be the result of transient or inadvertent misconfigurations, this draft recommends that the client and server MUST abort such handshakes.

6. Security Considerations

6.1. Triple Handshake Preconditions and Impact

One way to mount a triple handshake attack has been described in Section 1, along with a mention of the security mechanisms that break due to the attack; more in-depth discussion and diagrams can be found in [TRIPLE-HS]. Here, some further discussion is presented about attack preconditions and impact.

To mount a triple handshake attack, it must be possible to force the same master secret on two different sessions. For this to happen, two preconditions must be met:

- The client, C, must be willing to connect to a malicious server, A. In certain contexts, like the web, this can be easily achieved, since a browser can be instructed to load content from an untrusted origin.

- The pre-master secret must be synchronized on the two sessions. This is particularly easy to achieve with the RSA and DHE key
exchanges, but under some conditions, ECDHE, SRP, and PSK key exchanges can be exploited to this effect as well.

Once the master secret is synchronized on two sessions, any security property that relies on the uniqueness of the master secret is compromised. For example, a TLS exporter [RFC5705] no longer provides a unique key bound to the current session.

TLS session resumption also relies on the uniqueness of the master secret to authenticate the resuming peers. Hence, if a synchronized session is resumed, the peers cannot be sure about each other's identities, and the attacker knows the connection keys. Clearly, a precondition to this step of the attack is that both client and server support session resumption (either via session identifier or session tickets [RFC5077]).

Additionally, in a synchronized abbreviated handshake, the whole transcript is synchronized, which includes the "verify_data" values. So, after an abbreviated handshake, channel bindings like "tls-unique" [RFC5929] will not identify uniquely the connection anymore.

Synchronization of the "verify_data" in abbreviated handshakes also undermines the security guarantees of the renegotiation indication extension [RFC5746], re-enabling a prefix-injection flaw similar to the renegotiation attack [Ray09]. However, in a triple handshake attack, the client sees the server certificate changing across different full handshakes. Hence, a precondition to mount this stage of the attack is that the client accepts different certificates at each handshake, even if their common names do not match. Before the triple handshake attack was discovered, this used to be widespread behavior, at least among some web browsers, that were hence vulnerable to the attack.

The extended master secret extension thwarts triple handshake attacks at their first stage, by ensuring that different sessions necessarily end up with different master secret values. Hence, all security properties relying on the uniqueness of the master secret are now expected to hold. In particular, if a TLS session is protected by the extended master secret extension, it is safe to resume it, to use its channel bindings, and to allow for certificate changes across renegotiation, meaning that all certificates are controlled by the same peer. A symbolic cryptographic protocol analysis justifying the extended master secret extension appears in [VERIFIED-BINDINGS].
6.2. Cryptographic Properties of the Hash Function

The session hashes of two different sessions need to be distinct, hence the "Hash" function used to compute the "session_hash" needs to be collision resistant. As such, hash functions such as MD5 or SHA1 are NOT RECOMMENDED.

We observe that the "Hash" function used in the Finished message computation already needs to be collision resistant for the renegotiation indication extension [RFC5746] to work, because a meaningful collision on the handshake messages (and hence on the "verify_data") may re-enable the renegotiation attack [Ray09].

The hash function used to compute the session hash depends on the TLS protocol version. All current ciphersuites defined for TLS 1.2 use SHA256 or better, and so does the session hash. For earlier versions of the protocol, only MD5 and SHA1 can be assumed to be supported, and this document does not require legacy implementations to add support for new hash functions. In these versions, the session hash uses the concatenation of MD5 and SHA1, as in the Finished message.

6.3. Handshake Messages included in the Session Hash

The "session_hash" is intended to encompass all relevant session information, including ciphersuite negotiation, key exchange messages and client and server identities. The hash is needed to compute the extended master secret, and hence must be available before the Finished messages.

This document sets the "session_hash" to cover all handshake messages up to and including the ClientKeyExchange. For existing TLS ciphersuites, these messages include all the significant contents of the new session---CertificateVerify does not change the session content. At the same time, this allows the extended master secret to be computed immediately after the pre-master secret, so that implementations can shred the temporary pre-master secret from memory as early as possible.

It is possible that new ciphersuites or TLS extensions may include additional messages between ClientKeyExchange and Finished that add important session context. In such cases, some of the security guarantees of this specification may no longer apply, and new man-in-the-middle attacks may be possible. For example, if the client and server support the session ticket extension [RFC5077], the session hash does not cover the new session ticket sent by the server. Hence, a man-in-the-middle may be able to cause a client to store a session ticket that was not meant for the current session. Attacks based on this vector are not yet known, but applications that store...
additional information in session tickets beyond those covered in the session hash require careful analysis.

6.4. No SSL 3.0 Support

SSL 3.0 [RFC6101] is a predecessor of the TLS protocol, and it is equally vulnerable to the triple handshake attacks, alongside other vulnerabilities stemming from its use of obsolete cryptographic constructions that are now considered weak. SSL 3.0 has been deprecated [I-D.ietf-tls-sslv3-diediedie].

The countermeasure described in this document relies on a TLS extension and hence cannot be used with SSL 3.0. Clients and servers implementing this document SHOULD refuse SSL 3.0 handshakes. If they choose to support SSL 3.0, the resulting sessions MUST use the legacy master secret computation, and the interoperability considerations of Section 5.4 apply.

7. IANA Considerations

IANA has added the extension code point 23 (0x0017), which has been used by prototype implementations, for the "extended_master_secret" extension to the TLS ExtensionType values registry as specified in TLS [RFC5246].
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1. Introduction

RFC EDITOR: PLEASE REMOVE THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPH

The source for this draft is maintained in GitHub. Suggested changes should be submitted as pull requests at https://github.com/tlsgw/tls13-spec. Instructions are on that page as well. Editorial changes can be managed in GitHub, but any substantive change should be discussed on the TLS mailing list.

The primary goal of TLS is to provide a secure channel between two communicating peers; the only requirement from the underlying transport is a reliable, in-order, data stream. Specifically, the secure channel should provide the following properties:

- **Authentication**: The server side of the channel is always authenticated; the client side is optionally authenticated. Authentication can happen via asymmetric cryptography (e.g., RSA [RSA], ECDSA [ECDSA], EdDSA [RFC8032]) or a pre-shared key (PSK).

- **Confidentiality**: Data sent over the channel after establishment is only visible to the endpoints. TLS does not hide the length of the data it transmits, though endpoints are able to pad TLS records in order to obscure lengths and improve protection against traffic analysis techniques.

- **Integrity**: Data sent over the channel after establishment cannot be modified by attackers.

These properties should be true even in the face of an attacker who has complete control of the network, as described in [RFC3552]. See Appendix E for a more complete statement of the relevant security properties.

**TLS consists of two primary components:**

- A handshake protocol (Section 4) that authenticates the communicating parties, negotiates cryptographic modes and parameters, and establishes shared keying material. The handshake protocol is designed to resist tampering; an active attacker should not be able to force the peers to negotiate different parameters than they would if the connection were not under attack.

- A record protocol (Section 5) that uses the parameters established by the handshake protocol to protect traffic between the communicating peers. The record protocol divides traffic up into a series of records, each of which is independently protected using the traffic keys.
TLS is application protocol independent; higher-level protocols can layer on top of TLS transparently. The TLS standard, however, does not specify how protocols add security with TLS; how to initiate TLS handshaking and how to interpret the authentication certificates exchanged are left to the judgment of the designers and implementors of protocols that run on top of TLS.

This document defines TLS version 1.3. While TLS 1.3 is not directly compatible with previous versions, all versions of TLS incorporate a versioning mechanism which allows clients and servers to interoperably negotiate a common version if one is supported by both peers.

This document supersedes and obsoletes previous versions of TLS including version 1.2 [RFC5246]. It also obsoletes the TLS ticket mechanism defined in [RFC5077] and replaces it with the mechanism defined in Section 2.2. Section 4.2.7 updates [RFC4492] by modifying the protocol attributes used to negotiate Elliptic Curves. Because TLS 1.3 changes the way keys are derived, it updates [RFC5705] as described in Section 7.5. It also changes how OCSP messages are carried and therefore updates [RFC6066] and obsoletes [RFC6961] as described in Section 4.4.2.1.

1.1. Conventions and Terminology

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

The following terms are used:

client: The endpoint initiating the TLS connection.

collection: A transport-layer connection between two endpoints.

endpoint: Either the client or server of the connection.

handshake: An initial negotiation between client and server that establishes the parameters of their subsequent interactions within TLS.

peer: An endpoint. When discussing a particular endpoint, "peer" refers to the endpoint that is not the primary subject of discussion.

receiver: An endpoint that is receiving records.
sender: An endpoint that is transmitting records.

server: The endpoint which did not initiate the TLS connection.

1.2. Change Log

RFC EDITOR PLEASE DELETE THIS SECTION.

(*) indicates changes to the wire protocol which may require implementations to update.

draft-28

Add a section on exposure of PSK identities.

draft-27

- SHOULD->MUST for being able to process "supported_versions" without 0x0304.

- Much editorial cleanup.

draft-26

- Clarify that you can’t negotiate pre-TLS 1.3 with supported_versions.

draft-25

- Add the header to additional data (*)

- Minor clarifications.

- IANA cleanup.

draft-24

- Require that CH2 have version 0303 (*)

- Some clarifications

draft-23

- Renumber key_share (*)

- Add a new extension and new code points to allow negotiating PSS separately for certificates and CertificateVerify (*)
- Slightly restrict when CCS must be accepted to make implementation easier.
- Document protocol invariants
- Add some text on the security of static RSA.

draft-22
- Implement changes for improved middlebox penetration (*)
- Move server_certificate_type to encrypted extensions (*)
- Allow resumption with a different SNI (*)
- Padding extension can change on HRR (*)
- Allow an empty ticket_nonce (*)
- Remove requirement to immediately respond to close_notify with close_notify (allowing half-close)

draft-21
- Add a per-ticket nonce so that each ticket is associated with a different PSK (*).
- Clarify that clients should send alerts with the handshake key if possible.
- Update state machine to show rekeying events
- Add discussion of 0-RTT and replay. Recommend that implementations implement some anti-replay mechanism.

draft-20
- Add "post_handshake_auth" extension to negotiate post-handshake authentication (*).
- Shorten labels for HKDF-Expand-Label so that we can fit within one compression block (*).
- Define how RFC 7250 works (*)
- Re-enable post-handshake client authentication even when you do PSK. The previous prohibition was editorial error.
- Remove cert_type and user_mapping, which don’t work on TLS 1.3 anyway.
- Added the no_application_protocol alert from [RFC7301] to the list of extensions.
- Added discussion of traffic analysis and side channel attacks.

draft-19

- Hash context_value input to Exporters (*)
- Add an additional Derive-Secret stage to Exporters (*).
- Hash ClientHello1 in the transcript when HRR is used. This reduces the state that needs to be carried in cookies. (*)
- Restructure CertificateRequest to have the selectors in extensions. This also allowed defining a "certificate_authorities" extension which can be used by the client instead of trusted_ca_keys (*).
- Tighten record framing requirements and require checking of them (*).
- Consolidate "ticket_early_data_info" and "early_data" into a single extension (*).
- Change end_of_early_data to be a handshake message (*).
- Add pre-extract Derive-Secret stages to key schedule (*).
- Remove spurious requirement to implement "pre_shared_key".
- Clarify location of "early_data" from server (it goes in EE, as indicated by the table in S 10).
- Require peer public key validation
- Add state machine diagram.

draft-18

- Remove unnecessary resumption_psk which is the only thing expanded from the resumption master secret. (*)
- Fix signature_algorithms entry in extensions table.
- Restate rule from RFC 6066 that you can’t resume unless SNI is the same.

draft-17

- Remove 0-RTT Finished and resumption_context, and replace with a psk_binder field in the PSK itself (*)
- Restructure PSK key exchange negotiation modes (*)
- Add max_early_data_size field to TicketEarlyDataInfo (*)
- Add a 0-RTT exporter and change the transcript for the regular exporter (*)
- Merge TicketExtensions and Extensions registry. Changes ticket_early_data_info code point (*)
- Replace Client.key_shares in response to HRR (*)
- Remove redundant labels for traffic key derivation (*)
- Harmonize requirements about cipher suite matching: for resumption you need to match KDF but for 0-RTT you need whole cipher suite. This allows PSKs to actually negotiate cipher suites. (*)
- Move SCT and OCSP into Certificate.extensions (*)
- Explicitly allow non-offered extensions in NewSessionTicket
- Explicitly allow predicting client Finished for NST
- Clarify conditions for allowing 0-RTT with PSK

draft-16

- Revise version negotiation (*)
- Change RSASSA-PSS and EdDSA SignatureScheme codepoints for better backwards compatibility (*)
- Move HelloRetryRequest.selected_group to an extension (*)
- Clarify the behavior of no exporter context and make it the same as an empty context. (*)
- New KeyUpdate format that allows for requesting/not-requesting an answer. This also means changes to the key schedule to support independent updates (*)

- New certificate_required alert (*)
- Forbid CertificateRequest with 0-RTT and PSK.
- Relax requirement to check SNI for 0-RTT.

draft-15
- New negotiation syntax as discussed in Berlin (*)
- Require CertificateRequest.context to be empty during handshake (*)
- Forbid empty tickets (*)
- Forbid application data messages in between post-handshake messages from the same flight (*)
- Clean up alert guidance (*)
- Clearer guidance on what is needed for TLS 1.2.
- Guidance on 0-RTT time windows.
- Rename a bunch of fields.
- Remove old PRNG text.
- Explicitly require checking that handshake records not span key changes.

draft-14
- Allow cookies to be longer (*)
- Remove the "context" from EarlyDataIndication as it was undefined and nobody used it (*)
- Remove 0-RTT EncryptedExtensions and replace the ticket_age extension with an obfuscated version. Also necessitates a change to NewSessionTicket (*).
- Move the downgrade sentinel to the end of ServerHello.Random to accommodate tlsdate (*).
- Define ecdsa_sha1 (*).
- Allow resumption even after fatal alerts. This matches current practice.
- Remove non-closure warning alerts. Require treating unknown alerts as fatal.
- Make the rules for accepting 0-RTT less restrictive.
- Clarify 0-RTT backward-compatibility rules.
- Clarify how 0-RTT and PSK identities interact.
- Add a section describing the data limits for each cipher.
- Major editorial restructuring.
- Replace the Security Analysis section with a WIP draft.

draft-13
- Allow server to send SupportedGroups.
- Remove 0-RTT client authentication
- Remove (EC)DHE 0-RTT.
- Flesh out 0-RTT PSK mode and shrink EarlyDataIndication
- Turn PSK-resumption response into an index to save room
- Move CertificateStatus to an extension
- Extra fields in NewSessionTicket.
- Restructure key schedule and add a resumption_context value.
- Require DH public keys and secrets to be zero-padded to the size of the group.
- Remove the redundant length fields in KeyShareEntry.
- Define a cookie field for HRR.

draft-12
- Provide a list of the PSK cipher suites.
- Remove the ability for the ServerHello to have no extensions (this aligns the syntax with the text).
- Clarify that the server can send application data after its first flight (0.5 RTT data)
- Revise signature algorithm negotiation to group hash, signature algorithm, and curve together. This is backwards compatible.
- Make ticket lifetime mandatory and limit it to a week.
- Make the purpose strings lower-case. This matches how people are implementing for interop.
- Define exporters.
- Editorial cleanup

draft-11
- Port the CFRG curves & signatures work from RFC4492bis.
- Remove sequence number and version from additional_data, which is now empty.
- Reorder values in HkdfLabel.
- Add support for version anti-downgrade mechanism.
- Update IANA considerations section and relax some of the policies.
- Unify authentication modes. Add post-handshake client authentication.
- Remove early_handshake content type. Terminate 0-RTT data with an alert.
- Reset sequence number upon key change (as proposed by Fournet et al.)

draft-10
- Remove ClientCertificateTypes field from CertificateRequest and add extensions.
- Merge client and server key shares into a single extension.

draft-09
- Change to RSA-PSS signatures for handshake messages.
- Remove support for DSA.
- Update key schedule per suggestions by Hugo, Hoeteck, and Bjoern Tackmann.
- Add support for per-record padding.
- Switch to encrypted record ContentType.
- Change HKDF labeling to include protocol version and value lengths.
- Shift the final decision to abort a handshake due to incompatible certificates to the client rather than having servers abort early.
- Deprecate SHA-1 with signatures.
- Add MTI algorithms.

draft-08
- Remove support for weak and lesser used named curves.
- Remove support for MD5 and SHA-224 hashes with signatures.
- Update lists of available AEAD cipher suites and error alerts.
- Reduce maximum permitted record expansion for AEAD from 2048 to 256 octets.
- Require digital signatures even when a previous configuration is used.
- Merge EarlyDataIndication and KnownConfiguration.
- Change code point for server_configuration to avoid collision with server_hello_done.
- Relax certificate_list ordering requirement to match current practice.

draft-07
- Integration of semi-ephemeral DH proposal.
- Add initial 0-RTT support.
- Remove resumption and replace with PSK + tickets.
- Move ClientKeyShare into an extension.
- Move to HKDF.

draft-06
- Prohibit RC4 negotiation for backwards compatibility.
- Freeze & deprecate record layer version field.
- Update format of signatures with context.
- Remove explicit IV.

draft-05
- Prohibit SSL negotiation for backwards compatibility.
- Fix which MS is used for exporters.

draft-04
- Modify key computations to include session hash.
- Remove ChangeCipherSpec.
- Renumber the new handshake messages to be somewhat more consistent with existing convention and to remove a duplicate registration.
- Remove renegotiation.
- Remove point format negotiation.

draft-03
- Remove GMT time.
- Merge in support for ECC from RFC 4492 but without explicit curves.
- Remove the unnecessary length field from the AD input to AEAD ciphers.
- Rename {Client,Server}KeyExchange to {Client,Server}KeyShare.
- Add an explicit HelloRetryRequest to reject the client’s.
draft-02
- Increment version number.
- Rework handshake to provide 1-RTT mode.
- Remove custom DHE groups.
- Remove support for compression.
- Remove support for static RSA and DH key exchange.
- Remove support for non-AEAD ciphers.

1.3. Major Differences from TLS 1.2

The following is a list of the major functional differences between TLS 1.2 and TLS 1.3. It is not intended to be exhaustive and there are many minor differences.

- The list of supported symmetric algorithms has been pruned of all algorithms that are considered legacy. Those that remain all use Authenticated Encryption with Associated Data (AEAD) algorithms. The ciphersuite concept has been changed to separate the authentication and key exchange mechanisms from the record protection algorithm (including secret key length) and a hash to be used with the key derivation function and HMAC.

- A 0-RTT mode was added, saving a round-trip at connection setup for some application data, at the cost of certain security properties.

- Static RSA and Diffie-Hellman cipher suites have been removed; all public-key based key exchange mechanisms now provide forward secrecy.

- All handshake messages after the ServerHello are now encrypted. The newly introduced EncryptedExtension message allows various extensions previously sent in clear in the ServerHello to also enjoy confidentiality protection from active attackers.

- The key derivation functions have been re-designed. The new design allows easier analysis by cryptographers due to their improved key separation properties. The HMAC-based Extract-and-Expand Key Derivation Function (HKDF) is used as an underlying primitive.
- The handshake state machine has been significantly restructured to be more consistent and to remove superfluous messages such as ChangeCipherSpec (except when needed for middlebox compatibility).

- Elliptic curve algorithms are now in the base spec and new signature algorithms, such as ed25519 and ed448, are included. TLS 1.3 removed point format negotiation in favor of a single point format for each curve.

- Other cryptographic improvements including the removal of compression and custom DHE groups, changing the RSA padding to use RSASSA-PSS, and the removal of DSA.

- The TLS 1.2 version negotiation mechanism has been deprecated in favor of a version list in an extension. This increases compatibility with existing servers that incorrectly implemented version negotiation.

- Session resumption with and without server-side state as well as the PSK-based ciphersuites of earlier TLS versions have been replaced by a single new PSK exchange.

- Updated references to point to the updated versions of RFCs, as appropriate (e.g., RFC 5280 rather than RFC 3280).

1.4. Updates Affecting TLS 1.2

This document defines several changes that optionally affect implementations of TLS 1.2, including those which do not also support TLS 1.3:

- A version downgrade protection mechanism is described in Section 4.1.3.

- RSASSA-PSS signature schemes are defined in Section 4.2.3.

- The "supported_versions" ClientHello extension can be used to negotiate the version of TLS to use, in preference to the legacy_version field of the ClientHello.

- The "signature_algorithms_cert" extension allows a client to indicate which signature algorithms it can validate in X.509 certificates

Additionally, this document clarifies some compliance requirements for earlier versions of TLS; see Section 9.3.
2. Protocol Overview

The cryptographic parameters used by the secure channel are produced by the TLS handshake protocol. This sub-protocol of TLS is used by the client and server when first communicating with each other. The handshake protocol allows peers to negotiate a protocol version, select cryptographic algorithms, optionally authenticate each other, and establish shared secret keying material. Once the handshake is complete, the peers use the established keys to protect the application layer traffic.

A failure of the handshake or other protocol error triggers the termination of the connection, optionally preceded by an alert message (Section 6).

TLS supports three basic key exchange modes:

- (EC)DHE (Diffie-Hellman over either finite fields or elliptic curves)
- PSK-only
- PSK with (EC)DHE

Figure 1 below shows the basic full TLS handshake:
The handshake can be thought of as having three phases (indicated in the diagram above):

- **Key Exchange**: Establish shared keying material and select the cryptographic parameters. Everything after this phase is encrypted.

- **Server Parameters**: Establish other handshake parameters (whether the client is authenticated, application layer protocol support, etc.).

- **Authentication**: Authenticate the server (and optionally the client) and provide key confirmation and handshake integrity.
In the Key Exchange phase, the client sends the ClientHello (Section 4.1.2) message, which contains a random nonce (ClientHello.random); its offered protocol versions; a list of symmetric cipher/HKDF hash pairs; either a set of Diffie-Hellman key shares (in the "key_share" extension Section 4.2.8), a set of pre-shared key labels (in the "pre_shared_key" extension Section 4.2.11) or both; and potentially additional extensions. Additional fields and/or messages may also be present for middlebox compatibility.

The server processes the ClientHello and determines the appropriate cryptographic parameters for the connection. It then responds with its own ServerHello (Section 4.1.3), which indicates the negotiated connection parameters. The combination of the ClientHello and the ServerHello determines the shared keys. If (EC)DHE key establishment is in use, then the ServerHello contains a "key_share" extension with the server’s ephemeral Diffie-Hellman share; the server’s share MUST be in the same group as one of the client’s shares. If PSK key establishment is in use, then the ServerHello contains a "pre_shared_key" extension indicating which of the client’s offered PSKs was selected. Note that implementations can use (EC)DHE and PSK together, in which case both extensions will be supplied.

The server then sends two messages to establish the Server Parameters:

EncryptedExtensions: responses to ClientHello extensions that are not required to determine the cryptographic parameters, other than those that are specific to individual certificates. [Section 4.3.1]

CertificateRequest: if certificate-based client authentication is desired, the desired parameters for that certificate. This message is omitted if client authentication is not desired. [Section 4.3.2]

Finally, the client and server exchange Authentication messages. TLS uses the same set of messages every time that certificate-based authentication is needed. (PSK-based authentication happens as a side effect of key exchange.) Specifically:

Certificate: the certificate of the endpoint and any per-certificate extensions. This message is omitted by the server if not authenticating with a certificate and by the client if the server did not send CertificateRequest (thus indicating that the client should not authenticate with a certificate). Note that if raw public keys [RFC7250] or the cached information extension [RFC7924] are in use, then this message will not contain a
certificate but rather some other value corresponding to the server’s long-term key. [Section 4.4.2]

CertificateVerify: a signature over the entire handshake using the private key corresponding to the public key in the Certificate message. This message is omitted if the endpoint is not authenticating via a certificate. [Section 4.4.3]

Finished: a MAC (Message Authentication Code) over the entire handshake. This message provides key confirmation, binds the endpoint’s identity to the exchanged keys, and in PSK mode also authenticates the handshake. [Section 4.4.4]

Upon receiving the server’s messages, the client responds with its Authentication messages, namely Certificate and CertificateVerify (if requested), and Finished.

At this point, the handshake is complete, and the client and server derive the keying material required by the record layer to exchange application-layer data protected through authenticated encryption. Application data MUST NOT be sent prior to sending the Finished message, except as specified in [Section 2.3]. Note that while the server may send application data prior to receiving the client’s Authentication messages, any data sent at that point is, of course, being sent to an unauthenticated peer.

2.1. Incorrect DHE Share

If the client has not provided a sufficient "key_share" extension (e.g., it includes only DHE or ECDHE groups unacceptable to or unsupported by the server), the server corrects the mismatch with a HelloRetryRequest and the client needs to restart the handshake with an appropriate "key_share" extension, as shown in Figure 2. If no common cryptographic parameters can be negotiated, the server MUST abort the handshake with an appropriate alert.
2.2. Resumption and Pre-Shared Key (PSK)

Although TLS PSKs can be established out of band, PSKs can also be established in a previous connection and then used to establish a new connection ("session resumption" or "resuming" with a PSK). Once a handshake has completed, the server can send to the client a PSK identity that corresponds to a unique key derived from the initial handshake (see Section 4.6.1). The client can then use that PSK identity in future handshakes to negotiate the use of the associated PSK. If the server accepts the PSK, then the security context of the new connection is cryptographically tied to the original connection and the key derived from the initial handshake is used to bootstrap the cryptographic state instead of a full handshake. In TLS 1.2 and below, this functionality was provided by "session IDs" and "session tickets" [RFC5077]. Both mechanisms are obsoleted in TLS 1.3.

PSKs can be used with (EC)DHE key exchange in order to provide forward secrecy in combination with shared keys, or can be used
alone, at the cost of losing forward secrecy for the application data.

Figure 3 shows a pair of handshakes in which the first establishes a PSK and the second uses it:

```
Client                                           Server

Initial Handshake:                                
ClientHello + key_share               -------->  
ServerHello + key_share
                     {EncryptedExtensions}
                     {CertificateRequest*}
                     {Certificate*}
                     {CertificateVerify*}
                     {Finished}
<--------     [Application Data*]

                     {Certificate*}
                     {CertificateVerify*}
                     {Finished}
<--------     [NewSessionTicket]

[Application Data] <--------> [Application Data]

Subsequent Handshake:                             
ClientHello + key_share*        -------->
                     + pre_shared_key
                     {EncryptedExtensions}
                     {Finished}
<-------- [Application Data*]

                     [Application Data] <--------> [Application Data]
```

Figure 3: Message flow for resumption and PSK

As the server is authenticating via a PSK, it does not send a Certificate or a CertificateVerify message. When a client offers resumption via PSK, it SHOULD also supply a "key_share" extension to the server to allow the server to decline resumption and fall back to a full handshake, if needed. The server responds with a "pre_shared_key" extension to negotiate use of PSK key establishment
and can (as shown here) respond with a "key_share" extension to do (EC)DHE key establishment, thus providing forward secrecy.

When PSKs are provisioned out of band, the PSK identity and the KDF hash algorithm to be used with the PSK MUST also be provisioned.

Note: When using an out-of-band provisioned pre-shared secret, a critical consideration is using sufficient entropy during the key generation, as discussed in [RFC4086]. Deriving a shared secret from a password or other low-entropy sources is not secure. A low-entropy secret, or password, is subject to dictionary attacks based on the PSK binder. The specified PSK authentication is not a strong password-based authenticated key exchange even when used with Diffie-Hellman key establishment. Specifically, it does not prevent an attacker that can observe the handshake from performing a brute-force attack on the password/pre-shared key.

