

27 February - 02 March, 2001

Gothenburg, Sweden

From: Telenor

Title: Update information on TS33200 (v031 to v032)

Update information on TS33200 (v031 to v032)

Based on the inputs from Ericsson and Siemens to the SA3 mailing list on TS33200 v031 and based on some of my own considerations I have updated TS33200 from v031 to v032.

The changes made are restricted to those that should not be too controversial. Other issues that have been raised are addressed in a separate document. Changes that are strictly editorial are not noted.

Section	Changes
Introduction	- Sentence that identifies protocols/interfaces removed. - Last sentences removed (SS7 and IP don't have the same key mngt architecture)
Scope	- Removed: " with extension to cover the Iu-interface towards RNS" - Removed: " Protection of the Iu/Iur-interfaces is not considered part of R4."
3.1	- Redundant explanation for Anti-Replay. Sentence removed: " Anti-replay protection is particularly important for connectionless packet based transmission."
3.3	- Abbreviation added: " BG Border Gateway" ¹
4.1	- Sentence explaining the concept "security domain" rewritten to clarify/simplify
4.1	- First bullet point header modified according to Siemens suggestion - Removed: " It is noted that SEGs and Border Gateways (BG) could be co-located and even implemented within the same physical node." - Second bullet point changes to be inline with Siemens suggestion (except Marc's last ".by means of.." part. - Modified: The contents in the second paragraph is updated according to Siemens suggestion.
4.2	Modified: Updated to reflect Siemens suggestions
4.3	The section has been changed to reflect some of the suggestions from Siemens and Ericsson.
4.4.1	A "will" is substituted for a "may" in the second sentence (Siemens suggestion) Table-1: HTTP references removed. Siemens changes introduced. Ericsson clarification to Zf introduced. Editor: "Affected protocol" changed to "Protocol type".
4.4.1	Table-2: - I have added a note to explain that actual MAPsec protection is determined by the MAPsec Security Profile. An empty profile would indicate that MAPsec is not required for any of the interfaces. - J interface added as suggested by Siemens - Gs-interface removed - Iu/Iur removed from the table.
4.4.2	The text is clarified and some redundant definitions have been removed.
4.4.3	Filtering routers and Firewalls: Moved to informative annex c.
4.4.5	NATs: Moved to informative annex c. The text is rewritten, as it was somewhat unclear.

¹ Siemens did suggest Boundary Gateway, but according to 23.060 it shall be Border Gateway.

27 February - 02 March, 2001

Gothenburg, Sweden

4.5	- First and second bullet point: Changes as suggested by Ericsson - Removed: " In practicality, the security gateways are defined by functionality and are expected to physically coincide with the border gateways already defined for the GTP core network architecture. " - Added: " They shall offer capabilities for secure storage of long-term keys used for IKE authentication."
4.6	The text is updated and hopefully improved, but there still remain many issues.
5.1	Only minimal updating.
5.2	No changes. More material is needed.
5.3.1	Some of the suggestions by Siemens introduced.
5.3.2	Most of the suggestions from Ericsson and Siemens are implemented
5.4	Most of the suggestions from Ericsson and Siemens are implemented Figure-2 has not been updated, although it really should be.
6.2.3	Siemens suggestions implemented.
7	HTTP references removed.
Annex A.2	Redundant tutorial material removed.
Annex A.3	Redundant tutorial material removed.
Annex A.4	Must admit that I'm not quite sure if the ESP_AES has yet been approved. Could anybody check this.
Annex B	Removed: the bullet point containing security endpoint/hop-by-hop

/Geir M. Kjøien, Telenor R&D

27 February - 02 March, 2001

Gothenburg, Sweden

From: Telenor**Title:** Outstanding issues (TS33200 v032)

Outstanding issues (TS33200 v032)

The following is a list of some of the identified outstanding issues with TS33200 v032. Input on these issues is needed for SA3#17.

