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1. Introduction

Unlike earlier versions of TLS, current drafts of TLS 1.3 [I-D.ietf-tls-tls13] do not provide support for the RSA handshake -- and have instead adopted ephemeral-mode Diffie-Hellman (DHE) and elliptic-curve Diffie-Hellman (ECDHE) as the primary cryptographic key exchange mechanism used in TLS.

While ephemeral (EC) Diffie-Hellman is in nearly all ways an improvement over the TLS RSA handshake, the use of these mechanisms complicates certain enterprise settings. Specifically, the use of ephemeral ciphersuites is not compatible with current enterprise network monitoring tools such as Intrusion Detection Systems (IDS) and application monitoring systems, which leverage the current TLS RSA handshake passively monitor intranet TLS connections made between

Green, et al. Expires January 4, 2018

[Page 2]
endpoints under the enterprise’s control. This traffic includes TLS connections made from enterprise network security devices (firewalls) and load balancers at the edge of the enterprise network to internal enterprise TLS servers. It does not include TLS connections traveling over the external Internet.

Such monitoring of the enterprise network is ubiquitous and indispensable in some industries. This monitoring is required for effective and safe operation of enterprise networks. Loss of this capability may slow adoption of TLS 1.3.

This document describes an optional configuration for TLS servers that is compatible with the TLS 1.3 ephemeral ciphersuites without precluding enterprise network monitoring. This configuration allows for the use of a static (EC) Diffie-Hellman private key for all TLS connections made to the server. Passive monitoring of TLS connections can be enabled by installing a corresponding copy of this key in each authorized monitoring device.

An advantage of this proposal is that it can be implemented using software modifications to the TLS server and enterprise network monitoring tools, without the need to make changes to TLS client implementations.

1.1. Terminology

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

This document introduces the term "static (elliptic curve) Diffie-Hellman ephemeral", generally written as "static (EC)DHE", to refer to long-lived finite field or elliptic curve Diffie-Hellman keys or key pairs that will be used with the TLS 1.3 ephemeral ciphersuites to negotiate traffic keys for multiple TLS sessions.

For clarity, this document also introduces the term "ephemeral (elliptic curve) Diffie-Hellman ephemeral", generally written as "ephemeral (EC)DHE", to denote finite field or elliptic curve Diffie-Hellman keys or key pairs that will be used with the TLS 1.3 ephemeral ciphersuites to negotiate traffic keys for a single TLS sessions.

1.2. ASN.1

The Cryptographic Message Syntax (CMS) [RFC5652] and asymmetric key packages [RFC5958] are generated using ASN.1 [X680], which uses the
Basic Encoding Rules (BER) and the Distinguished Encoding Rules (DER) [X690].

2. Enterprise Out-of-band TLS Decryption Architecture

This document describes the use of a static (elliptic-curve) Diffie-Hellman (static (EC)DHE) private key by servers for use in TLS 1.3 sessions internal to an enterprise network where network monitoring is required. In Figure 1, the Web Servers use a static (EC)DHE key pair with the standard TLS 1.3 handshake for connections from the Load Balancer, and the Back-End Services use static (EC)DHE for connections from the Web Servers. The Load Balancer uses ephemeral (EC)DHE key pairs with the standard TLS 1.3 handshake for connections from external Browsers over the Internet, to provide Forward Secrecy on those connections that are exposed to third-party monitoring. Internally, the static (EC)DHE keys are provided to authorized TLS Decrypter devices, such as intrusion detection systems, application monitoring systems or network packet capture devices.
3. Enterprise Requirements for Passive (out-of-band) TLS Decryption

Enterprise networks based on this architecture have operational requirements for traffic monitoring and ex post facto analysis for purposes of:

- Application troubleshooting and performance analysis
- Fraud monitoring
- Security, including intrusion detection, malware detection, confidential data exfiltration and layer 7 DDoS protection
- Audit compliance
- Customer Experience Monitoring
Specific requirements to meet the listed operational requirements include:

- TLS decryption for network security monitoring tools must be done in real time with no gaps in decryption.
- The solution must be able to decrypt passively captured pcap traces.
- The solution must scale to handle thousands of TLS sessions/sec.
- Key material must be preserved for back-in-time analysis. The period for key retention depends upon local policy, reflecting operational, security and compliance requirements.
- Key material must be encrypted during network transit.
- The solution must not negatively impact the enterprise infrastructure (servers, network, etc.)
- The solution must be able to decrypt the session when a TLS session is reused. This may involve the use of a TLS decryption appliance.
- The solution must be able to decrypt in a physical data center, in a virtual environment, and in a cloud.

4. Summary of the Existing Diffie-Hellman Handshake

In TLS 1.3, servers exchange keys using two primary modes, DHE and ECDHE. In a simplified view of the full handshake, the following steps occur:

1. The client generates an ephemeral public and private key, and transmits the public key within a "key_share" message, along with a random nonce (ClientHello.random).
2. The server generates an ephemeral public and private key, and transmits the public key within a "key_share" message, along with a random nonce (ServerHello.random).
3. The two parties now calculate a shared (EC)DHE secret by combining the other party’s ephemeral public key with their own ephemeral private key.
4. A series of traffic and handshake keys is derived by combining this shared secret with various inputs from the handshake, including the ClientHello.random and ServerHello.random.
5. Data encryption is performed using the shared secret.
5. Using static (EC)DHE on the server

The proposal embodied in this draft modifies the standard TLS handshake summarized above in the following ways:

For each elliptic curve (and FF-DH parameter length) supported by the server, the server is provisioned with a static (EC)DHE private/public key pair. This key pair may be either:

* generated at server installation, and rotated at periodic intervals appropriate for any long-term server key,

* generated at a central key management server and distributed (in a secure encrypted form) to the appropriate endpoint servers.

All steps of the original handshake proceed as above, with the following modification to server behavior. Step (2) proceeds as follows:

2. The server transmits the static public key within a "key_share" message, along with a random nonce (ServerHello.random).

6. Key Representation

The Asymmetric Key Package [RFC5958] MUST be used to transfer the centrally managed Diffie-Hellman key pair. The key package contains at least one Diffie-Hellman key pair. Each Diffie-Hellman key pair is associated with a set of attributes, including the key validity period for that Diffie-Hellman key pair.

OneAsymmetricKey is defined in Section 2 of [RFC5958]. The fields are used as follows:

- version MUST be set to v2, which has an integer value of 1.

- privateKeyAlgorithm MUST be set to the algorithm identifier of the Diffie-Hellman key pair. For convenience, some popular algorithm identifiers are listed in Figure 2.

- privateKey MUST be set to the Diffie-Hellman private key encoded as an OCTET STRING.

- attributes MUST be included even though the field is optional. The set of attributes MUST include the key validity period attribute defined in Section 15 of [RFC7906]. Other attributes MAY be included as well.
publicKey MUST be included even though the field is optional. It MUST be set to the Diffie-Hellman public key, encoded as a BIT STRING. This is the same BIT STRING that would be included in an X.509 certificate [RFC5280] for this public key.

Finite Field Diffie-Hellman
object identifier: { 1 2 840 10046 2 1 }
parameter encoding: DomainParameters, Section 2.3.3 of [RFC3279]
private key encoding: INTEGER
public key encoding: INTEGER

Elliptic Curve Diffie-Hellman
object identifier: { 1 3 132 1 12 }
parameter encoding: ECParameters, Section 2.1.2 of [RFC5480]
(MUST use the namedCurve CHOICE)
private key encoding: ECPrivateKey, Section 3 of [RFC5915]
public key encoding: ECPoint, Section 2.2 of [RFC5480]

Figure 2: Popular Diffie-Hellman Algorithm Identifiers

The CMS protecting content types [RFC5652][RFC5083] can be used to provide authentication and confidentiality protection for the Asymmetric Key Package:

- SignedData can be used to apply a digital signature to the Asymmetric Key Package.
- EncryptedData can be used to encrypt the Asymmetric Key Package with previously distributed symmetric encryption key.
- EnvelopedData can be used to encrypt the Asymmetric Key Package, where the sender and the receiver establish a symmetric encryption key using Diffie-Hellman key agreement.
- AuthEnvelopedData can be used to protect the Asymmetric Key Package where the sender and the receiver establish a symmetric authenticated encryption key using Diffie-Hellman key agreement.