2.3. 0-RTT Data

When clients and servers share a PSK (either obtained externally or via a previous handshake), TLS 1.3 allows clients to send data on the first flight ("early data"). The client uses the PSK to authenticate the server and to encrypt the early data.

As shown in Figure 4, the 0-RTT data is just added to the 1-RTT handshake in the first flight. The rest of the handshake uses the same messages as for a 1-RTT handshake with PSK resumption.
Figure 4: Message flow for a zero round trip handshake

IMPORTANT NOTE: The security properties for 0-RTT data are weaker than those for other kinds of TLS data. Specifically:

1. This data is not forward secret, as it is encrypted solely under keys derived using the offered PSK.

2. There are no guarantees of non-replay between connections. Protection against replay for ordinary TLS 1.3 1-RTT data is provided via the server's Random value, but 0-RTT data does not depend on the ServerHello and therefore has weaker guarantees. This is especially relevant if the data is authenticated either with TLS client authentication or inside the application.
protocol. The same warnings apply to any use of the
early_exporter_master_secret.

0-RTT data cannot be duplicated within a connection (i.e., the server
will not process the same data twice for the same connection) and an
attacker will not be able to make 0-RTT data appear to be 1-RTT data
(because it is protected with different keys.) Appendix E.5 contains
a description of potential attacks and Section 8 describes mechanisms
which the server can use to limit the impact of replay.

3. Presentation Language

This document deals with the formatting of data in an external
representation. The following very basic and somewhat casually
defined presentation syntax will be used.

3.1. Basic Block Size

The representation of all data items is explicitly specified. The
basic data block size is one byte (i.e., 8 bits). Multiple byte data
items are concatenations of bytes, from left to right, from top to
bottom. From the byte stream, a multi-byte item (a numeric in the
example) is formed (using C notation) by:

   value = (byte[0] << 8*(n-1)) | (byte[1] << 8*(n-2)) |
   ... | byte[n-1];

This byte ordering for multi-byte values is the commonplace network
byte order or big-endian format.

3.2. Miscellaneous

Comments begin with "/*" and end with "*/".

Optional components are denoted by enclosing them in "[[ ]]" double
brackets.

Single-byte entities containing uninterpreted data are of type
opaque.

A type alias \texttt{T'} for an existing type \texttt{T} is defined by:

   \texttt{T T'};
3.3. Numbers

The basic numeric data type is an unsigned byte (uint8). All larger numeric data types are formed from fixed-length series of bytes concatenated as described in Section 3.1 and are also unsigned. The following numeric types are predefined.

```plaintext
uint8 uint16[2];
uint8 uint24[3];
uint8 uint32[4];
uint8 uint64[8];
```

All values, here and elsewhere in the specification, are transmitted in network byte (big-endian) order; the uint32 represented by the hex bytes 01 02 03 04 is equivalent to the decimal value 16909060.

3.4. Vectors

A vector (single-dimensioned array) is a stream of homogeneous data elements. The size of the vector may be specified at documentation time or left unspecified until runtime. In either case, the length declares the number of bytes, not the number of elements, in the vector. The syntax for specifying a new type, T', that is a fixed-length vector of type T is

```plaintext
T T'[n];
```

Here, T' occupies n bytes in the data stream, where n is a multiple of the size of T. The length of the vector is not included in the encoded stream.

In the following example, Datum is defined to be three consecutive bytes that the protocol does not interpret, while Data is three consecutive Datum, consuming a total of nine bytes.

```plaintext
opaque Datum[3];       /* three uninterpreted bytes */
Datum Data[9];         /* 3 consecutive 3-byte vectors */
```

Variable-length vectors are defined by specifying a subrange of legal lengths, inclusively, using the notation <floor..ceiling>. When these are encoded, the actual length precedes the vector’s contents in the byte stream. The length will be in the form of a number consuming as many bytes as required to hold the vector’s specified maximum (ceiling) length. A variable-length vector with an actual length field of zero is referred to as an empty vector.

```plaintext
T T'<floor..ceiling>;
```
In the following example, mandatory is a vector that must contain between 300 and 400 bytes of type opaque. It can never be empty. The actual length field consumes two bytes, a uint16, which is sufficient to represent the value 400 (see Section 3.3). Similarly, longer can represent up to 800 bytes of data, or 400 uint16 elements, and it may be empty. Its encoding will include a two-byte actual length field prepended to the vector. The length of an encoded vector must be an exact multiple of the length of a single element (e.g., a 17-byte vector of uint16 would be illegal).

```
opake mandatory<300..400>
  /* length field is 2 bytes, cannot be empty */
uint16 longer<0..800>
  /* zero to 400 16-bit unsigned integers */
```

### 3.5. Enumerateds

An additional sparse data type is available called enum or enumerated. Each definition is a different type. Only enumerations of the same type may be assigned or compared. Every element of an enumerated must be assigned a value, as demonstrated in the following example. Since the elements of the enumerated are not ordered, they can be assigned any unique value, in any order.

```
enum { e1(v1), e2(v2), ... , en(vn) [, (n)] } Te;
```

Future extensions or additions to the protocol may define new values. Implementations need to be able to parse and ignore unknown values unless the definition of the field states otherwise.

An enumerated occupies as much space in the byte stream as would its maximal defined ordinal value. The following definition would cause one byte to be used to carry fields of type Color.

```
enum { red(3), blue(5), white(7) } Color;
```

One may optionally specify a value without its associated tag to force the width definition without defining a superfluous element.

In the following example, Taste will consume two bytes in the data stream but can only assume the values 1, 2, or 4 in the current version of the protocol.

```
enum { sweet(1), sour(2), bitter(4), (32000) } Taste;
```

The names of the elements of an enumeration are scoped within the defined type. In the first example, a fully qualified reference to the second element of the enumeration would be Color.blue. Such
qualification is not required if the target of the assignment is well
specified.

    Color color = Color.blue;     /* overspecified, legal */
    Color color = blue;           /* correct, type implicit */

The names assigned to enumerateds do not need to be unique. The
numerical value can describe a range over which the same name
applies. The value includes the minimum and maximum inclusive values
in that range, separated by two period characters. This is
principally useful for reserving regions of the space.

    enum { sad(0), meh(1..254), happy(255) } Mood;

3.6. Constructed Types

Structure types may be constructed from primitive types for
convenience. Each specification declares a new, unique type. The
syntax for definition is much like that of C.

    struct {
        T1 f1;
        T2 f2;
        ...
        Tn fn;
    } T;

Fixed- and variable-length vector fields are allowed using the
standard vector syntax. Structures V1 and V2 in the variants example
below demonstrate this.

The fields within a structure may be qualified using the type’s name,
with a syntax much like that available for enumerateds. For example,
T.f2 refers to the second field of the previous declaration.

3.7. Constants

Fields and variables may be assigned a fixed value using "=" as in:

    struct {
        T1 f1 = 8; /* T.f1 must always be 8 */
        T2 f2;
    } T;
3.8. Variants

Defined structures may have variants based on some knowledge that is available within the environment. The selector must be an enumerated type that defines the possible variants the structure defines. Each arm of the select specifies the type of that variant’s field and an optional field label. The mechanism by which the variant is selected at runtime is not prescribed by the presentation language.

```
struct {
    T1 f1;
    T2 f2;
    ....
    Tn fn;
    select (E) {
        case e1: Te1 [fe1];
        case e2: Te2 [fe2];
        ....
        case en: Ten [fen];
    };
} Tv;
```

For example:

```
enum { apple(0), orange(1) } VariantTag;

struct {
    uint16 number;
    opaque string<0..10>; /* variable length */
} V1;

struct {
    uint32 number;
    opaque string[10];    /* fixed length */
} V2;

struct {
    VariantTag type;
    select (VariantRecord.type) {
        case apple:  V1;
        case orange: V2;
    };
} VariantRecord;
```
4. Handshake Protocol

The handshake protocol is used to negotiate the security parameters of a connection. Handshake messages are supplied to the TLS record layer, where they are encapsulated within one or more TLSPlaintext or TLSCiphertext structures, which are processed and transmitted as specified by the current active connection state.

```c
enum {
    client_hello(1),
    server_hello(2),
    new_session_ticket(4),
    end_of_early_data(5),
    encrypted_extensions(8),
    certificate(11),
    certificate_request(13),
    certificate_verify(15),
    finished(20),
    key_update(24),
    message_hash(254),
    (255)
} HandshakeType;

struct {
    HandshakeType msg_type;    /* handshake type */
    uint24 length;             /* bytes in message */
    select (Handshake.msg_type) {
        case client_hello:      ClientHello;
        case server_hello:      ServerHello;
        case end_of_early_data: EndOfEarlyData;
        case encrypted_extensions: EncryptedExtensions;
        case certificate_request: CertificateRequest;
        case certificate:       Certificate;
        case certificate_verify: CertificateVerify;
        case finished:          Finished;
        case new_session_ticket: NewSessionTicket;
        case key_update:        KeyUpdate;
    }
} Handshake;
```

Protocol messages MUST be sent in the order defined in Section 4.4.1 and shown in the diagrams in Section 2. A peer which receives a handshake message in an unexpected order MUST abort the handshake with an "unexpected_message" alert.

New handshake message types are assigned by IANA as described in Section 11.
4.1. Key Exchange Messages

The key exchange messages are used to determine the security capabilities of the client and the server and to establish shared secrets including the traffic keys used to protect the rest of the handshake and the data.

4.1.1. Cryptographic Negotiation

In TLS, the cryptographic negotiation proceeds by the client offering the following four sets of options in its ClientHello:

- A list of cipher suites which indicates the AEAD algorithm/HKDF hash pairs which the client supports.

- A "supported_groups" (Section 4.2.7) extension which indicates the (EC)DHE groups which the client supports and a "key_share" (Section 4.2.8) extension which contains (EC)DHE shares for some or all of these groups.

- A "signature_algorithms" (Section 4.2.3) extension which indicates the signature algorithms which the client can accept.

- A "pre_shared_key" (Section 4.2.11) extension which contains a list of symmetric key identities known to the client and a "psk_key_exchange_modes" (Section 4.2.9) extension which indicates the key exchange modes that may be used with PSKs.

If the server does not select a PSK, then the first three of these options are entirely orthogonal: the server independently selects a cipher suite, an (EC)DHE group and key share for key establishment, and a signature algorithm/certificate pair to authenticate itself to the client. If there is no overlap between the received "supported_groups" and the groups supported by the server then the server MUST abort the handshake with a "handshake_failure" or an "insufficient_security" alert.

If the server selects a PSK, then it MUST also select a key establishment mode from the set indicated by client’s "psk_key_exchange_modes" extension (at present, PSK alone or with (EC)DHE). Note that if the PSK can be used without (EC)DHE then non-overlap in the "supported_groups" parameters need not be fatal, as it is in the non-PSK case discussed in the previous paragraph.

If the server selects an (EC)DHE group and the client did not offer a compatible "key_share" extension in the initial ClientHello, the server MUST respond with a HelloRetryRequest (Section 4.1.4) message.
If the server successfully selects parameters and does not require a HelloRetryRequest, it indicates the selected parameters in the ServerHello as follows:

- If PSK is being used, then the server will send a "pre_shared_key" extension indicating the selected key.
- If PSK is not being used, then (EC)DHE and certificate-based authentication are always used.
- When (EC)DHE is in use, the server will also provide a "key_share" extension.
- When authenticating via a certificate, the server will send the Certificate (Section 4.4.2) and CertificateVerify (Section 4.4.3) messages. In TLS 1.3 as defined by this document, either a PSK or a certificate is always used, but not both. Future documents may define how to use them together.

If the server is unable to negotiate a supported set of parameters (i.e., there is no overlap between the client and server parameters), it MUST abort the handshake with either a "handshake_failure" or "insufficient_security" fatal alert (see Section 6).

4.1.2. Client Hello

When a client first connects to a server, it is REQUIRED to send the ClientHello as its first TLS message. The client will also send a ClientHello when the server has responded to its ClientHello with a HelloRetryRequest. In that case, the client MUST send the same ClientHello without modification, except:

- If a "key_share" extension was supplied in the HelloRetryRequest, replacing the list of shares with a list containing a single KeyShareEntry from the indicated group.
- Removing the "early_data" extension (Section 4.2.10) if one was present. Early data is not permitted after HelloRetryRequest.
- Including a "cookie" extension if one was provided in the HelloRetryRequest.
- Updating the "pre_shared_key" extension if present by recomputing the "obfuscated_ticket_age" and binder values and (optionally) removing any PSKs which are incompatible with the server’s indicated cipher suite.
- Optionally adding, removing, or changing the length of the "padding" extension [RFC7685].

- Other modifications that may be allowed by an extension defined in the future and present in the HelloRetryRequest.

Because TLS 1.3 forbids renegotiation, if a server has negotiated TLS 1.3 and receives a ClientHello at any other time, it MUST terminate the connection with an "unexpected_message" alert.

If a server established a TLS connection with a previous version of TLS and receives a TLS 1.3 ClientHello in a renegotiation, it MUST retain the previous protocol version. In particular, it MUST NOT negotiate TLS 1.3.

Structure of this message:

```c
uint16 ProtocolVersion;
opaque Random[32];

uint8 CipherSuite[2];    /* Cryptographic suite selector */

struct {
    ProtocolVersion legacy_version = 0x0303;    /* TLS v1.2 */
    Random random;
    opaque legacy_session_id<0..32>;
    CipherSuite cipher_suites<2..2^16-2>;
    opaque legacy_compression_methods<1..2^8-1>
    Extension extensions<8..2^16-1>;
} ClientHello;
```

- **legacy_version** In previous versions of TLS, this field was used for version negotiation and represented the highest version number supported by the client. Experience has shown that many servers do not properly implement version negotiation, leading to "version intolerance" in which the server rejects an otherwise acceptable ClientHello with a version number higher than it supports. In TLS 1.3, the client indicates its version preferences in the "supported_versions" extension (Section 4.2.1) and the legacy_version field MUST be set to 0x0303, which is the version number for TLS 1.2. (See Appendix D for details about backward compatibility.)

- **random** 32 bytes generated by a secure random number generator. See Appendix C for additional information.

- **legacy_session_id** Versions of TLS before TLS 1.3 supported a "session resumption" feature which has been merged with Pre-Shared
Keys in this version (see Section 2.2). A client which has a cached session ID set by a pre-TLS 1.3 server SHOULD set this field to that value. In compatibility mode (see Appendix D.4) this field MUST be non-empty, so a client not offering a pre-TLS 1.3 session MUST generate a new 32-byte value. This value need not be random but SHOULD be unpredictable to avoid implementations fixating on a specific value (also known as ossification). Otherwise, it MUST be set as a zero length vector (i.e., a single zero byte length field).

cipher_suites This is a list of the symmetric cipher options supported by the client, specifically the record protection algorithm (including secret key length) and a hash to be used with HKDF, in descending order of client preference. If the list contains cipher suites that the server does not recognize, support or wish to use, the server MUST ignore those cipher suites and process the remaining ones as usual. Values are defined in Appendix B.4. If the client is attempting a PSK key establishment, it SHOULD advertise at least one cipher suite indicating a Hash associated with the PSK.

legacy_compression_methods Versions of TLS before 1.3 supported compression with the list of supported compression methods being sent in this field. For every TLS 1.3 ClientHello, this vector MUST contain exactly one byte, set to zero, which corresponds to the "null" compression method in prior versions of TLS. If a TLS 1.3 ClientHello is received with any other value in this field, the server MUST abort the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert. Note that TLS 1.3 servers might receive TLS 1.2 or prior ClientHellos which contain other compression methods and (if negotiating such a prior version) MUST follow the procedures for the appropriate prior version of TLS. TLS 1.3 ClientHellos are identified as having a legacy_version of 0x0303 and a supported_versions extension present with 0x0304 as the highest version indicated therein.

extensions Clients request extended functionality from servers by sending data in the extensions field. The actual "Extension" format is defined in Section 4.2. In TLS 1.3, use of certain extensions is mandatory, as functionality is moved into extensions to preserve ClientHello compatibility with previous versions of TLS. Servers MUST ignore unrecognized extensions.

All versions of TLS allow an extensions field to optionally follow the compression_methods field. TLS 1.3 ClientHello messages always contain extensions (minimally "supported_versions", otherwise they will be interpreted as TLS 1.2 ClientHello messages). However, TLS 1.3 servers might receive ClientHello messages without an extensions
field from prior versions of TLS. The presence of extensions can be detected by determining whether there are bytes following the compression_methods field at the end of the ClientHello. Note that this method of detecting optional data differs from the normal TLS method of having a variable-length field, but it is used for compatibility with TLS before extensions were defined. TLS 1.3 servers will need to perform this check first and only attempt to negotiate TLS 1.3 if the "supported_versions" extension is present. If negotiating a version of TLS prior to 1.3, a server MUST check that the message either contains no data after legacy_compression_methods or that it contains a valid extensions block with no data following. If not, then it MUST abort the handshake with a "decode_error" alert.

In the event that a client requests additional functionality using extensions, and this functionality is not supplied by the server, the client MAY abort the handshake.

After sending the ClientHello message, the client waits for a ServerHello or HelloRetryRequest message. If early data is in use, the client may transmit early application data (Section 2.3) while waiting for the next handshake message.

4.1.3. Server Hello

The server will send this message in response to a ClientHello message to proceed with the handshake if it is able to negotiate an acceptable set of handshake parameters based on the ClientHello.

Structure of this message:

```c
struct {
    ProtocolVersion legacy_version = 0x0303;  /* TLS v1.2 */
    Random random;
    opaque legacy_session_id_echo<0..32>;
    CipherSuite cipher_suite;
    uint8 legacy_compression_method = 0;
    Extension extensions<6..2^16-1>;
} ServerHello;
```

legacy_version In previous versions of TLS, this field was used for version negotiation and represented the selected version number for the connection. Unfortunately, some middleboxes fail when presented with new values. In TLS 1.3, the TLS server indicates its version using the "supported_versions" extension (Section 4.2.1), and the legacy_version field MUST be set to 0x0303, which is the version number for TLS 1.2. (See Appendix D for details about backward compatibility.)
random 32 bytes generated by a secure random number generator. See Appendix C for additional information. The last eight bytes MUST be overwritten as described below if negotiating TLS 1.2 or TLS 1.1, but the remaining bytes MUST be random. This structure is generated by the server and MUST be generated independently of the ClientHello.random.

legacy_session_id_echo The contents of the client’s legacy_session_id field. Note that this field is echoed even if the client’s value corresponded to a cached pre-TLS 1.3 session which the server has chosen not to resume. A client which receives a legacy_session_id_echo field that does not match what it sent in the ClientHello MUST abort the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert.

cipher_suite The single cipher suite selected by the server from the list in ClientHello.cipher_suites. A client which receives a cipher suite that was not offered MUST abort the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert.

legacy_compression_method A single byte which MUST have the value 0.

extensions A list of extensions. The ServerHello MUST only include extensions which are required to establish the cryptographic context and negotiate the protocol version. All TLS 1.3 ServerHello messages MUST contain the "supported_versions" extension. Current ServerHello messages additionally contain either the "pre_shared_key" or "key_share" extensions, or both when using a PSK with (EC)DHE key establishment. Other extensions are sent separately in the EncryptedExtensions message.

For reasons of backward compatibility with middleboxes (see Appendix D.4) the HelloRetryRequest message uses the same structure as the ServerHello, but with Random set to the special value of the SHA-256 of "HelloRetryRequest":

CF 21 AD 74 E5 9A 61 11 BE 1D 8C 02 1E 65 B8 91
C2 A2 11 16 7A BB 8C 5E 07 9E 09 E2 C8 A8 33 9C

Upon receiving a message with type server_hello, implementations MUST first examine the Random value and if it matches this value, process it as described in Section 4.1.4).

TLS 1.3 has a downgrade protection mechanism embedded in the server’s random value. TLS 1.3 servers which negotiate TLS 1.2 or below in response to a ClientHello MUST set the last eight bytes of their Random value specially.
If negotiating TLS 1.2, TLS 1.3 servers MUST set the last eight bytes of their Random value to the bytes:

44 4F 57 4E 47 52 44 01

If negotiating TLS 1.1 or below, TLS 1.3 servers MUST and TLS 1.2 servers SHOULD set the last eight bytes of their Random value to the bytes:

44 4F 57 4E 47 52 44 00

TLS 1.3 clients receiving a ServerHello indicating TLS 1.2 or below MUST check that the last eight bytes are not equal to either of these values. TLS 1.2 clients SHOULD also check that the last eight bytes are not equal to the second value if the ServerHello indicates TLS 1.1 or below. If a match is found, the client MUST abort the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert. This mechanism provides limited protection against downgrade attacks over and above what is provided by the Finished exchange: because the ServerKeyExchange, a message present in TLS 1.2 and below, includes a signature over both random values, it is not possible for an active attacker to modify the random values without detection as long as ephemeral ciphers are used. It does not provide downgrade protection when static RSA is used.

Note: This is a change from [RFC5246], so in practice many TLS 1.2 clients and servers will not behave as specified above.

A legacy TLS client performing renegotiation with TLS 1.2 or prior and which receives a TLS 1.3 ServerHello during renegotiation MUST abort the handshake with a "protocol_version" alert. Note that renegotiation is not possible when TLS 1.3 has been negotiated.

RFC EDITOR: PLEASE REMOVE THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPH Implementations of draft versions (see Section 4.2.1.1) of this specification SHOULD NOT implement this mechanism on either client and server. A pre-RFC client connecting to RFC servers, or vice versa, will appear to downgrade to TLS 1.2. With the mechanism enabled, this will cause an interoperability failure.

4.1.4. Hello Retry Request

The server will send this message in response to a ClientHello message if it is able to find an acceptable set of parameters but the ClientHello does not contain sufficient information to proceed with the handshake. As discussed in Section 4.1.3, the HelloRetryRequest has the same format as a ServerHello message, and the legacy_version, legacy_session_id_echo, cipher_suite, and legacyCompression methods
fields have the same meaning. However, for convenience we discuss HelloRetryRequest throughout this document as if it were a distinct message.

The server’s extensions MUST contain "supported_versions" and otherwise the server SHOULD send only the extensions necessary for the client to generate a correct ClientHello pair. As with ServerHello, a HelloRetryRequest MUST NOT contain any extensions that were not first offered by the client in its ClientHello, with the exception of optionally the "cookie" (see Section 4.2.2) extension.

Upon receipt of a HelloRetryRequest, the client MUST check the legacy_version, legacy_session_id_echo, cipher_suite, and legacy_compression_method as specified in Section 4.1.3 and then process the extensions, starting with determining the version using "supported_versions". Clients MUST abort the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert if the HelloRetryRequest would not result in any change in the ClientHello. If a client receives a second HelloRetryRequest in the same connection (i.e., where the ClientHello was itself in response to a HelloRetryRequest), it MUST abort the handshake with an "unexpected_message" alert.

Otherwise, the client MUST process all extensions in the HelloRetryRequest and send a second updated ClientHello. The HelloRetryRequest extensions defined in this specification are:

- supported_versions (see Section 4.2.1)
- cookie (see Section 4.2.2)
- key_share (see Section 4.2.8)

In addition, in its updated ClientHello, the client SHOULD NOT offer any pre-shared keys associated with a hash other than that of the selected cipher suite. This allows the client to avoid having to compute partial hash transcripts for multiple hashes in the second ClientHello. A client which receives a cipher suite that was not offered MUST abort the handshake. Servers MUST ensure that they negotiate the same cipher suite when receiving a conformant updated ClientHello (if the server selects the cipher suite as the first step in the negotiation, then this will happen automatically). Upon receiving the ServerHello, clients MUST check that the cipher suite supplied in the ServerHello is the same as that in the HelloRetryRequest and otherwise abort the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert.

The value of selected_version in the HelloRetryRequest "supported_versions" extension MUST be retained in the ServerHello,
and a client MUST abort the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert if the value changes.

4.2. Extensions

A number of TLS messages contain tag-length-value encoded extensions structures.

struct {
    ExtensionType extension_type;
    opaque extension_data<0..2^16-1>;
} Extension;

enum {
    server_name(0),               /* RFC 6066 */
    max_fragment_length(1),       /* RFC 6066 */
    status_request(5),           /* RFC 6066 */
    supported_groups(10),         /* RFC 4492, 7919 */
    signature_algorithms(13),     /* RFC 6066 */
    use_srtp(14),                 /* RFC 5764 */
    heartbeat(15),                /* RFC 6520 */
    application_layer_protocol_negotiation(16), /* RFC 7301 */
    signed_certificate_timestamp(18), /* RFC 6962 */
    client_certificate_type(19),  /* RFC 7250 */
    server_certificate_type(20),  /* RFC 7250 */
    padding(21),                  /* RFC 7685 */
    pre_shared_key(41),           /* [[this document]] */
    early_data(42),               /* [[this document]] */
    supported_versions(43),       /* [[this document]] */
    cookie(44),                   /* [[this document]] */
    psk_key_exchange_modes(45),   /* [[this document]] */
    certificateAuthorities(47),   /* [[this document]] */
    oid_filters(48),              /* [[this document]] */
    post_handshake_auth(49),      /* [[this document]] */
    signature_algorithms_cert(50),/* [[this document]] */
    key_share(51),                 /* [[this document]] */
    (65535)
} ExtensionType;

Here:

- "extension_type" identifies the particular extension type.
- "extension_data" contains information specific to the particular extension type.

The list of extension types is maintained by IANA as described in Section 11.
Extensions are generally structured in a request/response fashion, though some extensions are just indications with no corresponding response. The client sends its extension requests in the ClientHello message and the server sends its extension responses in the ServerHello, EncryptedExtensions, HelloRetryRequest and Certificate messages. The server sends extension requests in the CertificateRequest message which a client MAY respond to with a Certificate message. The server MAY also send unsolicited extensions in the NewSessionTicket, though the client does not respond directly to these.

Implementations MUST NOT send extension responses if the remote endpoint did not send the corresponding extension requests, with the exception of the "cookie" extension in HelloRetryRequest. Upon receiving such an extension, an endpoint MUST abort the handshake with an "unsupported_extension" alert.

The table below indicates the messages where a given extension may appear, using the following notation: CH (ClientHello), SH (ServerHello), EE (EncryptedExtensions), CT (Certificate), CR (CertificateRequest), NST (NewSessionTicket) and HRR (HelloRetryRequest). If an implementation receives an extension which it recognizes and which is not specified for the message in which it appears it MUST abort the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>TLS 1.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>server_name [RFC6066]</td>
<td>CH, EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max_fragment_length [RFC6066]</td>
<td>CH, EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status_request [RFC6066]</td>
<td>CH, CR, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supported_groups [RFC7919]</td>
<td>CH, EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signature_algorithms [RFC5246]</td>
<td>CH, CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use_srtp [RFC5764]</td>
<td>CH, EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heartbeat [RFC6520]</td>
<td>CH, EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>application_layer_protocol_negotiation [RFC7301]</td>
<td>CH, EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signed_certificate_timestamp [RFC6962]</td>
<td>CH, CR, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>client_certificate_type [RFC7250]</td>
<td>CH, EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>server_certificate_type [RFC7250]</td>
<td>CH, EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>padding [RFC7685]</td>
<td>CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>key_share [[this document]]</td>
<td>CH, SH, HRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre_shared_key [[this document]]</td>
<td>CH, SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psk_key_exchange_modes [[this document]]</td>
<td>CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early_data [[this document]]</td>
<td>CH, EE, NST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cookie [[this document]]</td>
<td>CH, HRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supported_versions [[this document]]</td>
<td>CH, SH, HRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certificateAuthorities [[this document]]</td>
<td>CH, CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oid_filters [[this document]]</td>
<td>CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post_handshake_auth [[this document]]</td>
<td>CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signature_algorithms_cert [[this document]]</td>
<td>CH, CR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When multiple extensions of different types are present, the extensions MAY appear in any order, with the exception of "pre_shared_key" Section 4.2.11 which MUST be the last extension in the ClientHello. There MUST NOT be more than one extension of the same type in a given extension block.