- **The question of Rel4 vs Rel5**
A lot of what's now in TS33200 is really Rel5 material. This has a lot to do with the history of MAPsec and our decisions on how to separate the WIs to go into NDS. Personally, I prefer to look at today's contents of TS33200 as Rel4 all of it.
- **Iu/Iur-interface: We need to decide how to deal with the Iu/Iur interfaces.**
- **Gs-interface:**
This is an SS7 based interface in the core network. The protocol is an adapted BSSAP (defined in TS29.016 and TS29.018). We need to decide how to deal with the Gs-interface.
- **The need for MAPsec towards EIR and SMS nodes.**
Table-2 currently covers all MAP interfaces. One certainly can regulate the need to support MAPsec on these interfaces with the security profiles, so there need not be any harm in allowing these interfaces to be covered in table-2. I'd prefer it from a completeness point of view and since there indeed may be a need for secure SMS transport and for integrity protected IMEI inquiries.
- **Description of KAC:**
The description of KAC is incomplete. It really cannot be completed until we have completed MAPsec in chapter 7.
- **Section 5.1 (Security Associations)**
Section 5.1 is largely tutorial in nature. As such it could perhaps be entirely deleted or moved to an informative annex. Or we may choose to keep it as is.
- **Figure-2 in section 5.4 ought to be updated**
- **Chapter 7 on MAPsec must be completed**
Both Siemens and Ericsson had major issues with chapter 7. The chapter is clearly not complete. I did not do any updates on chapter 7 in v032 except to remove HTTP references. I still kept the PUSH/PULL procedures that I introduced in v031, although as have been noted that while this is valuable discussion material it has not been agreed by S3.
INPUT URGENTLY NEEDED.

3GPP TS 33.200 V0.3.2 (2001-02)

Technical Specification

**3rd Generation Partnership Project;
Technical Specification Group SA3
3G Security;
Network Domain Security
(Release 4)**



The present document has been developed within the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP™) and may be further elaborated for the purposes of 3GPP.

The present document has not been subject to any approval process by the 3GPP Organizational Partners and shall not be implemented. This Specification is provided for future development work within 3GPP only. The Organizational Partners accept no liability for any use of this Specification. Specifications and reports for implementation of the 3GPP™ system should be obtained via the 3GPP Organizational Partners' Publications Offices.

Keywords

Security, Core Network, Key management

3GPP

Postal address

3GPP support office address

650 Route des Lucioles - Sophia Antipolis
Valbonne - FRANCE
Tel.: +33 4 92 94 42 00 Fax: +33 4 93 65 47 16

Internet

<http://www.3gpp.org>

Copyright Notification

No part may be reproduced except as authorized by written permission.
The copyright and the foregoing restriction extend to reproduction in all media.

© 2000, 3GPP Organizational Partners (ARIB, CWTS, ETSI, T1, TTA, TTC).
All rights reserved.

Contents

Foreword.....	5
Introduction.....	5
1 Scope	6
2 References	6
3 Definitions, symbols and abbreviations.....	7
3.1 Definitions.....	7
3.2 Symbols.....	7
3.3 Abbreviations	8
4 Overview over UMTS network domain security	8
4.1 Introduction.....	8
4.2 Security for SS7 and mixed SS7/IP based protocols.....	9
4.3 Security for native IP based protocols.....	9
4.4 Security domains.....	10
4.4.1 Security domains and interfaces	10
4.4.2 Security termination points.....	10
4.5 Security Gateways (SEGs).....	11
4.6 Key Administration Centres (KACs)	11
5 Key management and distribution architecture for the UMTS core network.....	12
5.1 Security Associations (SAs).....	12
5.1.1 Security Association functionality.....	13
5.1.2 Security Policy Database (SPD).....	13
5.1.3 Security Association Database (SAD).....	14
5.1.4 SA bundles and SA combinations	14
5.2 Use of the Internet Key Exchange protocol	14
5.3 UMTS key management and distribution architecture for native IP based protocols	15
5.3.1 Network domain security architecture outline.....	15
5.3.2 Interface description	16
5.4 UMTS key management and distribution architecture for SS7 and mixed SS7/IP-based protocols	17
6 Security for native IP based protocols.....	18
6.1 Security services afforded to the protocols	18
6.2 Security for GTP	18
6.2.2 The need for protecting GTP-C	18
6.2.2 Policy discrimination of GTP-C and GTP-U.....	18
6.2.3 Security policy granularity	19
7 Security for SS7 and mixed SS7/IP based protocols.....	19
7.1 Security services afforded to the protocols	19
7.2 MAP security (MAPsec).....	19
7.2.1 MAPsec Domain of Interpretation.....	19
7.2.1.1 MAPsec DoI requirements	19
7.2.1.2 MAPsec Situation definition	20
7.2.1.3 MAPsec Security Policy Requirements.....	20
7.2.1.4 MAPsec Security Association Attributes	20
7.2.1.5 MAPsec Payload Contents	21
7.2.1.6 MAPsec Key Exchange Requirements.....	21
7.2.2 MAPsec required modifications to standard IKE.....	21
7.2.3 Policy requirements for the MAPsec SPD.....	21
7.2.4 MAPsec SA transport protocol for the Ze-interface.....	21
7.2.4.1 MAPsec SA PUSH procedure	22
7.2.4.2 MAPsec SA PULL procedure	22
7.2.5 MAPsec structure of protected operations.....	23
7.2.5.1 MAPsec protection modes.....	23
7.2.5.2 Protection Mode 0	23