7. TLS Static DH Key (TSK) Protocol

The TLS Static DH Key (TSK) Protocol is used in cases where the Diffie-Hellman keys are centrally managed. The two main roles in the TSK protocol are "key manager" and "key consumer". Key consumers can...
be TLS servers or TLS decrypters. The key manager generates, distributes, and tracks static (EC)DHE keys used by key consumers. TSK messaging is based on HTTPS [RFC2818]. Keys are transferred as Asymmetric Key Packages [RFC5958], using the profile in Section 6 of this document.

```
<p>| TLS server | ------ | key manager |------ |
|
|------------|--------|-------------|------|
|            |        |-------------|------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>-------------</th>
<th>------</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Figure 3: TSK protocol components

The key manager can push keys to key consumers:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLS server</th>
<th>key manager</th>
<th>TLS decrypter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\ Generate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/ key pair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>------------&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Push key pair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Push key pair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Figure 4: TSK protocol push model

Alternatively, key consumers can request (or pull) keys from the key manager.
7.1. Key Push

An HTTPS-based TSK push is composed of the appropriate HTTP headers, followed by the binary value of the BER (Basic Encoding Rules) encoding of the Asymmetric Key Package.

The Content-Type header MUST be application/cms [RFC7193] if the Asymmetric Key Package is encrypted with CMS [RFC6032]. The Content-Type header MUST be application/pkcs8 if the Asymmetric Key Package is transferred in plain text (within the encrypted HTTPS stream).

7.2. Key Request

A key consumer may request a key by providing a fingerprint [RFC6234] of the public key. The key manager is responsible for determining if the key consumer is authorized to receive a copy of the key being requested.

Example with plain text Asymmetric Key Package:

GET /tsk/key/PublicKeyFingerprint
Accept: application/pkcs8

Example with CMS encrypted and/or signed Asymmetric Key Package:

GET /tsk/key/PublicKeyFingerprint
Accept: application/cms

The response to the TSK push is composed of the appropriate HTTP headers, followed by the binary value of the BER (Basic Encoding Rules) encoding of the Asymmetric Key Package.
The Content-Type header MUST be application/cms [RFC7193] if the Asymmetric Key Package is encrypted with CMS [RFC6032]. The Content-Type header MUST be application/pkcs8 if the Asymmetric Key Package is transferred in plain text (within the encrypted HTTPS stream).

8. Alternative Solutions for Enterprise Monitoring and Troubleshooting

- Export of ephemeral keys
- Export of decrypted traffic from TLS proxy devices at the edge of the enterprise network
- Placement of TLS proxies in the enterprise network
- Reliance on TCP/IP headers not encrypted by TLS
- Reliance on application/server logs
- Doing troubleshooting and malware analysis at the endpoint.
- Adding a TCP or UDP extension to provide the information needed to do packet analysis.

9. Weaknesses of Alternative Solutions

Export of ephemeral keys: Scale - In a large enterprise there will be billions of ephemeral keys to export and manage. There will also be difficulty in transporting these keys to real time tools that need decrypted packets. The complexity of the solution is a problem that adds risk.

Export of decrypted traffic from TLS proxy devices: Decrypted traffic at only the edge of the network is not adequate for the enterprise requirements listed above (troubleshooting, network security monitoring, etc...)

TLS proxies in the network: Inline TLS proxies will not scale to the number of decryption points needed within an enterprise. Each inline proxy adds cost, latency, and production risk.

Reliance on TCP/IP headers: IP and/or TCP headers are not adequate for the enterprise requirements listed above. Troubleshooters must be able to find transactions in a pcap trace, identified by markers like userids, session ids, URLs, and time stamps. Threat Detection teams must be able to look for Indicators of Compromise in the payload of packets, etc.
Reliance on Application/server logs: Logging is not adequate for the enterprise requirements listed above. Code developers cannot anticipate every possible problem and put a log message in just the right place. There are billions of lines of code in a data center, and it’s not scalable to try and improve logging.

Troubleshooting and malware analysis at the endpoint: Endpoints don’t have the robustness to do their own workload and handle the burden of the various enterprise requirements listed above. These requirements would include always-on full packet capture at the endpoint with no packet drops.

Adding TCP/UDP extensions: An important part of troubleshooting, network security monitoring, etc. is analysis of the application-specific payload of the packet. It is not possible to anticipate ahead of time, among thousands of unique applications, which fields in the application payload will be important.

10. Security considerations

We now consider the security implications of the change described above:

1. The shift from fully-ephemeral (EC)HDE to static (EC)DHE affects the security properties offered by the TLS 1.3 handshake by eliminating the Forward Secrecy property provided by the server. If a server is compromised and the private key is stolen, then an attacker who observes any TLS handshake (even one that occurred prior to the compromise) performed with this static (EC)DHE key pair will be able to recover session traffic encryption keys and will be able to decrypt traffic.

2. As long as the server static secret key is not compromised, the resulting protocol will provide strong cryptographic security, as long as the Diffie-Hellman parameters (e.g., finite-field group or elliptic curve) are correctly generated and provide security at a sufficient cryptographic security level.

3. A flaw in the generation of finite-field Diffie-Hellman parameters or the use of an insecure implementation could leak some bits of the static secret key over time. This risk is not present in ephemeral DH implementations. Implementers should use care to avoid such pitfalls.

Thus the modification described in Section 10 represents a deliberate weakening of some security properties. Implementers who choose to include this capability should carefully consider the risks to their
infrastructure of using a handshake without Forward Secrecy. Static (EC)DHE key pairs should be rotated regularly.

11. IANA Considerations

This document contains no actions for IANA.
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This draft describes the general problem of encryption of the Server Name Identification (SNI) parameter. The proposed solutions hide a Hidden Service behind a Fronting Service, only disclosing the SNI of the Fronting Service to external observers. The draft starts by listing known attacks against SNI encryption, discusses the current "co-tenancy fronting" solution, and then presents two potential TLS layer solutions that might mitigate these attacks. The first solution is based on TLS in TLS "quasi tunneling", and the second solution is based on "combined tickets". These solutions only require minimal extensions to the TLS protocol.
1. Introduction

Historically, adversaries have been able to monitor the use of web services through three channels: looking at DNS requests, looking at IP addresses in packet headers, and looking at the data stream. To protect against these threats, we propose SNI encryption in TLS.
between user and services. These channels are getting progressively
closed. A growing fraction of Internet communication is encrypted,
mostly using Transport Layer Security (TLS) [RFC5246]. Progressive
deployment of solutions like DNS in TLS [RFC7858] mitigates the
disclosure of DNS information. More and more services are colocated
on multiplexed servers, loosening the relation between IP address and
web service. However, multiplexed servers rely on the Service Name
Information (SNI) to direct TLS connections to the appropriate
service implementation. This protocol element is transmitted in
clear text. As the other methods of monitoring get blocked,
monitoring focuses on the clear text SNI. The purpose of SNI
encryption is to prevent that.

In the past, there have been multiple attempts at defining SNI
encryption. These attempts have generally floundered, because the
simple designs fail to mitigate several of the attacks listed in
Section 2. In the absence of a TLS level solution, the most popular
approach to SNI privacy is HTTP level fronting, which we discuss in
Section 3.

The current draft proposes two designs for SNI Encryption in TLS.
Both designs hide a "Hidden Service" behind a "Fronting Service". To
an external observer, the TLS connections will appear to be directed
towards the Fronting Service. The cleartext SNI parameter will
document the Fronting Service. A second SNI parameter will be
transmitted in an encrypted form to the Fronting Service, and will
allow that service to redirect the connection towards the Hidden
Service.

The first design relies on tunneling TLS in TLS, as explained in
Section 4. It does not require TLS extensions, but relies on
conventions in the implementation of TLS 1.3 [I-D.ietf-tls-tls13] by
the Client and the Fronting Server.

The second design, presented in Section 5 removes the requirement for
tunneling, on simply relies on Combined Tickets. It uses the
extension process for session tickets already defined in
[I-D.ietf-tls-tls13].

This draft is presented as is to trigger discussions. It is expected
that as the draft progresses, only one of the two proposed solutions
will be retained.

1.1. Key Words

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. Security and Privacy Requirements for SNI Encryption

Over the past years, there have been multiple proposals to add an SNI encryption option in TLS. Many of these proposals appeared promising, but were rejected after security reviews pointed plausible attacks. In this section, we collect a list of these known attacks.

2.1. Mitigate Replay Attacks

The simplest SNI encryption designs replace in the initial TLS exchange the clear text SNI with an encrypted value, using a key known to the multiplexed server. Regardless of the encryption used, these designs can be broken by a simple replay attack, which works as follow:

1- The user starts a TLS connection to the multiplexed server, including an encrypted SNI value.

2- The adversary observes the exchange and copies the encrypted SNI parameter.

3- The adversary starts its own connection to the multiplexed server, including in its connection parameters the encrypted SNI copied from the observed exchange.

4- The multiplexed server establishes the connection to the protected service, thus revealing the identity of the service.

One of the goals of SNI encryption is to prevent adversaries from knowing which Hidden Service the client is using. Successful replay attacks breaks that goal by allowing adversaries to discover that service.

SNI encryption designs MUST mitigate this attack.

2.2. Avoid Widely Shared Secrets

It is easy to think of simple schemes in which the SNI is encrypted or hashed using a shared secret. This symmetric key must be known by the multiplexed server, and by every users of the protected services. Such schemes are thus very fragile, since the compromise of a single user would compromise the entire set of users and protected services.

SNI encryption designs MUST NOT rely on widely shared secrets.
2.3. Prevent SNI-based Denial of Service Attacks

Encrypting the SNI may create extra load for the multiplexed server. Adversaries may mount denial of service attacks by generating random encrypted SNI values and forcing the multiplexed server to spend resources in useless decryption attempts.

It may be argued that this is not an important DOS avenue, as regular TLS connection attempts also require the server to perform a number of cryptographic operations. However, in many cases, the SNI decryption will have to be performed by a front end component with limited resources, while the TLS operations are performed by the component dedicated to their respective services. SNI based DOS attacks could target the front end component.

SNI encryption designs MUST mitigate the risk of denial of service attacks through forced SNI decryption.

2.4. Do not stick out

In some designs, handshakes using SNI encryption can be easily differentiated from "regular" handshakes. For example, some designs require specific extensions in the Client Hello packets, or specific values of the clear text SNI parameter. If adversaries can easily detect the use of SNI encryption, they could block it, or they could flag the users of SNI encryption for special treatment.

In the future, it might be possible to assume that a large fraction of TLS handshakes use SNI encryption. If that was the case, the detection of SNI encryption would be a lesser concern. However, we have to assume that in the near future, only a small fraction of TLS connections will use SNI encryption.

SNI encryption designs MUST minimize the observable differences between the TLS handshakes that use SNI encryption and those that don’t.

2.5. Forward Secrecy

The general concerns about forward secrecy apply to SNI encryption just as well as to regular TLS sessions. For example, some proposed designs rely on a public key of the multiplexed server to define the SNI encryption key. If the corresponding public key was compromised, the adversaries would be able to process archival records of past connections, and retrieve the protected SNI used in these connections. These designs failed to maintain forward secrecy of SNI encryption.
SNI encryption designs SHOULD provide forward secrecy for the protected SNI. However, this may be very hard to achieve in practice. Designs MAY compromise there, if they have other good properties.

2.6. Proper Security Context

We can design solutions in which the multiplexed server or a fronting service act as a relay to reach the protected service. Some of those solutions involve just one TLS handshake between the client and the multiplexed server, or between the client and the fronting service. The master secret is verified by verifying a certificate provided by either of these entities, but not by the protected service.

These solutions expose the client to a Man-In-The-Middle attack by the multiplexed server or by the fronting service. Even if the client has some reasonable trust in these services, the possibility of MITM attack is troubling.

The multiplexed server or the fronting services could be pressured by adversaries. By design, they could be forced to deny access to the protected service, or to divulge which client accessed it. But if MITM is possible, the adversaries would also be able to pressure them into intercepting or spoofing the communications between client and protected service.

SNI encryption designs MUST ensure that the master secret are negotiated and verified "end to end", between client and protected service.

2.7. Fronting Server Spoofing

Adversaries could mount an attack by spoofing the Fronting Service. A spoofed Fronting Service could act as a "honeypot" for users of hidden services. At a minimum, the fake server could record the IP addresses of these users. If the SNI encryption solution places too much trust on the fronting server, the fake server could also serve fake content of its own choosing, including various forms of malware.

There are two main channels by which adversaries can conduct this attack. Adversaries can simply try to mislead users into believing that the honeypot is a valid Fronting Server, especially if that information is carried by word of mouth or in unprotected DNS records. Adversaries can also attempt to hijack the traffic to the regular Fronting Server, using for example spoofed DNS responses or spoofed IP level routing, combined with a spoofed certificate.
To mitigate this class of attacks, SNI encryption implementations MUST ensure that the Fronting Servers are properly authenticated, and SHOULD ensure that the relation between Hidden Services and Fronting Services is obtained in a trustworthy manner.

3. HTTP Co-Tenancy Fronting

In the absence of TLS level SNI encryption, many sites rely on an "HTTP Co-Tenancy" solution. The TLS connection is established with the fronting server, and HTTP requests are then sent over that connection to the hidden service. For example, the TLS SNI could be set to "fronting.example.com", the fronting server, and HTTP requests sent over that connection could be directed to "hidden.example.com/some-content", accessing the hidden service. This solution works well in practice when the fronting server and the hidden server are 'co-tenant' of the same multiplexed server.

The HTTP fronting solution can be deployed without modification to the TLS protocol, and does not require using and specific version of TLS. There are however a few issues regarding discovery, client implementations, trust, and applicability:

- The client has to discover that the hidden service can be accessed through the fronting server.
- The client browser's has to be directed to access the hidden service through the fronting service.
- Since the TLS connection is established with the fronting service, the client has no proof that the content does in fact come from the hidden service. The solution does thus not mitigate the context sharing issues described in Section 2.6.
- Since this is an HTTP level solution, it would not protected non HTTP protocols such as DNS over TLS [RFC7858] or IMAP over TLS [RFC2595].

The discovery issue is common to pretty much every SNI encryption solution, and is also discussed in Section 4.2.3 and Section 5.3. The browser issue may be solved by developing a browser extension that support HTTP Fronting, and manages the list of fronting services associated with the hidden services that the client uses. The multi-protocol issue can be mitigated by using implementation of other applications over HTTP, such as for example DNS over HTTPS [I-D.hoffman-dns-over-https]. The trust issue, however, requires specific developments such as HTTP tunnels or Delegation Tokens.
3.1. HTTPS Tunnels

The HTTP Fronting solution places a lot of trust in the Fronting Server. This required trust can be reduced by tunnelling HTTPS in HTTPS, which effectively treats the Fronting Server as an HTTP Proxy. In this solution, the client establishes a TLS connection to the Fronting Server, and then issues an HTTP Connect request to the Hidden Server. This will establish an end-to-end HTTPS over TLS connection between the client and the Hidden Server, mitigating the issues described in Section 2.6.

The HTTPS in HTTPS solution requires double encryption of every packet. It also requires that the fronting server decrypts and relays messages to the hidden server. Both of these requirements make the implementation onerous.

3.2. Delegation Token

Clients would see their privacy compromised if they contacted the wrong fronting server to access the hidden service, since this wrong server could disclose their access to adversaries. This can possibly be mitigated by recording the relation between fronting server and hidden server in a Delegation Token.

The delegation token would be a form of certificate, signed by the hidden service. It would have the following components:

- The DNS name of the fronting service
- TTL (i.e. expiration date)
- An indication of the type of access that would be used, such as direct fronting in which the hidden content is directly served by the fronting server, or HTTPS in HTTPS, or one of the TLS level solutions discussed in Section 4 and Section 5
- Triple authentication, to make the barrier to setting up a honeypot extremely high
  1. Cert chain for hidden server certificate (e.g., hidden.example.com) up to CA.
  2. Certificate transparency proof of the hidden service certificate (hidden.example.com) from a popular log, with a requirement that the browser checks the proof before connecting.
3. A TLSA record for hidden service domain name (hidden.example.com), with full DNSSEC chain (also mandatory to check)

o Possibly, a list of valid addresses of the fronting service.

o Some extension mechanism for other bits

If N multiple domains on a CDN are acceptable fronts, then we may want some way to indicate this without publishing and maintaining N separate tokens.

Delegation tokens could be published by the fronting server, in response for example to a specific query by a client. The client would then examine whether one of the Delegation Tokens matches the hidden service that it wants to access.

QUESTION: Do we need a revocation mechanism? What if a fronting service obtains a delegation token, and then becomes untrustable for some other reason? Or is it sufficient to just use short TTL?

4. SNI Encapsulation Specification

We propose to provide SNI Privacy by using a form of TLS encapsulation. The big advantage of this design compared to previous attempts is that it requires effectively no changes to TLS 1.3. It only requires a way to signal to the Gateway server that the encrypted application data is actually a ClientHello which is intended for the hidden service. Once the tunneled session is established, encrypted packets will be forwarded to the Hidden Service without requiring encryption or decryption by the Fronting Service.

4.1. Tunneling TLS in TLS

The proposed design is to encapsulate a second Client Hello in the early data of a TLS connection to the Fronting Service. To the outside, it just appears that the client is resuming a session with the fronting service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Fronting Service</th>
<th>Hidden Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ClientHello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ early_data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ key_share*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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+ psk_key_exchange_modes
+ pre_shared_key
+ SNI = fronting

{  
//Application data
ClientHello#2
   + KeyShare
   + signature_algorithms*
   + psk_key_exchange_modes*
   + pre_shared_key*
   + SNI = hidden

}

-------->

ClientHello#2
   + KeyShare
   + signature_algorithms*
   + psk_key_exchange_modes*
   + pre_shared_key*
   + SNI = hidden ---->

<Application Data*>  
<end_of_early_data>    ------------------->

ServerHello
   + pre_shared_key
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The way this works is that the Gateway decrypts the _data_ in the client’s first flight, which is actually ClientHello#2 from the client, containing the true SNI and then passes it on to the Hidden server. However, the Hidden server responds with its own ServerHello which the Gateway just passes unchanged, because it’s actually the
response to ClientHello#2 rather than to ClientHello#1. As long as ClientHello#1 and ClientHello#2 are similar (e.g., differing only in the client’s actual share (though of course it must be in the same group)), SNI, and maybe EarlyDataIndication), then an attacker should not be able to distinguish these cases.

4.2. Tunneling design issues

The big advantage of this design is that it requires effectively no changes to TLS. It only requires a way to signal to the Fronting Server that the encrypted application data is actually a ClientHello which is intended for the hidden service.

The major disadvantage of this overall design strategy (however it’s signaled) is that it’s somewhat harder to implement in the co-tenanted cases than the most trivial "RealSNI" scheme. That means that it’s somewhat less likely that servers will implement it "by default" and more likely that they will have to take explicit effort to allow Encrypted SNI. Conversely, however, these modes (aside from a server with a single wildcard or multi-SAN cert) involve more changes to TLS to deal with issues like "what is the server cert that is digested into the keys", and that requires more analysis, so there is an advantage to deferring that. If we have EncryptedExtensions in the client’s first flight it would be possible to add RealSNI later if/when we had clearer analysis for that case.

Notes on several obvious technical issues:

1. How does the Fronting Server distinguish this case from where the initial flight is actual application data? See Section 4.2.1 for some thoughts on this.

2. Can we make this work with 0-RTT data from the client to the Hidden server? The answer is probably yes, as discussed in Section 4.2.2.

3. What happens if the Fronting Server doesn’t gateway, e.g., because it has forgotten the ServerConfiguration? In that case, the client gets a handshake with the Gateway, which it will have to determine via trial decryption. At this point the Gateway supplies a ServerConfiguration and the client can reconnect as above.

4. What happens if the client does 0-RTT inside 0-RTT (as in #2 above) and the Hidden server doesn’t recognize the ServerConfiguration in ClientHello#2? In this case, the client gets a 0-RTT rejection and it needs to do trial decryption to
know whether the rejection was from the Gateway or the Hidden server.

The client part of that logic, including the handling of question #3 above, is discussed in Section 4.2.3.

4.2.1. Gateway logic

The big advantage of this design is that it requires effectively no changes to TLS. It only requires a way to signal to the Fronting Server that the encrypted application data is actually a ClientHello which is intended for the hidden service. The two most obvious designs are:

- Have an EncryptedExtension which indicates that the inner data is tunnelled.
- Have a "tunnelled" TLS content type.

EncryptedExtensions would be the most natural, but they were removed from the ClientHello during the TLS standardization. In Section 4.1 we assume that the second ClientHello is just transmitted as 0-RTT data, and that the servers use some form of pattern matching to differentiate between this second ClientHello and other application messages.

4.2.2. Early data

In the proposed design, the second ClientHello is sent to the Fronting Server as early data, encrypted with Client->Fronting 0-RTT key. If the Client follows the second ClientHello with 0-RTT data, that data could in theory be sent in two ways:

1. The client could use double encryption. The data is first encrypted with the Client->Hidden 0-RTT key, then wrapped and encrypted with the Client->Fronting 0-RTT key. The Fronting server would decrypt, unwrap and relay.

2. The client could just encrypt the data with the Client->Hidden 0-RTT key, and ask the server to blindly relay it.

Each of these ways has its issues. The double encryption scenario would require two end of early data messages, one double encrypted and relayed by the Fronting Server to the Hidden Server, and another sent from Client to Fronting Server, to delimitate the end of these double encrypted stream, and also to ensure that the stream of messages is not distinguishable from simply sending 0-RTT data to the Fronting server. The blind relaying is simpler, and is the scenario...
described in the diagram of Section 4.1. In that scenario, the Fronting server switches to relaying mode immediately after unwrapping and forwarding the second ClientHello.

4.2.3. Client requirements

In order to use the tunneling service, the client needs to identify the Fronting Service willing to tunnel to the Hidden Service. We can assume that the client will learn the identity of suitable Fronting Services from the Hidden Service itself.

In order to tunnel the second ClientHello as 0-RTT data, the client needs to have a shared secret with the Fronting Service. To avoid the trap of "well known shared secrets" described in Section 2.2, this should be a pair wise secret. The most practical solution is to use a session resumption ticket. This requires that prior to the tunneling attempt, the client establishes regular connections with the fronting service and obtains one or several session resumption tickets.

5. SNI encryption with combined tickets

EDITOR’S NOTE: This section is an alternative design to Section 4. As the draft progresses, only one of the alternatives will be selected, and the text corresponding to the other alternative will be deleted.

We propose to provide SNI Privacy by relying solely on "combined tickets". The big advantage of this design compared to previous attempts is that it requires only minimal changes to implementations of TLS 1.3. These changes are confined to the handling of the combined ticket by Fronting and Hidden service, and to the signaling of the Fronting SNI to the client by the Hidden service.

5.1. Session resumption with combined tickets

In this example, the client obtains a combined session resumption ticket during a previous connection to the hidden service, and has learned the SNI of the fronting service. The session resumption will happen as follow:

```
Client                    Fronting Service         Hidden Service
ClientHello
+ early_data
```
+ key_share*
+ psk_key_exchange_modes
+ pre_shared_key
+ SNI = fronting

-------->

// Decode the ticket
// Forwards to hidden
ClientHello  -------->

(Application Data*)  ------------------------>

ServerHello
+ pre_shared_key
+ key_share*
(EncryptedExtensions)
+ early_data*
(Finished)

<---------------------- [Application Data]
(EndOfEarlyData)

(Finished)  ------------------------>

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

+ Indicates noteworthy extensions sent in the
previously noted message.
The Fronting server that receives the Client Hello will find the combined ticket in the pre_shared_key extensions, just as it would in a regular session resumption attempt. When parsing the ticket, the Fronting server will discover that the session really is meant to be resumed with the Hidden server. It will arrange for all the connection data to be forwarded to the Hidden server, including forwarding a copy of the initial Client Hello.

The Hidden server will receive the Client Hello. It will obtain the identity of the Fronting service from the SNI parameter. It will then parse the session resumption ticket, and proceed with the resumption of the session.

In this design, the Client Hello message is relayed unchanged from Fronting server to hidden server. This ensures that code changes are confined to the interpretation of the message parameters. The construction of handshake contexts is left unchanged.

5.2. New Combined Session Ticket

In normal TLS 1.3 operations, the server can send New Session Ticket messages at any time after the receiving the Client Finished message. The ticket structure is defined in TLS 1.3 as:
struct {
    uint32 ticket_lifetime;
    uint32 ticket_age_add;
    opaque ticket_nonce<1..255>;
    opaque ticket<1..2^16-1>;
    Extension extensions<0..2^16-2>;
}

NewSessionTicket;

When SNI encryption is enabled, tickets will carry a "Fronting SNI" extension, and the ticket value itself will be negotiated between Fronting Service and Hidden Service, as in:

Client                    Fronting Service         Hidden Service

<=======   <Ticket Request>

Combined Ticket =======>

[New Session Ticket

<------------------------    + SNI Extension]

<==> sent on connection between Hidden and Fronting service

< encrypted with Fronting<->Hidden key

[] encrypted with Client->Hidden 1-RTT key

In theory, the actual format of the ticket could be set by mutual agreement between Fronting Service and Hidden Service. In practice, it is probably better to provide guidance, as the ticket must meet three of requirements:

- The Fronting Server must understand enough of the combined ticket to relay the connection towards the Hidden Server;
The Hidden Server must understand enough of the combined ticket to resume the session with the client;

Third parties must not be able to deduce the name of the Hidden Service from the value of the ticket.

There are two plausible designs, a stateful design and a shared key design. (There is also a design in which the Hidden Server encrypts the tickets with the public key of the Fronting Server, but that does not seem very practical.) In the stateful design, the ticket are just random numbers that the Fronting sever associates with the Hidden server, and the Hidden server associates with the session context. The shared key design would work as follow:

- the hidden server and the fronting server share a symmetric key $K_{sni}$.
- the "clear text" ticket includes a nonce, the ordinary ticket used for session resumption by the hidden service, and the id of the Hidden service for the Fronting Service.
- the ticket will be encrypted with AEAD, using the nonce as an IV.
- When the client reconnects to the fronting server, it decrypts the ticket using $K_{sni}$ and if it succeeds, then it just forwards the CH to the hidden server indicated in id-hidden-service (which of course has to know to ignore SNI). Otherwise, it terminates the connection itself with its own SNI.

The hidden server can just refresh the ticket any time it pleases, as usual.

This design allows the Hidden Service to hides behind many Fronting Services, each using a different key. The Client Hello received by the Hidden Server carries the SNI of the Fronting Service, which the Hidden Server can use to select the appropriate $K_{sni}$.

### 5.3. First session

The previous sections present how sessions can be resumed with the combined ticket. Clients that have never contacted the Hidden Server will need to obtain a first ticket during a first session. The most plausible option is to have the client directly connects to the Hidden Service, and then asks for a combined ticket. The obvious issue is that the SNI will not be encrypted for this first connection, which exposes clients to surveillance and censorship.
The client may also learn about the relation between Fronting Service and Hidden Service through an out of band channel, such as DNS service, or word of mouth. However, it is difficult to establish a combined ticket completely out of band, since the ticket must be associated to two shared secrets, one shared with the Fronting service so the second Client Hello can be sent as 0-RTT data, and the other shared with the Hidden service to ensure protection against replay attacks.

An alternative may be to use the TLS-in-TLS service described in Section 4.1 for the first contact. There will be some overhead due to tunnelling, but as we discussed in Section 4.2.3 the tunneling solution allows for safe first contact. Yet another way would be to use the HTTPS in HTTPS tunneling described in Section 3.1.

6. Security Considerations

The encapsulation protocol proposed in this draft mitigates the known attacks listed in Section 2. For example, the encapsulation design uses pairwise security contexts, and is not dependent on the widely shared secrets described in Section 2.2. The design also does not rely on additional public key operations by the multiplexed server or by the fronting server, and thus does not open the attack surface for denial of service discussed in Section 2.3. The session keys are negotiated end to end between the client and the protected service, as required in Section 2.6.

The combined ticket solution also mitigates the known attacks. The design also uses pairwise security contexts, and is not dependent on the widely shared secrets described in Section 2.2. The design also does not rely on additional public key operations by the multiplexed server or by the fronting server, and thus does not open the attack surface for denial of service discussed in Section 2.3. The session keys are negotiated end to end between the client and the protected service, as required in Section 2.6.

However, in some cases, proper mitigation depends on careful implementation.

6.1. Replay attacks and side channels

Both solutions mitigate the replay attacks described in Section 2.1 because adversaries cannot receive the replies intended for the client. However, the connection from the fronting service to the hidden service can be observed through side channels.

To give an obvious example, suppose that the fronting service merely relays the data by establishing a TCP connection to the hidden service.
service. Adversaries can associate the arrival of an encrypted message to the fronting service and the setting of a connection to the hidden service, and deduce which hidden service the user accessed.

The mitigation of this attack relies on proper implementation of the fronting service. This may require cooperation from the multiplexed server.

6.2. Sticking out

The TLS encapsulation protocol mostly fulfills the requirements to "not stick out" expressed in Section 2.4. The initial messages will be sent as 0-RTT data, and will be encrypted using the 0-RTT key negotiated with the fronting service. Adversaries cannot tell whether the client is using TLS encapsulation or some other 0-RTT service. However, this is only true if the fronting service regularly uses 0-RTT data.

The combined token solution almost perfectly fulfills the requirements to "not stick out" expressed in Section 2.4, as the observable flow of message is almost exactly the same as a regular TLS connection. However, adversaries could observe the values of the PSK Identifier that contains the combined ticket. The proposed ticket structure is designed to thwart analysis of the ticket, but if implementations are not careful the size of the combined ticket can be used as a side channel allowing adversaries to distinguish between different Hidden Services located behind the same Fronting Service.

6.3. Forward Secrecy

In the TLS encapsulation protocol, the encapsulated Client Hello is encrypted using the session resumption key. If this key is revealed, the Client Hello data will also be revealed. The mitigation there is to not use the same session resumption key multiple time.

The most common implementations of TLS tickets have the server using Session Ticket Encryption Keys (STEKs) to create an encrypted copy of the session parameters which is then stored by the client. When the client resumes, it supplies this encrypted copy, the server decrypts it, and has the parameters it needs to resume. The server need only remember the STEK. If a STEK is disclosed to an adversary, then all of the data encrypted by sessions protected by the STEK may be decrypted by an adversary.

To mitigate this attack, server implementations of the TLS encapsulation protocol SHOULD use stateful tickets instead of STEK protected TLS tickets. If they do rely on STEK protected tickets,
they MUST ensure that the K_sni keys used to encrypt these tickets are rotated frequently.

7. IANA Considerations

Do we need to register an extension point? Or is it just OK to use early data?
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1. Introduction

The source for this draft is maintained in GitHub. Suggested changes should be submitted as pull requests at https://github.com/tlswg/dtls13-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 the TLS protocol is to provide privacy and data integrity between two communicating peers. The TLS protocol is composed of two layers: the TLS Record Protocol and the TLS Handshake Protocol. However, TLS must run over a reliable transport channel - typically TCP [RFC0793].
There are applications that use UDP [RFC0768] as a transport and to offer communication security protection for those applications the Datagram Transport Layer Security (DTLS) protocol has been designed. DTLS is deliberately designed to be as similar to TLS as possible, both to minimize new security invention and to maximize the amount of code and infrastructure reuse.

DTLS 1.0 [RFC4347] was originally defined as a delta from TLS 1.1 [RFC4346] and DTLS 1.2 [RFC6347] was defined as a series of deltas to TLS 1.2 [RFC5246]. There is no DTLS 1.1; that version number was skipped in order to harmonize version numbers with TLS. This specification describes the most current version of the DTLS protocol based on TLS 1.3 [TLS13].

Implementations that speak both DTLS 1.2 and DTLS 1.3 can interoperate with those that speak only DTLS 1.2 (using DTLS 1.2 of course), just as TLS 1.3 implementations can interoperate with TLS 1.2 (see Appendix D of [TLS13] for details). While backwards compatibility with DTLS 1.0 is possible the use of DTLS 1.0 is not recommended as explained in Section 3.1.2 of RFC 7525 [RFC7525].

2. 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 DTLS connection.
- connection: 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 transactions.
- peer: An endpoint. When discussing a particular endpoint, "peer" refers to the endpoint that is remote to the primary subject of discussion.
- receiver: An endpoint that is receiving records.
- sender: An endpoint that is transmitting records.
- session: An association between a client and a server resulting from a handshake.

- server: The endpoint which did not initiate the DTLS connection.

The reader is assumed to be familiar with the TLS 1.3 specification since this document is defined as a delta from TLS 1.3. As in TLS 1.3 the HelloRetryRequest has the same format as a ServerHello message but for convenience we use the term HelloRetryRequest throughout this document as if it were a distinct message.

Figures in this document illustrate various combinations of the DTLS protocol exchanges and the symbols have the following meaning:

- '+' indicates noteworthy extensions sent in the previously noted message.

- '*' indicates optional or situation-dependent messages/extensions that are not always sent.

- '{}' indicates messages protected using keys derived from a [sender]_handshake_traffic_secret.

- '[]' indicates messages protected using keys derived from traffic_secret_N.

3. DTLS Design Rationale and Overview

The basic design philosophy of DTLS is to construct "TLS over datagram transport". Datagram transport does not require nor provide reliable or in-order delivery of data. The DTLS protocol preserves this property for application data. Applications such as media streaming, Internet telephony, and online gaming use datagram transport for communication due to the delay-sensitive nature of transported data. The behavior of such applications is unchanged when the DTLS protocol is used to secure communication, since the DTLS protocol does not compensate for lost or reordered data traffic.

TLS cannot be used directly in datagram environments for the following five reasons:

1. TLS relies on an implicit sequence number on records. If a record is not received, then the recipient will use the wrong sequence number when attempting to remove record protection from subsequent records. DTLS solves this problem by adding sequence numbers.
2. The TLS handshake is a lock-step cryptographic handshake. Messages must be transmitted and received in a defined order; any other order is an error. DTLS handshake messages are also assigned sequence numbers to enable reassembly in the correct order in case datagrams are lost or reordered.

3. During the handshake, messages are implicitly acknowledged by other handshake messages, but the last flight of messages and post-handshake messages (such as the NewSessionTicket message) do not result in any direct response that would allow the sender to detect loss. DTLS adds an acknowledgment message to enable better loss recovery.

4. Handshake messages are potentially larger than can be contained in a single datagram. DTLS adds fields to handshake messages to support fragmentation and reassembly.

5. Datagram transport protocols, like UDP, are susceptible to abusive behavior effecting denial of service attacks against nonparticipants. DTLS adds a return-routability check that uses the TLS HelloRetryRequest message (see Section 5.1 for details).

3.1. Packet Loss

DTLS uses a simple retransmission timer to handle packet loss. Figure 1 demonstrates the basic concept, using the first phase of the DTLS handshake:

Client                                   Server
------                                   -----

ClientHello           ------>

X<-- HelloRetryRequest     (lost)

[Timer Expires]

ClientHello           ----->
(retransmit)

Figure 1: DTLS retransmission example

Once the client has transmitted the ClientHello message, it expects to see a HelloRetryRequest or a ServerHello from the server. However, if the server’s message is lost, the client knows that either the ClientHello or the response from the server has been lost and retransmits. When the server receives the retransmission, it knows to retransmit.
The server also maintains a retransmission timer and retransmits when that timer expires.

Note that timeout and retransmission do not apply to the HelloRetryRequest since this would require creating state on the server. The HelloRetryRequest is designed to be small enough that it will not itself be fragmented, thus avoiding concerns about interleaving multiple HelloRetryRequests.

3.2. Reordering

In DTLS, each handshake message is assigned a specific sequence number. When a peer receives a handshake message, it can quickly determine whether that message is the next message it expects. If it is, then it processes it. If not, it queues it for future handling once all previous messages have been received.

3.3. Message Size

TLS and DTLS handshake messages can be quite large (in theory up to $2^{24}-1$ bytes, in practice many kilobytes). By contrast, UDP datagrams are often limited to less than 1500 bytes if IP fragmentation is not desired. In order to compensate for this limitation, each DTLS handshake message may be fragmented over several DTLS records, each of which is intended to fit in a single IP packet. Each DTLS handshake message contains both a fragment offset and a fragment length. Thus, a recipient in possession of all bytes of a handshake message can reassemble the original unfragmented message.

3.4. Replay Detection

DTLS optionally supports record replay detection. The technique used is the same as in IPsec AH/ESP, by maintaining a bitmap window of received records. Records that are too old to fit in the window and records that have previously been received are silently discarded. The replay detection feature is optional, since packet duplication is not always malicious, but can also occur due to routing errors. Applications may conceivably detect duplicate packets and accordingly modify their data transmission strategy.

4. The DTLS Record Layer

The DTLS record layer is different from the TLS 1.3 record layer.

1. The DTLSsiphertext structure omits the superfluous version number and type fields.
2. DTLS adds an epoch and sequence number to the TLS record header. This sequence number allows the recipient to correctly verify the DTLS MAC. However, the number of bits used for the epoch and sequence number fields in the DTLSPlaintext structure have been reduced from those in previous versions.

3. The DTLSPlaintext structure has a variable length header.

Note that the DTLS 1.3 record layer is different from the DTLS 1.2 record layer.

DTLSPlaintext records are used to send unprotected records and DTLSPlaintext records are used to send protected records.

The DTLS record formats are shown below. Unless explicitly stated the meaning of the fields is unchanged from previous TLS / DTLS versions.