In TLS 1.3, unlike TLS 1.2, extensions are negotiated for each handshake even when in resumption-PSK mode. However, 0-RTT parameters are those negotiated in the previous handshake; mismatches may require rejecting 0-RTT (see Section 4.2.10).

There are subtle (and not so subtle) interactions that may occur in this protocol between new features and existing features which may result in a significant reduction in overall security. The following considerations should be taken into account when designing new extensions:

- Some cases where a server does not agree to an extension are error conditions (e.g., the handshake cannot continue), and some are simply refusals to support particular features. In general, error alerts should be used for the former and a field in the server extension response for the latter.

- Extensions should, as far as possible, be designed to prevent any attack that forces use (or non-use) of a particular feature by manipulation of handshake messages. This principle should be followed regardless of whether the feature is believed to cause a security problem. Often the fact that the extension fields are included in the inputs to the Finished message hashes will be sufficient, but extreme care is needed when the extension changes the meaning of messages sent in the handshake phase. Designers and implementors should be aware of the fact that until the handshake has been authenticated, active attackers can modify messages and insert, remove, or replace extensions.

4.2.1. Supported Versions

```c
struct {
    select (Handshake.msg_type) {
        case client_hello:
            ProtocolVersion versions<2..254>;
        case server_hello: /* and HelloRetryRequest */
            ProtocolVersion selected_version;
    }
} SupportedVersions;
```
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The "supported_versions" extension is used by the client to indicate which versions of TLS it supports and by the server to indicate which version it is using. The extension contains a list of supported versions in preference order, with the most preferred version first. Implementations of this specification MUST send this extension in the ClientHello containing all versions of TLS which they are prepared to negotiate (for this specification, that means minimally 0x0304, but if previous versions of TLS are allowed to be negotiated, they MUST be present as well).

If this extension is not present, servers which are compliant with this specification, and which also support TLS 1.2, MUST negotiate TLS 1.2 or prior as specified in [RFC5246], even if ClientHello.legacy_version is 0x0304 or later. Servers MAY abort the handshake upon receiving a ClientHello with legacy_version 0x0304 or later.

If this extension is present in the ClientHello, servers MUST NOT use the ClientHello.legacy_version value for version negotiation and MUST use only the "supported_versions" extension to determine client preferences. Servers MUST only select a version of TLS present in that extension and MUST ignore any unknown versions that are present in that extension. Note that this mechanism makes it possible to negotiate a version prior to TLS 1.2 if one side supports a sparse range. Implementations of TLS 1.3 which choose to support prior versions of TLS SHOULD support TLS 1.2. Servers MUST be prepared to receive ClientHellos that include this extension but do not include 0x0304 in the list of versions.

A server which negotiates a version of TLS prior to TLS 1.3 MUST set ServerHello.version and MUST NOT send the "supported_versions" extension. A server which negotiates TLS 1.3 MUST respond by sending a "supported_versions" extension containing the selected version value (0x0304). It MUST set the ServerHello.legacy_version field to 0x0303 (TLS 1.2). Clients MUST check for this extension prior to processing the rest of the ServerHello (although they will have to parse the ServerHello in order to read the extension). If this extension is present, clients MUST ignore the ServerHello.legacy_version value and MUST use only the "supported_versions" extension to determine the selected version. If the "supported_versions" extension in the ServerHello contains a version not offered by the client or contains a version prior to TLS 1.3, the client MUST abort the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert.
4.2.1.1. Draft Version Indicator

While the eventual version indicator for the RFC version of TLS 1.3 will be 0x0304, implementations of draft versions of this specification SHOULD instead advertise 0x7f00 | draft_version in the ServerHello and HelloRetryRequest "supported_versions" extension. For instance, draft-17 would be encoded as the 0x7f11. This allows pre-RFC implementations to safely negotiate with each other, even if they would otherwise be incompatible.

4.2.2. Cookie

struct {
  opaque cookie<1..2^{16}-1>
} Cookie;

Cookies serve two primary purposes:

- Allowing the server to force the client to demonstrate reachability at their apparent network address (thus providing a measure of DoS protection). This is primarily useful for non-connection-oriented transports (see [RFC6347] for an example of this).

- Allowing the server to offload state to the client, thus allowing it to send a HelloRetryRequest without storing any state. The server can do this by storing the hash of the ClientHello in the HelloRetryRequest cookie (protected with some suitable integrity algorithm).

When sending a HelloRetryRequest, the server MAY provide a "cookie" extension to the client (this is an exception to the usual rule that the only extensions that may be sent are those that appear in the ClientHello). When sending the new ClientHello, the client MUST copy the contents of the extension received in the HelloRetryRequest into a "cookie" extension in the new ClientHello. Clients MUST NOT use cookies in their initial ClientHello in subsequent connections.

When a server is operating statelessly it may receive an unprotected record of type change_cipher_spec between the first and second ClientHello (see Section 5). Since the server is not storing any state this will appear as if it were the first message to be received. Servers operating statelessly MUST ignore these records.
4.2.3. Signature Algorithms

TLS 1.3 provides two extensions for indicating which signature algorithms may be used in digital signatures. The "signature_algorithms_cert" extension applies to signatures in certificates and the "signature_algorithms" extension, which originally appeared in TLS 1.2, applies to signatures in CertificateVerify messages. The keys found in certificates MUST also be of appropriate type for the signature algorithms they are used with. This is a particular issue for RSA keys and PSS signatures, as described below. If no "signature_algorithms_cert" extension is present, then the "signature_algorithms" extension also applies to signatures appearing in certificates. Clients which desire the server to authenticate itself via a certificate MUST send "signature_algorithms". If a server is authenticating via a certificate and the client has not sent a "signature_algorithms" extension, then the server MUST abort the handshake with a "missing_extension" alert (see Section 9.2).

The "signature_algorithms_cert" extension was added to allow implementations which supported different sets of algorithms for certificates and in TLS itself to clearly signal their capabilities. TLS 1.2 implementations SHOULD also process this extension. Implementations which have the same policy in both cases MAY omit the "signature_algorithms_cert" extension.

The "extension_data" field of these extensions contains a SignatureSchemeList value:
enum {
    /* RSASSA-PKCS1-v1_5 algorithms */
    rsa_pkcs1_sha256(0x0401),
    rsa_pkcs1_sha384(0x0501),
    rsa_pkcs1_sha512(0x0601),

    /* ECDSA algorithms */
    ecdsa_secp256r1_sha256(0x0403),
    ecdsa_secp384r1_sha384(0x0503),
    ecdsa_secp521r1_sha512(0x0603),

    /* RSASSA-PSS algorithms with public key OID rsaEncryption */
    rsa_pss_rsae_sha256(0x0804),
    rsa_pss_rsae_sha384(0x0805),
    rsa_pss_rsae_sha512(0x0806),

    /* EdDSA algorithms */
    ed25519(0x0807),
    ed448(0x0808),

    /* RSASSA-PSS algorithms with public key OID RSASSA-PSS */
    rsa_pss_pss_sha256(0x0809),
    rsa_pss_pss_sha384(0x080a),
    rsa_pss_pss_sha512(0x080b),

    /* Legacy algorithms */
    rsa_pkcs1_sha1(0x0201),
    ecdsa_sha1(0x0203),

    /* Reserved Code Points */
    private_use(0xFE00..0xFFFF),
    (0xFFFF)
} SignatureScheme;

struct {
    SignatureScheme supported_signature_algorithms<2..2^16-2>;
} SignatureSchemeList;

Note: This enum is named "SignatureScheme" because there is already a "SignatureAlgorithm" type in TLS 1.2, which this replaces. We use the term "signature algorithm" throughout the text.

Each SignatureScheme value lists a single signature algorithm that the client is willing to verify. The values are indicated in descending order of preference. Note that a signature algorithm takes as input an arbitrary-length message, rather than a digest. Algorithms which traditionally act on a digest should be defined in TLS to first hash the input with a specified hash algorithm and then
proceed as usual. The code point groups listed above have the following meanings:

RSASSA-PKCS1-v1_5 algorithms  Indicates a signature algorithm using RSASSA-PKCS1-v1_5 [RFC8017] with the corresponding hash algorithm as defined in [SHS]. These values refer solely to signatures which appear in certificates (see Section 4.4.2.2) and are not defined for use in signed TLS handshake messages, although they MAY appear in "signature_algorithms" and "signature_algorithms_cert" for backward compatibility with TLS 1.2.

ECDSA algorithms  Indicates a signature algorithm using ECDSA [ECDSA], the corresponding curve as defined in ANSI X9.62 [X962] and FIPS 186-4 [DSS], and the corresponding hash algorithm as defined in [SHS]. The signature is represented as a DER-encoded [X690] ECDSA-Sig-Value structure.

RSASSA-PSS RSAE algorithms  Indicates a signature algorithm using RSASSA-PSS [RFC8017] with mask generation function 1. The digest used in the mask generation function and the digest being signed are both the corresponding hash algorithm as defined in [SHS]. The length of the salt MUST be equal to the length of the output of the digest algorithm. If the public key is carried in an X.509 certificate, it MUST use the rsaEncryption OID [RFC5280].

EdDSA algorithms  Indicates a signature algorithm using EdDSA as defined in [RFC8032] or its successors. Note that these correspond to the "PureEdDSA" algorithms and not the "prehash" variants.

RSASSA-PSS PSS algorithms  Indicates a signature algorithm using RSASSA-PSS [RFC8017] with mask generation function 1. The digest used in the mask generation function and the digest being signed are both the corresponding hash algorithm as defined in [SHS]. The length of the salt MUST be equal to the length of the digest algorithm. If the public key is carried in an X.509 certificate, it MUST use the RSASSA-PSS OID [RFC5756]. When used in certificate signatures, the algorithm parameters MUST be DER encoded. If the corresponding public key’s parameters are present, then the parameters in the signature MUST be identical to those in the public key.

Legacy algorithms  Indicates algorithms which are being deprecated because they use algorithms with known weaknesses, specifically SHA-1 which is used in this context with either with RSA using RSASSA-PKCS1-v1_5 or ECDSA. These values refer solely to signatures which appear in certificates (see Section 4.4.2.2) and
are not defined for use in signed TLS handshake messages, although they MAY appear in "signature_algorithms" and "signature_algorithms_cert" for backward compatibility with TLS 1.2. Endpoints SHOULD NOT negotiate these algorithms but are permitted to do so solely for backward compatibility. Clients offering these values MUST list them as the lowest priority (listed after all other algorithms in SignatureSchemeList). TLS 1.3 servers MUST NOT offer a SHA-1 signed certificate unless no valid certificate chain can be produced without it (see Section 4.4.2.2).

The signatures on certificates that are self-signed or certificates that are trust anchors are not validated since they begin a certification path (see [RFC5280], Section 3.2). A certificate that begins a certification path MAY use a signature algorithm that is not advertised as being supported in the "signature_algorithms" extension.

Note that TLS 1.2 defines this extension differently. TLS 1.3 implementations willing to negotiate TLS 1.2 MUST behave in accordance with the requirements of [RFC5246] when negotiating that version. In particular:

- TLS 1.2 ClientHellos MAY omit this extension.

- In TLS 1.2, the extension contained hash/signature pairs. The pairs are encoded in two octets, so SignatureScheme values have been allocated to align with TLS 1.2’s encoding. Some legacy pairs are left unallocated. These algorithms are deprecated as of TLS 1.3. They MUST NOT be offered or negotiated by any implementation. In particular, MD5 [SLOTH], SHA-224, and DSA MUST NOT be used.

- ECDSA signature schemes align with TLS 1.2’s ECDSA hash/signature pairs. However, the old semantics did not constrain the signing curve. If TLS 1.2 is negotiated, implementations MUST be prepared to accept a signature that uses any curve that they advertised in the "supported_groups" extension.

- Implementations that advertise support for RSASSA-PSS (which is mandatory in TLS 1.3), MUST be prepared to accept a signature using that scheme even when TLS 1.2 is negotiated. In TLS 1.2, RSASSA-PSS is used with RSA cipher suites.
4.2.4. Certificate Authorities

The "certificate_authorities" extension is used to indicate the certificate authorities which an endpoint supports and which SHOULD be used by the receiving endpoint to guide certificate selection.

The body of the "certificate_authorities" extension consists of a CertificateAuthoritiesExtension structure.

opaque DistinguishedName<1..2^16-1>;

struct {
    DistinguishedName authorities<3..2^16-1>;
} CertificateAuthoritiesExtension;

authorities A list of the distinguished names [X501] of acceptable certificate authorities, represented in DER-encoded [X690] format. These distinguished names specify a desired distinguished name for trust anchor or subordinate CA; thus, this message can be used to describe known trust anchors as well as a desired authorization space.

The client MAY send the "certificate_authorities" extension in the ClientHello message. The server MAY send it in the CertificateRequest message.

The "trusted_ca_keys" extension, which serves a similar purpose [RFC6066], but is more complicated, is not used in TLS 1.3 (although it may appear in ClientHello messages from clients which are offering prior versions of TLS).

4.2.5. OID Filters

The "oid_filters" extension allows servers to provide a set of OID/value pairs which it would like the client’s certificate to match. This extension, if provided by the server, MUST only be sent in the CertificateRequest message.

struct {
    opaque certificate_extension_oid<1..2^8-1>;
    opaque certificate_extension_values<0..2^16-1>;
} OIDFilter;

struct {
    OIDFilter filters<0..2^16-1>;
} OIDFilterExtension;
filters A list of certificate extension OIDs [RFC5280] with their allowed value(s) and represented in DER-encoded [X690] format. Some certificate extension OIDs allow multiple values (e.g., Extended Key Usage). If the server has included a non-empty filters list, the client certificate included in the response MUST contain all of the specified extension OIDs that the client recognizes. For each extension OID recognized by the client, all of the specified values MUST be present in the client certificate (but the certificate MAY have other values as well). However, the client MUST ignore and skip any unrecognized certificate extension OIDs. If the client ignored some of the required certificate extension OIDs and supplied a certificate that does not satisfy the request, the server MAY at its discretion either continue the connection without client authentication, or abort the handshake with an "unsupported_certificate" alert. Any given OID MUST NOT appear more than once in the filters list.

PKIX RFCs define a variety of certificate extension OIDs and their corresponding value types. Depending on the type, matching certificate extension values are not necessarily bitwise-equal. It is expected that TLS implementations will rely on their PKI libraries to perform certificate selection using certificate extension OIDs.

This document defines matching rules for two standard certificate extensions defined in [RFC5280]:

- The Key Usage extension in a certificate matches the request when all key usage bits asserted in the request are also asserted in the Key Usage certificate extension.

- The Extended Key Usage extension in a certificate matches the request when all key purpose OIDs present in the request are also found in the Extended Key Usage certificate extension. The special anyExtendedKeyUsage OID MUST NOT be used in the request.

Separate specifications may define matching rules for other certificate extensions.

4.2.6. Post-Handshake Client Authentication

The "post_handshake_auth" extension is used to indicate that a client is willing to perform post-handshake authentication (Section 4.6.2). Servers MUST NOT send a post-handshake CertificateRequest to clients which do not offer this extension. Servers MUST NOT send this extension.

```
struct {} PostHandshakeAuth;
```
The "extension_data" field of the "post_handshake_auth" extension is zero length.

4.2.7. Negotiated Groups

When sent by the client, the "supported_groups" extension indicates the named groups which the client supports for key exchange, ordered from most preferred to least preferred.

Note: In versions of TLS prior to TLS 1.3, this extension was named "elliptic_curves" and only contained elliptic curve groups. See [RFC4492] and [RFC7919]. This extension was also used to negotiate ECDSA curves. Signature algorithms are now negotiated independently (see Section 4.2.3).

The "extension_data" field of this extension contains a "NamedGroupList" value:

```
enum {  
    /* Elliptic Curve Groups (ECDHE) */  
    secp256r1(0x0017), secp384r1(0x0018), secp521r1(0x0019),  
    x25519(0x001D), x448(0x001E),  
    
    /* Finite Field Groups (DHE) */  
    ffdfhe2048(0x0100), ffdfhe3072(0x0101), ffdfhe4096(0x0102),  
    ffdfhe6144(0x0103), ffdfhe8192(0x0104),  
    
    /* Reserved Code Points */  
    ffdfhe_private_use(0x01FC..0x01FF),  
    ecdhe_private_use(0xFE00..0xFEFF),  
    (0xFFFF)  
} NamedGroup;
```

```
struct {  
    NamedGroup named_group_list<2..2^16-1>;  
} NamedGroupList;
```

**Elliptic Curve Groups (ECDHE)** Indicates support for the corresponding named curve, defined either in FIPS 186-4 [DSS] or in [RFC7748]. Values 0xFE00 through 0xFEFF are reserved for private use.

**Finite Field Groups (DHE)** Indicates support of the corresponding finite field group, defined in [RFC7919]. Values 0x01FC through 0x01FF are reserved for private use.
Items in named_group_list are ordered according to the client’s preferences (most preferred choice first).

As of TLS 1.3, servers are permitted to send the "supported_groups" extension to the client. Clients MUST NOT act upon any information found in "supported_groups" prior to successful completion of the handshake but MAY use the information learned from a successfully completed handshake to change what groups they use in their "key_share" extension in subsequent connections. If the server has a group it prefers to the ones in the "key_share" extension but is still willing to accept the ClientHello, it SHOULD send "supported_groups" to update the client’s view of its preferences; this extension SHOULD contain all groups the server supports, regardless of whether they are currently supported by the client.

4.2.8. Key Share

The "key_share" extension contains the endpoint’s cryptographic parameters.

Clients MAY send an empty client_shares vector in order to request group selection from the server at the cost of an additional round trip. (see Section 4.1.4)

    struct {
        NamedGroup group;
        opaque key_exchange<1..2^16-1>;
    } KeyShareEntry;

group  The named group for the key being exchanged.

key_exchange  Key exchange information. The contents of this field are determined by the specified group and its corresponding definition. Finite Field Diffie-Hellman [DH] parameters are described in Section 4.2.8.1; Elliptic Curve Diffie-Hellman parameters are described in Section 4.2.8.2.

In the ClientHello message, the "extension_data" field of this extension contains a "KeyShareClientHello" value:

    struct {
        KeyShareEntry client_shares<0..2^16-1>;
    } KeyShareClientHello;

client_shares  A list of offered KeyShareEntry values in descending order of client preference.
This vector MAY be empty if the client is requesting a HelloRetryRequest. Each KeyShareEntry value MUST correspond to a group offered in the "supported_groups" extension and MUST appear in the same order. However, the values MAY be a non-contiguous subset of the "supported_groups" extension and MAY omit the most preferred groups. Such a situation could arise if the most preferred groups are new and unlikely to be supported in enough places to make pregenerating key shares for them efficient.

Clients can offer as many KeyShareEntry values as the number of supported groups it is offering, each representing a single set of key exchange parameters. For instance, a client might offer shares for several elliptic curves or multiple FFDHE groups. The key_exchange values for each KeyShareEntry MUST be generated independently. Clients MUST NOT offer multiple KeyShareEntry values for the same group. Clients MUST NOT offer any KeyShareEntry values for groups not listed in the client’s "supported_groups" extension. Servers MAY check for violations of these rules and abort the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert if one is violated.

In a HelloRetryRequest message, the "extension_data" field of this extension contains a KeyShareHelloRetryRequest value:

```
struct {
    NamedGroup selected_group;
} KeyShareHelloRetryRequest;
```

selected_group The mutually supported group the server intends to negotiate and is requesting a retried ClientHello/KeyShare for.

Upon receipt of this extension in a HelloRetryRequest, the client MUST verify that (1) the selected_group field corresponds to a group which was provided in the "supported_groups" extension in the original ClientHello; and (2) the selected_group field does not correspond to a group which was provided in the "key_share" extension in the original ClientHello. If either of these checks fails, then the client MUST abort the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert. Otherwise, when sending the new ClientHello, the client MUST replace the original "key_share" extension with one containing only a new KeyShareEntry for the group indicated in the selected_group field of the triggering HelloRetryRequest.

In a ServerHello message, the "extension_data" field of this extension contains a KeyShareServerHello value:

```
struct {
    KeyShareEntry server_share;
} KeyShareServerHello;
```
server_share  A single KeyShareEntry value that is in the same group as one of the client’s shares.

If using (EC)DHE key establishment, servers offer exactly one KeyShareEntry in the ServerHello. This value MUST be in the same group as the KeyShareEntry value offered by the client that the server has selected for the negotiated key exchange. Servers MUST NOT send a KeyShareEntry for any group not indicated in the "supported_groups" extension and MUST NOT send a KeyShareEntry when using the "psk_ke" PskKeyExchangeMode. If using (EC)DHE key establishment, and a HelloRetryRequest containing a "key_share" extension was received by the client, the client MUST verify that the selected NamedGroup in the ServerHello is the same as that in the HelloRetryRequest. If this check fails, the client MUST abort the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert.

4.2.8.1. Diffie-Hellman Parameters

Diffie-Hellman [DH] parameters for both clients and servers are encoded in the opaque key_exchange field of a KeyShareEntry in a KeyShare structure. The opaque value contains the Diffie-Hellman public value \( Y = g^X \mod p \) for the specified group (see [RFC7919] for group definitions) encoded as a big-endian integer and padded to the left with zeros to the size of \( p \) in bytes.

Note: For a given Diffie-Hellman group, the padding results in all public keys having the same length.

Peers MUST validate each other’s public key \( Y \) by ensuring that \( 1 < Y < p-1 \). This check ensures that the remote peer is properly behaved and isn’t forcing the local system into a small subgroup.

4.2.8.2. ECDHE Parameters

ECDHE parameters for both clients and servers are encoded in the opaque key_exchange field of a KeyShareEntry in a KeyShare structure.

For secp256r1, secp384r1 and secp521r1, the contents are the serialized value of the following struct:

```c
struct {
    uint8 legacy_form = 4;
    opaque X[coordinate_length];
    opaque Y[coordinate_length];
} UncompressedPointRepresentation;
```

\( X \) and \( Y \) respectively are the binary representations of the \( x \) and \( y \) values in network byte order. There are no internal length markers,
so each number representation occupies as many octets as implied by the curve parameters. For P-256 this means that each of X and Y use 32 octets, padded on the left by zeros if necessary. For P-384 they take 48 octets each, and for P-521 they take 66 octets each.

For the curves secp256r1, secp384r1 and secp521r1, peers MUST validate each other’s public value Q by ensuring that the point is a valid point on the elliptic curve. The appropriate validation procedures are defined in Section 4.3.7 of [X962] and alternatively in Section 5.6.2.3 of [KEYAGREEMENT]. This process consists of three steps: (1) verify that Q is not the point at infinity (O), (2) verify that for Q = (x, y) both integers x and y are in the correct interval, (3) ensure that (x, y) is a correct solution to the elliptic curve equation. For these curves, implementers do not need to verify membership in the correct subgroup.

For X25519 and X448, the contents of the public value are the byte string inputs and outputs of the corresponding functions defined in [RFC7748], 32 bytes for X25519 and 56 bytes for X448.

Note: Versions of TLS prior to 1.3 permitted point format negotiation; TLS 1.3 removes this feature in favor of a single point format for each curve.

4.2.9. Pre-Shared Key Exchange Modes

In order to use PSKs, clients MUST also send a "psk_key_exchange_modes" extension. The semantics of this extension are that the client only supports the use of PSKs with these modes, which restricts both the use of PSKs offered in this ClientHello and those which the server might supply via NewSessionTicket.

A client MUST provide a "psk_key_exchange_modes" extension if it offers a "pre_shared_key" extension. If clients offer "pre_shared_key" without a "psk_key_exchange_modes" extension, servers MUST abort the handshake. Servers MUST NOT select a key exchange mode that is not listed by the client. This extension also restricts the modes for use with PSK resumption; servers SHOULD NOT send NewSessionTicket with tickets that are not compatible with the advertised modes; however, if a server does so, the impact will just be that the client’s attempts at resumption fail.

The server MUST NOT send a "psk_key_exchange_modes" extension.
enum { psk_ke(0), psk_dhe_ke(1), (255) } PskKeyExchangeMode;

struct {
    PskKeyExchangeMode ke_modes<1..255>;
} PskKeyExchangeModes;

psk_ke  PSK-only key establishment. In this mode, the server MUST NOT supply a "key_share" value.

psk_dhe_ke  PSK with (EC)DHE key establishment. In this mode, the client and server MUST supply "key_share" values as described in Section 4.2.8.

Any future values that are allocated must ensure that the transmitted protocol messages unambiguously identify which mode was selected by the server; at present, this is indicated by the presence of the "key_share" in the ServerHello.

4.2.10.  Early Data Indication

When a PSK is used and early data is allowed for that PSK, the client can send application data in its first flight of messages. If the client opts to do so, it MUST supply both the "early_data" extension as well as the "pre_shared_key" extension.

The "extension_data" field of this extension contains an "EarlyDataIndication" value.

struct {} Empty;

struct {
    select (Handshake.msg_type) {
        case new_session_ticket:   uint32 max_early_data_size;
        case client_hello:         Empty;
        case encrypted_extensions: Empty;
    };
} EarlyDataIndication;

See Section 4.6.1 for the use of the max_early_data_size field.

The parameters for the 0-RTT data (version, symmetric cipher suite, ALPN protocol, etc.) are those associated with the PSK in use. For externally provisioned PSKs, the associated values are those provisioned along with the key. For PSKs established via a NewSessionTicket message, the associated values are those which were negotiated in the connection which established the PSK. The PSK used to encrypt the early data MUST be the first PSK listed in the client’s "pre_shared_key" extension.
For PSKs provisioned via NewSessionTicket, a server MUST validate that the ticket age for the selected PSK identity (computed by subtracting ticket_age_add from PskIdentity.obfuscated_ticket_age modulo 2^32) is within a small tolerance of the time since the ticket was issued (see Section 8). If it is not, the server SHOULD proceed with the handshake but reject 0-RTT, and SHOULD NOT take any other action that assumes that this ClientHello is fresh.

0-RTT messages sent in the first flight have the same (encrypted) content types as messages of the same type sent in other flights (handshake and application_data) but are protected under different keys. After receiving the server’s Finished message, if the server has accepted early data, an EndOfEarlyData message will be sent to indicate the key change. This message will be encrypted with the 0-RTT traffic keys.

A server which receives an "early_data" extension MUST behave in one of three ways:

- Ignore the extension and return a regular 1-RTT response. The server then skips past early data by attempting to deprotect received records using the handshake traffic key, discarding records which fail deprotection (up to the configured max_early_data_size). Once a record is deprotected successfully, it is treated as the start of the client’s second flight and the server proceeds as with an ordinary 1-RTT handshake.