7.2.5.3	Protection Mode 1	23
7.2.5.4	Protection Mode 2	24
7.2.6	MAPsec security header	24
7.2.7	MAPsec protection profiles	25
7.2.8	MAPsec algorithms	25
8	Security for the Iu/Iur-interfaces	26
Annex A (normative): Usage and support of IPsec in the UMTS network domain control plane.....		27
A.1	Usage of IPsec payload compression	27
A.2	Support of ESP	27
A.3	Support of tunnel mode	27
A.4	Support of ESP encryption transforms	27
Annex B (normative): UMTS Security Profiles		28
B.1	UMTS Security Profile for MAP	28
B.2	UMTS Security Profile for GTP.....	28
Annex C (informative): Network Address Translators (NATs), filtering routers and firewalls.....		29
C.1	Network Address Translators (NATs).....	29
C.2	Filtering routers and firewalls	29
Annex D (informative): Change history		29

Foreword

This Technical Specification has been produced by the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP).

The contents of the present document are subject to continuing work within the TSG and may change following formal TSG approval. Should the TSG modify the contents of the present document, it will be re-released by the TSG with an identifying change of release date and an increase in version number as follows:

Version x.y.z

where:

- x the first digit:
 - 1 presented to TSG for information;
 - 2 presented to TSG for approval;
 - 3 or greater indicates TSG approved document under change control.
- y the second digit is incremented for all changes of substance, i.e. technical enhancements, corrections, updates, etc.
- z the third digit is incremented when editorial only changes have been incorporated in the document.

Introduction

An identified security weakness in 2G systems is the absence of security in SS7 networks. This was formerly perceived not to be a problem, since the SS7 networks were the provinces of a small number of large institutions. This is no longer the case, and so there is now a need for security precautions. Another significant development has been the introduction of IP as the network layer in the GPRS backbone network and then later in the UMTS network domain. Furthermore, IP is not only used for signalling traffic, but also for user traffic. The introduction of IP therefore signifies not only a shift towards packet switching, which is a major change by its own accounts, but also a shift towards completely open and easily accessible protocols. The implication is that from a security point of view, a whole new set of threats and risks must be faced.

For 3G systems it is a clear goal to be able to protect the core network signalling protocols, and by implication this means that security solutions must be found for both SS7 and IP based protocols.

Various protocols and interfaces are used for control plane signalling to/from, inside and between core networks. The security services that have been identified as being needed are confidentiality, integrity, authentication and anti-replay protection. These will be ensured by standard procedures, based on cryptographic techniques.

1 Scope

The present document defines the security architecture for the UMTS network domain control plane. The scope of the UMTS network domain control plane is to cover the control signalling in the UMTS core network. This includes both the SS7 and IP based control plane signalling protocols.

The UMTS core network contains a number of SS7 based protocols, which in this specification are referred to as legacy protocols. While the stated goal of the network domain security is to cover all of the core network protocols, not all of the legacy protocols will be protected in Rel4. Behind this is a realization that SS7 based legacy protocols can in practice only be protected at the application layer, and that the work involved in protecting the legacy protocols therefore will be high and require redesign of the protocol itself. Even in the cases where it would be technically feasible to do the job it is questionable whether the benefits would ever justify the required effort. Consequently, the only legacy protocol that is protected in Rel4 is the MAP protocol [4].