```c
struct {
    ContentType type;
    ProtocolVersion legacy_record_version;
    uint16 epoch = 0                                 // DTLS field
    uint48 sequence_number;                          // DTLS field
    uint16 length;
    opaque fragment[DTLSPlaintext.length];
} DTLSPlaintext;
```

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

```c
struct {
    opaque unified_hdr[variable];
    opaque encrypted_record[length];
} DTLSPlaintext;
```

**Figure 2: DTLS 1.3 Record Format**

unified_hdr: The unified_hdr is a field of variable length, as shown in Figure 3.

encrypted_record: Identical to the encrypted_record field in a TLS 1.3 record.

The DTLSPlaintext header is tightly bit-packed, as shown below:
Figure 3: DTLS 1.3 CipherText Header

Fixed Bits: The three high bits of the first byte of the DTLSCiphertext header are set to 001.

C: The C bit (0x10) is set if the connection ID is present.

S: The S bit (0x08) indicates the size of the sequence number. 0 means an 8-bit sequence number, 1 means 16-bit.

L: The L bit (0x04) is set if the length is present.

E: The two low bits (0x03) include the low order two bits of the epoch.

Connection ID: Variable length connection ID. The connection ID concept is described in [DTLS-CID]. An example can be found in Section 9.1.

Sequence Number: The low order 8 or 16 bits of the record sequence number. This value is 16 bits if the S bit is set to 1, and 8 bits if the S bit is 0.

Length: Identical to the length field in a TLS 1.3 record.

As with previous versions of DTLS, multiple DTLSPlaintext and DTLSCiphertext records can be included in the same underlying transport datagram.

Figure 4 illustrates different record layer header types.
The length field MAY be omitted by clearing the L bit, which means that the record consumes the entire rest of the datagram in the lower level transport. In this case it is not possible to have multiple DTLSChiphertext format records without length fields in the same datagram.

Omitting the length field MUST only be used for data which is protected with one of the application_traffic_secret values, and not for messages protected with either [sender]_handshake_traffic_secret or [sender]_early_traffic_secret values. When using an [sender]_application_traffic_secret for message protection, Implementations MAY include the length field at their discretion.

The entire header value shown above is used as it appears on the wire as the additional data value for the AEAD function.
4.1. Determining the Header Format

Implementations can distinguish the two header formats by examining the first byte:

- If the first byte is alert(21), handshake(22), or ack(proposed, 25), the record MUST be interpreted as a DTLSPlaintext record.
- If the first byte is any other other value, then receivers MUST check to see if the leading bits of the first byte are 001. If so, the implementation MUST process the record as DTLSCiphertext; the true content type will be inside the protected portion.
- Otherwise, the record MUST be rejected as if it had failed deprotection, as described in Section 4.5.2.

4.2. Sequence Number and Epoch

DTLS uses an explicit or partly explicit sequence number, rather than an implicit one, carried in the sequence_number field of the record. Sequence numbers are maintained separately for each epoch, with each sequence_number initially being 0 for each epoch.

The epoch number is initially zero and is incremented each time keying material changes and a sender aims to rekey. More details are provided in Section 6.1.

4.2.1. Processing Guidelines

Because DTLS records could be reordered, a record from epoch 1 may be received after epoch 2 has begun. In general, implementations SHOULD discard packets from earlier epochs, but if packet loss causes noticeable problems implementations MAY choose to retain keying material from previous epochs for up to the default MSL specified for TCP [RFC0793] to allow for packet reordering. (Note that the intention here is that implementers use the current guidance from the IETF for MSL, as specified in [RFC0793] or successors not that they attempt to interrogate the MSL that the system TCP stack is using.) Until the handshake has completed, implementations MUST accept packets from the old epoch.

Conversely, it is possible for records that are protected with the new epoch to be received prior to the completion of a handshake. For instance, the server may send its Finished message and then start transmitting data. Implementations MAY either buffer or discard such packets, though when DTLS is used over reliable transports (e.g., SCTP [RFC4960]), they SHOULD be buffered and processed once the handshake completes. Note that TLS’s restrictions on when packets
may be sent still apply, and the receiver treats the packets as if they were sent in the right order. In particular, it is still impermissible to send data prior to completion of the first handshake.

Implementations MUST send retransmissions of lost messages using the same epoch and keying material as the original transmission.

Implementations MUST either abandon an association or re-key prior to allowing the sequence number to wrap.

Implementations MUST NOT allow the epoch to wrap, but instead MUST establish a new association, terminating the old association.

4.2.2. Reconstructing the Sequence Number and Epoch

When receiving protected DTLS records message, the recipient does not have a full epoch or sequence number value and so there is some opportunity for ambiguity. Because the full epoch and sequence number are used to compute the per-record nonce, failure to reconstruct these values leads to failure to deprotect the record, and so implementations MAY use a mechanism of their choice to determine the full values. This section provides an algorithm which is comparatively simple and which implementations are RECOMMENDED to follow.

If the epoch bits match those of the current epoch, then implementations SHOULD reconstruct the sequence number by computing the full sequence number which is numerically closest to one plus the sequence number of the highest successfully deprotected record.

During the handshake phase, the epoch bits unambiguously indicate the correct key to use. After the handshake is complete, if the epoch bits do not match those from the current epoch implementations SHOULD use the most recent past epoch which has matching bits, and then reconstruct the sequence number as described above.

4.2.3. Sequence Number Encryption

In DTLS 1.3, when records are encrypted, record sequence numbers are also encrypted. The basic pattern is that the underlying encryption algorithm used with the AEAD algorithm is used to generate a mask which is then XORed with the sequence number.

When the AEAD is based on AES, then the Mask is generated by computing AES-ECB on the first 16 bytes of the ciphertext:

$$\text{Mask} = \text{AES-ECB(sn_key, Ciphertext[0..15])}$$
When the AEAD is based on ChaCha20, then the mask is generated by treating the first 12 bytes of the ciphertext as the Nonce and the next 4 bytes as the counter, passing them to the ChaCha20 block function (Section 2.3 of [CHACHA]):

\[
\text{Mask} = \text{ChaCha20}(\text{sn\_key}, \text{Ciphertext}[0..12], \text{Ciphertext}[13..15])
\]

The \text{sn\_key} is computed as follows:

\[
[\text{sender}]\_\text{sn\_key} = \text{HKDF-Expand-Label}(\text{Secret}, "sn", "", \text{key\_length})
\]

[sender] denotes the sending side. The Secret value to be used is described in Section 7.3 of [TLS13].

The encrypted sequence number is computed by XORing the leading bytes of the Mask with the sequence number. Decryption is accomplished by the same process.

In some (rare) cases the ciphertext may be less than 16 bytes. This cannot happen with most of the DTLS AEAD algorithms because the authentication tag itself is 16 bytes, however some algorithms such as TLS_AES_128_CCM_8_SHA256 have a shorter authentication tag, and in combination with a short plaintext, the result might be less than 16 bytes. In this case, implementations MUST pad the plaintext out (using the conventional record padding mechanism) in order to make a suitable-length ciphertext.

Note that sequence number encryption is only applied to the DTLS\text{Ciphertext} structure and not to the DTLS\text{ Plaintext} structure, which also contains a sequence number.

4.3. Transport Layer Mapping

DTLS messages MAY be fragmented into multiple DTLS records. Each DTLS record MUST fit within a single datagram. In order to avoid IP fragmentation, clients of the DTLS record layer SHOULD attempt to size records so that they fit within any PMTU estimates obtained from the record layer.

Multiple DTLS records MAY be placed in a single datagram. Records are encoded consecutively. The length field from DTLS records containing that field can be used to determine the boundaries between records. The final record in a datagram can omit the length field. The first byte of the datagram payload MUST be the beginning of a record. Records MUST NOT span datagrams.

DTLS records, as defined in this document, do not contain any association identifiers and applications must arrange to multiplex...
between associations. With UDP, the host/port number is used to look up the appropriate security association for incoming records. However, the Connection ID extension defined in [DTLS-CID] adds an association identifier to DTLS records.

Some transports, such as DCCP [RFC4340], provide their own sequence numbers. When carried over those transports, both the DTLS and the transport sequence numbers will be present. Although this introduces a small amount of inefficiency, the transport layer and DTLS sequence numbers serve different purposes; therefore, for conceptual simplicity, it is superior to use both sequence numbers.

Some transports provide congestion control for traffic carried over them. If the congestion window is sufficiently narrow, DTLS handshake retransmissions may be held rather than transmitted immediately, potentially leading to timeouts and spurious retransmission. When DTLS is used over such transports, care should be taken not to overrun the likely congestion window. [RFC5238] defines a mapping of DTLS to DCCP that takes these issues into account.

4.4. PMTU Issues

In general, DTLS’s philosophy is to leave PMTU discovery to the application. However, DTLS cannot completely ignore PMTU for three reasons:

- The DTLS record framing expands the datagram size, thus lowering the effective PMTU from the application’s perspective.

- In some implementations, the application may not directly talk to the network, in which case the DTLS stack may absorb ICMP [RFC1191] "Datagram Too Big" indications or ICMPv6 [RFC4443] "Packet Too Big" indications.

- The DTLS handshake messages can exceed the PMTU.

In order to deal with the first two issues, the DTLS record layer SHOULD behave as described below.

If PMTU estimates are available from the underlying transport protocol, they should be made available to upper layer protocols. In particular:

- For DTLS over UDP, the upper layer protocol SHOULD be allowed to obtain the PMTU estimate maintained in the IP layer.
- For DTLS over DCCP, the upper layer protocol SHOULD be allowed to obtain the current estimate of the PMTU.

- For DTLS over TCP or SCTP, which automatically fragment and reassemble datagrams, there is no PMTU limitation. However, the upper layer protocol MUST NOT write any record that exceeds the maximum record size of $2^{14}$ bytes.

Note that DTLS does not defend against spoofed ICMP messages; implementations SHOULD ignore any such messages that indicate PMTUs below the IPv4 and IPv6 minimums of 576 and 1280 bytes respectively.

The DTLS record layer SHOULD allow the upper layer protocol to discover the amount of record expansion expected by the DTLS processing.

If there is a transport protocol indication (either via ICMP or via a refusal to send the datagram as in Section 14 of [RFC4340]), then the DTLS record layer MUST inform the upper layer protocol of the error.

The DTLS record layer SHOULD NOT interfere with upper layer protocols performing PMTU discovery, whether via [RFC1191] or [RFC4821] mechanisms. In particular:

- Where allowed by the underlying transport protocol, the upper layer protocol SHOULD be allowed to set the state of the DF bit (in IPv4) or prohibit local fragmentation (in IPv6).

- If the underlying transport protocol allows the application to request PMTU probing (e.g., DCCP), the DTLS record layer SHOULD honor this request.

The final issue is the DTLS handshake protocol. From the perspective of the DTLS record layer, this is merely another upper layer protocol. However, DTLS handshakes occur infrequently and involve only a few round trips; therefore, the handshake protocol PMTU handling places a premium on rapid completion over accurate PMTU discovery. In order to allow connections under these circumstances, DTLS implementations SHOULD follow the following rules:

- If the DTLS record layer informs the DTLS handshake layer that a message is too big, it SHOULD immediately attempt to fragment it, using any existing information about the PMTU.

- If repeated retransmissions do not result in a response, and the PMTU is unknown, subsequent retransmissions SHOULD back off to a smaller record size, fragmenting the handshake message as appropriate. This standard does not specify an exact number of
retransmits to attempt before backing off, but 2-3 seems appropriate.

4.5. Record Payload Protection

Like TLS, DTLS transmits data as a series of protected records. The rest of this section describes the details of that format.

4.5.1. Anti-Replay

Each DTLS record contains a sequence number to provide replay protection. Sequence number verification SHOULD be performed using the following sliding window procedure, borrowed from Section 3.4.3 of [RFC4303].

The received packet counter for a session MUST be initialized to zero when that session is established. For each received record, the receiver MUST verify that the record contains a sequence number that does not duplicate the sequence number of any other record received during the lifetime of the session. This check SHOULD happen after deprotecting the packet; otherwise the packet discard might itself serve as a timing channel for the sequence number.

Duplicates are rejected through the use of a sliding receive window. (How the window is implemented is a local matter, but the following text describes the functionality that the implementation must exhibit.) The receiver SHOULD pick a window large enough to handle any plausible reordering, which depends on the data rate. (The receiver does not notify the sender of the window size.)

The "right" edge of the window represents the highest validated sequence number value received on the session. Records that contain sequence numbers lower than the "left" edge of the window are rejected. Packets falling within the window are checked against a list of received packets within the window. An efficient means for performing this check, based on the use of a bit mask, is described in Section 3.4.3 of [RFC4303]. If the received record falls within the window and is new, or if the packet is to the right of the window, then the packet is new.

The window MUST NOT be updated until the packet has been deprotected successfully.

4.5.2. Handling Invalid Records

Unlike TLS, DTLS is resilient in the face of invalid records (e.g., invalid formatting, length, MAC, etc.). In general, invalid records SHOULD be silently discarded, thus preserving the association;
however, an error MAY be logged for diagnostic purposes. Implementations which choose to generate an alert instead, MUST generate error alerts to avoid attacks where the attacker repeatedly probes the implementation to see how it responds to various types of error. Note that if DTLS is run over UDP, then any implementation which does this will be extremely susceptible to denial-of-service (DoS) attacks because UDP forgery is so easy. Thus, this practice is NOT RECOMMENDED for such transports, both to increase the reliability of DTLS service and to avoid the risk of spoofing attacks sending traffic to unrelated third parties.

If DTLS is being carried over a transport that is resistant to forgery (e.g., SCTP with SCTP-AUTH), then it is safer to send alerts because an attacker will have difficulty forging a datagram that will not be rejected by the transport layer.

5. The DTLS Handshake Protocol

DTLS 1.3 re-uses the TLS 1.3 handshake messages and flows, with the following changes:

1. To handle message loss, reordering, and fragmentation modifications to the handshake header are necessary.

2. Retransmission timers are introduced to handle message loss.

3. A new ACK content type has been added for reliable message delivery of handshake messages.

Note that TLS 1.3 already supports a cookie extension, which is used to prevent denial-of-service attacks. This DoS prevention mechanism is described in more detail below since UDP-based protocols are more vulnerable to amplification attacks than a connection-oriented transport like TCP that performs return-routability checks as part of the connection establishment.

DTLS implementations do not use the TLS 1.3 "compatibility mode" described in Section D.4 of [TLS13]. DTLS servers MUST NOT echo the "session_id" value from the client and endpoints MUST NOT send ChangeCipherSpec messages. Note however that implementations MUST ignore ChangeCipherSpec messages received in unprotected records.

With these exceptions, the DTLS message formats, flows, and logic are the same as those of TLS 1.3.
5.1. Denial-of-Service Countermeasures

Datagram security protocols are extremely susceptible to a variety of DoS attacks. Two attacks are of particular concern:

1. An attacker can consume excessive resources on the server by transmitting a series of handshake initiation requests, causing the server to allocate state and potentially to perform expensive cryptographic operations.

2. An attacker can use the server as an amplifier by sending connection initiation messages with a forged source of the victim. The server then sends its response to the victim machine, thus flooding it. Depending on the selected ciphersuite this response message can be quite large, as it is the case for a Certificate message.

In order to counter both of these attacks, DTLS borrows the stateless cookie technique used by Photuris [RFC2522] and IKE [RFC7296]. When the client sends its ClientHello message to the server, the server MAY respond with a HelloRetryRequest message. The HelloRetryRequest message, as well as the cookie extension, is defined in TLS 1.3. The HelloRetryRequest message contains a stateless cookie generated using the technique of [RFC2522]. The client MUST retransmit the ClientHello with the cookie added as an extension. The server then verifies the cookie and proceeds with the handshake only if it is valid. This mechanism forces the attacker/client to be able to receive the cookie, which makes DoS attacks with spoofed IP addresses difficult. This mechanism does not provide any defense against DoS attacks mounted from valid IP addresses.

The DTLS 1.3 specification changes the way how cookies are exchanged compared to DTLS 1.2. DTLS 1.3 re-uses the HelloRetryRequest message and conveys the cookie to the client via an extension. The client receiving the cookie uses the same extension to place the cookie subsequently into a ClientHello message. DTLS 1.2 on the other hand used a separate message, namely the HelloVerifyRequest, to pass a cookie to the client and did not utilize the extension mechanism. For backwards compatibility reason the cookie field in the ClientHello is present in DTLS 1.3 but is ignored by a DTLS 1.3 compliant server implementation.

The exchange is shown in Figure 5. Note that the figure focuses on the cookie exchange; all other extensions are omitted.