- Request that the client send another ClientHello by responding with a HelloRetryRequest. A client MUST NOT include the "early_data" extension in its followup ClientHello. The server then ignores early data by skipping all records with external content type of "application_data" (indicating that they are encrypted), up to the configured max_early_data_size.

- Return its own "early_data" extension in EncryptedExtensions, indicating that it intends to process the early data. It is not possible for the server to accept only a subset of the early data messages. Even though the server sends a message accepting early data, the actual early data itself may already be in flight by the time the server generates this message.

In order to accept early data, the server MUST have accepted a PSK cipher suite and selected the first key offered in the client’s "pre_shared_key" extension. In addition, it MUST verify that the following values are the same as those associated with the selected PSK:

- The TLS version number
- The selected cipher suite
- The selected ALPN [RFC7301] protocol, if any

These requirements are a superset of those needed to perform a 1-RTT handshake using the PSK in question. For externally established PSKs, the associated values are those provisioned along with the key. For PSKs established via a NewSessionTicket message, the associated values are those negotiated in the connection during which the ticket was established.

Future extensions MUST define their interaction with 0-RTT.

If any of these checks fail, the server MUST NOT respond with the extension and must discard all the first flight data using one of the first two mechanisms listed above (thus falling back to 1-RTT or 2-RTT). If the client attempts a 0-RTT handshake but the server rejects it, the server will generally not have the 0-RTT record protection keys and must instead use trial decryption (either with the 1-RTT handshake keys or by looking for a cleartext ClientHello in the case of HelloRetryRequest) to find the first non-0-RTT message.

If the server chooses to accept the "early_data" extension, then it MUST comply with the same error handling requirements specified for all records when processing early data records. Specifically, if the server fails to decrypt a 0-RTT record following an accepted "early_data" extension it MUST terminate the connection with a "bad_record_mac" alert as per Section 5.2.

If the server rejects the "early_data" extension, the client application MAY opt to retransmit the application data previously sent in early data once the handshake has been completed. Note that automatic re-transmission of early data could result in assumptions about the status of the connection being incorrect. For instance, when the negotiated connection selects a different ALPN protocol from what was used for the early data, an application might need to construct different messages. Similarly, if early data assumes anything about the connection state, it might be sent in error after the handshake completes.

A TLS implementation SHOULD NOT automatically re-send early data; applications are in a better position to decide when re-transmission is appropriate. A TLS implementation MUST NOT automatically re-send early data unless the negotiated connection selects the same ALPN protocol.
4.2.11. Pre-Shared Key Extension

The "pre_shared_key" extension is used to negotiate the identity of the pre-shared key to be used with a given handshake in association with PSK key establishment.

The "extension_data" field of this extension contains a "PreSharedKeyExtension" value:

struct {
    opaque identity<1..2^16-1>;  // A label for a key. For instance, a ticket defined in Appendix B.3.4 or a label for a pre-shared key established externally.
    uint32 obfuscated_ticket_age;  // An obfuscated version of the age of the key. Section 4.2.11.1 describes how to form this value for identities established via the NewSessionTicket message. For identities established externally an obfuscated_ticket_age of 0 SHOULD be used, and servers MUST ignore the value.
    PskIdentity;
} PskIdentity;

opaque PskBinderEntry<32..255>;

struct {
    PskIdentity identities<7..2^16-1>;  // A list of the identities that the client is willing to negotiate with the server. If sent alongside the "early_data" extension (see Section 4.2.10), the first identity is the one used for 0-RTT data.
    PskBinderEntry binders<33..2^16-1>;
} OfferedPsks;

struct {
    select (Handshake.msg_type) {
        case client_hello: OfferedPsks;
        case server_hello: uint16 selected_identity;
    }
};

} PreSharedKeyExtension;

identities  // A series of HMAC values, one for each PSK offered in the "pre_shared_keys" extension and in the same order, computed as described below.
selected_identity  The server’s chosen identity expressed as a
(0-based) index into the identities in the client’s list.

Each PSK is associated with a single Hash algorithm. For PSKs
established via the ticket mechanism (Section 4.6.1), this is the KDF
Hash algorithm on the connection where the ticket was established.
For externally established PSKs, the Hash algorithm MUST be set when
the PSK is established, or default to SHA-256 if no such algorithm is
defined. The server MUST ensure that it selects a compatible PSK (if
any) and cipher suite.

In TLS versions prior to TLS 1.3, the Server Name Identification
(SNI) value was intended to be associated with the session (Section 3
of [RFC6066]), with the server being required to enforce that the SNI
value associated with the session matches the one specified in the
resumption handshake. However, in reality the implementations were
not consistent on which of two supplied SNI values they would use,
leading to the consistency requirement being de-facto enforced by the
clients. In TLS 1.3, the SNI value is always explicitly specified in
the resumption handshake, and there is no need for the server to
associate an SNI value with the ticket. Clients, however, SHOULD
store the SNI with the PSK to fulfill the requirements of
Section 4.6.1.

Implementor’s note: when session resumption is the primary use case
of PSKs the most straightforward way to implement the PSK/cipher
suite matching requirements is to negotiate the cipher suite first
and then exclude any incompatible PSKs. Any unknown PSKs (e.g., they
are not in the PSK database or are encrypted with an unknown key)
SHOULD simply be ignored. If no acceptable PSKs are found, the
server SHOULD perform a non-PSK handshake if possible. If backwards
compatibility is important, client provided, externally established
PSKs SHOULD influence cipher suite selection.

Prior to accepting PSK key establishment, the server MUST validate
the corresponding binder value (see Section 4.2.11.2 below). If this
value is not present or does not validate, the server MUST abort the
handshake. Servers SHOULD NOT attempt to validate multiple binders;
rather they SHOULD select a single PSK and validate solely the binder
that corresponds to that PSK. See [Section 8.2] and [Appendix E.6]
for the security rationale for this requirement. In order to accept
PSK key establishment, the server sends a "pre_shared_key" extension
indicating the selected identity.

Clients MUST verify that the server’s selected_identity is within the
range supplied by the client, that the server selected a cipher suite
indicating a Hash associated with the PSK and that a server
"key_share" extension is present if required by the ClientHello
"psk_key_exchange_modes". If these values are not consistent the client MUST abort the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert.

If the server supplies an "early_data" extension, the client MUST verify that the server’s selected_identity is 0. If any other value is returned, the client MUST abort the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert.

The "pre_shared_key" extension MUST be the last extension in the ClientHello (this facilitates implementation as described below). Servers MUST check that it is the last extension and otherwise fail the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert.

4.2.11.1. Ticket Age

The client’s view of the age of a ticket is the time since the receipt of the NewSessionTicket message. Clients MUST NOT attempt to use tickets which have ages greater than the "ticket_lifetime" value which was provided with the ticket. The "obfuscated_ticket_age" field of each PskIdentity contains an obfuscated version of the ticket age formed by taking the age in milliseconds and adding the "ticket_age_add" value that was included with the ticket (see Section 4.6.1), modulo 2^32. This addition prevents passive observers from correlating connections unless tickets are reused. Note that the "ticket_lifetime" field in the NewSessionTicket message is in seconds but the "obfuscated_ticket_age" is in milliseconds. Because ticket lifetimes are restricted to a week, 32 bits is enough to represent any plausible age, even in milliseconds.

4.2.11.2. PSK Binder

The PSK binder value forms a binding between a PSK and the current handshake, as well as a binding between the handshake in which the PSK was generated (if via a NewSessionTicket message) and the current handshake. Each entry in the binders list is computed as an HMAC over a transcript hash (see Section 4.4.1) containing a partial ClientHello up to and including the PreSharedKeyExtension.identities field. That is, it includes all of the ClientHello but not the binders list itself. The length fields for the message (including the overall length, the length of the extensions block, and the length of the "pre_shared_key" extension) are all set as if binders of the correct lengths were present.

The PskBinderEntry is computed in the same way as the Finished message (Section 4.4.4) but with the BaseKey being the binder_key derived via the key schedule from the corresponding PSK which is being offered (see Section 7.1).
If the handshake includes a HelloRetryRequest, the initial ClientHello and HelloRetryRequest are included in the transcript along with the new ClientHello. For instance, if the client sends ClientHello1, its binder will be computed over:

\[
\text{Transcript-Hash(Truncate(ClientHello1))}
\]

Where Truncate() removes the binders list from the ClientHello.

If the server responds with HelloRetryRequest, and the client then sends ClientHello2, its binder will be computed over:

\[
\text{Transcript-Hash(ClientHello1, HelloRetryRequest, Truncate(ClientHello2))}
\]

The full ClientHello1/ClientHello2 is included in all other handshake hash computations. Note that in the first flight, Truncate(ClientHello1) is hashed directly, but in the second flight, ClientHello1 is hashed and then reinjected as a "message_hash" message, as described in Section 4.4.1.

4.2.11.3. Processing Order

Clients are permitted to "stream" 0-RTT data until they receive the server’s Finished, only then sending the EndOfEarlyData message, followed by the rest of the handshake. In order to avoid deadlocks, when accepting "early_data", servers MUST process the client’s ClientHello and then immediately send their flight of messages, rather than waiting for the client’s EndOfEarlyData message before sending its ServerHello.

4.3. Server Parameters

The next two messages from the server, EncryptedExtensions and CertificateRequest, contain information from the server that determines the rest of the handshake. These messages are encrypted with keys derived from the server_handshake_traffic_secret.

4.3.1. Encrypted Extensions

In all handshakes, the server MUST send the EncryptedExtensions message immediately after the ServerHello message. This is the first message that is encrypted under keys derived from the server_handshake_traffic_secret.

The EncryptedExtensions message contains extensions that can be protected, i.e., any which are not needed to establish the
cryptographic context, but which are not associated with individual certificates. The client MUST check EncryptedExtensions for the presence of any forbidden extensions and if any are found MUST abort the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert.

Structure of this message:

```c
struct {
    Extension extensions<0..2^16-1>;
} EncryptedExtensions;
```

extensions A list of extensions. For more information, see the table in Section 4.2.

4.3.2. Certificate Request

A server which is authenticating with a certificate MAY optionally request a certificate from the client. This message, if sent, MUST follow EncryptedExtensions.

Structure of this message:

```c
struct {
    opaque certificate_request_context<0..2^8-1>;
    Extension extensions<2..2^16-1>;
} CertificateRequest;
```

certificate_request_context An opaque string which identifies the certificate request and which will be echoed in the client’s Certificate message. The certificate_request_context MUST be unique within the scope of this connection (thus preventing replay of client CertificateVerify messages). This field SHALL be zero length unless used for the post-handshake authentication exchanges described in Section 4.6.2. When requesting post-handshake authentication, the server SHOULD make the context unpredictable to the client (e.g., by randomly generating it) in order to prevent an attacker who has temporary access to the client’s private key from pre-computing valid CertificateVerify messages.

extensions A set of extensions describing the parameters of the certificate being requested. The "signature_algorithms" extension MUST be specified, and other extensions may optionally be included if defined for this message. Clients MUST ignore unrecognized extensions.

In prior versions of TLS, the CertificateRequest message carried a list of signature algorithms and certificate authorities which the server would accept. In TLS 1.3 the former is expressed by sending
the "signature_algorithms" and optionally "signature_algorithms_cert" extensions. The latter is expressed by sending the "certificateAuthorities" extension (see Section 4.2.4).

Servers which are authenticating with a PSK MUST NOT send the CertificateRequest message in the main handshake, though they MAY send it in post-handshake authentication (see Section 4.6.2) provided that the client has sent the "post_handshake_auth" extension (see Section 4.2.6).

4.4. Authentication Messages

As discussed in Section 2, TLS generally uses a common set of messages for authentication, key confirmation, and handshake integrity: Certificate, CertificateVerify, and Finished. (The PreSharedKey binders also perform key confirmation, in a similar fashion.) These three messages are always sent as the last messages in their handshake flight. The Certificate and CertificateVerify messages are only sent under certain circumstances, as defined below. The Finished message is always sent as part of the Authentication block. These messages are encrypted under keys derived from [sender]_handshake_traffic_secret.

The computations for the Authentication messages all uniformly take the following inputs:

- The certificate and signing key to be used.
- A Handshake Context consisting of the set of messages to be included in the transcript hash.
- A base key to be used to compute a MAC key.

Based on these inputs, the messages then contain:

Certificate  The certificate to be used for authentication, and any supporting certificates in the chain. Note that certificate-based client authentication is not available in PSK (including 0-RTT) flows.

CertificateVerify A signature over the value Transcript-Hash(Handshake Context, Certificate)

Finished A MAC over the value Transcript-Hash(Handshake Context, Certificate, CertificateVerify) using a MAC key derived from the base key.
The following table defines the Handshake Context and MAC Base Key for each scenario:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Handshake Context</th>
<th>Base Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Server</td>
<td>ClientHello ... later of EncryptedExtensions/CertificateRequest</td>
<td>server_handshake_traffic_secret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>ClientHello ... later of server</td>
<td>client_handshake_traffic_secret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finished/EndOfEarlyData</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Handshake</td>
<td>ClientHello ... client Finished + CertificateRequest</td>
<td>client_application_traffic_secret_N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1. The Transcript Hash

Many of the cryptographic computations in TLS make use of a transcript hash. This value is computed by hashing the concatenation of each included handshake message, including the handshake message header carrying the handshake message type and length fields, but not including record layer headers. I.e.,

Transcript-Hash(M1, M2, ... Mn) = Hash(M1 || M2 || ... || Mn)

As an exception to this general rule, when the server responds to a ClientHello with a HelloRetryRequest, the value of ClientHello1 is replaced with a special synthetic handshake message of handshake type "message_hash" containing Hash(ClientHello1). I.e.,

Transcript-Hash(ClientHello1, HelloRetryRequest, ... Mn) =
Hash(message_hash || /* Handshake type */
00 00 Hash.Length || /* Handshake message length (bytes) */
Hash(ClientHello1) || /* Hash of ClientHello1 */
HelloRetryRequest || ... || Mn)

The reason for this construction is to allow the server to do a stateless HelloRetryRequest by storing just the hash of ClientHello1 in the cookie, rather than requiring it to export the entire intermediate hash state (see Section 4.2.2).

For concreteness, the transcript hash is always taken from the following sequence of handshake messages, starting at the first ClientHello and including only those messages that were sent:

In general, implementations can implement the transcript by keeping a running transcript hash value based on the negotiated hash. Note, however, that subsequent post-handshake authentications do not include each other, just the messages through the end of the main handshake.

4.4.2. Certificate

This message conveys the endpoint’s certificate chain to the peer.

The server MUST send a Certificate message whenever the agreed-upon key exchange method uses certificates for authentication (this includes all key exchange methods defined in this document except PSK).

The client MUST send a Certificate message if and only if the server has requested client authentication via a CertificateRequest message (Section 4.3.2). If the server requests client authentication but no suitable certificate is available, the client MUST send a Certificate message containing no certificates (i.e., with the "certificate_list" field having length 0). A Finished message MUST be sent regardless of whether the Certificate message is empty.

Structure of this message:
/* Managed by IANA */
enum {
    X509(0),
    RawPublicKey(2),
    (255)
} CertificateType;

struct {
    select (certificate_type) {
        case RawPublicKey:
            /* From RFC 7250 ASN.1_subjectPublicKeyInfo */
            opaque ASN1_subjectPublicKeyInfo<1..2^24-1>;
        case X509:
            opaque cert_data<1..2^24-1>;
    }
    Extension extensions<0..2^16-1>;
} CertificateEntry;

struct {
    opaque certificate_request_context<0..2^8-1>;
    CertificateEntry certificate_list<0..2^24-1>;
} Certificate;

certificate_request_context  If this message is in response to a CertificateRequest, the value of certificate_request_context in that message. Otherwise (in the case of server authentication), this field SHALL be zero length.

certificate_list  This is a sequence (chain) of CertificateEntry structures, each containing a single certificate and set of extensions.

extensions:  A set of extension values for the CertificateEntry. The "Extension" format is defined in Section 4.2. Valid extensions for server certificates at present include OCSP Status extension ([RFC6066]) and SignedCertificateTimestamps ([RFC6962]); future extensions may be defined for this message as well. Extensions in the Certificate message from the server MUST correspond to ones from the ClientHello message. Extensions in the Certificate from the client MUST correspond with extensions in the CertificateRequest message from the server. If an extension applies to the entire chain, it SHOULD be included in the first CertificateEntry.

If the corresponding certificate type extension ("server_certificate_type" or "client_certificate_type") was not negotiated in Encrypted Extensions, or the X.509 certificate type was
negotiated, then each CertificateEntry contains a DER-encoded X.509 certificate. The sender’s certificate MUST come in the first CertificateEntry in the list. Each following certificate SHOULD directly certify the one immediately preceding it. Because certificate validation requires that trust anchors be distributed independently, a certificate that specifies a trust anchor MAY be omitted from the chain, provided that supported peers are known to possess any omitted certificates.

Note: Prior to TLS 1.3, "certificate_list" ordering required each certificate to certify the one immediately preceding it; however, some implementations allowed some flexibility.Servers sometimes send both a current and deprecated intermediate for transitional purposes, and others are simply configured incorrectly, but these cases can nonetheless be validated properly. For maximum compatibility, all implementations SHOULD be prepared to handle potentially extraneous certificates and arbitrary orderings from any TLS version, with the exception of the end-entity certificate which MUST be first.

If the RawPublicKey certificate type was negotiated, then the certificate_list MUST contain no more than one CertificateEntry, which contains an ASN1_subjectPublicKeyInfo value as defined in [RFC7250], Section 3.

The OpenPGP certificate type [RFC6091] MUST NOT be used with TLS 1.3.

The server’s certificate_list MUST always be non-empty. A client will send an empty certificate_list if it does not have an appropriate certificate to send in response to the server’s authentication request.

4.4.2.1. OCSP Status and SCT Extensions

[RFC6066] and [RFC6961] provide extensions to negotiate the server sending OCSP responses to the client. In TLS 1.2 and below, the server replies with an empty extension to indicate negotiation of this extension and the OCSP information is carried in a CertificateStatus message. In TLS 1.3, the server’s OCSP information is carried in an extension in the CertificateEntry containing the associated certificate. Specifically: The body of the "status_request" extension from the server MUST be a CertificateStatus structure as defined in [RFC6066], which is interpreted as defined in [RFC6960].

Note: status_request_v2 extension ([RFC6961]) is deprecated. TLS 1.3 servers MUST NOT act upon its presence or information in it when processing Client Hello, in particular they MUST NOT send the
status_request_v2 extension in the Encrypted Extensions, Certificate Request or the Certificate messages. TLS 1.3 servers MUST be able to process Client Hello messages that include it, as it MAY be sent by clients that wish to use it in earlier protocol versions.

A server MAY request that a client present an OCSP response with its certificate by sending an empty "status_request" extension in its CertificateRequest message. If the client opts to send an OCSP response, the body of its "status_request" extension MUST be a CertificateStatus structure as defined in [RFC6066].

Similarly, [RFC6962] provides a mechanism for a server to send a Signed Certificate Timestamp (SCT) as an extension in the ServerHello in TLS 1.2 and below. In TLS 1.3, the server’s SCT information is carried in an extension in CertificateEntry.

4.4.2.2. Server Certificate Selection

The following rules apply to the certificates sent by the server:

- The certificate type MUST be X.509v3 [RFC5280], unless explicitly negotiated otherwise (e.g., [RFC7250]).

- The server’s end-entity certificate’s public key (and associated restrictions) MUST be compatible with the selected authentication algorithm from the client’s "signature_algorithms" extension (currently RSA, ECDSA, or EdDSA).

- The certificate MUST allow the key to be used for signing (i.e., the digitalSignature bit MUST be set if the Key Usage extension is present) with a signature scheme indicated in the client’s "signature_algorithms="/"signature_algorithms_cert" extensions (see Section 4.2.3).

- The "server_name" [RFC6066] and "certificateAuthorities" extensions are used to guide certificate selection. As servers MAY require the presence of the "server_name" extension, clients SHOULD send this extension, when applicable.

All certificates provided by the server MUST be signed by a signature algorithm advertised by the client, if it is able to provide such a chain (see Section 4.2.3). Certificates that are self-signed or certificates that are expected to be trust anchors are not validated as part of the chain and therefore MAY be signed with any algorithm.

If the server cannot produce a certificate chain that is signed only via the indicated supported algorithms, then it SHOULD continue the handshake by sending the client a certificate chain of its choice.
that may include algorithms that are not known to be supported by the
client. This fallback chain SHOULD NOT use the deprecated SHA-1 hash
algorithm in general, but MAY do so if the client’s advertisement
permits it, and MUST NOT do so otherwise.

If the client cannot construct an acceptable chain using the provided
certificates and decides to abort the handshake, then it MUST abort
the handshake with an appropriate certificate-related alert (by
default, "unsupported_certificate"; see Section 6.2 for more).

If the server has multiple certificates, it chooses one of them based
on the above-mentioned criteria (in addition to other criteria, such
as transport layer endpoint, local configuration and preferences).

4.4.2.3. Client Certificate Selection

The following rules apply to certificates sent by the client:

- The certificate type MUST be X.509v3 [RFC5280], unless explicitly
  negotiated otherwise (e.g., [RFC7250]).

- If the "certificateAuthorities" extension in the
  CertificateRequest message was present, at least one of the
  certificates in the certificate chain SHOULD be issued by one of
  the listed CAs.

- The certificates MUST be signed using an acceptable signature
  algorithm, as described in Section 4.3.2. Note that this relaxes
  the constraints on certificate-signing algorithms found in prior
  versions of TLS.

- If the CertificateRequest message contained a non-empty
  "oid_filters" extension, the end-entity certificate MUST match the
  extension OIDs that are recognized by the client, as described in
  Section 4.2.5.

Note that, as with the server certificate, there are certificates
that use algorithm combinations that cannot be currently used with
TLS.

4.4.2.4. Receiving a Certificate Message

In general, detailed certificate validation procedures are out of
scope for TLS (see [RFC5280]). This section provides TLS-specific
requirements.

If the server supplies an empty Certificate message, the client MUST
abort the handshake with a "decode_error" alert.
If the client does not send any certificates (i.e., it sends an empty Certificate message), the server MAY at its discretion either continue the handshake without client authentication, or abort the handshake with a "certificate_required" alert. Also, if some aspect of the certificate chain was unacceptable (e.g., it was not signed by a known, trusted CA), the server MAY at its discretion either continue the handshake (considering the client unauthenticated) or abort the handshake.

Any endpoint receiving any certificate which it would need to validate using any signature algorithm using an MD5 hash MUST abort the handshake with a "bad_certificate" alert. SHA-1 is deprecated and it is RECOMMENDED that any endpoint receiving any certificate which it would need to validate using any signature algorithm using a SHA-1 hash abort the handshake with a "bad_certificate" alert. For clarity, this means that endpoints MAY accept these algorithms for certificates that are self-signed or are trust anchors.

All endpoints are RECOMMENDED to transition to SHA-256 or better as soon as possible to maintain interoperability with implementations currently in the process of phasing out SHA-1 support.

Note that a certificate containing a key for one signature algorithm may be signed using a different signature algorithm (for instance, an RSA key signed with an ECDSA key).

4.4.3. Certificate Verify

This message is used to provide explicit proof that an endpoint possesses the private key corresponding to its certificate. The CertificateVerify message also provides integrity for the handshake up to this point. Servers MUST send this message when authenticating via a certificate. Clients MUST send this message whenever authenticating via a certificate (i.e., when the Certificate message is non-empty). When sent, this message MUST appear immediately after the Certificate message and immediately prior to the Finished message.

Structure of this message:

```c
struct {
    SignatureScheme algorithm;
    opaque signature<0..2^16-1>;
} CertificateVerify;
```

The algorithm field specifies the signature algorithm used (see Section 4.2.3 for the definition of this field). The signature is a digital signature using that algorithm. The content that is covered
under the signature is the hash output as described in Section 4.4.1, namely:

\[ \text{Transcript-Hash(Handshake Context, Certificate)} \]

The digital signature is then computed over the concatenation of:

- A string that consists of octet 32 (0x20) repeated 64 times
- The context string
- A single 0 byte which serves as the separator
- The content to be signed

This structure is intended to prevent an attack on previous versions of TLS in which the ServerKeyExchange format meant that attackers could obtain a signature of a message with a chosen 32-byte prefix (ClientHello.random). The initial 64-byte pad clears that prefix along with the server-controlled ServerHello.random.

The context string for a server signature is: "TLS 1.3, server CertificateVerify" The context string for a client signature is: "TLS 1.3, client CertificateVerify" It is used to provide separation between signatures made in different contexts, helping against potential cross-protocol attacks.

For example, if the transcript hash was 32 bytes of 01 (this length would make sense for SHA-256), the content covered by the digital signature for a server CertificateVerify would be:

```
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2020202020202020202020202020202020202020202020202020202020202020
544c5320312e332c207365727665722204365727469666963617465656726966
79
00
0101010101010101010101010101010101010101010101010101010101010101
```

On the sender side the process for computing the signature field of the CertificateVerify message takes as input:

- The content covered by the digital signature
- The private signing key corresponding to the certificate sent in the previous message

If the CertificateVerify message is sent by a server, the signature algorithm MUST be one offered in the client’s "signature_algorithms"
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extension unless no valid certificate chain can be produced without
unsupported algorithms (see Section 4.2.3).

If sent by a client, the signature algorithm used in the signature
MUST be one of those present in the supported_signature_algorithms
field of the "signature_algorithms" extension in the
CertificateRequest message.

In addition, the signature algorithm MUST be compatible with the key
in the sender’s end-entity certificate. RSA signatures MUST use an
RSASSA-PSS algorithm, regardless of whether RSASSA-PKCS1-v1_5
algorithms appear in "signature_algorithms". The SHA-1 algorithm
MUST NOT be used in any signatures of CertificateVerify messages.
All SHA-1 signature algorithms in this specification are defined
solely for use in legacy certificates and are not valid for
CertificateVerify signatures.

The receiver of a CertificateVerify message MUST verify the signature
field. The verification process takes as input:

- The content covered by the digital signature
- The public key contained in the end-entity certificate found in
  the associated Certificate message.
- The digital signature received in the signature field of the
  CertificateVerify message

If the verification fails, the receiver MUST terminate the handshake
with a "decrypt_error" alert.

4.4.4. Finished

The Finished message is the final message in the authentication
block. It is essential for providing authentication of the handshake
and of the computed keys.

Recipients of Finished messages MUST verify that the contents are
correct and if incorrect MUST terminate the connection with a
"decrypt_error" alert.

Once a side has sent its Finished message and received and validated
the Finished message from its peer, it may begin to send and receive
application data over the connection. There are two settings in
which it is permitted to send data prior to receiving the peer’s
Finished:

1. Clients sending 0-RTT data as described in Section 4.2.10.
2. Servers MAY send data after sending their first flight, but because the handshake is not yet complete, they have no assurance of either the peer’s identity or of its liveness (i.e., the ClientHello might have been replayed).

The key used to compute the Finished message is computed from the Base key defined in Section 4.4 using HKDF (see Section 7.1). Specifically:

\[
\text{finished_key} = \text{HKDF-Expand-Label(BaseKey, "finished", ",", Hash.length)}
\]

Structure of this message:

```c
struct {
  opaque verify_data[Hash.length];
} Finished;
```

The verify_data value is computed as follows:

\[
\text{verify_data} = \text{HMAC(finished_key, Transcript-Hash(Handshake Context, Certificate*, CertificateVerify*))}
\]

* Only included if present.

