

# Multicast Data Security Transformations

draft-irtf-smug-data-transforms-01.txt

Ran Canetti, Pankaj Rohatgi Pau-Chen Cheng  
IBM Watson

# The desired functionalities

- Group Secrecy (GS):
  - Guarantee that only group members have access to the communicated data.
- Group Authentication (GA):
  - Guarantee that received data was generated by *some* group member.
- Source Authentication (SA):
  - Guarantee that received data originates with claimed sender and was not modified en-route.

# Deployment considerations:

- Should transforms include only a single functionality or should there be aggregation?
- Interaction with RM protocols:
  - SA is easier if RM is provided.
  - FEC-based RM needs SA on individual packets/frames (I.e., “below” the RM transform)
  - Retransmission-based RM needs the encryption to be done “above” the RM transform (unless repair-nodes have access to group key)

# Deployment considerations:

## Placement in communication layers

- Source Authentication:
  - Many different algorithms, new ones keep coming up.
  - Some algorithms more suitable to transport/application, some more suitable to IP layer.
  - Typically state kept across frames/packets
- Data Encryption and Group authentication:
  - Standard encryption methods exist (ESP, SSL/TLS)
  - Can be done on any-size frames, no need in state across frames.

# Deployment considerations:

## Order of application

- Conflicting requirements:
  - For authentication, MAC is better done on the ciphertext.
  - For non-repudiation, signature is better done on the cleartext.

# A proposed design

- Two “identical” transforms:
  - One in IP layer, one in transport/application layer.
  - Each transform can provide all three security functionalities: SA, GA, GS.
  - Group policy will specify where is each functionality carried out.

# The IP-layer transform: MESP

- An extension of ESP, where the encryption algorithm is extended to potentially include an “internal authentication” mechanism:



Ext-auth[Enc[Int-auth[Data]]]

- When no Int-auth is provided, it is identical to ESP. In particular, can keep the IANA protocol number of ESP (protocol 50).

# The IP-layer transform: MESP

- Resulting order of algorithms:  
Ext-auth[Enc[Int-auth[data]]]
- Ext. authentication can provide either GA or SA.  
(Currently ESP provides GA. Using, say, TESLA, can provide also SA.)
- Int. authentication will typically provide signature-based SA.

### MESP packet format



# The transport/application layer transform: AMESP

- Identical to MESP, with the exception that the IP header and next-protocol are not necessary.
- Can be used either as a stand-alone transform or in conjunction with an RM transform.

# Possible usage patterns

- Everything in application layer:
  - AMESP with GA[ENC[SA[data]]]
  - AMESP with SA[ENC[data]]
  - Null MESP
- Everything in IP layer:
  - Null AMESP
  - MESP like AMESP in above case
- Mixed: SA in App, GS+GA in IP, etc.

**AMESP in conjunction with  
a transport/application layer RM transform:**