The cookie extension is defined in Section 4.2.2 of [TLS13]. When sending the initial ClientHello, the client does not have a cookie yet. In this case, the cookie extension is omitted and the legacy_cookie field in the ClientHello message SHOULD be set to a zero length vector (i.e., a single zero byte length field) and MUST be ignored by a server negotiating DTLS 1.3.

When responding to a HelloRetryRequest, the client MUST create a new ClientHello message following the description in Section 4.1.2 of [TLS13].

If the HelloRetryRequest message is used, the initial ClientHello and the HelloRetryRequest are included in the calculation of the transcript hash. The computation of the message hash for the HelloRetryRequest is done according to the description in Section 4.4.1 of [TLS13].

The handshake transcript is not reset with the second ClientHello and a stateless server-cookie implementation requires the transcript of the HelloRetryRequest to be stored in the cookie or the internal state of the hash algorithm, since only the hash of the transcript is required for the handshake to complete.

When the second ClientHello is received, the server can verify that the cookie is valid and that the client can receive packets at the given IP address. If the client’s apparent IP address is embedded in the cookie, this prevents an attacker from generating an acceptable ClientHello apparently from another user.

One potential attack on this scheme is for the attacker to collect a number of cookies from different addresses where it controls endpoints and then reuse them to attack the server. The server can defend against this attack by changing the secret value frequently,
thus invalidating those cookies. If the server wishes to allow legitimate clients to handshake through the transition (e.g., a client received a cookie with Secret 1 and then sent the second ClientHello after the server has changed to Secret 2), the server can have a limited window during which it accepts both secrets. [RFC7296] suggests adding a key identifier to cookies to detect this case. An alternative approach is simply to try verifying with both secrets. It is RECOMMENDED that servers implement a key rotation scheme that allows the server to manage keys with overlapping lifetime.

Alternatively, the server can store timestamps in the cookie and reject cookies that were generated outside a certain interval of time.

DTLS servers SHOULD perform a cookie exchange whenever a new handshake is being performed. If the server is being operated in an environment where amplification is not a problem, the server MAY be configured not to perform a cookie exchange. The default SHOULD be that the exchange is performed, however. In addition, the server MAY choose not to do a cookie exchange when a session is resumed. Clients MUST be prepared to do a cookie exchange with every handshake.

If a server receives a ClientHello with an invalid cookie, it MUST NOT respond with a HelloRetryRequest. Restarting the handshake from scratch, without a cookie, allows the client to recover from a situation where it obtained a cookie that cannot be verified by the server. As described in Section 4.1.4 of [TLS13], clients SHOULD also abort the handshake with an "unexpected_message" alert in response to any second HelloRetryRequest which was sent in the same connection (i.e., where the ClientHello was itself in response to a HelloRetryRequest).

5.2. DTLS Handshake Message Format

In order to support message loss, reordering, and message fragmentation, DTLS modifies the TLS 1.3 handshake header:
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 */
    uint16 message_seq;        /* DTLS-required field */
    uint24 fragment_offset;    /* DTLS-required field */
    uint24 fragment_length;    /* DTLS-required field */
    select (HandshakeType) {
        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;
    } body;
} Handshake;

The first message each side transmits in each association always has
message_seq = 0. Whenever a new message is generated, the
message_seq value is incremented by one. When a message is
retransmitted, the old message_seq value is re-used, i.e., not
incremented. From the perspective of the DTLS record layer, the
retransmission is a new record. This record will have a new
DTLSPlaintext.sequence_number value.

DTLS implementations maintain (at least notionally) a
next_receive_seq counter. This counter is initially set to zero.
When a handshake message is received, if its message_seq value
matches next_receive_seq, next_receive_seq is incremented and the
message is processed. If the sequence number is less than
next_receive_seq, the message MUST be discarded. If the sequence number is greater than next_receive_seq, the implementation SHOULD queue the message but MAY discard it. (This is a simple space/bandwidth tradeoff).

In addition to the handshake messages that are deprecated by the TLS 1.3 specification, DTLS 1.3 furthermore deprecates the HelloVerifyRequest message originally defined in DTLS 1.0. DTLS 1.3-compliant implements MUST NOT use the HelloVerifyRequest to execute a return-routability check. A dual-stack DTLS 1.2/DTLS 1.3 client MUST, however, be prepared to interact with a DTLS 1.2 server.

5.3. ClientHello Message

The format of the ClientHello used by a DTLS 1.3 client differs from the TLS 1.3 ClientHello format as shown below.

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

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

struct {
  ProtocolVersion legacy_version = { 254, 253 }; // DTLSv1.2
  Random random;
  opaque legacy_session_id<0..32>;
  opaque legacy_cookie<0..2^8-1>;
  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 DTLS, 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 DTLS 1.3, the client indicates its version preferences in the "supported_versions" extension (see Section 4.2.1 of [TLS13]) and the legacy_version field MUST be set to (254, 253), which was the version number for DTLS 1.2.

**random:** Same as for TLS 1.3.

**legacy_session_id:** Same as for TLS 1.3.
legacy_cookie: A DTLS 1.3-only client MUST set the legacy_cookie field to zero length.

cipher_suites: Same as for TLS 1.3.

legacy_compression_methods: Same as for TLS 1.3.

extensions: Same as for TLS 1.3.

5.4. Handshake Message Fragmentation and Reassembly

Each DTLS message MUST fit within a single transport layer datagram. However, handshake messages are potentially bigger than the maximum record size. Therefore, DTLS provides a mechanism for fragmenting a handshake message over a number of records, each of which can be transmitted separately, thus avoiding IP fragmentation.

When transmitting the handshake message, the sender divides the message into a series of N contiguous data ranges. These ranges MUST NOT be larger than the maximum handshake fragment size and MUST jointly contain the entire handshake message. The ranges MUST NOT overlap. The sender then creates N handshake messages, all with the same message_seq value as the original handshake message. Each new message is labeled with the fragment_offset (the number of bytes contained in previous fragments) and the fragment_length (the length of this fragment). The length field in all messages is the same as the length field of the original message. An unfragmented message is a degenerate case with fragment_offset=0 and fragment_length=length.

When a DTLS implementation receives a handshake message fragment, it MUST buffer it until it has the entire handshake message. DTLS implementations MUST be able to handle overlapping fragment ranges. This allows senders to retransmit handshake messages with smaller fragment sizes if the PMTU estimate changes.

Note that as with TLS, multiple handshake messages may be placed in the same DTLS record, provided that there is room and that they are part of the same flight. Thus, there are two acceptable ways to pack two DTLS messages into the same datagram: in the same record or in separate records.

5.5. End Of Early Data

The DTLS 1.3 handshake has one important difference from the TLS 1.3 handshake: the EndOfEarlyData message is omitted both from the wire and the handshake transcript: because DTLS records have epochs, EndOfEarlyData is not necessary to determine when the early data is complete, and because DTLS is lossy, attackers can trivially mount
the deletion attacks that EndOfEarlyData prevents in TLS. Servers SHOULD aggressively age out the epoch 1 keys upon receiving the first epoch 2 record and SHOULD NOT accept epoch 1 data after the first epoch 3 record is received.

5.6. DTLS Handshake Flights

DTLS messages are grouped into a series of message flights, according to the diagrams below.
Figure 6: Message flights for a full DTLS Handshake (with cookie exchange)
Figure 7: Message flights for resumption and PSK handshake (without cookie exchange)
Client                           Server

ClientHello
+ early_data
+ psk_key_exchange_modes
+ key_share*
+ pre_shared_key
(Application Data*)  -------->

ServerHello
+ pre_shared_key
+ key_share*
(EncryptedExtensions)  | Flight 2 |
{Finished}  +----------+

<Application Data*>  -------->

(EndOfEarlyData)
{Finished}  +----------+
[Application Data*]

---------->  +----------+

[Application Data*]  -------->

---------->  +----------+

[Application Data]  +----------+

Figure 8: Message flights for the Zero-RTT handshake

Client                           Server

---------->  +----------+

[NewSessionTicket]  | Flight 1 |

---------->  +----------+

[ACK]

---------->  +----------+

Figure 9: Message flights for the new session ticket message

Note: The application data sent by the client is not included in the timeout and retransmission calculation.
5.7. Timeout and Retransmission

5.7.1. State Machine

DTLS uses a simple timeout and retransmission scheme with the state machine shown in Figure 10. Because DTLS clients send the first message (ClientHello), they start in the PREPARING state. DTLS servers start in the WAITING state, but with empty buffers and no retransmit timer.
The state machine has four basic states: PREPARING, SENDING, WAITING, and FINISHED.

In the PREPARING state, the implementation does whatever computations are necessary to prepare the next flight of messages. It then buffers them up for transmission (emptying the buffer first) and enters the SENDING state.

In the SENDING state, the implementation transmits the buffered flight of messages. If the implementation has received one or more ACKs (see Section 7) from the peer, then it SHOULD omit any messages or message fragments which have already been ACKed. Once the messages have been sent, the implementation then enters the FINISHED state if this is the last flight in the handshake. Or, if the implementation expects to receive more messages, it sets a retransmit timer and then enters the WAITING state.

There are four ways to exit the WAITING state:

1. The retransmit timer expires: the implementation transitions to the SENDING state, where it retransmits the flight, resets the retransmit timer, and returns to the WAITING state.

2. The implementation reads a ACK from the peer: upon receiving an ACK for a partial flight (as mentioned in Section 7.1), the implementation transitions to the SENDING state, where it retransmits the unacked portion of the flight, resets the retransmit timer, and returns to the WAITING state. Upon receiving an ACK for a complete flight, the implementation cancels all retransmissions and either remains in WAITING, or, if the ACK was for the final flight, transitions to FINISHED.

3. The implementation reads a retransmitted flight from the peer: the implementation transitions to the SENDING state, where it retransmits the flight, resets the retransmit timer, and returns to the WAITING state. The rationale here is that the receipt of
a duplicate message is the likely result of timer expiry on the peer and therefore suggests that part of one’s previous flight was lost.

4. The implementation receives some or all next flight of messages: if this is the final flight of messages, the implementation transitions to FINISHED. If the implementation needs to send a new flight, it transitions to the PREPARING state. Partial reads (whether partial messages or only some of the messages in the flight) may also trigger the implementation to send an ACK, as described in Section 7.1.

Because DTLS clients send the first message (ClientHello), they start in the PREPARING state. DTLS servers start in the WAITING state, but with empty buffers and no retransmit timer.

In addition, for at least twice the default Maximum Segment Lifetime (MSL) defined for [RFC0793], when in the FINISHED state, the server MUST respond to retransmission of the client’s second flight with a retransmit of its ACK.

Note that because of packet loss, it is possible for one side to be sending application data even though the other side has not received the first side’s Finished message. Implementations MUST either discard or buffer all application data packets for the new epoch until they have received the Finished message for that epoch. Implementations MAY treat receipt of application data with a new epoch prior to receipt of the corresponding Finished message as evidence of reordering or packet loss and retransmit their final flight immediately, shortcutting the retransmission timer.

5.7.2. Timer Values

Though timer values are the choice of the implementation, mishandling of the timer can lead to serious congestion problems; for example, if many instances of a DTLS time out early and retransmit too quickly on a congested link. Implementations SHOULD use an initial timer value of 100 msec (the minimum defined in RFC 6298 [RFC6298]) and double the value at each retransmission, up to no less than the RFC 6298 maximum of 60 seconds. Application specific profiles, such as those used for the Internet of Things environment, may recommend longer timer values. Note that a 100 msec timer is recommend rather than the 3-second RFC 6298 default in order to improve latency for time-sensitive applications. Because DTLS only uses retransmission for handshake and not dataflow, the effect on congestion should be minimal.
Implementations SHOULD retain the current timer value until a transmission without loss occurs, at which time the value may be reset to the initial value. After a long period of idleness, no less than 10 times the current timer value, implementations may reset the timer to the initial value.

5.8. CertificateVerify and Finished Messages

CertificateVerify and Finished messages have the same format as in TLS 1.3. Hash calculations include entire handshake messages, including DTLS-specific fields: message_seq, fragment_offset, and fragment_length. However, in order to remove sensitivity to handshake message fragmentation, the CertificateVerify and the Finished messages MUST be computed as if each handshake message had been sent as a single fragment following the algorithm described in Section 4.4.3 and Section 4.4.4 of [TLS13], respectively.

5.9. Alert Messages

Note that Alert messages are not retransmitted at all, even when they occur in the context of a handshake. However, a DTLS implementation which would ordinarily issue an alert SHOULD generate a new alert message if the offending record is received again (e.g., as a retransmitted handshake message). Implementations SHOULD detect when a peer is persistently sending bad messages and terminate the local connection state after such misbehavior is detected.

5.10. Establishing New Associations with Existing Parameters

If a DTLS client-server pair is configured in such a way that repeated connections happen on the same host/port quartet, then it is possible that a client will silently abandon one connection and then initiate another with the same parameters (e.g., after a reboot). This will appear to the server as a new handshake with epoch=0. In cases where a server believes it has an existing association on a given host/port quartet and it receives an epoch=0 ClientHello, it SHOULD proceed with a new handshake but MUST NOT destroy the existing association until the client has demonstrated reachability either by completing a cookie exchange or by completing a complete handshake including delivering a verifiable Finished message. After a correct Finished message is received, the server MUST abandon the previous association to avoid confusion between two valid associations with overlapping epochs. The reachability requirement prevents off-path/blind attackers from destroying associations merely by sending forged ClientHellos.

Note: it is not always possible to distinguish which association a given packet is from. For instance, if the client performs a
handshake, abandons the connection, and then immediately starts a new
handshake, it may not be possible to tell which connection a given
protected record is for. In these cases, trial decryption MAY be
necessary, though implementations could also use some sort of
connection identifier, such as the one specified in
[I-D.ietf-tls-dtls-connection-id].

6. Example of Handshake with Timeout and Retransmission

The following is an example of a handshake with lost packets and
retransmissions.
Figure 11: Example DTLS exchange illustrating message loss
6.1. Epoch Values and Rekeying

A recipient of a DTLS message needs to select the correct keying material in order to process an incoming message. With the possibility of message loss and re-order an identifier is needed to determine which cipher state has been used to protect the record payload. The epoch value fulfills this role in DTLS. In addition to the key derivation steps described in Section 7 of [TLS13] triggered by the states during the handshake a sender may want to rekey at any time during the lifetime of the connection and has to have a way to indicate that it is updating its sending cryptographic keys.

This version of DTLS assigns dedicated epoch values to messages in the protocol exchange to allow identification of the correct cipher state:

- epoch value (0) is used with unencrypted messages. There are three unencrypted messages in DTLS, namely ClientHello, ServerHello, and HelloRetryRequest.

- epoch value (1) is used for messages protected using keys derived from client_early_traffic_secret. This includes early data sent by the client and the EndOfEarlyData message.

- epoch value (2) is used for messages protected using keys derived from [sender]_handshake_traffic_secret. Messages transmitted during the initial handshake, such as EncryptedExtensions, CertificateRequest, Certificate, CertificateVerify, and Finished belong to this category. Note, however, post-handshake are protected under the appropriate application traffic key and are not included in this category.

- epoch value (3) is used for payloads protected using keys derived from the initial traffic_secret_0. This may include handshake messages, such as post-handshake messages (e.g., a NewSessionTicket message).

- epoch value (4 to 2^{16}-1) is used for payloads protected using keys from the traffic_secret_N (N>0).

Using these reserved epoch values a receiver knows what cipher state has been used to encrypt and integrity protect a message. Implementations that receive a payload with an epoch value for which no corresponding cipher state can be determined MUST generate a "unexpected_message" alert. For example, client incorrectly uses epoch value 5 when sending early application data in a 0-RTT exchange. A server will not be able to compute the appropriate keys and will therefore have to respond with an alert.
Note that epoch values do not wrap. If a DTLS implementation would need to wrap the epoch value, it MUST terminate the connection.

The traffic key calculation is described in Section 7.3 of [TLS13].

Figure 12 illustrates the epoch values in an example DTLS handshake.