HMAC [RFC2104] uses the Hash algorithm for the handshake. As noted above, the HMAC input can generally be implemented by a running hash, i.e., just the handshake hash at this point.

In previous versions of TLS, the verify_data was always 12 octets long. In TLS 1.3, it is the size of the HMAC output for the Hash used for the handshake.

Note: Alerts and any other record types are not handshake messages and are not included in the hash computations.

Any records following a Finished message MUST be encrypted under the appropriate application traffic key as described in Section 7.2. In particular, this includes any alerts sent by the server in response to client Certificate and CertificateVerify messages.

4.5. End of Early Data

```c
struct {} EndOfEarlyData;
```
If the server sent an "early_data" extension, the client MUST send an EndOfEarlyData message after receiving the server Finished. If the server does not send an "early_data" extension, then the client MUST NOT send an EndOfEarlyData message. This message indicates that all 0-RTT application_data messages, if any, have been transmitted and that the following records are protected under handshake traffic keys. Servers MUST NOT send this message and clients receiving it MUST terminate the connection with an "unexpected_message" alert. This message is encrypted under keys derived from the client_early_traffic_secret.

4.6. Post-Handshake Messages

TLS also allows other messages to be sent after the main handshake. These messages use a handshake content type and are encrypted under the appropriate application traffic key.

4.6.1. New Session Ticket Message

At any time after the server has received the client Finished message, it MAY send a NewSessionTicket message. This message creates a unique association between the ticket value and a secret PSK derived from the resumption master secret (see Section 7).

The client MAY use this PSK for future handshakes by including the ticket value in the "pre_shared_key" extension in its ClientHello (Section 4.2.11). Servers MAY send multiple tickets on a single connection, either immediately after each other or after specific events (see Appendix C.4). For instance, the server might send a new ticket after post-handshake authentication in order to encapsulate the additional client authentication state. Multiple tickets are useful for clients for a variety of purposes, including:

- Opening multiple parallel HTTP connections.
- Performing connection racing across interfaces and address families via, e.g., Happy Eyeballs [RFC8305] or related techniques.

Any ticket MUST only be resumed with a cipher suite that has the same KDF hash algorithm as that used to establish the original connection.

Clients MUST only resume if the new SNI value is valid for the server certificate presented in the original session, and SHOULD only resume if the SNI value matches the one used in the original session. The latter is a performance optimization: normally, there is no reason to expect that different servers covered by a single certificate would be able to accept each other’s tickets, hence attempting resumption.
in that case would waste a single-use ticket. If such an indication
is provided (externally or by any other means), clients MAY resume
with a different SNI value.

On resumption, if reporting an SNI value to the calling application,
implementations MUST use the value sent in the resumption ClientHello
rather than the value sent in the previous session. Note that if a
server implementation declines all PSK identities with different SNI
values, these two values are always the same.

Note: Although the resumption master secret depends on the client’s
second flight, servers which do not request client authentication MAY
calculate the remainder of the transcript independently and then send a
NewSessionTicket immediately upon sending its Finished rather than
waiting for the client Finished. This might be appropriate in cases
where the client is expected to open multiple TLS connections in
parallel and would benefit from the reduced overhead of a resumption
handshake, for example.

struct {
    uint32 ticket_lifetime;
    uint32 ticket_age_add;
    opaque ticket_nonce<0..255>;
    opaque ticket<1..2^16-1>;
    Extension extensions<0..2^16-2>;
} NewSessionTicket;

ticket_lifetime  Indicates the lifetime in seconds as a 32-bit
unsigned integer in network byte order from the time of ticket
issuance. Servers MUST NOT use any value greater than 604800
seconds (7 days). The value of zero indicates that the ticket
should be discarded immediately. Clients MUST NOT cache tickets
for longer than 7 days, regardless of the ticket_lifetime, and MAY
delete tickets earlier based on local policy. A server MAY treat
a ticket as valid for a shorter period of time than what is stated
in the ticket_lifetime.

ticket_age_add  A securely generated, random 32-bit value that is
used to obscure the age of the ticket that the client includes in
the "pre_shared_key" extension. The client-side ticket age is
added to this value modulo 2^32 to obtain the value that is
transmitted by the client. The server MUST generate a fresh value
for each ticket it sends.

ticket_nonce  A per-ticket value that is unique across all tickets
issued on this connection.
ticket  The value of the ticket to be used as the PSK identity. The
ticket itself is an opaque label. It MAY either be a database
lookup key or a self-encrypted and self-authenticated value.
Section 4 of [RFC5077] describes a recommended ticket construction
mechanism.

extensions A set of extension values for the ticket. The
"Extension" format is defined in Section 4.2. Clients MUST ignore
unrecognized extensions.

The sole extension currently defined for NewSessionTicket is
"early_data", indicating that the ticket may be used to send 0-RTT
data (Section 4.2.10). It contains the following value:

max_early_data_size  The maximum amount of 0-RTT data that the client
is allowed to send when using this ticket, in bytes. Only
Application Data payload (i.e., plaintext but not padding or the
inner content type byte) is counted. A server receiving more than
max_early_data_size bytes of 0-RTT data SHOULD terminate the
connection with an "unexpected_message" alert. Note that servers
that reject early data due to lack of cryptographic material will
be unable to differentiate padding from content, so clients SHOULD
NOT depend on being able to send large quantities of padding in
early data records.

The PSK associated with the ticket is computed as:

    HKDF-Expand-Label(resumption_master_secret,
                     "resumption", ticket_nonce, Hash.length)

Because the ticket_nonce value is distinct for each NewSessionTicket
message, a different PSK will be derived for each ticket.

Note that in principle it is possible to continue issuing new tickets
which indefinitely extend the lifetime of the keying material
originally derived from an initial non-PSK handshake (which was most
likely tied to the peer’s certificate). It is RECOMMENDED that
implementations place limits on the total lifetime of such keying
material; these limits should take into account the lifetime of the
peer’s certificate, the likelihood of intervening revocation, and the
time since the peer’s online CertificateVerify signature.

4.6.2. Post-Handshake Authentication

When the client has sent the "post_handshake_auth" extension (see
Section 4.2.6), a server MAY request client authentication at any
time after the handshake has completed by sending a
CertificateRequest message. The client MUST respond with the
appropriate Authentication messages (see Section 4.4). If the client chooses to authenticate, it MUST send Certificate, CertificateVerify, and Finished. If it declines, it MUST send a Certificate message containing no certificates followed by Finished. All of the client’s messages for a given response MUST appear consecutively on the wire with no intervening messages of other types.

A client that receives a CertificateRequest message without having sent the "post_handshake_auth" extension MUST send an "unexpected_message" fatal alert.

Note: Because client authentication could involve prompting the user, servers MUST be prepared for some delay, including receiving an arbitrary number of other messages between sending the CertificateRequest and receiving a response. In addition, clients which receive multiple CertificateRequests in close succession MAY respond to them in a different order than they were received (the certificate_request_context value allows the server to disambiguate the responses).

4.6.3. Key and IV Update

    enum {
       update_not_requested(0), update_requested(1), (255)
    } KeyUpdateRequest;

    struct {
       KeyUpdateRequest request_update;
    } KeyUpdate;

    request_update Indicates whether the recipient of the KeyUpdate should respond with its own KeyUpdate. If an implementation receives any other value, it MUST terminate the connection with an "illegal_parameter" alert.

The KeyUpdate handshake message is used to indicate that the sender is updating its sending cryptographic keys. This message can be sent by either peer after it has sent a Finished message. Implementations that receive a KeyUpdate message prior to receiving a Finished message MUST terminate the connection with an "unexpected_message" alert. After sending a KeyUpdate message, the sender SHALL send all its traffic using the next generation of keys, computed as described in Section 7.2. Upon receiving a KeyUpdate, the receiver MUST update its receiving keys.

If the request_update field is set to "update_requested" then the receiver MUST send a KeyUpdate of its own with request_update set to "update_notRequested" prior to sending its next application data.
record. This mechanism allows either side to force an update to the entire connection, but causes an implementation which receives multiple KeyUpdates while it is silent to respond with a single update. Note that implementations may receive an arbitrary number of messages between sending a KeyUpdate with request_update set to update_requested and receiving the peer’s KeyUpdate, because those messages may already be in flight. However, because send and receive keys are derived from independent traffic secrets, retaining the receive traffic secret does not threaten the forward secrecy of data sent before the sender changed keys.

If implementations independently send their own KeyUpdates with request_update set to "update_requested", and they cross in flight, then each side will also send a response, with the result that each side increments by two generations.

Both sender and receiver MUST encrypt their KeyUpdate messages with the old keys. Additionally, both sides MUST enforce that a KeyUpdate with the old key is received before accepting any messages encrypted with the new key. Failure to do so may allow message truncation attacks.

5. Record Protocol

The TLS record protocol takes messages to be transmitted, fragments the data into manageable blocks, protects the records, and transmits the result. Received data is verified, decrypted, reassembled, and then delivered to higher-level clients.

TLS records are typed, which allows multiple higher-level protocols to be multiplexed over the same record layer. This document specifies four content types: handshake, application data, alert, and change_cipher_spec. The change_cipher_spec record is used only for compatibility purposes (see Appendix D.4).

An implementation may receive an unencrypted record of type change_cipher_spec consisting of the single byte value 0x01 at any time after the first ClientHello message has been sent or received and before the peer's Finished message has been received and MUST simply drop it without further processing. Note that this record may appear at a point at the handshake where the implementation is expecting protected records and so it is necessary to detect this condition prior to attempting to deprotect the record. An implementation which receives any other change_cipher_spec value or which receives a protected change_cipher_spec record MUST abort the handshake with an "unexpected_message" alert. A change_cipher_spec record received before the first ClientHello message or after the peer’s Finished message MUST be treated as an unexpected record type.
(though stateless servers may not be able to distinguish these cases from allowed cases).

Implementations MUST NOT send record types not defined in this document unless negotiated by some extension. If a TLS implementation receives an unexpected record type, it MUST terminate the connection with an "unexpected_message" alert. New record content type values are assigned by IANA in the TLS Content Type Registry as described in Section 11.

5.1. Record Layer

The record layer fragments information blocks into TLSPlaintext records carrying data in chunks of $2^{14}$ bytes or less. Message boundaries are handled differently depending on the underlying ContentType. Any future content types MUST specify appropriate rules. Note that these rules are stricter than what was enforced in TLS 1.2.

Handshake messages MAY be coalesced into a single TLSPlaintext record or fragmented across several records, provided that:

- Handshake messages MUST NOT be interleaved with other record types. That is, if a handshake message is split over two or more records, there MUST NOT be any other records between them.

- Handshake messages MUST NOT span key changes. Implementations MUST verify that all messages immediately preceding a key change align with a record boundary; if not, then they MUST terminate the connection with an "unexpected_message" alert. Because the ClientHello, EndOfEarlyData, ServerHello, Finished, and KeyUpdate messages can immediately precede a key change, implementations MUST send these messages in alignment with a record boundary.

Implementations MUST NOT send zero-length fragments of Handshake types, even if those fragments contain padding.

Alert messages (Section 6) MUST NOT be fragmented across records and multiple Alert messages MUST NOT be coalesced into a single TLSPlaintext record. In other words, a record with an Alert type MUST contain exactly one message.

Application Data messages contain data that is opaque to TLS. Application Data messages are always protected. Zero-length fragments of Application Data MAY be sent as they are potentially useful as a traffic analysis countermeasure. Application Data fragments MAY be split across multiple records or coalesced into a single record.
enum {
    invalid(0),
    change_cipher_spec(20),
    alert(21),
    handshake(22),
    application_data(23),
    (255)
} ContentType;

struct {
    ContentType type;
    ProtocolVersion legacy_record_version;
    uint16 length;
    opaque fragment[TLSPlaintext.length];
} TLSPlaintext;

type The higher-level protocol used to process the enclosed fragment.

legacy_record_version This value MUST be set to 0x0303 for all records generated by a TLS 1.3 implementation other than an initial ClientHello (i.e., one not generated after a HelloRetryRequest), where it MAY also be 0x0301 for compatibility purposes. This field is deprecated and MUST be ignored for all purposes. Previous versions of TLS would use other values in this field under some circumstances.

length The length (in bytes) of the following TLSPlaintext.fragment. The length MUST NOT exceed $2^{14}$ bytes. An endpoint that receives a record that exceeds this length MUST terminate the connection with a "record_overflow" alert.

fragment The data being transmitted. This value is transparent and is treated as an independent block to be dealt with by the higher-level protocol specified by the type field.

This document describes TLS 1.3, which uses the version 0x0304. This version value is historical, deriving from the use of 0x0301 for TLS 1.0 and 0x0300 for SSL 3.0. In order to maximize backwards compatibility, records containing an initial ClientHello SHOULD have version 0x0301 and a record containing a second ClientHello or a ServerHello MUST have version 0x0303, reflecting TLS 1.0 and TLS 1.2 respectively. When negotiating prior versions of TLS, endpoints follow the procedure and requirements in Appendix D.

When record protection has not yet been engaged, TLSPlaintext structures are written directly onto the wire. Once record protection has started, TLSPlaintext records are protected and sent
as described in the following section. Note that application data records MUST NOT be written to the wire unprotected (see Section 2 for details).

5.2. Record Payload Protection

The record protection functions translate a TLSPlaintext structure into a TLSCiphertext. The deprotection functions reverse the process. In TLS 1.3, as opposed to previous versions of TLS, all ciphers are modeled as "Authenticated Encryption with Additional Data" (AEAD) [RFC5116]. AEAD functions provide an unified encryption and authentication operation which turns plaintext into authenticated ciphertext and back again. Each encrypted record consists of a plaintext header followed by an encrypted body, which itself contains a type and optional padding.

```c
struct {
    opaque content[TLSPlaintext.length];
    ContentType type;
    uint8 zeros[length_of_padding];
} TLSInnerPlaintext;

struct {
    ContentType opaque_type = application_data; /* 23 */
    ProtocolVersion legacy_record_version = 0x0303; /* TLS v1.2 */
    uint16 length;
    opaque encrypted_record[TLSCiphertext.length];
} TLSCiphertext;
```

- **content** The TLSPlaintext.fragment value, containing the byte encoding of a handshake or an alert message, or the raw bytes of the application’s data to send.

- **type** The TLSPlaintext.type value containing the content type of the record.

- **zeros** An arbitrary-length run of zero-valued bytes may appear in the cleartext after the type field. This provides an opportunity for senders to pad any TLS record by a chosen amount as long as the total stays within record size limits. See Section 5.4 for more details.

- **opaque_type** The outer opaque_type field of a TLSCiphertext record is always set to the value 23 (application_data) for outward compatibility with middleboxes accustomed to parsing previous versions of TLS. The actual content type of the record is found in TLSInnerPlaintext.type after decryption.
The legacy_record_version field is always 0x0303. TLS 1.3 TLSCiphertexts are not generated until after TLS 1.3 has been negotiated, so there are no historical compatibility concerns where other values might be received. Note that the handshake protocol including the ClientHello and ServerHello messages authenticates the protocol version, so this value is redundant.

The length (in bytes) of the following TLSCiphertext.encrypted_record, which is the sum of the lengths of the content and the padding, plus one for the inner content type, plus any expansion added by the AEAD algorithm. The length MUST NOT exceed $2^{14} + 256$ bytes. An endpoint that receives a record that exceeds this length MUST terminate the connection with a "record_overflow" alert.

The AEAD-encrypted form of the serialized TLSInnerPlaintext structure.

AEAD algorithms take as input a single key, a nonce, a plaintext, and "additional data" to be included in the authentication check, as described in Section 2.1 of [RFC5116]. The key is either the client_write_key or the server_write_key, the nonce is derived from the sequence number and the client_write_iv or server_write_iv (see Section 5.3), and the additional data input is the record header. I.e.,

```
additional_data = TLSCiphertext.opaque_type || TLSCiphertext.legacy_record_version || TLSCiphertext.length
```

The plaintext input to the AEAD algorithm is the encoded TLSInnerPlaintext structure. Derivation of traffic keys is defined in Section 7.3.

The AEAD output consists of the ciphertext output from the AEAD encryption operation. The length of the plaintext is greater than the corresponding TLSPlaintext.length due to the inclusion of TLSInnerPlaintext.type and any padding supplied by the sender. The length of the AEAD output will generally be larger than the plaintext, but by an amount that varies with the AEAD algorithm. Since the ciphers might incorporate padding, the amount of overhead could vary with different lengths of plaintext. Symbolically,

```
AEADEncrypted = AEAD-Encrypt(write_key, nonce, additional_data, plaintext)
```
Then the encrypted_record field of TLSCiphertext is set to AEADEncrypted.

In order to decrypt and verify, the cipher takes as input the key, nonce, additional data, and the AEADEncrypted value. The output is either the plaintext or an error indicating that the decryption failed. There is no separate integrity check. That is:

plaintext of encrypted_record = AEAD-Decrypt(peer_write_key, nonce, additional_data, AEADEncrypted)

If the decryption fails, the receiver MUST terminate the connection with a "bad_record_mac" alert.

An AEAD algorithm used in TLS 1.3 MUST NOT produce an expansion greater than 255 octets. An endpoint that receives a record from its peer with TLSCiphertext.length larger than $2^{14} + 256$ octets MUST terminate the connection with a "record_overflow" alert. This limit is derived from the maximum TLSInnerPlaintext length of $2^{14}$ octets + 1 octet for ContentType + the maximum AEAD expansion of 255 octets.

5.3. Per-Record Nonce

A 64-bit sequence number is maintained separately for reading and writing records. The appropriate sequence number is incremented by one after reading or writing each record. Each sequence number is set to zero at the beginning of a connection and whenever the key is changed; the first record transmitted under a particular traffic key MUST use sequence number 0.

Because the size of sequence numbers is 64-bit, they should not wrap. If a TLS implementation would need to wrap a sequence number, it MUST either re-key (Section 4.6.3) or terminate the connection.

Each AEAD algorithm will specify a range of possible lengths for the per-record nonce, from N_MIN bytes to N_MAX bytes of input ([RFC5116]). The length of the TLS per-record nonce (iv_length) is set to the larger of 8 bytes and N_MIN for the AEAD algorithm (see [RFC5116] Section 4). An AEAD algorithm where N_MAX is less than 8 bytes MUST NOT be used with TLS. The per-record nonce for the AEAD construction is formed as follows:

1. The 64-bit record sequence number is encoded in network byte order and padded to the left with zeros to iv_length.

2. The padded sequence number is XORed with the static client_write_iv or server_write_iv, depending on the role.
The resulting quantity (of length iv_length) is used as the per-record nonce.

Note: This is a different construction from that in TLS 1.2, which specified a partially explicit nonce.

5.4. Record Padding

All encrypted TLS records can be padded to inflate the size of the TLSCiphertext. This allows the sender to hide the size of the traffic from an observer.

When generating a TLSCiphertext record, implementations MAY choose to pad. An unpadded record is just a record with a padding length of zero. Padding is a string of zero-valued bytes appended to the ContentType field before encryption. Implementations MUST set the padding octets to all zeros before encrypting.

Application Data records may contain a zero-length TLSInnerPlaintext.content if the sender desires. This permits generation of plausibly-sized cover traffic in contexts where the presence or absence of activity may be sensitive. Implementations MUST NOT send Handshake or Alert records that have a zero-length TLSInnerPlaintext.content; if such a message is received, the receiving implementation MUST terminate the connection with an "unexpected_message" alert.

The padding sent is automatically verified by the record protection mechanism; upon successful decryption of a TLSCiphertext.encrypted_record, the receiving implementation scans the field from the end toward the beginning until it finds a non-zero octet. This non-zero octet is the content type of the message. This padding scheme was selected because it allows padding of any encrypted TLS record by an arbitrary size (from zero up to TLS record size limits) without introducing new content types. The design also enforces all-zero padding octets, which allows for quick detection of padding errors.

Implementations MUST limit their scanning to the cleartext returned from the AEAD decryption. If a receiving implementation does not find a non-zero octet in the cleartext, it MUST terminate the connection with an "unexpected_message" alert.

The presence of padding does not change the overall record size limitations - the full encoded TLSInnerPlaintext MUST NOT exceed 2^14 + 1 octets. If the maximum fragment length is reduced, as for example by the max_fragment_length extension from [RFC6066], then the
reduced limit applies to the full plaintext, including the content
type and padding.

Selecting a padding policy that suggests when and how much to pad is
a complex topic and is beyond the scope of this specification. If
the application layer protocol on top of TLS has its own padding, it
may be preferable to pad application_data TLS records within the
application layer. Padding for encrypted handshake and alert TLS
records must still be handled at the TLS layer, though. Later
documents may define padding selection algorithms or define a padding
policy request mechanism through TLS extensions or some other means.

5.5. Limits on Key Usage

There are cryptographic limits on the amount of plaintext which can
be safely encrypted under a given set of keys. [AEAD-LIMITS]
provides an analysis of these limits under the assumption that the
underlying primitive (AES or ChaCha20) has no weaknesses.
Implementations SHOULD do a key update as described in Section 4.6.3
prior to reaching these limits.

For AES-GCM, up to $2^{24.5}$ full-size records (about 24 million) may be
encrypted on a given connection while keeping a safety margin of
approximately $2^{-57}$ for Authenticated Encryption (AE) security. For
ChaCha20/Poly1305, the record sequence number would wrap before the
safety limit is reached.

6. Alert Protocol

One of the content types supported by the TLS record layer is the
alert type. Like other messages, alert messages are encrypted as
specified by the current connection state.

Alert messages convey a description of the alert and a legacy field
that conveyed the severity of the message in previous versions of
TLS. Alerts are divided into two classes: closure alerts and error
alerts. In TLS 1.3, the severity is implicit in the type of alert
being sent, and the 'level' field can safely be ignored. The
"close_notify" alert is used to indicate orderly closure of one
direction of the connection. Upon receiving such an alert, the TLS
implementation SHOULD indicate end-of-data to the application.

Error alerts indicate abortive closure of the connection (see
Section 6.2). Upon receiving an error alert, the TLS implementation
SHOULD indicate an error to the application and MUST NOT allow any
further data to be sent or received on the connection. Servers and
clients MUST forget the secret values and keys established in failed
connections, with the exception of the PSKs associated with session tickets, which SHOULD be discarded if possible.

All the alerts listed in Section 6.2 MUST be sent with AlertLevel=fatal and MUST be treated as error alerts regardless of the AlertLevel in the message. Unknown alert types MUST be treated as error alerts.

Note: TLS defines two generic alerts (see Section 6) to use upon failure to parse a message. Peers which receive a message which cannot be parsed according to the syntax (e.g., have a length extending beyond the message boundary or contain an out-of-range length) MUST terminate the connection with a "decode_error" alert. Peers which receive a message which is syntactically correct but semantically invalid (e.g., a DHE share of p - 1, or an invalid enum) MUST terminate the connection with an "illegal_parameter" alert.
enum { warning(1), fatal(2), (255) } AlertLevel;

enum {
    close_notify(0),
    unexpected_message(10),
    bad_record_mac(20),
    record_overflow(22),
    handshake_failure(40),
    bad_certificate(42),
    unsupported_certificate(43),
    certificate_revoked(44),
    certificate_expired(45),
    certificate_unknown(46),
    illegal_parameter(47),
    unknown_ca(48),
    access_denied(49),
    decode_error(50),
    decrypt_error(51),
    protocol_version(70),
    insufficient_security(71),
    internal_error(80),
    inappropriate_fallback(86),
    user_canceled(90),
    missing_extension(109),
    unsupported_extension(110),
    unrecognized_name(112),
    bad_certificate_status_response(113),
    unknown_psk_identity(115),
    certificate_required(116),
    no_application_protocol(120),
    (255)
} AlertDescription;

struct {
    AlertLevel level;
    AlertDescription description;
} Alert;

6.1. Closure Alerts

The client and the server must share knowledge that the connection is ending in order to avoid a truncation attack.

   close_notify  This alert notifies the recipient that the sender will not send any more messages on this connection. Any data received after a closure alert has been received MUST be ignored.
user_canceled  This alert notifies the recipient that the sender is canceling the handshake for some reason unrelated to a protocol failure. If a user cancels an operation after the handshake is complete, just closing the connection by sending a "close_notify" is more appropriate. This alert SHOULD be followed by a "close_notify". This alert generally has AlertLevel=warning.

Either party MAY initiate a close of its write side of the connection by sending a "close_notify" alert. Any data received after a closure alert has been received MUST be ignored. If a transport-level close is received prior to a "close_notify", the receiver cannot know that all the data that was sent has been received.

Each party MUST send a "close_notify" alert before closing its write side of the connection, unless it has already sent some error alert. This does not have any effect on its read side of the connection. Note that this is a change from versions of TLS prior to TLS 1.3 in which implementations were required to react to a "close_notify" by discarding pending writes and sending an immediate "close_notify" alert of their own. That previous requirement could cause truncation in the read side. Both parties need not wait to receive a "close_notify" alert before closing their read side of the connection, though doing so would introduce the possibility of truncation.

If the application protocol using TLS provides that any data may be carried over the underlying transport after the TLS connection is closed, the TLS implementation MUST receive a "close_notify" alert before indicating end-of-data to the application-layer. No part of this standard should be taken to dictate the manner in which a usage profile for TLS manages its data transport, including when connections are opened or closed.

Note: It is assumed that closing the write side of a connection reliably delivers pending data before destroying the transport.

6.2. Error Alerts

Error handling in the TLS Handshake Protocol is very simple. When an error is detected, the detecting party sends a message to its peer. Upon transmission or receipt of a fatal alert message, both parties MUST immediately close the connection.

Whenever an implementation encounters a fatal error condition, it SHOULD send an appropriate fatal alert and MUST close the connection without sending or receiving any additional data. In the rest of this specification, when the phrases "terminate the connection" and "abort the handshake" are used without a specific alert it means that
the implementation SHOULD send the alert indicated by the
descriptions below. The phrases "terminate the connection with a X
alert" and "abort the handshake with a X alert" mean that the
implementation MUST send alert X if it sends any alert. All alerts
defined in this section below, as well as all unknown alerts, are
universally considered fatal as of TLS 1.3 (see Section 6). The
implementation SHOULD provide a way to facilitate logging the sending
and receiving of alerts.

