TLS 1.3

draft-ietf-tls-tls13-19

Eric Rescorla

Mozilla

ekr@rtfm.com

Agenda

- Status
- WGLC issues
- Timeline

Status

- In WGLC#2 with: draft-ietf-tls-tls13-19
 - Modest changes from -18 (more later)
- Quite a few interoperable implementations
 - draft-18 in Firefox Beta (NSS), Chrome Beta (BoringSSL),
 Cloudflare, OpenSSL, Facebook (Fizz), OpenSSL
 - draft-19 under development with partial interop

Additional Derive-Secret stage to key schedule

- Added before each HKDF-Extract from a non-0 salt
- Restore extract/expand parity
- Prevent theoretical concern about collisions from chosen "IKM" values

Hash the context value in exporters

- The context value is limited to 255 bytes
- But the context length in 5705 is 16 bits
- Consensus: hash the value before feeding to HKDF

Hash ClientHello1 in transcript when doing HRR

- This makes stateless HRR easier
- Also insert the selected cipher suite in HRR

Add an additional Derive-Secret stage to exporters

- The EKM can be used to compute any exported value
 - This means if you need a long-term exporter the EKM is a threat to other exported value
- Solution: domain separate exporters on label

Change end_of_early_data to be a handshake message

- It was goofy to have it an alert
- All other state transitions are handshake messages
- Spec isn't very clear on how this fits into the transcript
 - Consensus answer:
 ServerFinished, EOED, [Client Certificate]...
 - -20 will be clearer

PR#768: DH Key Reuse Considerations

- Not that confident of the analysis
- We don't really want to encourage re-use

Proposed resolution: drop

PR#762: Short Headers

- Concerns about interop
 - Already seeing some interop problems without this
 - Controlled experiments not very encouraging

• Proposed resolution: drop

Non-X.509 Certificates

- We've changed Certificate a lot
- The other certificate format documents assume you replace all of Certificate, which doesn't work
- Proposed resolution:
 - Deprecate the following for TLS 1.3:
 {client,server}_certificate_type, user_mapping,
 cert_type, cached_info?
 - People can update drafts with new code points if they want

Opting-out of post-handshake client auth

Olivier Levillain on-list:

The client can not indeed ignore all this state to answer, since it is supposed to answer at least with a Finished message, which will cover the CertificateRequest message. Moreover, since each of these Finished messages must cover the initial handshake and the current CertificateRequest message, it requires a forkable hash implementation, which requires more memory.

Potential options:

- Remove post-handshake auth
- Require an extension to opt-in to post-handshake auth
- Specifically allow ignoring post-handshake
- Do nothing
- Proposal: Do nothing

Any other issues?

On to draft-20 and IETF-LC