```
Client                                             Server
------                                             ------
ClientHello (epoch=0)                                -------->
<-------- HelloRetryRequest (epoch=0)
ClientHello (epoch=0)                                -------->
<-------- ServerHello (epoch=0)
{EncryptedExtensions} (epoch=2)                     
{Certificate} (epoch=2)                             
{CertificateVerify} (epoch=2)                       
{Finished} (epoch=2)
{Certificate} (epoch=2)                             
{CertificateVerify} (epoch=2)                       
{Finished} (epoch=2)
<-------- [ACK] (epoch=3)
{Application Data} (epoch=3)                        
<-------- [Application Data] (epoch=3)
```

Some time later ...
7. ACK Message

The ACK message is used by an endpoint to indicate handshake-containing the TLS records it has received from the other side. ACK is not a handshake message but is rather a separate content type, with code point TBD (proposed, 25). This avoids having ACK being added to the handshake transcript. Note that ACKs can still be sent in the same UDP datagram as handshake records.

```c
struct {
    uint64 record_numbers<0..2^16-1>;
} ACK;
```

record_numbers: a list of the records containing handshake messages in the current flight which the endpoint has received, in numerically increasing order. ACKs only cover the current outstanding flight (this is possible because DTLS is generally a lockstep protocol). Thus, an ACK from the server would not cover both the ClientHello and the client’s Certificate. Implementations can accomplish this by clearing their ACK list upon receiving the start of the next flight.

ACK records MUST be sent with an epoch that is equal to or higher than the record which is being acknowledged. Implementations SHOULD simply use the current key.
7.1. Sending ACKs

When an implementation receives a partial flight, it SHOULD generate an ACK that covers the messages from that flight which it has received so far. Implementations have some discretion about when to generate ACKs, but it is RECOMMENDED that they do so under two circumstances:

- When they receive a message or fragment which is out of order, either because it is not the next expected message or because it is not the next piece of the current message. Implementations MUST NOT send ACKs for handshake messages which they discard as out-of-order, because otherwise those messages will not be retransmitted.

- When they have received part of a flight and do not immediately receive the rest of the flight (which may be in the same UDP datagram). A reasonable approach here is to set a timer for 1/4 the current retransmit timer value when the first record in the flight is received and then send an ACK when that timer expires. In addition, implementations MUST send ACKs upon receiving all of any flight which they do not respond to with their own messages. Specifically, this means the client’s final flight of the main handshake, the server’s transmission of the NewSessionTicket, and KeyUpdate messages. ACKs SHOULD NOT be sent for other complete flights because they are implicitly acknowledged by the receipt of the next flight, which generally immediately follows the flight. Each NewSessionTicket or KeyUpdate is an individual flight; in particular, a KeyUpdate sent in response to a KeyUpdate with update_requested does not implicitly acknowledge that message. Implementations MAY acknowledge the records corresponding to each transmission of that flight or simply acknowledge the most recent one.

ACKs MUST NOT be sent for other records of any content type other than handshake or for records which cannot be unprotected.

Note that in some cases it may be necessary to send an ACK which does not contain any record numbers. For instance, a client might receive an EncryptedExtensions message prior to receiving a ServerHello. Because it cannot decrypt the EncryptedExtensions, it cannot safely acknowledge it (as it might be damaged). If the client does not send an ACK, the server will eventually retransmit its first flight, but this might take far longer than the actual round trip time between client and server. Having the client send an empty ACK shortcuts this process.
7.2. Receiving ACKs

When an implementation receives an ACK, it SHOULD record that the messages or message fragments sent in the records being ACKed were received and omit them from any future retransmissions. Upon receipt of an ACK for only some messages from a flight, an implementation SHOULD retransmit the remaining messages or fragments. Note that this requires implementations to track which messages appear in which records. Once all the messages in a flight have been acknowledged, the implementation MUST cancel all retransmissions of that flight. As noted above, the receipt of any packet responding to a given flight MUST be taken as an implicit acknowledgement for the entire flight.

8. Key Updates

As with TLS 1.3, DTLS 1.3 implementations send a KeyUpdate message to indicate that they are updating their sending keys. As with other handshake messages with no built-in response, KeyUpdates MUST be acknowledged. In order to facilitate epoch reconstruction Section 4.2.2 implementations MUST NOT send with the new keys or send a new KeyUpdate until the previous KeyUpdate has been acknowledged (this avoids having too many epochs in active use).

Due to loss and/or re-ordering, DTLS 1.3 implementations may receive a record with an older epoch than the current one (the requirements above preclude receiving a newer record). They SHOULD attempt to process those records with that epoch (see Section 4.2.2 for information on determining the correct epoch), but MAY opt to discard such out-of-epoch records.

Although KeyUpdate MUST be acknowledged, it is possible for the ACK to be lost, in which case the sender of the KeyUpdate will retransmit it. Implementations MUST retain the ability to ACK the KeyUpdate for up to 2MSL. It is RECOMMENDED that they do so by retaining the pre-update keying material, but they MAY do so by responding to messages which appear to be out-of-epoch with a canned ACK message; in this case, implementations SHOULD rate limit how often they send such ACKs.

9. Connection ID Updates

If the client and server have negotiated the "connection_id" extension [DTLS-CID], either side can send a new connection ID which it wishes the other side to use in a NewConnectionId message.
enum {
    cid_immediate(0), cid_spare(1), (255)
} ConnectionIdUsage;

opaque ConnectionId<0..2^8-1>;

struct {
    ConnectionIds cids<0..2^16-1>;
    ConnectionIdUsage usage;
} NewConnectionId;

cid Indicates the set of CIDs which the sender wishes the peer to use.

usage Indicates whether the new CIDs should be used immediately or are spare. If usage is set to "cid_immediate", then one of the new CID MUST be used immediately for all future records. If it is set to "cid_spare", then either existing or new CID MAY be used.

Endpoints SHOULD use receiver-provided CIDs in the order they were provided. Endpoints MUST NOT have more than one NewConnectionId message outstanding.

If the client and server have negotiated the "connection_id" extension, either side can request a new CID using the RequestConnectionId message.

struct {
    uint8 num_cids;
} RequestConnectionId;

num_cids The number of CIDs desired.

Endpoints SHOULD respond to RequestConnectionId by sending a NewConnectionId with usage "cid_spare" containing num_cid CIDs soon as possible. Endpoints MUST NOT send a RequestConnectionId message when an existing request is still unfulfilled; this implies that endpoints needs to request new CIDs well in advance. An endpoint MAY ignore requests, which it considers excessive (though they MUST be acknowledged as usual).

Endpoints MUST NOT send either of these messages if they did not negotiate a connection ID. If an implementation receives these messages when connection IDs were not negotiated, it MUST abort the connection with an unexpected_message alert.
9.1. Connection ID Example

Below is an example exchange for DTLS 1.3 using a single connection id in each direction.

Note: The connection_id extension is defined in [DTLS-CID], which is used in ClientHello and ServerHello messages.
10. Application Data Protocol

Application data messages are carried by the record layer and are fragmented and encrypted based on the current connection state. The messages are treated as transparent data to the record layer.
11. Security Considerations

Security issues are discussed primarily in [TLS13].

The primary additional security consideration raised by DTLS is that of denial of service. DTLS includes a cookie exchange designed to protect against denial of service. However, implementations that do not use this cookie exchange are still vulnerable to DoS. In particular, DTLS servers that do not use the cookie exchange may be used as attack amplifiers even if they themselves are not experiencing DoS. Therefore, DTLS servers SHOULD use the cookie exchange unless there is good reason to believe that amplification is not a threat in their environment. Clients MUST be prepared to do a cookie exchange with every handshake.

With the exception of order protection and non-replayability, the security guarantees for DTLS 1.3 are the same as TLS 1.3. While TLS always provides order protection and non-replayability, DTLS does not provide order protection and may not provide replay protection.

Unlike TLS implementations, DTLS implementations SHOULD NOT respond to invalid records by terminating the connection.

If implementations process out-of-epoch records as recommended in Section 8, then this creates a denial of service risk since an adversary could inject packets with fake epoch values, forcing the recipient to compute the next-generation application_traffic_secret using the HKDF-Expand-Label construct to only find out that the message was does not pass the AEAD cipher processing. The impact of this attack is small since the HKDF-Expand-Label only performs symmetric key hashing operations. Implementations which are concerned about this form of attack can discard out-of-epoch records.

The security and privacy properties of the connection ID for DTLS 1.3 builds on top of what is described in [DTLS-CID]. There are, however, several improvements:

- The use of the Post-Handshake message allows the client and the server to update their connection IDs and those values are exchanged with confidentiality protection.

- With multi-homing, an adversary is able to correlate the communication interaction over the two paths, which adds further privacy concerns. In order to prevent this, implementations SHOULD attempt to use fresh connection IDs whenever they change local addresses or ports (though this is not always possible to detect). The RequestConnectionId message can be used to ask for new IDs in order to ensure that you have a pool of suitable IDs.
- Switching connection ID based on certain events, or even regularly, helps against tracking by on-path adversaries but the sequence numbers can still allow linkability. For this reason this specification defines an algorithm for encrypting sequence numbers, see Section 4.2.3.

- Since the DTLS 1.3 exchange encrypts handshake messages much earlier than in previous DTLS versions information identifying the DTLS client, such as the client certificate, less information is available to an on-path adversary.

12. Changes to DTLS 1.2

Since TLS 1.3 introduces a large number of changes to TLS 1.2, the list of changes from DTLS 1.2 to DTLS 1.3 is equally large. For this reason this section focuses on the most important changes only.

- New handshake pattern, which leads to a shorter message exchange
- Support for AEAD-only ciphers
- HelloRetryRequest of TLS 1.3 used instead of HelloVerifyRequest
- More flexible ciphersuite negotiation
- New session resumption mechanism
- PSK authentication redefined
- New key derivation hierarchy utilizing a new key derivation construct
- Removed support for weaker and older cryptographic algorithms
- Improved version negotiation
- Optimized record layer encoding and thereby its size
- Added connection ID functionality
- Sequence numbers are encrypted.

13. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to allocate a new value in the "TLS ContentType" registry for the ACK message, defined in Section 7, with content type 25. IANA is requested to reserve the content type range 32-63 so that content types in this range are not allocated.
IANA is requested to allocate two values in the "TLS Handshake Type" registry, defined in [TLS13], for RequestConnectionId (TBD), and NewConnectionId (TBD), as defined in this document.
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Appendix A. Protocol Data Structures and Constant Values

This section provides the normative protocol types and constants definitions.

A.1. Record Layer

struct {
    ContentType type;
    ProtocolVersion legacy_record_version;
    uint16 epoch = 0 // DTLS field
    uint48 sequence_number; // DTLS field
    uint16 length;
    opaque fragment[DTLSPlaintext.length];
} DTLSPlaintext;

struct {
    opaque content[DTLSPlaintext.length];
    ContentType type;
    uint8 zeros[length_of_padding];
} DTLSInnerPlaintext;

struct {
    opaque unified_hdr[variable];
    opaque encrypted_record[length];
} DTLSChiphertext;

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
|0|0|1|C|S|L|E E|
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
| Connection ID | Legend:
 (if any, / length as / C - Connection ID (CID) present
 | negotiated) | S - Sequence number length
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
| 8 or 16 bit | L - Length present
| Sequence Number |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
| 16 bit Length |
 (if present)
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-

A.2. Handshake Protocol

enum {
    hello_request_RESERVED(0),
    client_hello(1),

server_hello(2),
hello_verify_request_RESERVED(3),
ew_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;

struct {
    HandshakeType msg_type;            /* handshake type */
    uint24 length;                     /* bytes in message */
    uint16 message_seq;                /* DTLS-required field */
    uint24 fragment_offset;            /* DTLS-required field */
    uint24 fragment_length;            /* DTLS-required field */
    select (HandshakeType) {
        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;
    } body;
} Handshake;

uint16 ProtocolVersion;
opaque Random[32];

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

struct {
    ProtocolVersion legacy_version = { 254,253 }; // DTLSv1.2
    Random random;
    opaque legacy_session_id<0..32>;
    opaque legacy_cookie<0..2^8-1>; // DTLS
}

CipherSuite cipher_suites<2..2^16-2>
opaque legacy_compression_methods<1..2^8-1>
Extension extensions<8..2^16-1>
} ClientHello;

A.3. ACKs

struct {
    uint64 record_numbers<0..2^16-1>
} ACK;

A.4. Connection ID Management

enum {
    cid_immediate(0), cid_spare(1), (255)
} ConnectionIdUsage;

opaque ConnectionId<0..2^8-1>;

struct {
    ConnectionIds cids<0..2^16-1>;
    ConnectionIdUsage usage;
} NewConnectionId;

struct {
    uint8 num_cids;
} RequestConnectionId;
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1. Introduction

This document provides a way to authenticate one party of a Transport Layer Security (TLS) communication to another using a certificate after the session has been established. This allows both the client and server to prove ownership of additional identities at any time after the handshake has completed. This proof of authentication can be exported and transmitted out of band from one party to be validated by the other party.

This mechanism provides two advantages over the authentication that TLS natively provides:

- multiple identities - Endpoints that are authoritative for multiple identities - but do not have a single certificate that includes all of the identities - can authenticate with those identities over a single connection.
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spontaneous authentication — Endpoints can authenticate after a
collection is established, in response to events in a higher-layer
protocol, as well as integrating more context.

This document intends to replace much of the functionality of
renegotiation in previous versions of TLS. It has the advantages
over renegotiation of not requiring additional on-the-wire changes
during a connection. For simplicity, only TLS 1.2 and later are
supported.

Post-handshake authentication is defined in TLS 1.3, but it has the
disadvantage of requiring additional state to be stored in the TLS
state machine and it composes poorly with multiplexed connection
protocols like HTTP/2 [RFC7540]. It is also only available for
client authentication. This mechanism is intended to be used as part
of a replacement for post-handshake authentication in applications.

2. 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.

3. Authenticator Request

The authenticator request is a structured message that can be
exported from either party of a TLS connection. It can be
transmitted to the other party of the TLS connection at the
application layer. The application layer protocol used to send the
authenticator SHOULD use TLS as its underlying transport to keep the
request confidential.

An authenticator request message can be constructed by either the
client or the server. This authenticator request uses the
CertificateRequest message structure from Section 4.3.2 of [TLS13].
This message does not include the TLS record layer and is therefore
not encrypted with a handshake key.

The CertificateRequest is used to define the parameters in a request
for an authenticator. The definition for TLS 1.3 is:

```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 authenticator message. A certificate_request_context value MUST be unique for each authenticator request within the scope of a connection (preventing replay and context confusion). The certificate_request_context SHOULD be chosen to be unpredictable to the peer (e.g., by randomly generating it) in order to prevent an attacker who has temporary access to the peer’s private key from pre-computing valid authenticators. This value is unrelated to the certificate_request_context used in post-handshake authentication and collisions do not need to be avoided.

extensions: The extensions that are allowed in this structure include the extensions defined for CertificateRequest messages defined in Section 4.2. of [TLS13] and the server_name [RFC6066] extension, which is allowed for client-generated authenticator requests.

4. Authenticator

The authenticator is a structured message that can be exported from either party of a TLS connection. It can be transmitted to the other party of the TLS connection at the application layer. The application layer protocol used to send the authenticator SHOULD use TLS as its underlying transport to keep the certificate confidential.

An authenticator message can be constructed by either the client or the server given an established TLS connection, a certificate, and a corresponding private key. Clients MUST NOT send an authenticator without a preceding authenticator request; for servers an authenticator request is optional. The authenticator uses the message structures from Section 4.4 of [TLS13], but different parameters. These messages do not include the TLS record layer and are therefore not encrypted with a handshake key.

4.1. Authenticator Keys

Each authenticator is computed using a Handshake Context and Finished MAC Key derived from the TLS session. These values are derived using an exporter as described in [RFC5705] (for TLS 1.2) or [TLS13] (for TLS 1.3). These values use different labels depending on the role of the sender:

- The Handshake Context is an exporter value that is derived using the label "EXPORTER-client authenticator handshake context" or "EXPORTER-server authenticator handshake context" for authenticators sent by the client and server respectively.
The Finished MAC Key is an exporter value derived using the label "EXPORTER-client authenticator finished key" or "EXPORTER-server authenticator finished key" for authenticators sent by the client and server respectively.

The context_value used for the exporter is empty (zero length) for all four values. The length of the exported value is equal to the length of the output of the hash function selected in TLS for the pseudorandom function (PRF). Cipher suites that do not use the TLS PRF MUST define a hash function that can be used for this purpose or they cannot be used. For TLS 1.3 symmetric cipher suites, the hash algorithm used with HKDF is used.

If the connection is TLS 1.2, the master secret MUST have been computed with the extended master secret [RFC7627] to avoid key synchronization attacks.

4.2. Authenticator Construction

An authenticator is formed from the concatenation of TLS 1.3 [TLS13] Certificate, CertificateVerify, and Finished messages.

If an authenticator request is present, the extensions used to guide the construction of these messages are taken from the authenticator request. Unrecognized extensions MUST be ignored. If the certificate_request_context from the authenticator request has already been used in the connection, then no authenticator should be constructed. If there is no authenticator request, the extensions are chosen from the TLS handshake. Only servers can provide an authenticator without a corresponding request. In such cases, ClientHello extensions are used to determine permissible extensions in the Certificate message.

4.2.1. Certificate

The certificate to be used for authentication and any supporting certificates in the chain. This structure is defined in [TLS13], Section 4.4.2.

The certificate message contains an opaque string called certificate_request_context, which is extracted from the authenticator request if present. If no authenticator request is provided, the certificate_request_context can be chosen arbitrarily but MUST be unique within the scope of the connection and be unpredictable to the peer.

The certificates chosen in the Certificate message MUST conform to the requirements of a Certificate message in the negotiated version.
of TLS. In particular, the certificate chain MUST be valid for the algorithms indicated by the peer in the
"signature_algorithms" and "signature_algorithms_cert" extension, as described in Section 4.2.3 of [TLS13] for TLS 1.3 or the
"signature_algorithms" extension from Sections 7.4.2 and 7.4.6 of [RFC5246] for TLS 1.2.

In addition to "signature_algorithms" and
"signature_algorithms_cert", the "server_name" [RFC6066],
"certificateAuthorities" (Section 4.2.4. of [TLS13]), and
"oidFilters" (Section 4.2.5. of [TLS13]) extensions are used to
guide certificate selection. The extensions, or others that might
affect certificate selection, are taken from the authenticator request if present, or the TLS handshake if not.

Alternative certificate formats such as [RFC7250] Raw Public Keys are not supported in this version of the specification.

4.2.2. CertificateVerify

This message is used to provide explicit proof that an endpoint possesses the private key corresponding to its certificate. The definition for TLS 1.3 is:

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

The algorithm field specifies the signature algorithm used (see Section 4.2.3 of [TLS13] for the definition of this field). The signature is a digital signature using that algorithm.

The signature scheme MUST be a valid signature scheme for TLS 1.3. This excludes all RSASSA-PKCS1-v1_5 algorithms and combinations of ECDSA and hash algorithms that are not supported in TLS 1.3.

If an authenticator request is present, the signature algorithm MUST be chosen from one of the signature schemes in the authenticator request. Otherwise, the signature algorithm used should be chosen from the "signature_algorithms" sent by the peer in the TLS handshake.
The signature is computed using the chosen signature scheme over the concatenation of:

- A string that consists of octet 32 (0x20) repeated 64 times
- The context string "Exported Authenticator" (which is not NULL-terminated)
- A single 0 byte which serves as the separator
- The hashed authenticator transcript

The authenticator transcript is the hash of the concatenated Handshake Context, authenticator request (if present), and Certificate message:

\[ \text{Hash(Handshake Context || authenticator request || Certificate)} \]

Where Hash is the hash function negotiated by TLS. If the authenticator request is not present, it is omitted from this construction (that is, it is zero length).

If the party that generates the exported authenticator does so with a different connection than the party that is validating it, then the Handshake Context will not match, resulting in a CertificateVerify message that does not validate. This includes situations in which the application data is sent via TLS-terminating proxy. Given a failed CertificateVerify validation, it may be helpful for the application to confirm that both peers share the same connection using a value derived from the connection secrets before taking a user-visible action.

4.2.3. Finished

A HMAC [HMAC] over the hashed authenticator transcript, which is the concatenated Handshake Context, authenticator request (if present), Certificate, and CertificateVerify:

\[ \text{Hash(Handshake Context || authenticator request || Certificate || CertificateVerify)} \]

The HMAC is computed using the same hash function using the Finished MAC Key as a key.
4.2.4. Authenticator Creation

An endpoint constructs an authenticator by serializing the Certificate, CertificateVerify, and Finished as TLS handshake messages and concatenating the octets:

Certificate || CertificateVerify || Finished

A given authenticator can be validated by checking the validity of the CertificateVerify message given the authenticator request (if used) and recomputing the Finished message to see if it matches.

5. Empty Authenticator

If, given an authenticator request, the endpoint does not have an appropriate certificate or does not want to return one, it constructs an authenticated refusal called an empty authenticator. This is an HMAC over the hashed authenticator transcript with a Certificate message containing no CertificateEntries and the CertificateVerify message omitted:

"Hash(Handshake Context || authenticator request || Certificate) "

The HMAC is computed using the same hash function using the Finished MAC Key as a key.

6. API considerations

The creation and validation of both authenticator requests and authenticators SHOULD be implemented inside the TLS library even if it is possible to implement it at the application layer. TLS implementations supporting the use of exported authenticators MUST provide application programming interfaces by which clients and servers may request and verify exported authenticator messages.

Notwithstanding the success conditions described below, all APIs MUST fail if:

- the connection uses a TLS version of 1.1 or earlier, or
- the connection is TLS 1.2 and the extended master secret [RFC7627] was not used

The following sections describes APIs that are considered necessary to implement exported authenticators. These are informative only.
6.1. The "request" API

The "request" API takes as input:

- certificate_request_context (from 0 to 255 bytes)
- set of extensions to include (this MUST include signature_algorithms)

It returns an authenticator request, which is a sequence of octets that includes a CertificateRequest message.