The following error alerts are defined:

unexpected_message An inappropriate message (e.g., the wrong
handshake message, premature application data, etc.) was received.
This alert should never be observed in communication between
proper implementations.

bad_record_mac This alert is returned if a record is received which
cannot be deprotected. Because AEAD algorithms combine decryption
and verification, and also to avoid side channel attacks, this
alert is used for all deprotection failures. This alert should
never be observed in communication between proper implementations,
except when messages were corrupted in the network.

record_overflow A TLSCiphertext record was received that had a
length more than 2^14 + 256 bytes, or a record decrypted to a
TLSPlaintext record with more than 2^14 bytes (or some other
negotiated limit). This alert should never be observed in
communication between proper implementations, except when messages
were corrupted in the network.

handshake_failure Receipt of a "handshake_failure" alert message
indicates that the sender was unable to negotiate an acceptable
set of security parameters given the options available.

bad_certificate A certificate was corrupt, contained signatures that
did not verify correctly, etc.

unsupported_certificate A certificate was of an unsupported type.

certificate_revoked A certificate was revoked by its signer.

certificate_expired A certificate has expired or is not currently
valid.

certificate_unknown Some other (unspecified) issue arose in
processing the certificate, rendering it unacceptable.
illegal_parameter  A field in the handshake was incorrect or inconsistent with other fields. This alert is used for errors which conform to the formal protocol syntax but are otherwise incorrect.

unknown_ca  A valid certificate chain or partial chain was received, but the certificate was not accepted because the CA certificate could not be located or could not be matched with a known trust anchor.

access_denied  A valid certificate or PSK was received, but when access control was applied, the sender decided not to proceed with negotiation.

decode_error  A message could not be decoded because some field was out of the specified range or the length of the message was incorrect. This alert is used for errors where the message does not conform to the formal protocol syntax. This alert should never be observed in communication between proper implementations, except when messages were corrupted in the network.

decrypt_error  A handshake (not record-layer) cryptographic operation failed, including being unable to correctly verify a signature or validate a Finished message or a PSK binder.

protocol_version  The protocol version the peer has attempted to negotiate is recognized but not supported. (see Appendix D)

insufficient_security  Returned instead of "handshake_failure" when a negotiation has failed specifically because the server requires parameters more secure than those supported by the client.

internal_error  An internal error unrelated to the peer or the correctness of the protocol (such as a memory allocation failure) makes it impossible to continue.

inappropriate_fallback  Sent by a server in response to an invalid connection retry attempt from a client (see [RFC7507]).

missing_extension  Sent by endpoints that receive a handshake message not containing an extension that is mandatory to send for the offered TLS version or other negotiated parameters.

unsupported_extension  Sent by endpoints receiving any handshake message containing an extension known to be prohibited for inclusion in the given handshake message, or including any extensions in a ServerHello or Certificate not first offered in the corresponding ClientHello.
unrecognized_name  Sent by servers when no server exists identified by the name provided by the client via the "server_name" extension (see [RFC6066]).

bad_certificate_status_response  Sent by clients when an invalid or unacceptable OCSP response is provided by the server via the "status_request" extension (see [RFC6066]).

unknown_psk_identity  Sent by servers when PSK key establishment is desired but no acceptable PSK identity is provided by the client. Sending this alert is OPTIONAL; servers MAY instead choose to send a "decrypt_error" alert to merely indicate an invalid PSK identity.

certificate_required  Sent by servers when a client certificate is desired but none was provided by the client.

no_application_protocol  Sent by servers when a client "application_layer_protocol_negotiation" extension advertises only protocols that the server does not support (see [RFC7301]).

New Alert values are assigned by IANA as described in Section 11.

7.  Cryptographic Computations

The TLS handshake establishes one or more input secrets which are combined to create the actual working keying material, as detailed below. The key derivation process incorporates both the input secrets and the handshake transcript. Note that because the handshake transcript includes the random values from the Hello messages, any given handshake will have different traffic secrets, even if the same input secrets are used, as is the case when the same PSK is used for multiple connections.

7.1.  Key Schedule

The key derivation process makes use of the HKDF-Extract and HKDF-Expand functions as defined for HKDF [RFC5869], as well as the functions defined below:
HKDF-Expand-Label(Secret, Label, Context, Length) =
    HKDF-Expand(Secret, HkdfLabel, Length)

Where HkdfLabel is specified as:

struct {
    uint16 length = Length;
    opaque label<7..255> = "tls13 " + Label;
    opaque context<0..255> = Context;
} HkdfLabel;

Derive-Secret(Secret, Label, Messages) =
    HKDF-Expand-Label(Secret, Label,
                     Transcript-Hash(Messages), Hash.length)

The Hash function used by Transcript-Hash and HKDF is the cipher
suite hash algorithm.  Hash.length is its output length in bytes.
Messages is the concatenation of the indicated handshake messages,
including the handshake message type and length fields, but not
including record layer headers.  Note that in some cases a zero-
length Context (indicated by "") is passed to HKDF-Expand-Label.  The
Labels specified in this document are all ASCII strings, and do not
include a trailing NUL byte.

Note: with common hash functions, any label longer than 12 characters
requires an additional iteration of the hash function to compute.
The labels in this specification have all been chosen to fit within
this limit.

Keys are derived from two input secrets using the HKDF-Extract and
Derive-Secret functions.  The general pattern for adding a new secret
is to use HKDF-Extract with the salt being the current secret state
and the IKM being the new secret to be added.  In this version of TLS
1.3, the two input secrets are:

- PSK (a pre-shared key established externally or derived from the
  resumption_master_secret value from a previous connection)

- (EC)DHE shared secret (Section 7.4)

This produces a full key derivation schedule shown in the diagram
below.  In this diagram, the following formatting conventions apply:

- HKDF-Extract is drawn as taking the Salt argument from the top and
  the IKM argument from the left, with its output to the bottom and
  the name of the output on the right.
- Derive-Secret’s Secret argument is indicated by the incoming arrow. For instance, the Early Secret is the Secret for generating the client_early_traffic_secret.

- "0" indicates a string of Hash-lengths bytes set to 0.

```
0
v
PSK -> HKDF-Extract = Early Secret
    +-----+ Derive-Secret(., "ext binder" | "res binder", "") = binder_key
    |      +-----+ Derive-Secret(., "c e traffic", ClientHello) = client_early_traffic_secret
    |      +-----+ Derive-Secret(., "e exp master", ClientHello) = early_exporter_master_secret
    v
      Derive-Secret(., "derived", "")
      v
(EC)DHE -> HKDF-Extract = Handshake Secret
    +-----+ Derive-Secret(., "c hs traffic", ClientHello...ServerHello) = client_handshake_traffic_secret
    |      +-----+ Derive-Secret(., "s hs traffic", ClientHello...ServerHello) = server_handshake_traffic_secret
    v
      Derive-Secret(., "derived", "")
      v
0 -> HKDF-Extract = Master Secret
    +-----+ Derive-Secret(., "c ap traffic", ClientHello...server Finished) = client_application_traffic_secret_0
    |      +-----+ Derive-Secret(., "s ap traffic",
```
The general pattern here is that the secrets shown down the left side of the diagram are just raw entropy without context, whereas the secrets down the right side include handshake context and therefore can be used to derive working keys without additional context. Note that the different calls to Derive-Secret may take different Messages arguments, even with the same secret. In a 0-RTT exchange, Derive-Secret is called with four distinct transcripts; in a 1-RTT-only exchange with three distinct transcripts.

If a given secret is not available, then the 0-value consisting of a string of Hash.length bytes set to zeros is used. Note that this does not mean skipping rounds, so if PSK is not in use Early Secret will still be HKDF-Extract(0, 0). For the computation of the binder_secret, the label is "ext binder" for external PSKs (those provisioned outside of TLS) and "res binder" for resumption PSKs (those provisioned as the resumption master secret of a previous handshake). The different labels prevent the substitution of one type of PSK for the other.

There are multiple potential Early Secret values depending on which PSK the server ultimately selects. The client will need to compute one for each potential PSK; if no PSK is selected, it will then need to compute the early secret corresponding to the zero PSK.

Once all the values which are to be derived from a given secret have been computed, that secret SHOULD be erased.

7.2. Updating Traffic Secrets

Once the handshake is complete, it is possible for either side to update its sending traffic keys using the KeyUpdate handshake message defined in Section 4.6.3. The next generation of traffic keys is computed by generating client_/server_application_traffic_secret_N+1 from client_/server_application_traffic_secret_N as described in this section then re-deriving the traffic keys as described in Section 7.3.
The next-generation application\_traffic\_secret is computed as:

\[
\text{application\_traffic\_secret}_N+1 = \text{HKDF-Expand-Label} (\text{application\_traffic\_secret}_N, \\
\quad \text{"traffic upd"}, \text{""}, \text{Hash.length})
\]

Once client/server\_application\_traffic\_secret\_N+1 and its associated traffic keys have been computed, implementations SHOULD delete client\_/server\_application\_traffic\_secret\_N and its associated traffic keys.

7.3. Traffic Key Calculation

The traffic keying material is generated from the following input values:

- A secret value
- A purpose value indicating the specific value being generated
- The length of the key being generated

The traffic keying material is generated from an input traffic secret value using:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[sender]\_write\_key} &= \text{HKDF-Expand-Label} (\text{Secret}, \text{"key"}, \text{""}, \text{key\_length}) \\
\text{[sender]\_write\_iv} &= \text{HKDF-Expand-Label} (\text{Secret}, \text{"iv"}, \text{""}, \text{iv\_length})
\end{align*}
\]

[sender] denotes the sending side. The Secret value for each record type is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Type</th>
<th>Secret</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-RTT Application</td>
<td>client_early_traffic_secret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handshake</td>
<td>[sender]_handshake_traffic_secret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Data</td>
<td>[sender]_application_traffic_secret_N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the traffic keying material is recomputed whenever the underlying Secret changes (e.g., when changing from the handshake to application data keys or upon a key update).
7.4. (EC)DHE Shared Secret Calculation

7.4.1. Finite Field Diffie-Hellman

For finite field groups, a conventional Diffie-Hellman [DH76] computation is performed. The negotiated key (Z) is converted to a byte string by encoding in big-endian and left padded with zeros up to the size of the prime. This byte string is used as the shared secret in the key schedule as specified above.

Note that this construction differs from previous versions of TLS which remove leading zeros.

7.4.2. Elliptic Curve Diffie-Hellman

For secp256r1, secp384r1 and secp521r1, ECDH calculations (including parameter and key generation as well as the shared secret calculation) are performed according to [IEEE1363] using the ECKAS-DH1 scheme with the identity map as key derivation function (KDF), so that the shared secret is the x-coordinate of the ECDH shared secret elliptic curve point represented as an octet string. Note that this octet string (Z in IEEE 1363 terminology) as output by FE2OSP, the Field Element to Octet String Conversion Primitive, has constant length for any given field; leading zeros found in this octet string MUST NOT be truncated.

(Note that this use of the identity KDF is a technicality. The complete picture is that ECDH is employed with a non-trivial KDF because TLS does not directly use this secret for anything other than for computing other secrets.)

ECDH functions are used as follows:

- The public key to put into the KeyShareEntry.key_exchange structure is the result of applying the ECDH scalar multiplication function to the secret key of appropriate length (into scalar input) and the standard public basepoint (into u-coordinate point input).

- The ECDH shared secret is the result of applying the ECDH scalar multiplication function to the secret key (into scalar input) and the peer’s public key (into u-coordinate point input). The output is used raw, with no processing.

For X25519 and X448, implementations SHOULD use the approach specified in [RFC7748] to calculate the Diffie-Hellman shared secret. Implementations MUST check whether the computed Diffie-Hellman shared secret is the all-zero value and abort if so, as described in
Section 6 of [RFC7748]. If implementors use an alternative implementation of these elliptic curves, they SHOULD perform the additional checks specified in Section 7 of [RFC7748].

7.5. Exporters

[RFC5705] defines keying material exporters for TLS in terms of the TLS pseudorandom function (PRF). This document replaces the PRF with HKDF, thus requiring a new construction. The exporter interface remains the same.

The exporter value is computed as:

\[
\text{TLS-Exporter}(\text{label}, \text{context\_value}, \text{key\_length}) = \\
\text{HKDF-Expand-Label}(\text{Derive-Secret}(\text{Secret, label, ""}), \"exporter\", \text{Hash(context\_value)}, \text{key\_length})
\]

Where Secret is either the early\_exporter\_master\_secret or the exporter\_master\_secret. Implementations MUST use the exporter\_master\_secret unless explicitly specified by the application. The early\_exporter\_master\_secret is defined for use in settings where an exporter is needed for 0-RTT data. A separate interface for the early exporter is RECOMMENDED; this avoids the exporter user accidentally using an early exporter when a regular one is desired or vice versa.

If no context is provided, the context\_value is zero-length. Consequently, providing no context computes the same value as providing an empty context. This is a change from previous versions of TLS where an empty context produced a different output to an absent context. As of this document’s publication, no allocated exporter label is used both with and without a context. Future specifications MUST NOT define a use of exporters that permit both an empty context and no context with the same label. New uses of exporters SHOULD provide a context in all exporter computations, though the value could be empty.

Requirements for the format of exporter labels are defined in section 4 of [RFC5705].

8. 0-RTT and Anti-Replay

As noted in Section 2.3 and Appendix E.5, TLS does not provide inherent replay protections for 0-RTT data. There are two potential threats to be concerned with:

- Network attackers who mount a replay attack by simply duplicating a flight of 0-RTT data.
Network attackers who take advantage of client retry behavior to arrange for the server to receive multiple copies of an application message. This threat already exists to some extent because clients that value robustness respond to network errors by attempting to retry requests. However, 0-RTT adds an additional dimension for any server system which does not maintain globally consistent server state. Specifically, if a server system has multiple zones where tickets from zone A will not be accepted in zone B, then an attacker can duplicate a ClientHello and early data intended for A to both A and B. At A, the data will be accepted in 0-RTT, but at B the server will reject 0-RTT data and instead force a full handshake. If the attacker blocks the ServerHello from A, then the client will complete the handshake with B and probably retry the request, leading to duplication on the server system as a whole.

The first class of attack can be prevented by sharing state to guarantee that the 0-RTT data is accepted at most once. Servers SHOULD provide that level of replay safety, by implementing one of the methods described in this section or by equivalent means. It is understood, however, that due to operational concerns not all deployments will maintain state at that level. Therefore, in normal operation, clients will not know which, if any, of these mechanisms servers actually implement and hence MUST only send early data which they deem safe to be replayed.

In addition to the direct effects of replays, there is a class of attacks where even operations normally considered idempotent could be exploited by a large number of replays (timing attacks, resource limit exhaustion and others described in Appendix E.5). Those can be mitigated by ensuring that every 0-RTT payload can be replayed only a limited number of times. The server MUST ensure that any instance of it (be it a machine, a thread or any other entity within the relevant serving infrastructure) would accept 0-RTT for the same 0-RTT handshake at most once; this limits the number of replays to the number of server instances in the deployment. Such a guarantee can be accomplished by locally recording data from recently-received ClientHellos and rejecting repeats, or by any other method that provides the same or a stronger guarantee. The "at most once per server instance" guarantee is a minimum requirement; servers SHOULD limit 0-RTT replays further when feasible.

The second class of attack cannot be prevented at the TLS layer and MUST be dealt with by any application. Note that any application whose clients implement any kind of retry behavior already needs to implement some sort of anti-replay defense.
8.1. Single-Use Tickets

The simplest form of anti-replay defense is for the server to only allow each session ticket to be used once. For instance, the server can maintain a database of all outstanding valid tickets; deleting each ticket from the database as it is used. If an unknown ticket is provided, the server would then fall back to a full handshake.

If the tickets are not self-contained but rather are database keys, and the corresponding PSKs are deleted upon use, then connections established using PSKs enjoy forward secrecy. This improves security for all 0-RTT data and PSK usage when PSK is used without (EC)DHE.

Because this mechanism requires sharing the session database between server nodes in environments with multiple distributed servers, it may be hard to achieve high rates of successful PSK 0-RTT connections when compared to self-encrypted tickets. Unlike session databases, session tickets can successfully do PSK-based session establishment even without consistent storage, though when 0-RTT is allowed they still require consistent storage for anti-replay of 0-RTT data, as detailed in the following section.

8.2. Client Hello Recording

An alternative form of anti-replay is to record a unique value derived from the ClientHello (generally either the random value or the PSK binder) and reject duplicates. Recording all ClientHellos causes state to grow without bound, but a server can instead record ClientHellos within a given time window and use the "obfuscated_ticket_age" to ensure that tickets aren’t reused outside that window.

In order to implement this, when a ClientHello is received, the server first verifies the PSK binder as described Section 4.2.11. It then computes the expected_arrival_time as described in the next section and rejects 0-RTT if it is outside the recording window, falling back to the 1-RTT handshake.

If the expected arrival time is in the window, then the server checks to see if it has recorded a matching ClientHello. If one is found, it either aborts the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert or accepts the PSK but reject 0-RTT. If no matching ClientHello is found, then it accepts 0-RTT and then stores the ClientHello for as long as the expected_arrival_time is inside the window. Servers MAY also implement data stores with false positives, such as Bloom filters, in which case they MUST respond to apparent replay by rejecting 0-RTT but MUST NOT abort the handshake.
The server MUST derive the storage key only from validated sections of the ClientHello. If the ClientHello contains multiple PSK identities, then an attacker can create multiple ClientHellos with different binder values for the less-preferred identity on the assumption that the server will not verify it, as recommended by Section 4.2.11. I.e., if the client sends PSKs A and B but the server prefers A, then the attacker can change the binder for B without affecting the binder for A. If the binder for B is part of the storage key, then this ClientHello will not appear as a duplicate, which will cause the ClientHello to be accepted, and may cause side effects such as replay cache pollution, although any 0-RTT data will not be decryptable because it will use different keys. If the validated binder or the ClientHello.random are used as the storage key, then this attack is not possible.

Because this mechanism does not require storing all outstanding tickets, it may be easier to implement in distributed systems with high rates of resumption and 0-RTT, at the cost of potentially weaker anti-replay defense because of the difficulty of reliably storing and retrieving the received ClientHello messages. In many such systems, it is impractical to have globally consistent storage of all the received ClientHellos. In this case, the best anti-replay protection is provided by having a single storage zone be authoritative for a given ticket and refusing 0-RTT for that ticket in any other zone. This approach prevents simple replay by the attacker because only one zone will accept 0-RTT data. A weaker design is to implement separate storage for each zone but allow 0-RTT in any zone. This approach limits the number of replays to once per zone. Application message duplication of course remains possible with either design.

When implementations are freshly started, they SHOULD reject 0-RTT as long as any portion of their recording window overlaps the startup time. Otherwise, they run the risk of accepting replays which were originally sent during that period.

Note: If the client’s clock is running much faster than the server’s then a ClientHello may be received that is outside the window in the future, in which case it might be accepted for 1-RTT, causing a client retry, and then acceptable later for 0-RTT. This is another variant of the second form of attack described above.

8.3. Freshness Checks

Because the ClientHello indicates the time at which the client sent it, it is possible to efficiently determine whether a ClientHello was likely sent reasonably recently and only accept 0-RTT for such a ClientHello, otherwise falling back to a 1-RTT handshake. This is necessary for the ClientHello storage mechanism described in
Section 8.2 because otherwise the server needs to store an unlimited number of ClientHellos and is a useful optimization for self-contained single-use tickets because it allows efficient rejection of ClientHellos which cannot be used for 0-RTT.

In order to implement this mechanism, a server needs to store the time that the server generated the session ticket, offset by an estimate of the round trip time between client and server. I.e.,

$$\text{adjusted\_creation\_time} = \text{creation\_time} + \text{estimated\_RTT}$$

This value can be encoded in the ticket, thus avoiding the need to keep state for each outstanding ticket. The server can determine the client’s view of the age of the ticket by subtracting the ticket’s "ticket\_age\_add\_value" from the "obfuscated\_ticket\_age" parameter in the client’s "pre\_shared\_key" extension. The server can determine the "expected\_arrival\_time" of the ClientHello as:

$$\text{expected\_arrival\_time} = \text{adjusted\_creation\_time} + \text{clients\_ticket\_age}$$

When a new ClientHello is received, the expected\_arrival\_time is then compared against the current server wall clock time and if they differ by more than a certain amount, 0-RTT is rejected, though the 1-RTT handshake can be allowed to complete.

There are several potential sources of error that might cause mismatches between the expected arrival time and the measured time. Variations in client and server clock rates are likely to be minimal, though potentially the absolute times may be off by large values. Network propagation delays are the most likely causes of a mismatch in legitimate values for elapsed time. Both the NewSessionTicket and ClientHello messages might be retransmitted and therefore delayed, which might be hidden by TCP. For clients on the Internet, this implies windows on the order of ten seconds to account for errors in clocks and variations in measurements; other deployment scenarios may have different needs. Clock skew distributions are not symmetric, so the optimal tradeoff may involve an asymmetric range of permissible mismatch values.

Note that freshness checking alone is not sufficient to prevent replays because it does not detect them during the error window, which, depending on bandwidth and system capacity could include billions of replays in real-world settings. In addition, this freshness checking is only done at the time the ClientHello is received, and not when later early application data records are received. After early data is accepted, records may continue to be streamed to the server over a longer time period.
9. Compliance Requirements

9.1. Mandatory-to-Implement Cipher Suites

In the absence of an application profile standard specifying otherwise, a TLS-compliant application MUST implement the TLS_AES_128_GCM_SHA256 [GCM] cipher suite and SHOULD implement the TLS_AES_256_GCM_SHA384 [GCM] and TLS_CHACHA20_POLY1305_SHA256 [RFC7539] cipher suites. (see Appendix B.4)

A TLS-compliant application MUST support digital signatures with rsa_pkcs1_sha256 (for certificates), rsa_pss_rsae_sha256 (for CertificateVerify and certificates), and ecdsa_secp256r1_sha256. A TLS-compliant application MUST support key exchange with secp256r1 (NIST P-256) and SHOULD support key exchange with X25519 [RFC7748].

9.2. Mandatory-to-Implement Extensions

In the absence of an application profile standard specifying otherwise, a TLS-compliant application MUST implement the following TLS extensions:

- Supported Versions ("supported_versions"; Section 4.2.1)
- Cookie ("cookie"; Section 4.2.2)
- Signature Algorithms ("signature_algorithms"; Section 4.2.3)
- Signature Algorithms Certificate ("signature_algorithms_cert"; Section 4.2.3)
- Negotiated Groups ("supported_groups"; Section 4.2.7)
- Key Share ("key_share"; Section 4.2.8)
- Server Name Indication ("server_name"; Section 3 of [RFC6066])

All implementations MUST send and use these extensions when offering applicable features:

- "supported_versions" is REQUIRED for all ClientHello, ServerHello and HelloRetryRequest messages.
- "signature_algorithms" is REQUIRED for certificate authentication.
- "supported_groups" is REQUIRED for ClientHello messages using DHE or ECDHE key exchange.
- "key_share" is REQUIRED for DHE or ECDHE key exchange.
- "pre_shared_key" is REQUIRED for PSK key agreement.
- "psk_key_exchange_modes" is REQUIRED for PSK key agreement.

A client is considered to be attempting to negotiate using this specification if the ClientHello contains a "supported_versions" extension with 0x0304 contained in its body. Such a ClientHello message MUST meet the following requirements:

- If not containing a "pre_shared_key" extension, it MUST contain both a "signature_algorithms" extension and a "supported_groups" extension.
- If containing a "supported_groups" extension, it MUST also contain a "key_share" extension, and vice versa. An empty KeyShare.client_shares vector is permitted.

Servers receiving a ClientHello which does not conform to these requirements MUST abort the handshake with a "missing_extension" alert.

Additionally, all implementations MUST support use of the "server_name" extension with applications capable of using it. Servers MAY require clients to send a valid "server_name" extension. Servers requiring this extension SHOULD respond to a ClientHello lacking a "server_name" extension by terminating the connection with a "missing_extension" alert.

9.3. Protocol Invariants

This section describes invariants that TLS endpoints and middleboxes MUST follow. It also applies to earlier versions of TLS.

TLS is designed to be securely and compatibly extensible. Newer clients or servers, when communicating with newer peers, should negotiate the most preferred common parameters. The TLS handshake provides downgrade protection: Middleboxes passing traffic between a newer client and newer server without terminating TLS should be unable to influence the handshake (see Appendix E.1). At the same time, deployments update at different rates, so a newer client or server MAY continue to support older parameters, which would allow it to interoperate with older endpoints.

For this to work, implementations MUST correctly handle extensible fields:
A client sending a ClientHello MUST support all parameters advertised in it. Otherwise, the server may fail to interoperate by selecting one of those parameters.

A server receiving a ClientHello MUST correctly ignore all unrecognized cipher suites, extensions, and other parameters. Otherwise, it may fail to interoperate with newer clients. In TLS 1.3, a client receiving a CertificateRequest or NewSessionTicket MUST also ignore all unrecognized extensions.

A middlebox which terminates a TLS connection MUST behave as a compliant TLS server (to the original client), including having a certificate which the client is willing to accept, and as a compliant TLS client (to the original server), including verifying the original server’s certificate. In particular, it MUST generate its own ClientHello containing only parameters it understands, and it MUST generate a fresh ServerHello random value, rather than forwarding the endpoint’s value.

Note that TLS’s protocol requirements and security analysis only apply to the two connections separately. Safely deploying a TLS terminator requires additional security considerations which are beyond the scope of this document.

An middlebox which forwards ClientHello parameters it does not understand MUST NOT process any messages beyond that ClientHello. It MUST forward all subsequent traffic unmodified. Otherwise, it may fail to interoperate with newer clients and servers.

Forwarded ClientHellos may contain advertisements for features not supported by the middlebox, so the response may include future TLS additions the middlebox does not recognize. These additions MAY change any message beyond the ClientHello arbitrarily. In particular, the values sent in the ServerHello might change, the ServerHello format might change, and the TLSCiphertext format might change.

The design of TLS 1.3 was constrained by widely-deployed non-compliant TLS middleboxes (see Appendix D.4), however it does not relax the invariants. Those middleboxes continue to be non-compliant.

10. Security Considerations

Security issues are discussed throughout this memo, especially in Appendix C, Appendix D, and Appendix E.
11. IANA Considerations

This document uses several registries that were originally created in [RFC4346]. IANA [SHALL update/has updated] these to reference this document. The registries and their allocation policies are below:

- TLS Cipher Suite Registry: values with the first byte in the range 0-254 (decimal) are assigned via Specification Required [RFC8126]. Values with the first byte 255 (decimal) are reserved for Private Use [RFC8126].

  IANA [SHALL add/has added] the cipher suites listed in Appendix B.4 to the registry. The "Value" and "Description" columns are taken from the table. The "DTLS-OK" and "Recommended" columns are both marked as "Yes" for each new cipher suite. ([This assumes [I-D.ietf-tls-iana-registry-updates] has been applied.])

- TLS ContentType Registry: Future values are allocated via Standards Action [RFC8126].

- TLS Alert Registry: Future values are allocated via Standards Action [RFC8126]. IANA [SHALL update/has updated] this registry to include values for "missing_extension" and "certificate_required". The "DTLS-OK" column is marked as "Yes" for each new alert.

- TLS HandshakeType Registry: Future values are allocated via Standards Action [RFC8126]. IANA [SHALL update/has updated] this registry to rename item 4 from "NewSessionTicket" to "new_session_ticket" and to add the "hello_retry_request_RESERVED", "encrypted_extensions", "end_of_early_data", "key_update", and "message_hash" values. The "DTLS-OK" are marked as "Yes" for each of these additions.

This document also uses the TLS ExtensionType Registry originally created in [RFC4366]. IANA has updated it to reference this document. Changes to the registry follow:

- IANA [SHALL update/has updated] the registration policy as follows:

  Values with the first byte in the range 0-254 (decimal) are assigned via Specification Required [RFC8126]. Values with the first byte 255 (decimal) are reserved for Private Use [RFC8126].

- IANA [SHALL update/has updated] this registry to include the "key_share", "pre_shared_key", "psk_key_exchange_modes", "psk_key_exchange_modes", and "key_share" values.
"early_data", "cookie", "supported_versions", "certificateAuthorities", "oidFilters", "post_handshake_auth", and "signature_algorithms_cert", extensions with the values defined in this document and the Recommended value of "Yes".

- IANA [SHALL update/has updated] this registry to include a "TLS 1.3" column which lists the messages in which the extension may appear. This column [SHALL be/has been] initially populated from the table in Section 4.2 with any extension not listed there marked as "-" to indicate that it is not used by TLS 1.3.

