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5.2 Security Associations (SAs)

5.2.0 General

For NDS/IP-networks the key management and distribution between SEGs is handled by the protocol Internet Key Exchange Internet Key Exchange (IKEv2) (RFC 7296 [43]). The main purpose of IKEv2 is to negotiate, establish and maintain Security Associations between parties that are to establish secure connections. The concept of a Security Association is central to IPsec and IKEv2.

To secure a typical, bi-directional communication between two nodes using IKEv2 an IKE SA is established through which the Child Security associations i.e. IPsec security associations are established.

IPsec Security associations are uniquely defined by the following parameters:

- A Security Parameter Index (SPI);

- An IP Destination Address (this is the address of the ESP SA endpoint);

- A security protocol identifier (this will always be the ESP protocol in NDS/IP).

With regard to the use of IPsec security associations in the network domain control plane of NDS/IP-networks the following is noted:

- NDS/IP only requires support for ESP SAs;

The specification of IPsec SAs can be found in RFC4301 [35].

**\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* Next Changes\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***

5.4.0 General

NOTE:

Clause 5.4 contains the general 3GPP IKEv2 profile. Other 3GPP specifications point to clause 5.4. Thus parts of clause 5.4 may also apply to devices and network nodes as specified in other specifications. New specifications using IKE should refer to this profile with as few exceptions as possible. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, the 3GPP IKEv2 profile apply for all uses of IKEv2 to protect 3GPP interfaces.

NOTE: Clause 6.2.1b of TS 33.310 [30] provides additional requirements to the general 3GPP IKEv2 profile when certificate based IKEv2 authentication is used.

NOTE: For implementation requirements and usage guidance for IKEv2, RFC 7296 has been updated in RFC 8247. In this case, RFC 8247 and the present document takes precedence over RFC 7296.

5.4.1 Void

5.4.2 Profiling of IKEv2

The Internet Key Exchange protocol IKEv2 shall be supported for negotiation of IPsec SAs. The following additional requirements apply.

**General:**

IKEv2 Configuration Payload as defined in RFC 7296 [43] should be supported.

Protocol support for High Availability as defined in RFC 6311 [42] should be supported.

**For IKE\_SA\_INIT exchange:**

The following algorithms are listed with their names according to [44].

Following algorithms shall be supported:

- Confidentiality: AES-GCM with a 16 octet ICV with 128-bit key length;

- Pseudo-random function: PRF\_HMAC\_SHA2\_256;

- Integrity: AUTH\_HMAC\_SHA256\_128;

- Diffie-Hellman group 19 (256-bit random ECP group) ;

Following algorithms should be supported:

- Confidentiality: AES-GCM with a 16 octet ICV with 256-bit key length;

- Pseudo-random function: PRF\_HMAC\_SHA2\_384;

- Diffie-Hellman group 20 (384-bit random ECP group).

- Diffie-Hellman group 31 (Curve25519).

NOTE 1: The IANA IKEv2 registry [44] contains further references for the algorithms listed.

For security reasons, the use of Diffie-Hellman MODP groups less than 2048-bit shall not be supported.

**For IKE\_AUTH exchange:**

- Authentication method 2 - Shared Key Message Integrity Code shall be supported;

- IP addresses and Fully Qualified Domain Names (FQDN) shall be supported for identification;

- Re-keying of IPsec SAs and IKE SAs shall be supported as specified in RFC 7296 [43].

- In addition to the requirements defined in RFC 7296 [43], rekeying shall not lead to a noticeable degradation of service.

**For the CREATE\_CHILD\_SA exchange:**

- A DH key exchange should be used (giving Perfect Forward Secrecy)and the session keys should be changed frequently.

**For reauthentication:**

- Reauthentication of IKE SAs as specified in RFC 7296 [43] section 2.8.3 shall be supported;

- A NE shall proactively initiate reauthentication of IKE SAs, and creation of its Child SAs, i.e. the new SAs shall be established before the old ones expire;

- A NE shall destroy an IKE SA and its Child SAs when the authentication lifetime of the IKE SA expires;

NOTE 2: NE actions related to reauthentication are controlled by locally configured lifetimes according to RFC 4301 [35]: a soft authentication lifetime that warns the implementation to initiate reauthentication, and a hard authentication lifetime when the current IKE SA and its Child SAs are destroyed.

- In addition to the requirements defined in RFC 7296 [43], reauthentication shall not lead to a noticeable degradation of service.

**\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* Next Changes\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***

## 5.6 Network domain security key management and distribution architecture for native IP based protocols

### 5.6.1 Network domain security architecture outline

The NDS/IP key management and distribution architecture is based on the IKEv2 (RFC 7296 [43]) protocol. As described in the previous section a number of options available in the full IETF IPsec protocol suite have been considered to be unnecessary for NDS/IP. Furthermore, some features that are optional in IETF IPsec have been mandated for NDS/IP and lastly a few required features in IETF IPsec have been deprecated for use within NDS/IP scope. Sections 5.3 and 5.4 give an overview over the profiling of IPsec and IKEv2 in NDS/IP.

The compound effect of the design choices in how IPsec is utilized within the NDS/IP scope is that the NDS/IP key management and distribution architecture is quite simple and straightforward.

The basic idea to the NDS/IP architecture is to provide hop-by-hop security. This is in accordance with the *chained-tunnels* or *hub-and-spoke* models of operation. The use of hop-by-hop security also makes it easy to operate separate security policies internally and towards other external security domains.

In NDS/IP only the Security Gateways (SEGs) shall engage in direct communication with entities in other security domains for NDS/IP traffic. The SEGs will then establish and maintain IPsec secured ESP Security Association in tunnel mode between security domains. SEGs will normally maintain at least one IPsec tunnel available at all times to a particular peer SEG. The SEG will maintain logically separate SAD and SPD databases for each interface.

The NEs may be able to establish and maintain ESP Security Associations as needed towards a SEG or other NEs within the same security domain. All NDS/IP traffic from a NE in one security domain towards a NE in a different security domain will be routed via a SEG and will be afforded hop-by-hop security protection towards the final destination.

Operators may decide to establish only one ESP Security Association between two communicating security domains. This would make for coarse-grained security granularity. The benefits to this is that it gives a certain amount of protection against traffic flow analysis while the drawback is that one will not be able to differentiate the security protection given between the communicating entities. This does not preclude negotiation of finer grained security granularity at the discretion of the communicating entities.



Figure 1: NDS architecture for IP-based protocols

Additional guidelines on how to apply IPsec in SCTP are specified in RFC3554 [26]. This RFC is optional for implementation unless otherwise explicitly indicated per reference point.

NOTE: TS 33.310 [30] defines an inter-operator Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) that can be used to support the establishment of IPsec connections.
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