6.2. The "get context" API

The "get context" API takes as input:

- authenticator

It returns the certificate_request_context.

6.3. The "authenticate" API

The "authenticate" takes as input:

- a set of certificate chains and associated extensions (OCSP, SCT, etc.)
- a signer (either the private key associated with the certificate, or interface to perform private key operation) for each chain
- an optional authenticator request or certificate_request_context (from 0 to 255 bytes)

It returns either the exported authenticator or an empty authenticator as a sequence of octets. It is RECOMMENDED that the logic for selecting the certificates and extensions to include in the exporter is implemented in the TLS library. Implementing this in the TLS library lets the implementer take advantage of existing extension and certificate selection logic.

It is also possible to implement this API outside of the TLS library using TLS exporters. This may be preferable in cases where the application does not have access to a TLS library with these APIs or when TLS is handled independently of the application layer protocol.
6.4. The "validate" API

The "validate" API takes as input:

- an optional authenticator request
- an authenticator

It returns the certificate chain and extensions and a status to indicate whether the authenticator is valid or not. If the authenticator was empty — that is, it did not contain a certificate — the certificate chain will contain no certificates.

7. IANA Considerations

7.1. Update of the TLS ExtensionType Registry

IANA is requested to update the entry for server_name(0) in the registry for ExtensionType (defined in [TLS13]) by replacing the value in the "TLS 1.3" column with the value "CH, EE, CR".

7.2. Update of the TLS Exporter Labels Registry

IANA is requested to add the following entries to the registry for Exporter Labels (defined in [RFC5705]): "EXPORTER-server authenticator handshake context", "EXPORTER-client authenticator finished key" and "EXPORTER-server authenticator finished key".

8. Security Considerations

The Certificate/Verify/Finished pattern intentionally looks like the TLS 1.3 pattern which now has been analyzed several times. In the case where the client presents an authenticator to a server, [SIGMAC] presents a relevant framework for analysis.

Authenticators are independent and unidirectional. There is no explicit state change inside TLS when an authenticator is either created or validated.

- This property makes it difficult to formally prove that a server is jointly authoritative over multiple certificates, rather than individually authoritative over each.
- There is no indication in the TLS layer about which point in time an authenticator was computed. Any feedback about the time of creation or validation of the authenticator should be tracked as part of the application layer semantics if required.
The signatures generated with this API cover the context string "Exported Authenticator" and therefore cannot be transplanted into other protocols.
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1. Introduction

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.

connection: 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 "certificateAuthorities" 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.
Figure 2: Message flow for a full handshake with mismatched parameters

Note: The handshake transcript incorporates the initial ClientHello/HelloRetryRequest exchange; it is not reset with the new ClientHello.

TLS also allows several optimized variants of the basic handshake, as described in the following sections.

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Server</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Handshake:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ClientHello</td>
<td>ServerHello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ key_share</td>
<td>+ key_share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{EncryptedExtensions}</td>
<td>{EncryptedExtensions}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{CertificateRequest*}</td>
<td>{CertificateRequest*}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Certificate*}</td>
<td>{Certificate*}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{CertificateVerify*}</td>
<td>{CertificateVerify*}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Finished}</td>
<td>{Finished}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Application Data*]</td>
<td>[Application Data*]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Subsequent Handshake: | |
| ClientHello | ServerHello |
| + key_share* | + pre_shared_key |
| + pre_shared_key | + key_share* |
| {EncryptedExtensions} | {EncryptedExtensions} |
| {Finished} | {Finished} |
| [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.
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:

```plaintext
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 T’ for an existing type T is defined by:

```plaintext
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.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{uint8} & \quad \text{uint16}[2]; \\
\text{uint8} & \quad \text{uint24}[3]; \\
\text{uint8} & \quad \text{uint32}[4]; \\
\text{uint8} & \quad \text{uint64}[8];
\end{align*}
\]

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

\[
T \ T'[n];
\]

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.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{opaque Datum}[3]; & \quad /* \text{three uninterpreted bytes} */ \\
\text{Datum Data}[9]; & \quad /* \text{3 consecutive 3-byte vectors} */
\end{align*}
\]

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.

\[
T \ T'<\text{floor..ceiling}>;
\]
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).

```c
opaque 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.

```c
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.

```c
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.

```c
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.

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

For example:

```c
eenum { 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;
```
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.

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 ClientHellas 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 ClientHellas 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:

    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)DH 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 legacy_compression methods.
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;
```
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

RFC EDITOR: PLEASE REMOVE THIS SECTION

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 [FIPS], 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.

```c
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.

```c
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:

```c
enum {

    /* Elliptic Curve Groups (ECDHE) */
    secp256r1(0x0017), secp384r1(0x0018), secp521r1(0x0019),
    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),
    (0xFFFF)
} NamedGroup;
```

```c
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 0x0E00 through 0x0EFF 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)

```c
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:

```c
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:

```c
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:

```c
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.
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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:

```c
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;
```

**identity** 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.

**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.

**identities** 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.

**binders** 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>Client</td>
<td>ClientHello ... later of server Finished/EndOfEarlyData</td>
<td>client_handshake_traffic_secret</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 "certificate_authorities" 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:

```plaintext
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:

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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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"
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:

```
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

```
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 compute 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

```c
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_not_requested" 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.
 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.,

\[
\text{additional_data} = \text{TLSCiphertext.opaque_type} \mid\mid \text{TLSCiphertext.legacy_record_version} \mid\mid \text{TLSCiphertext.length}
\]

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,

\[
\text{AEADEncrypted} = \text{AEAD-Encrypt(write_key, nonce, additional_data, plaintext)}
\]
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 TLSSNIPerText.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 TLSSNIPerText.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 TLSSNIPerText 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),
  decrypt_error(50),
  decode_error(50),
  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
```

```
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
```

```
(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
```

```
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:

```
application_traffic_secret_{N+1} = HKDF-Expand-Label(application_traffic_secret_{N}, 
                                 "traffic upd", 
                                 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:

```
[sender]_write_key = HKDF-Expand-Label(Secret, "key", 
                                    
[sender]_write_iv  = HKDF-Expand-Label(Secret, "iv", )
```

`[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]<em>application_traffic_secret</em>{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:

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

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_rsaes_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", "..."
"early_data", "cookie", "supported_versions",
"certificateAuthorities", "oid_filters", "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_rsa_sha256, rsa_pss_rsa_sha384, rsa_pss_rsa_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
Send Finished
after -->
K_send = application
here         +---------------------+---------------------+
             | Can send                       | Can send
             | app data                       | app data
             +---------------------+---------------------+
                   | Send Certificate + CertificateVerify]
Can send
app data
Send Finished
after -->
K_send = application
here         +---------------------+---------------------+
             | Can send                       | Can send
             | app data                       | app data
             +---------------------+---------------------+
                   | Send Certificate + CertificateVerify]
Can send
app data
Send Finished
after -->
K_send = application
here

0-RTT
K_recv = handshake
[Skip decrypt errors]
+--------+--------+
| No 0-RTT | K_recv = early data |
| WAIT_EOED -> | Recv early data |
| K_recv = handshake |
| +----------+---------------------+
| +----------+---------------------+

WAIT_FLIGHT2 <--------+

No auth
+---------------------+---------------------+
| No auth            | Client auth
| WAIT_CERT          | v
| Recv Certificate   | v
| empty Certificate  | v
| WAIT_CV            | v
| Recv CertificateVerify |
| +----------+---------------------+
| +----------+---------------------+

WAIT_FINISHED <---+
| Recv Finished |
| K_recv = application |
| +---------------------+
| 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

```
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;
```

```
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

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

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

```
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_filters(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>;
} OfferedPsk;

struct {
    select (Handshake.msg_type) {
        case client_hello: OfferedPsk;
        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_rsaes_sha256(0x0804),
    rsa_pss_rsaes_sha384(0x0805),
    rsa_pss_rsaes_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 */
    obsolete_RESERVED(0x0200..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;
```

+-----------+------------------------------------------------+
| Component | Contents                                       |
+-----------+------------------------------------------------+
| TLS       | The string "TLS"                               |
|           |                                                |
| AEAD      | The AEAD algorithm used for record protection  |
|           |                                                |
| HASH      | The hash algorithm used with HKDF              |
|           |                                                |
| VALUE     | The two byte ID assigned for this cipher suite |
+-----------+------------------------------------------------+

This specification defines the following cipher suites for use with TLS 1.3.

+------------------------------+-------------+
| Description                  | Value       |
+------------------------------+-------------+
| TLS_AES_128_GCM_SHA256       | {0x13,0x01} |
| TLS_AES_256_GCM_SHA384       | {0x13,0x02} |
| TLS_CHACHA20_POLY1305_SHA256 | {0x13,0x03} |
| TLS_AES_128_CCM_SHA256       | {0x13,0x04} |
| TLS_AES_128_CCM_8_SHA256     | {0x13,0x05} |
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] [HCJ16]. 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-liming 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
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Introduction

Implementing Transport Layer Security (TLS) [I-D.ietf-tls-tls13] for constrained devices can be challenging. However, recent improvements to the design and implementation of cryptographic algorithms have made TLS accessible to some highly limited devices (see for example [RFC7925]).

Receiving large protected records can be particularly difficult for a device with limited operating memory. TLS versions 1.2 and earlier [RFC5246] permit senders to generate records 16384 octets in size, plus any expansion from compression and protection up to 2048 octets (though typically this expansion is only 16 octets). TLS 1.3 reduces the allowance for expansion to 256 octets. Allocating up to 18K of memory for ciphertext is beyond the capacity of some implementations.

The "max_fragment_length" extension [RFC6066] was designed to enable constrained clients to negotiate a lower record size. However, "max_fragment_length" suffers from several design problems (see Section 3).

This document defines a "record_size_limit" extension that replaces "max_fragment_length" (see Section 4). This extension is valid in all versions of TLS.
3. Limitations of the "max_fragment_length" Extension

The "max_fragment_length" extension has several limitations that make it unsuitable for use.

A client that has no constraints preventing it from accepting a large record cannot use "max_fragment_length" without risking a reduction in the size of records. The maximum value that the extension permits is $2^{12}$, much smaller than the maximum record size of $2^{14}$ that the protocol permits.

For large data transfers, small record sizes can materially affect performance [TARREAU]. Consequently, clients that are capable of receiving large records could be unwilling to risk reducing performance by offering the extension, especially if the extension is rarely needed.

This would not be an issue if a codepoint were available or could be added for fragments of $2^{14}$ octets. However, RFC 6066 requires that servers abort the handshake with an "illegal_parameter" alert if they receive the extension with a value they don’t understand. This makes it impossible to add new values to the extension without risking connection attempts failing.

The "max_fragment_length" extension is also ill-suited to cases where the capabilities of client and server are asymmetric. The server is required to select a fragment length that is as small or smaller than the client offers and both endpoints need to comply with this smaller limit.

Constraints on record size are often receiver constraints. In particular, an Authentication Encryption with Additional Data (AEAD) ciphers (see [RFC5116]) API requires that an entire record be present to decrypt and authenticate it. Some implementations choose not to implement an AEAD interface in this way to avoid this problem, but that exposes them to risks that an AEAD is intended to protect against.

In comparison, an implementation might be able to send data incrementally. Encryption does not have the same atomicity requirement. Some ciphers can be encrypted and sent progressively. Thus, an endpoint might be willing to send more than its receive limit.

If these disincentives are sufficient to discourage clients from deploying the "max_fragment_length" extension, then constrained servers are unable to limit record sizes.
4. The "record_size_limit" Extension

The ExtensionData of the "record_size_limit" extension is

uint16 RecordSizeLimit;

The value of RecordSizeLimit is the maximum size of record that the
endpoint is willing to receive. When the "record_size_limit"
extension is negotiated, an endpoint MUST NOT generate a protected
record with plaintext that is larger than the RecordSizeLimit value
it receives from its peer. Unprotected messages – handshake messages
in particular – are not subject to this limit.

The size limit value governs the length of the plaintext of a
protected record. The value includes the content type and padding
added in TLS 1.3 (that is, the complete length of TLSInnerPlaintext).
Padding added as part of encryption, such as that added by a block
cipher, is not included in this count.

An endpoint that supports all record sizes can include any limit up
to the protocol-defined limit for maximum record size. For TLS 1.3
and earlier, that limit is \(2^{14}\) octets. Higher values are currently
reserved for future versions of the protocol that may allow larger
records; an endpoint MUST NOT send a value higher than the protocol-
defined maximum record size unless explicitly allowed by such a
future version or extension.

Even if a larger record size limit is provided by a peer, an endpoint
MUST NOT send records larger than the protocol-defined limit, unless
explicitly allowed by a future TLS version or extension.

The size limit expressed in the "record_size_limit" extension doesn’t
account for expansion due to compression or record protection. It is
expected that a constrained device will disable compression and know
– and account for – the maximum expansion possible due to record
protection based on the cipher suites it offers or selects. Note
that up to 256 octets of padding and padding length can be added to
block ciphers.

The record size limit only applies to protected records that are sent
toward a peer. An endpoint MAY send records that are larger than the
limit it advertises.

Clients SHOULD advertise the "record_size_limit" extension, even if
they have no need to limit the size of records. This allows servers
to apply a limit at their discretion. If this extension is not
negotiated, endpoints can send records of any size permitted by the
protocol or other negotiated extensions.

Endpoints MUST NOT send a "record_size_limit" extension with a value
smaller than 64. An endpoint MUST treat receipt of a smaller value
as a fatal error and generate an "illegal_parameter" alert.

In TLS 1.3, the server sends the "record_size_limit" extension in the
EncryptedExtensions message.

5. Deprecating "max_fragment_length"

The "record_size_limit" extension replaces the "max_fragment_length"
extension. A server that supports the "record_size_limit" extension
MUST ignore and "max_fragment_length" that appears in a ClientHello
if both extensions appear. A client MUST treat receipt of both
"max_fragment_length" and "record_size_limit" as a fatal error, and
SHOULD generate an "illegal_parameter" alert.

Clients that depend on having a small record size MAY continue to
advertise the "max_fragment_length".

6. Security Considerations

Very small record sizes might generate additional work for senders
and receivers, limiting throughput and increasing exposure to denial
of service.

7. IANA Considerations

This document registers the "record_size_limit" extension in the TLS
"ExtensionType Values" registry established in [RFC5246]. The
"record_size_limit" extension has been assigned a code point of TBD;
it is recommended and marked as "Encrypted" in TLS 1.3.
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