In addition, this document defines two new registries to be maintained by IANA:

- TLS SignatureScheme Registry: Values with the first byte in the range 0-253 (decimal) are assigned via Specification Required [RFC8126]. Values with the first byte 254 or 255 (decimal) are reserved for Private Use [RFC8126]. Values with the first byte in the range 0-6 or with the second byte in the range 0-3 that are not currently allocated are reserved for backwards compatibility. This registry SHALL have a "Recommended" column. The registry [shall be/ has been] initially populated with the values described in Section 4.2.3. The following values SHALL be marked as "Recommended": ecdsa_secp256r1_sha256, ecdsa_secp384r1_sha384, rsa_pss_rose_sha256, rsa_pss_rose_sha384, rsa_pss_rose_sha512, rsa_pss_pss_sha256, rsa_pss_pss_sha384, rsa_pss_pss_sha512, and ed25519.

- TLS PskKeyExchangeMode Registry: Values in the range 0-253 (decimal) are assigned via Specification Required [RFC8126]. Values with the first byte 254 or 255 (decimal) are reserved for Private Use [RFC8126]. This registry SHALL have a "Recommended" column. The registry [shall be/ has been] initially populated psk_ke (0) and psk_dhe_ke (1). Both SHALL be marked as "Recommended".
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Appendix A. State Machine

This section provides a summary of the legal state transitions for the client and server handshakes. State names (in all capitals, e.g., START) have no formal meaning but are provided for ease of comprehension. Actions which are taken only in certain circumstances are indicated in []. The notation "K_{send,recv} = foo" means "set the send/recv key to the given key".

A.1. Client

Note that with the transitions as shown above, clients may send alerts that derive from post-ServerHello messages in the clear or with the early data keys. If clients need to send such alerts, they SHOULD first rekey to the handshake keys if possible.
A.2. Server

START <------+
Recv ClientHello |         | Send HelloRetryRequest
   v         |     
RECV_D_CH ----+
   | Select parameters
   v
NEGOTIATED
   | Send ServerHello
   | K_send = handshake
   | Send EncryptedExtensions
   | [Send CertificateRequest]
Can send
app data                 
after -->                 | K_send = application
here                     
                        +--------------------------+
                        | 0-RTT                     
                        | K_recv = early data       
                        | [Skip decrypt errors]    
                        | +--------+--------+
                        | No 0-RTT | 0-RTT     
                        | K_recv = handshake  | K_recv = handshake
                        | <--------+          |    +------> WAIT_EOED -+
                        | |                    | Recv early data | Recv EndOfEarlyData
                        | |                    | +--------------------------+
                        | +> WAIT_FLIGHT2 <--------+
                        |
                        +--------------------------+
                        | No auth                   
                        | Client auth
                        | v
                        | WAIT_CERT
                        | Recv empty Certificate   
                        | | Recv Certificate
                        | | v
                        | | WAIT_CV
                        | | Recv CertificateVerify
                        | v
++> WAIT_FINISHED <----+
                        | Recv Finished
                        | K_recv = application
                        v
CONNECTED

Appendix B. Protocol Data Structures and Constant Values

This section provides the normative protocol types and constants definitions. Values listed as _RESERVED were used in previous versions of TLS and are listed here for completeness. TLS 1.3
implementations MUST NOT send them but might receive them from older
TLS implementations.

B.1. Record Layer

    enum {
        invalid(0),
        change_cipher_spec(20),
        alert(21),
        handshake(22),
        application_data(23),
        (255)
    } ContentType;

    struct {
        ContentType type;
        ProtocolVersion legacy_record_version;
        uint16 length;
        opaque fragment[TLSPlaintext.length];
    } TLSPlaintext;

    struct {
        opaque content[TLSPlaintext.length];
        ContentType type;
        uint8 zeros[length_of_padding];
    } TLSInnerPlaintext;

    struct {
        ContentType opaque_type = application_data; /* 23 */
        ProtocolVersion legacy_record_version = 0x0303; /* TLS v1.2 */
        uint16 length;
        opaque encrypted_record[TLSCiphertext.length];
    } TLSCiphertext;

B.2. Alert Messages
enum { warning(1), fatal(2), (255) } AlertLevel;

enum {
  close_notify(0),
  unexpected_message(10),
  bad_record_mac(20),
  decryption_failed_RESERVED(21),
  record_overflow(22),
  decompression_failure_RESERVED(30),
  handshake_failure(40),
  no_certificate_RESERVED(41),
  bad_certificate(42),
  unsupported_certificate(43),
  certificate_revoked(44),
  certificate_expired(45),
  certificate_unknown(46),
  illegal_parameter(47),
  unknown_ca(48),
  access_denied(49),
  decode_error(50),
  decrypt_error(51),
  export_restriction_RESERVED(60),
  protocol_version(70),
  insufficient_security(71),
  internal_error(80),
  inappropriate_fallback(86),
  user_canceled(90),
  no renegotiation_RESERVED(100),
  missing_extension(109),
  unsupported_extension(110),
  certificate_unobtainable_RESERVED(111),
  unrecognized_name(112),
  bad_certificate_status_response(113),
  bad_certificate_hash_value_RESERVED(114),
  unknown_psk_identity(115),
  certificate_required(116),
  no_application_protocol(120),
  (255)
} AlertDescription;

struct {
  AlertLevel level;
  AlertDescription description;
} Alert;
B.3. Handshake Protocol

```c
enum {
    hello_request_RESERVED(0),
    client_hello(1),
    server_hello(2),
    hello_verify_request_RESERVED(3),
    new_session_ticket(4),
    end_of_early_data(5),
    hello_retry_request_RESERVED(6),
    encrypted_extensions(8),
    certificate(11),
    server_key_exchange_RESERVED(12),
    certificate_request(13),
    server_hello_done_RESERVED(14),
    certificate_verify(15),
    client_key_exchange_RESERVED(16),
    finished(20),
    key_update(24),
    message_hash(254),
    (255)
} HandshakeType;
```

```c
struct {
    HandshakeType msg_type;    /* handshake type */
    uint24 length;             /* bytes in message */
    select (Handshake.msg_type) {
        case client_hello:          ClientHello;
        case server_hello:          ServerHello;
        case end_of_early_data:     EndOfEarlyData;
        case encrypted_extensions:  EncryptedExtensions;
        case certificate_request:   CertificateRequest;
        case certificate:           Certificate;
        case certificate_verify:    CertificateVerify;
        case finished:              Finished;
        case new_session_ticket:    NewSessionTicket;
        case key_update:            KeyUpdate;
    }
} Handshake;
```

B.3.1. Key Exchange Messages

```c
uint16 ProtocolVersion;
opaque Random[32];
```

```c
uint8 CipherSuite[2];    /* Cryptographic suite selector */
```

```c
struct {
```
ProtocolVersion legacy_version = 0x0303;    /* TLS v1.2 */
Random random;
opaque legacy_session_id<0..32>;
CipherSuite cipher_suites<2..2^16-2>;
opaque legacy_compression_methods<1..2^8-1>;
Extension extensions<8..2^16-1>;
} ClientHello;

struct {
    ProtocolVersion legacy_version = 0x0303;    /* TLS v1.2 */
    Random random;
    opaque legacy_session_id_echo<0..32>;
    CipherSuite cipher_suite;
    uint8 legacy_compression_method = 0;
    Extension extensions<6..2^16-1>;
} ServerHello;

struct {
    ExtensionType extension_type;
    opaque extension_data<0..2^16-1>;
} Extension;

enum {
    server_name(0),                              /* RFC 6066 */
    max_fragment_length(1),                      /* RFC 6066 */
    status_request(5),                           /* RFC 6066 */
    supported_groups(10),                        /* RFC 4492, 7919 */
    signature_algorithms(13),                    /* [[this document]] */
    use_srtp(14),                                 /* RFC 5764 */
    heartbeat(15),                                /* RFC 6520 */
    application_layer_protocol_negotiation(16),  /* RFC 7301 */
    signed_certificate_timestamp(18),            /* RFC 6962 */
    client_certificate_type(19),                 /* RFC 7250 */
    server_certificate_type(20),                 /* RFC 7250 */
    padding(21),                                  /* RFC 7685 */
    RESERVED(40),                                 /* Used but never assigned */
    pre_shared_key(41),                           /* [[this document]] */
    early_data(42),                               /* [[this document]] */
    supported_versions(43),                      /* [[this document]] */
    cookie(44),                                   /* [[this document]] */
    psk_key_exchange_modes(45),                   /* [[this document]] */
    RESERVED(46),                                 /* Used but never assigned */
    certificateAuthorities(47),                  /* [[this document]] */
    oid_fiльтers(48),                             /* [[this document]] */
    post_handshake_auth(49),                      /* [[this document]] */
    signature_algorithms_cert(50),               /* [[this document]] */
    key_share(51),                                 /* [[this document]] */
    (65535)
}
} ExtensionType;

struct {
    NamedGroup group;
    opaque key_exchange<1..2^16-1>;
} KeyShareEntry;

struct {
    KeyShareEntry client_shares<0..2^16-1>;
} KeyShareClientHello;

struct {
    NamedGroup selected_group;
} KeyShareHelloRetryRequest;

struct {
    KeyShareEntry server_share;
} KeyShareServerHello;

struct {
    uint8 legacy_form = 4;
    opaque X[coordinate_length];
    opaque Y[coordinate_length];
} UncompressedPointRepresentation;

enum { psk_ke(0), psk_dhe_ke(1), (255) } PskKeyExchangeMode;

struct {
    PskKeyExchangeMode ke_modes<1..255>;
} PskKeyExchangeModes;

struct {} Empty;

struct {
    select (Handshake.msg_type) {
        case new_session_ticket:   uint32 max_early_data_size;
        case client_hello:         Empty;
        case encrypted_extensions: Empty;
    }
} EarlyDataIndication;

struct {
    opaque identity<1..2^16-1>;
    uint32 obfuscated_ticket_age;
} PskIdentity;

opaque PskBinderEntry<32..255>;
struct {
    PskIdentity identities<7..2^16-1>;
    PskBinderEntry binders<33..2^16-1>;
} OfferedPsks;

struct {
    select (Handshake.msg_type) {
        case client_hello: OfferedPsks;
        case server_hello: uint16 selected_identity;
    }
} PreSharedKeyExtension;

B.3.1.1.  Version Extension

struct {
    select (Handshake.msg_type) {
        case client_hello:
            ProtocolVersion versions<2..254>;
        case server_hello: /* and HelloRetryRequest */
            ProtocolVersion selected_version;
    }
} SupportedVersions;

B.3.1.2.  Cookie Extension

struct {
    opaque cookie<1..2^16-1>;
} Cookie;

B.3.1.3.  Signature Algorithm Extension
enum {
    /* RSASSA-PKCS1-v1_5 algorithms */
    rsa_pkcs1_sha256(0x0401),
    rsa_pkcs1_sha384(0x0501),
    rsa_pkcs1_sha512(0x0601),

    /* ECDSA algorithms */
    ecdsa_secp256r1_sha256(0x0403),
    ecdsa_secp384r1_sha384(0x0503),
    ecdsa_secp521r1_sha512(0x0603),

    /* RSASSA-PSS algorithms with public key OID rsaEncryption */
    rsa_pss_rsa_e_sha256(0x0804),
    rsa_pss_rsa_e_sha384(0x0805),
    rsa_pss_rsa_e_sha512(0x0806),

    /* EdDSA algorithms */
    ed25519(0x0807),
    ed448(0x0808),

    /* RSASSA-PSS algorithms with public key OID RSASSA-PSS */
    rsa_pss_rsa_e_sha256(0x0809),
    rsa_pss_rsa_e_sha384(0x080a),
    rsa_pss_rsa_e_sha512(0x080b),

    /* Legacy algorithms */
    rsa_pkcs1_sha1(0x0201),
    ecdsa_sha1(0x0203),

    /* Reserved Code Points */
    obsolete_RESERVED(0x0000..0x0200),
    dsa_sha1_RESERVED(0x0202),
    obsolete_RESERVED(0x0204..0x0400),
    dsa_sha256_RESERVED(0x0402),
    obsolete_RESERVED(0x0404..0x0500),
    dsa_sha384_RESERVED(0x0502),
    obsolete_RESERVED(0x0504..0x0600),
    dsa_sha512_RESERVED(0x0602),
    obsolete_RESERVED(0x0604..0x06FF),
    private_use(0xFE00..0xFFFF),
    (0xFFFF)
} SignatureScheme;

struct {
    SignatureScheme supported_signature_algorithms<2..2^16-2>;
} SignatureSchemeList;
B.3.1.4. Supported Groups Extension

```c
enum {
    unallocated_RESERVED(0x0000),

    /* Elliptic Curve Groups (ECDHE) */
    obsolete_RESERVED(0x0001..0x0016),
    secp256r1(0x0017), secp384r1(0x0018), secp521r1(0x0019),
    obsolete_RESERVED(0x001A..0x001C),
    x25519(0x001D), x448(0x001E),

    /* Finite Field Groups (DHE) */
    ffdhe2048(0x0100), ffdhe3072(0x0101), ffdhe4096(0x0102),
    ffdhe6144(0x0103), ffdhe8192(0x0104),

    /* Reserved Code Points */
    ffdhe_private_use(0x01FC..0x01FF),
    ecdhe_private_use(0xFE00..0xFEFF),
    obsolete_RESERVED(0xFF01..0xFF02),
    (0xFFFF)
} NamedGroup;
```

```c
struct {
    NamedGroup named_group_list<2..2^16-1>;
} NamedGroupList;
```

Values within "obsolete_RESERVED" ranges are used in previous versions of TLS and MUST NOT be offered or negotiated by TLS 1.3 implementations. The obsolete curves have various known/theoretical weaknesses or have had very little usage, in some cases only due to unintentional server configuration issues. They are no longer considered appropriate for general use and should be assumed to be potentially unsafe. The set of curves specified here is sufficient for interoperability with all currently deployed and properly configured TLS implementations.

B.3.2. Server Parameters Messages
opaque DistinguishedName<1..2^16-1>;

struct {
    DistinguishedName authorities<3..2^16-1>
} CertificateAuthoritiesExtension;

struct {
    opaque certificate_extension_oid<1..2^8-1>
    opaque certificate_extension_values<0..2^16-1>
} OIDFilter;

struct {
    OIDFilter filters<0..2^16-1>
} OIDFilterExtension;

struct {} PostHandshakeAuth;

struct {
    Extension extensions<0..2^16-1>
} EncryptedExtensions;

struct {
    opaque certificate_request_context<0..2^8-1>
    Extension extensions<2..2^16-1>
} CertificateRequest;

B.3.3. Authentication Messages
/* Managed by IANA */
enum {
    X509(0),
    OpenPGP_RESERVED(1),
    RawPublicKey(2),
    (255)
} CertificateType;

struct {
    select (certificate_type) {
        case RawPublicKey:
            /* From RFC 7250 ASN.1_subjectPublicKeyInfo */
            opaque ASN1_subjectPublicKeyInfo<1..2^24-1>;
        case X509:
            opaque cert_data<1..2^24-1>;
    }
    Extension extensions<0..2^16-1>;
} CertificateEntry;

struct {
    opaque certificate_request_context<0..2^8-1>;
    CertificateEntry certificate_list<0..2^24-1>;
} Certificate;

struct {
    SignatureScheme algorithm;
    opaque signature<0..2^16-1>;
} CertificateVerify;

struct {
    opaque verify_data[Hash.length];
} Finished;

B.3.4. Ticket Establishment

struct {
    uint32 ticket_lifetime;
    uint32 ticket_age_add;
    opaque ticket_nonce<0..255>;
    opaque ticket<1..2^16-1>;
    Extension extensions<0..2^16-2>;
} NewSessionTicket;
B.3.5. Updating Keys

```c
struct {} EndOfEarlyData;
enum {
    update_not_requested(0), update_requested(1), (255)
} KeyUpdateRequest;
struct {
    KeyUpdateRequest request_update;
} KeyUpdate;
```

B.4. Cipher Suites

A symmetric cipher suite defines the pair of the AEAD algorithm and hash algorithm to be used with HKDF. Cipher suite names follow the naming convention:

```
CipherSuite TLS_AEAD_HASH = VALUE;
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLS</td>
<td>The string &quot;TLS&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEAD</td>
<td>The AEAD algorithm used for record protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HASH</td>
<td>The hash algorithm used with HKDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE</td>
<td>The two byte ID assigned for this cipher suite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This specification defines the following cipher suites for use with TLS 1.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLS_AES_128_GCM_SHA256</td>
<td>{0x13,0x01}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLS_AES_256_GCM_SHA384</td>
<td>{0x13,0x02}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLS_CHACHA20_POLY1305_SHA256</td>
<td>{0x13,0x03}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLS_AES_128_CCM_SHA256</td>
<td>{0x13,0x04}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLS_AES_128_CCM_8_SHA256</td>
<td>{0x13,0x05}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The corresponding AEAD algorithms AEAD_AES_128_GCM, AEAD_AES_256_GCM, and AEAD_AES_128_CCM are defined in [RFC5116]. AEAD_CHACHA20_POLY1305 is defined in [RFC7539]. AEAD_AES_128_CCM_8 is defined in [RFC6655]. The corresponding hash algorithms are defined in [SHS].

Although TLS 1.3 uses the same cipher suite space as previous versions of TLS, TLS 1.3 cipher suites are defined differently, only specifying the symmetric ciphers, and cannot be used for TLS 1.2. Similarly, TLS 1.2 and lower cipher suites cannot be used with TLS 1.3.

New cipher suite values are assigned by IANA as described in Section 11.

Appendix C. Implementation Notes

The TLS protocol cannot prevent many common security mistakes. This section provides several recommendations to assist implementors. [I-D.ietf-tls-tls13-vectors] provides test vectors for TLS 1.3 handshakes.

C.1. Random Number Generation and Seeding

TLS requires a cryptographically secure pseudorandom number generator (CSPRNG). In most cases, the operating system provides an appropriate facility such as /dev/urandom, which should be used absent other (performance) concerns. It is RECOMMENDED to use an existing CSPRNG implementation in preference to crafting a new one. Many adequate cryptographic libraries are already available under favorable license terms. Should those prove unsatisfactory, [RFC4086] provides guidance on the generation of random values.

TLS uses random values both in public protocol fields such as the public Random values in the ClientHello and ServerHello and to generate keying material. With a properly functioning CSPRNG, this does not present a security problem as it is not feasible to determine the CSPRNG state from its output. However, with a broken CSPRNG, it may be possible for an attacker to use the public output to determine the CSPRNG internal state and thereby predict the keying material, as documented in [CHECKOWAY]. Implementations can provide extra security against this form of attack by using separate CSPRNGs to generate public and private values.
C.2. Certificates and Authentication

Implementations are responsible for verifying the integrity of certificates and should generally support certificate revocation messages. Absent a specific indication from an application profile, Certificates should always be verified to ensure proper signing by a trusted Certificate Authority (CA). The selection and addition of trust anchors should be done very carefully. Users should be able to view information about the certificate and trust anchor. Applications SHOULD also enforce minimum and maximum key sizes. For example, certification paths containing keys or signatures weaker than 2048-bit RSA or 224-bit ECDSA are not appropriate for secure applications.

C.3. Implementation Pitfalls

Implementation experience has shown that certain parts of earlier TLS specifications are not easy to understand and have been a source of interoperability and security problems. Many of these areas have been clarified in this document but this appendix contains a short list of the most important things that require special attention from implementors.

TLS protocol issues:

- Do you correctly handle handshake messages that are fragmented to multiple TLS records (see Section 5.1)? Including corner cases like a ClientHello that is split to several small fragments? Do you fragment handshake messages that exceed the maximum fragment size? In particular, the Certificate and CertificateRequest handshake messages can be large enough to require fragmentation.

- Do you ignore the TLS record layer version number in all unencrypted TLS records? (see Appendix D)

- Have you ensured that all support for SSL, RC4, EXPORT ciphers, and MD5 (via the "signature_algorithms" extension) is completely removed from all possible configurations that support TLS 1.3 or later, and that attempts to use these obsolete capabilities fail correctly? (see Appendix D)

- Do you handle TLS extensions in ClientHello correctly, including unknown extensions?

- When the server has requested a client certificate, but no suitable certificate is available, do you correctly send an empty Certificate message, instead of omitting the whole message (see Section 4.4.2.3)?
- When processing the plaintext fragment produced by AEAD-Decrypt and scanning from the end for the ContentType, do you avoid scanning past the start of the cleartext in the event that the peer has sent a malformed plaintext of all-zeros?

- Do you properly ignore unrecognized cipher suites (Section 4.1.2), hello extensions (Section 4.2), named groups (Section 4.2.7), key shares (Section 4.2.8), supported versions (Section 4.2.1), and signature algorithms (Section 4.2.3) in the ClientHello?

- As a server, do you send a HelloRetryRequest to clients which support a compatible (EC)DHE group but do not predict it in the "key_share" extension? As a client, do you correctly handle a HelloRetryRequest from the server?

Cryptographic details:

- What countermeasures do you use to prevent timing attacks [TIMING]?

- When using Diffie-Hellman key exchange, do you correctly preserve leading zero bytes in the negotiated key (see Section 7.4.1)?

- Does your TLS client check that the Diffie-Hellman parameters sent by the server are acceptable, (see Section 4.2.8.1)?

- Do you use a strong and, most importantly, properly seeded random number generator (see Appendix C.1) when generating Diffie-Hellman private values, the ECDSA "k" parameter, and other security-critical values? It is RECOMMENDED that implementations implement "deterministic ECDSA" as specified in [RFC6979].

- Do you zero-pad Diffie-Hellman public key values to the group size (see Section 4.2.8.1)?

- Do you verify signatures after making them to protect against RSA-CRT key leaks? [FW15]

C.4. Client Tracking Prevention

Clients SHOULD NOT reuse a ticket for multiple connections. Reuse of a ticket allows passive observers to correlate different connections. Servers that issue tickets SHOULD offer at least as many tickets as the number of connections that a client might use; for example, a web browser using HTTP/1.1 [RFC7230] might open six connections to a server. Servers SHOULD issue new tickets with every connection. This ensures that clients are always able to use a new ticket when creating a new connection.
C.5. Unauthenticated Operation

Previous versions of TLS offered explicitly unauthenticated cipher suites based on anonymous Diffie-Hellman. These modes have been deprecated in TLS 1.3. However, it is still possible to negotiate parameters that do not provide verifiable server authentication by several methods, including:

- Raw public keys [RFC7250].
- Using a public key contained in a certificate but without validation of the certificate chain or any of its contents.

Either technique used alone is vulnerable to man-in-the-middle attacks and therefore unsafe for general use. However, it is also possible to bind such connections to an external authentication mechanism via out-of-band validation of the server’s public key, trust on first use, or a mechanism such as channel bindings (though the channel bindings described in [RFC5929] are not defined for TLS 1.3). If no such mechanism is used, then the connection has no protection against active man-in-the-middle attack; applications MUST NOT use TLS in such a way absent explicit configuration or a specific application profile.

Appendix D. Backward Compatibility

The TLS protocol provides a built-in mechanism for version negotiation between endpoints potentially supporting different versions of TLS.

TLS 1.x and SSL 3.0 use compatible ClientHello messages. Servers can also handle clients trying to use future versions of TLS as long as the ClientHello format remains compatible and there is at least one protocol version supported by both the client and the server.

Prior versions of TLS used the record layer version number (TLSPlaintext.legacy_record_version and TLSCiphertext.legacy_record_version) for various purposes. As of TLS 1.3, this field is deprecated. The value of TLSPlaintext.legacy_record_version MUST be ignored by all implementations. The value of TLSCiphertext.legacy_record_version is included in the additional data for deprotection but MAY otherwise be ignored or MAY be validated to match the fixed constant value. Version negotiation is performed using only the handshake versions (ClientHello.legacy_version, ServerHello.legacy_version, as well as the ClientHello, HelloRetryRequest and ServerHello "supported_versions" extensions). In order to maximize interoperability with older endpoints, implementations that negotiate
the use of TLS 1.0-1.2 SHOULD set the record layer version number to the negotiated version for the ServerHello and all records thereafter.

For maximum compatibility with previously non-standard behavior and misconfigured deployments, all implementations SHOULD support validation of certification paths based on the expectations in this document, even when handling prior TLS versions’ handshakes. (see Section 4.4.2.2)

TLS 1.2 and prior supported an "Extended Master Secret" [RFC7627] extension which digested large parts of the handshake transcript into the master secret. Because TLS 1.3 always hashes in the transcript up to the server CertificateVerify, implementations which support both TLS 1.3 and earlier versions SHOULD indicate the use of the Extended Master Secret extension in their APIs whenever TLS 1.3 is used.

D.1. Negotiating with an older server

A TLS 1.3 client who wishes to negotiate with servers that do not support TLS 1.3 will send a normal TLS 1.3 ClientHello containing 0x0303 (TLS 1.2) in ClientHello.legacy_version but with the correct version(s) in the "supported_versions" extension. If the server does not support TLS 1.3 it will respond with a ServerHello containing an older version number. If the client agrees to use this version, the negotiation will proceed as appropriate for the negotiated protocol. A client using a ticket for resumption SHOULD initiate the connection using the version that was previously negotiated.

Note that 0-RTT data is not compatible with older servers and SHOULD NOT be sent absent knowledge that the server supports TLS 1.3. See Appendix D.3.

If the version chosen by the server is not supported by the client (or not acceptable), the client MUST abort the handshake with a "protocol_version" alert.

Some legacy server implementations are known to not implement the TLS specification properly and might abort connections upon encountering TLS extensions or versions which they are not aware of. Interoperability with buggy servers is a complex topic beyond the scope of this document. Multiple connection attempts may be required in order to negotiate a backwards compatible connection; however, this practice is vulnerable to downgrade attacks and is NOT RECOMMENDED.
D.2. Negotiating with an older client

A TLS server can also receive a ClientHello indicating a version number smaller than its highest supported version. If the "supported_versions" extension is present, the server MUST negotiate using that extension as described in Section 4.2.1. If the "supported_versions" extension is not present, the server MUST negotiate the minimum of ClientHello.legacy_version and TLS 1.2. For example, if the server supports TLS 1.0, 1.1, and 1.2, and legacy_version is TLS 1.0, the server will proceed with a TLS 1.0 ServerHello. If the "supported_versions" extension is absent and the server only supports versions greater than ClientHello.legacy_version, the server MUST abort the handshake with a "protocol_version" alert.

Note that earlier versions of TLS did not clearly specify the record layer version number value in all cases (TLSPlaintext.legacy_record_version). Servers will receive various TLS 1.x versions in this field, but its value MUST always be ignored.

D.3. 0-RTT backwards compatibility

0-RTT data is not compatible with older servers. An older server will respond to the ClientHello with an older ServerHello, but it will not correctly skip the 0-RTT data and will fail to complete the handshake. This can cause issues when a client attempts to use 0-RTT, particularly against multi-server deployments. For example, a deployment could deploy TLS 1.3 gradually with some servers implementing TLS 1.3 and some implementing TLS 1.2, or a TLS 1.3 deployment could be downgraded to TLS 1.2.

A client that attempts to send 0-RTT data MUST fail a connection if it receives a ServerHello with TLS 1.2 or older. A client that attempts to repair this error SHOULD NOT send a TLS 1.2 ClientHello, but instead send a TLS 1.3 ClientHello without 0-RTT data.

To avoid this error condition, multi-server deployments SHOULD ensure a uniform and stable deployment of TLS 1.3 without 0-RTT prior to enabling 0-RTT.

D.4. Middlebox Compatibility Mode

Field measurements [Ben17a], [Ben17b], [Res17a], [Res17b] have found that a significant number of middleboxes misbehave when a TLS client/server pair negotiates TLS 1.3. Implementations can increase the chance of making connections through those middleboxes by making the TLS 1.3 handshake look more like a TLS 1.2 handshake:
- The client always provides a non-empty session ID in the ClientHello, as described in the legacy_session_id section of Section 4.1.2.

- If not offering early data, the client sends a dummy change_cipher_spec record (see the third paragraph of Section 5.1) immediately before its second flight. This may either be before its second ClientHello or before its encrypted handshake flight. If offering early data, the record is placed immediately after the first ClientHello.

- The server sends a dummy change_cipher_spec record immediately after its first handshake message. This may either be after a ServerHello or a HelloRetryRequest.

When put together, these changes make the TLS 1.3 handshake resemble TLS 1.2 session resumption, which improves the chance of successfully connecting through middleboxes. This "compatibility mode" is partially negotiated: The client can opt to provide a session ID or not and the server has to echo it. Either side can send change_cipher_spec at any time during the handshake, as they must be ignored by the peer, but if the client sends a non-empty session ID, the server MUST send the change_cipher_spec as described in this section.

D.5. Backwards Compatibility Security Restrictions

Implementations negotiating use of older versions of TLS SHOULD prefer forward secret and AEAD cipher suites, when available.

The security of RC4 cipher suites is considered insufficient for the reasons cited in [RFC7465]. Implementations MUST NOT offer or negotiate RC4 cipher suites for any version of TLS for any reason.

Old versions of TLS permitted the use of very low strength ciphers. Ciphers with a strength less than 112 bits MUST NOT be offered or negotiated for any version of TLS for any reason.

The security of SSL 3.0 [SSL3] is considered insufficient for the reasons enumerated in [RFC7568], and it MUST NOT be negotiated for any reason.

The security of SSL 2.0 [SSL2] is considered insufficient for the reasons enumerated in [RFC6176], and it MUST NOT be negotiated for any reason.

Implementations MUST NOT send an SSL version 2.0 compatible CLIENT-HELLO. Implementations MUST NOT negotiate TLS 1.3 or later using an
SSL version 2.0 compatible CLIENT-HELLO. Implementations are NOT RECOMMENDED to accept an SSL version 2.0 compatible CLIENT-HELLO in order to negotiate older versions of TLS.

Implementations MUST NOT send a ClientHello.legacy_version or ServerHello.legacy_version set to 0x0300 or less. Any endpoint receiving a Hello message with ClientHello.legacy_version or ServerHello.legacy_version set to 0x0300 MUST abort the handshake with a "protocol_version" alert.

Implementations MUST NOT send any records with a version less than 0x0300. Implementations SHOULD NOT accept any records with a version less than 0x0300 (but may inadvertently do so if the record version number is ignored completely).

Implementations MUST NOT use the Truncated HMAC extension, defined in Section 7 of [RFC6066], as it is not applicable to AEAD algorithms and has been shown to be insecure in some scenarios.

Appendix E. Overview of Security Properties

A complete security analysis of TLS is outside the scope of this document. In this section, we provide an informal description the desired properties as well as references to more detailed work in the research literature which provides more formal definitions.

We cover properties of the handshake separately from those of the record layer.

E.1. Handshake

The TLS handshake is an Authenticated Key Exchange (AKE) protocol which is intended to provide both one-way authenticated (server-only) and mutually authenticated (client and server) functionality. At the completion of the handshake, each side outputs its view of the following values:

- A set of "session keys" (the various secrets derived from the master secret) from which can be derived a set of working keys.
- A set of cryptographic parameters (algorithms, etc.)
- The identities of the communicating parties.

We assume the attacker to be an active network attacker, which means it has complete control over the network used to communicate between the parties [RFC3552]. Even under these conditions, the handshake should provide the properties listed below. Note that these
properties are not necessarily independent, but reflect the protocol consumers’ needs.

Establishing the same session keys. The handshake needs to output the same set of session keys on both sides of the handshake, provided that it completes successfully on each endpoint (See [CK01]; defn 1, part 1).

Secrecy of the session keys. The shared session keys should be known only to the communicating parties and not to the attacker (See [CK01]; defn 1, part 2). Note that in a unilaterally authenticated connection, the attacker can establish its own session keys with the server, but those session keys are distinct from those established by the client.

Peer Authentication. The client’s view of the peer identity should reflect the server’s identity. If the client is authenticated, the server’s view of the peer identity should match the client’s identity.

Uniqueness of the session keys: Any two distinct handshakes should produce distinct, unrelated session keys. Individual session keys produced by a handshake should also be distinct and independent.

Downgrade protection. The cryptographic parameters should be the same on both sides and should be the same as if the peers had been communicating in the absence of an attack (See [BBFKZG16]; defns 8 and 9).

Forward secret with respect to long-term keys If the long-term keying material (in this case the signature keys in certificate-based authentication modes or the external/resumption PSK in PSK with (EC)DHE modes) is compromised after the handshake is complete, this does not compromise the security of the session key (See [DOW92]), as long as the session key itself has been erased. The forward secrecy property is not satisfied when PSK is used in the "psk_ke" PskKeyExchangeMode.

Key Compromise Impersonation (KCI) resistance In a mutually-authenticated connection with certificates, compromising the long-term secret of one actor should not break that actor’s authentication of their peer in the given connection (see [HGFS15]). For example, if a client’s signature key is compromised, it should not be possible to impersonate arbitrary servers to that client in subsequent handshakes.

Protection of endpoint identities. The server’s identity (certificate) should be protected against passive attackers. The
client’s identity should be protected against both passive and active attackers.

Informally, the signature-based modes of TLS 1.3 provide for the establishment of a unique, secret, shared key established by an (EC)DHE key exchange and authenticated by the server’s signature over the handshake transcript, as well as tied to the server’s identity by a MAC. If the client is authenticated by a certificate, it also signs over the handshake transcript and provides a MAC tied to both identities. [SIGMA] describes the design and analysis of this type of key exchange protocol. If fresh (EC)DHE keys are used for each connection, then the output keys are forward secret.

The external PSK and resumption PSK bootstrap from a long-term shared secret into a unique per-connection set of short-term session keys. This secret may have been established in a previous handshake. If PSK with (EC)DHE key establishment is used, these session keys will also be forward secret. The resumption PSK has been designed so that the resumption master secret computed by connection N and needed to form connection N+1 is separate from the traffic keys used by connection N, thus providing forward secrecy between the connections. In addition, if multiple tickets are established on the same connection, they are associated with different keys, so compromise of the PSK associated with one ticket does not lead to the compromise of connections established with PSKs associated with other tickets. This property is most interesting if tickets are stored in a database (and so can be deleted) rather than if they are self-encrypted.

The PSK binder value forms a binding between a PSK and the current handshake, as well as between the session where the PSK was established and the current session. This binding transitively includes the original handshake transcript, because that transcript is digested into the values which produce the Resumption Master Secret. This requires that both the KDF used to produce the resumption master secret and the MAC used to compute the binder be collision resistant. See Appendix E.1.1 for more on this. Note: The binder does not cover the binder values from other PSKs, though they are included in the Finished MAC.

Note: TLS does not currently permit the server to send a certificate_request message in non-certificate-based handshakes (e.g., PSK). If this restriction were to be relaxed in future, the client’s signature would not cover the server’s certificate directly. However, if the PSK was established through a NewSessionTicket, the client’s signature would transitively cover the server’s certificate through the PSK binder. [PSK-FINISHED] describes a concrete attack on constructions that do not bind to the server’s certificate (see also [Kraw16]). It is unsafe to use certificate-based client
authentication when the client might potentially share the same PSK/key-id pair with two different endpoints. Implementations MUST NOT combine external PSKs with certificate-based authentication of either the client or the server unless negotiated by some extension.

If an exporter is used, then it produces values which are unique and secret (because they are generated from a unique session key). Exporters computed with different labels and contexts are computationally independent, so it is not feasible to compute one from another or the session secret from the exported value. Note: exporters can produce arbitrary-length values. If exporters are to be used as channel bindings, the exported value MUST be large enough to provide collision resistance. The exporters provided in TLS 1.3 are derived from the same handshake contexts as the early traffic keys and the application traffic keys respectively, and thus have similar security properties. Note that they do not include the client’s certificate; future applications which wish to bind to the client’s certificate may need to define a new exporter that includes the full handshake transcript.

For all handshake modes, the Finished MAC (and where present, the signature), prevents downgrade attacks. In addition, the use of certain bytes in the random nonces as described in Section 4.1.3 allows the detection of downgrade to previous TLS versions. See [BBFKZG16] for more detail on TLS 1.3 and downgrade.

As soon as the client and the server have exchanged enough information to establish shared keys, the remainder of the handshake is encrypted, thus providing protection against passive attackers, even if the computed shared key is not authenticated. Because the server authenticates before the client, the client can ensure that if it authenticates to the server, it only reveals its identity to an authenticated server. Note that implementations must use the provided record padding mechanism during the handshake to avoid leaking information about the identities due to length. The client’s proposed PSK identities are not encrypted, nor is the one that the server selects.

E.1.1. Key Derivation and HKDF

Key derivation in TLS 1.3 uses the HKDF function defined in [RFC5869] and its two components, HKDF-Extract and HKDF-Expand. The full rationale for the HKDF construction can be found in [Kraw10] and the rationale for the way it is used in TLS 1.3 in [KW16]. Throughout this document, each application of HKDF-Extract is followed by one or more invocations of HKDF-Expand. This ordering should always be followed (including in future revisions of this document), in particular, one SHOULD NOT use an output of HKDF-Extract as an input.
to another application of HKDF-Extract without an HKDF-Expand in between. Consecutive applications of HKDF-Expand are allowed as long as these are differentiated via the key and/or the labels.

Note that HKDF-Expand implements a pseudorandom function (PRF) with both inputs and outputs of variable length. In some of the uses of HKDF in this document (e.g., for generating exporters and the resumption_master_secret), it is necessary that the application of HKDF-Expand be collision-resistant, namely, it should be infeasible to find two different inputs to HKDF-Expand that output the same value. This requires the underlying hash function to be collision resistant and the output length from HKDF-Expand to be of size at least 256 bits (or as much as needed for the hash function to prevent finding collisions).

E.1.2. Client Authentication

A client that has sent authentication data to a server, either during the handshake or in post-handshake authentication, cannot be sure if the server afterwards considers the client to be authenticated or not. If the client needs to determine if the server considers the connection to be unilaterally or mutually authenticated, this has to be provisioned by the application layer. See [CHHSV17] for details. In addition, the analysis of post-handshake authentication from [Kraw16] shows that the client identified by the certificate sent in the post-handshake phase possesses the traffic key. This party is therefore the client that participated in the original handshake or one to whom the original client delegated the traffic key (assuming that the traffic key has not been compromised).

E.1.3. 0-RTT

The 0-RTT mode of operation generally provides similar security properties as 1-RTT data, with the two exceptions that the 0-RTT encryption keys do not provide full forward secrecy and that the server is not able to guarantee uniqueness of the handshake (non-replayability) without keeping potentially undue amounts of state. See Section 8 for mechanisms to limit the exposure to replay.

E.1.4. Exporter Independence

The exporter_master_secret and early_exporter_master_secret are derived to be independent of the traffic keys and therefore do not represent a threat to the security of traffic encrypted with those keys. However, because these secrets can be used to compute any exporter value, they SHOULD be erased as soon as possible. If the total set of exporter labels is known, then implementations SHOULD pre-compute the inner Derive-Secret stage of the exporter computation.
for all those labels, then erase the [early_]exporter_master_secret, followed by each inner values as soon as it is known that it will not be needed again.

E.1.5. Post-Compromise Security

TLS does not provide security for handshakes which take place after the peer’s long-term secret (signature key or external PSK) is compromised. It therefore does not provide post-compromise security [CCG16], sometimes also referred to as backwards or future secrecy. This is in contrast to KCI resistance, which describes the security guarantees that a party has after its own long-term secret has been compromised.

E.1.6. External References

The reader should refer to the following references for analysis of the TLS handshake: [DFGS15] [CHSV16] [DFGS16] [KW16] [Kraw16] [FGSW16] [LXZFH16] [FG17] [BBK17].

E.2. Record Layer

The record layer depends on the handshake producing strong traffic secrets which can be used to derive bidirectional encryption keys and nonces. Assuming that is true, and the keys are used for no more data than indicated in Section 5.5 then the record layer should provide the following guarantees:

Confidentiality. An attacker should not be able to determine the plaintext contents of a given record.

Integrity. An attacker should not be able to craft a new record which is different from an existing record which will be accepted by the receiver.

Order protection/non-replayability An attacker should not be able to cause the receiver to accept a record which it has already accepted or cause the receiver to accept record N+1 without having first processed record N.

Length concealment. Given a record with a given external length, the attacker should not be able to determine the amount of the record that is content versus padding.

Forward secrecy after key change. If the traffic key update mechanism described in Section 4.6.3 has been used and the previous generation key is deleted, an attacker who compromises
the endpoint should not be able to decrypt traffic encrypted with the old key.

Informally, TLS 1.3 provides these properties by AEAD-protecting the plaintext with a strong key. AEAD encryption [RFC5116] provides confidentiality and integrity for the data. Non-replayability is provided by using a separate nonce for each record, with the nonce being derived from the record sequence number (Section 5.3), with the sequence number being maintained independently at both sides thus records which are delivered out of order result in AEAD deprotection failures. In order to prevent mass cryptanalysis when the same plaintext is repeatedly encrypted by different users under the same key (as is commonly the case for HTTP), the nonce is formed by mixing the sequence number with a secret per-connection initialization vector derived along with the traffic keys. See [BT16] for analysis of this construction.

The re-keying technique in TLS 1.3 (see Section 7.2) follows the construction of the serial generator in [REKEY], which shows that re-keying can allow keys to be used for a larger number of encryptions than without re-keying. This relies on the security of the HKDF-Expand-Label function as a pseudorandom function (PRF). In addition, as long as this function is truly one way, it is not possible to compute traffic keys from prior to a key change (forward secrecy).

TLS does not provide security for data which is communicated on a connection after a traffic secret of that connection is compromised. That is, TLS does not provide post-compromise security/future secrecy/backward secrecy with respect to the traffic secret. Indeed, an attacker who learns a traffic secret can compute all future traffic secrets on that connection. Systems which want such guarantees need to do a fresh handshake and establish a new connection with an (EC)DHE exchange.

E.2.1. External References

The reader should refer to the following references for analysis of the TLS record layer: [BMMT15] [BT16] [BDFKPPRSZZ16] [BBK17] [Anon18].

E.3. Traffic Analysis

TLS is susceptible to a variety of traffic analysis attacks based on observing the length and timing of encrypted packets [CLINIC] [HCG16]. This is particularly easy when there is a small set of possible messages to be distinguished, such as for a video server hosting a fixed corpus of content, but still provides usable information even in more complicated scenarios.
TLS does not provide any specific defenses against this form of attack but does include a padding mechanism for use by applications: The plaintext protected by the AEAD function consists of content plus variable-length padding, which allows the application to produce arbitrary length encrypted records as well as padding-only cover traffic to conceal the difference between periods of transmission and periods of silence. Because the padding is encrypted alongside the actual content, an attacker cannot directly determine the length of the padding, but may be able to measure it indirectly by the use of timing channels exposed during record processing (i.e., seeing how long it takes to process a record or trickling in records to see which ones elicit a response from the server). In general, it is not known how to remove all of these channels because even a constant time padding removal function will likely feed the content into data-dependent functions. At minimum, a fully constant time server or client would require close cooperation with the application layer protocol implementation, including making that higher level protocol constant time.

Note: Robust traffic analysis defences will likely lead to inferior performance due to delay in transmitting packets and increased traffic volume.

E.4. Side Channel Attacks

In general, TLS does not have specific defenses against side-channel attacks (i.e., those which attack the communications via secondary channels such as timing) leaving those to the implementation of the relevant cryptographic primitives. However, certain features of TLS are designed to make it easier to write side-channel resistant code:

- Unlike previous versions of TLS which used a composite MAC-then-encrypt structure, TLS 1.3 only uses AEAD algorithms, allowing implementations to use self-contained constant-time implementations of those primitives.
- TLS uses a uniform "bad_record_mac" alert for all decryption errors, which is intended to prevent an attacker from gaining piecewise insight into portions of the message. Additional resistance is provided by terminating the connection on such errors; a new connection will have different cryptographic material, preventing attacks against the cryptographic primitives that require multiple trials.

Information leakage through side channels can occur at layers above TLS, in application protocols and the applications that use them. Resistance to side-channel attacks depends on applications and...
application protocols separately ensuring that confidential information is not inadvertently leaked.

E.5. Replay Attacks on 0-RTT

Replayable 0-RTT data presents a number of security threats to TLS-using applications, unless those applications are specifically engineered to be safe under replay (minimally, this means idempotent, but in many cases may also require other stronger conditions, such as constant-time response). Potential attacks include:

- Duplication of actions which cause side effects (e.g., purchasing an item or transferring money) to be duplicated, thus harming the site or the user.

- Attackers can store and replay 0-RTT messages in order to re-order them with respect to other messages (e.g., moving a delete to after a create).

- Exploiting cache timing behavior to discover the content of 0-RTT messages by replaying a 0-RTT message to a different cache node and then using a separate connection to measure request latency, to see if the two requests address the same resource.

If data can be replayed a large number of times, additional attacks become possible, such as making repeated measurements of the speed of cryptographic operations. In addition, they may be able to overload rate-limiting systems. For further description of these attacks, see [Mac17].

Ultimately, servers have the responsibility to protect themselves against attacks employing 0-RTT data replication. The mechanisms described in Section 8 are intended to prevent replay at the TLS layer but do not provide complete protection against receiving multiple copies of client data. TLS 1.3 falls back to the 1-RTT handshake when the server does not have any information about the client, e.g., because it is in a different cluster which does not share state or because the ticket has been deleted as described in Section 8.1. If the application layer protocol retransmits data in this setting, then it is possible for an attacker to induce message duplication by sending the ClientHello to both the original cluster (which processes the data immediately) and another cluster which will fall back to 1-RTT and process the data upon application layer replay. The scale of this attack is limited by the client’s willingness to retry transactions and therefore only allows a limited amount of duplication, with each copy appearing as a new connection at the server.
If implemented correctly, the mechanisms described in Section 8.1 and Section 8.2 prevent a replayed ClientHello and its associated 0-RTT data from being accepted multiple times by any cluster with consistent state; for servers which limit the use of 0-RTT to one cluster for a single ticket, then a given ClientHello and its associated 0-RTT data will only be accepted once. However, if state is not completely consistent, then an attacker might be able to have multiple copies of the data be accepted during the replication window. Because clients do not know the exact details of server behavior, they MUST NOT send messages in early data which are not safe to have replayed and which they would not be willing to retry across multiple 1-RTT connections.

Application protocols MUST NOT use 0-RTT data without a profile that defines its use. That profile needs to identify which messages or interactions are safe to use with 0-RTT and how to handle the situation when the server rejects 0-RTT and falls back to 1-RTT.

In addition, to avoid accidental misuse, TLS implementations MUST NOT enable 0-RTT (either sending or accepting) unless specifically requested by the application and MUST NOT automatically resend 0-RTT data if it is rejected by the server unless instructed by the application. Server-side applications may wish to implement special processing for 0-RTT data for some kinds of application traffic (e.g., abort the connection, request that data be resent at the application layer, or delay processing until the handshake completes). In order to allow applications to implement this kind of processing, TLS implementations MUST provide a way for the application to determine if the handshake has completed.

E.5.1. Replay and Exporters

Replays of the ClientHello produce the same early exporter, thus requiring additional care by applications which use these exporters. In particular, if these exporters are used as an authentication channel binding (e.g., by signing the output of the exporter) an attacker who compromises the PSK can transplant authenticators between connections without compromising the authentication key.

In addition, the early exporter SHOULD NOT be used to generate server-to-client encryption keys because that would entail the reuse of those keys. This parallels the use of the early application traffic keys only in the client-to-server direction.
E.6. PSK Identity Exposure

Because implementations respond to an invalid PSK binder by aborting the handshake, it may be possible for an attacker to verify whether a given PSK identity is valid. Specifically, if a server accepts both external PSK and certificate-based handshakes, a valid PSK identity will result in a failed handshake, whereas an invalid identity will just be skipped and result in a successful certificate handshake. Servers which solely support PSK handshakes may be able to resist this form of attack by treating the cases where there is no valid PSK identity and where there is an identity but it has an invalid binder identically.

E.7. Attacks on Static RSA

Although TLS 1.3 does not use RSA key transport and so is not directly susceptible to Bleichenbacher-type attacks, if TLS 1.3 servers also support static RSA in the context of previous versions of TLS, then it may be possible to impersonate the server for TLS 1.3 connections [JSS15]. TLS 1.3 implementations can prevent this attack by disabling support for static RSA across all versions of TLS. In principle, implementations might also be able to separate certificates with different keyUsage bits for static RSA decryption and RSA signature, but this technique relies on clients refusing to accept signatures using keys in certificates that do not have the digitalSignature bit set, and many clients do not enforce this restriction.

Appendix F. Working Group Information

The discussion list for the IETF TLS working group is located at the e-mail address tls@ietf.org [1]. Information on the group and information on how to subscribe to the list is at https://www.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/tls

Archives of the list can be found at: https://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/tls/current/index.html

Appendix G. Contributors

- Martin Abadi  
  University of California, Santa Cruz  
  abadi@cs.ucsc.edu

- Christopher Allen (co-editor of TLS 1.0)  
  Alacrity Ventures  
  ChristopherA@AlacrityManagement.com
- Richard Barnes
  Cisco
  rlb@ipv.sx

- Steven M. Bellovin
  Columbia University
  smb@cs.columbia.edu

- David Benjamin
  Google
  davidben@google.com

- Benjamin Beurdouche
  INRIA & Microsoft Research
  benjamin.beurdouche@ens.fr

- Karthikeyan Bhargavan (co-author of [RFC7627])
  INRIA
  karthikeyan.bhargavan@inria.fr

- Simon Blake-Wilson (co-author of [RFC4492])
  BCI
  sblakewilson@bcisse.com

- Nelson Bolyard (co-author of [RFC4492])
  Sun Microsystems, Inc.
  nelson@bolyard.com

- Ran Canetti
  IBM
  canetti@watson.ibm.com

- Matt Caswell
  OpenSSL
  matt@openssl.org

- Stephen Checkoway
  University of Illinois at Chicago
  sfc@uic.edu

- Pete Chown
  Skygate Technology Ltd
  pc@skygate.co.uk

- Katriel Cohn-Gordon
  University of Oxford
  me@katriel.co.uk
- Cas Cremers  
  University of Oxford  
  cas.cremers@cs.ox.ac.uk

- Antoine Delignat-Lavaud (co-author of [RFC7627])  
  INRIA  
  antdl@microsoft.com

- Tim Dierks (co-editor of TLS 1.0, 1.1, and 1.2)  
  Independent  
  tim@dierks.org

- Roelof DuToit  
  Symantec Corporation  
  roelof_dutoit@symantec.com

- Taher Elgamal  
  Securify  
  taher@securify.com

- Pasi Eronen  
  Nokia  
  pasi.eronen@nokia.com

- Cedric Fournet  
  Microsoft  
  fournnet@microsoft.com

- Anil Gangolli  
  anil@busybuddha.org

- David M. Garrett  
  dave@nulldereference.com

- Illya Gerasymchuk  
  Independent  
  illya@iluxonchik.me

- Alessandro Ghedini  
  Cloudflare Inc.  
  alessandro@cloudflare.com

- Daniel Kahn Gillmor  
  ACLU  
  dkg@fifthhorseman.net

- Matthew Green  
  Johns Hopkins University
- Jens Guballa
  ETAS
  jens.guballa@etas.com

- Felix Guenther
  TU Darmstadt
  mail@felixguenther.info

- Vipul Gupta (co-author of [RFC4492])
  Sun Microsystems Laboratories
  vipul.gupta@sun.com

- Chris Hawk (co-author of [RFC4492])
  Corriente Networks LLC
  chris@corriente.net

- Kipp Hickman

- Alfred Hoenes

- David Hopwood
  Independent Consultant
  david.hopwood@blueyonder.co.uk

- Marko Horvat
  MPI-SWS
  mhorvat@mpi-sws.org

- Jonathan Hoyland
  Royal Holloway, University of London
  jonathan.hoyland@gmail.com

- Subodh Iyengar
  Facebook
  subodh@fb.com

- Benjamin Kaduk
  Akamai
  kaduk@mit.edu

- Hubert Kario
  Red Hat Inc.
  hkario@redhat.com

- Phil Karlton (co-author of SSL 3.0)

- Leon Klingele
Facebook
knekritz@fb.com

- Erik Nygren
Akamai Technologies
erik+ietf@nygren.org

- Magnus Nystrom
Microsoft
mnystrom@microsoft.com

- Kazuho Oku
DeNA Co., Ltd.
kazuhooku@gmail.com

- Kenny Paterson
Royal Holloway, University of London
kenny.paterson@rhul.ac.uk

- Alfredo Pironti (co-author of [RFC7627])
INRIA
alfredo.pironti@inria.fr

- Andrei Popov
Microsoft
andrei.popov@microsoft.com

- Marsh Ray (co-author of [RFC7627])
Microsoft
maray@microsoft.com

- Robert Relyea
Netscape Communications
relyea@netscape.com

- Kyle Rose
Akamai Technologies
krose@krose.org

- Jim Roskind
Amazon
jroskind@amazon.com

- Michael Sabin

- Joe Salowey
Tableau Software
joe@salowey.net
- Rich Salz
  Akamai
  rsalz@akamai.com

- David Schinazi
  Apple Inc.
  dschinazi@apple.com

- Sam Scott
  Royal Holloway, University of London
  me@samjs.co.uk

- Dan Simon
  Microsoft, Inc.
  dansimon@microsoft.com

- Brian Smith
  Independent
  brian@briansmith.org

- Brian Sniffen
  Akamai Technologies
  ietf@bts.evenmere.org

- Nick Sullivan
  Cloudflare Inc.
  nick@cloudflare.com

- Bjoern Tackmann
  University of California, San Diego
  btackmann@eng.ucsd.edu

- Tim Taubert
  Mozilla
  ttaubert@mozilla.com

- Martin Thomson
  Mozilla
  mt@mozilla.com

- Sean Turner
  sn3rd
  sean@sn3rd.com

- Steven Valdez
  Google
  svaldez@google.com
Internet-Draft                     TLS                        March 2018

- Filippo Valsorda
  Cloudflare Inc.
  filippo@cloudflare.com

- Thyla van der Merwe
  Royal Holloway, University of London
  tjvdmerwe@gmail.com

- Victor Vasiliev
  Google
  vasilvv@google.com

- Tom Weinstein

- Hoeteck Wee
  Ecole Normale Superieure, Paris
  hoeteck@alum.mit.edu

- David Wong
  NCC Group
  david.wong@nccgroup.trust

- Christopher A. Wood
  Apple Inc.
  cawood@apple.com

- Tim Wright
  Vodafone
  timothy.wright@vodafone.com

- Peter Wu
  Independent
  peter@lekensteyn.nl

- Kazu Yamamoto
  Internet Initiative Japan Inc.
  kazu@iij.ad.jp

Author’s Address

    Eric Rescorla
    RTFM, Inc.

    EMail: ekr@rtfm.com

Rescorla               Expires September 21, 2018               [Page 156]