NOTE: Lawful Interception considerations and requirements are covered in separate specifications [8,9].

2 References

The following documents contain provisions which, through reference in this text, constitute provisions of the present document.

- [1] 3G TS 21.133: Security Threats and Requirements
- [2] 3G TS 21.905: 3G Vocabulary
- [3] 3G TS 23.060: General Packet Radio Service (GPRS); Service description; Stage 2
- [4] 3G TR 29.002: Mobile Application Part (MAP) specification
- [5] 3G TR 29.060: GPRS Tunnelling Protocol (GTP) across the Gn and Gp Interface
- [6] 3G TS 33.102: Security Architecture
- [7] 3G TS 33.103: Security Integration Guidelines
- [8] 3G TS 33.106: Lawful interception requirements
- [9] 3G TS 33.107: Lawful interception architecture and functions
- [10] 3G TS 33.120: Security Objectives and Principles
- [11] 3G TS 33.800: Principles for Network Domain Security
- [12] RFC-2393: IP Payload Compression Protocol (IPComp)
- [13] RFC-2401: Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol
- [14] RFC-2402: IP Authentication Header
- [15] RFC-2403: The Use of HMAC-MD5-96 within ESP and AH
- [16] RFC-2404: The Use of HMAC-SHA-1-96 within ESP and AH
- [17] RFC-2405: The ESP DES-CBC Cipher Algorithm With Explicit IV
- [18] RFC-2406: IP Encapsulating Security Payload
- [19] RFC-2407: The Internet IP Security Domain of Interpretation for ISAKMP
- [20] RFC-2408: Internet Security Association and Key Management Protocol (ISAKMP)
- [21] RFC-2409: The Internet Key Exchange (IKE)

- [22] RFC-2410: The NULL Encryption Algorithm and Its Use With IPsec
- [23] RFC-2411: IP Security Document Roadmap
- [24] RFC-2412: The OAKLEY Key Determination Protocol
- [25] RFC-2451: The ESP CBC-Mode Cipher Algorithms
- [26] RFC-2521: ICMP Security Failures Messages

3 Definitions, symbols and abbreviations

3.1 Definitions

For the purposes of the present document, the following terms and definitions apply.

Anti-replay protection: Anti-replay protection is a special case of integrity protection. Its main service is to protect against replay of self-contained packets that already have a cryptographic integrity mechanism in place.

Confidentiality: The property that information is not made available or disclosed to unauthorised individuals, entities or processes.

Data integrity: The property that data has not been altered in an unauthorised manner.

Data origin authentication: The corroboration that the source of data received is as claimed.

Entity authentication: The provision of assurance of the claimed identity of an entity.

Key freshness: A key is fresh if it can be guaranteed to be new, as opposed to an old key being reused through actions of either an adversary or authorised party.

Security Association: A uni-directional logical connection created for security purposes. All traffic traversing an SA is provided the same security protection. (this does not apply to IKE security association)

Transport mode: Mode of operation that primarily protects the payload of the IP packet, in effect giving protection to higher level layers

Tunnel mode: Mode of operation that protects the whole IP packet by tunnelling it so that the whole packet is protected

3.2 Symbols

For the purposes of the present document, the following symbols apply:

C	MAP interface between an HLR and an MSC
D	MAP interface between an HLR and a VLR
E	MAP interface between MSCs
F	MAP interface between a MSC and an EIR
Gc	Interface between a GGSN and an HLR
Gd	Interface between an MSC and an SGSN
Gf	Interface between an SGSN and an EIR
Gi	Reference point between GPRS and an external packet data network
Gn	Interface between two GSNs within the same PLMN
Gp	Interface between two GSNs in different PLMNs. The Gp interface allows support of GPRS network services across areas served by the co-operating GPRS PLMNs
Gr	Interface between an SGSN and an HLR
Gs	Interface between an SGSN and an MSC/VLR.
Iu	Interface between the RNS and the core network. It is also considered as a reference point.
Iur	Interface between RNSs in the access network
Za	Interface between SEGs belonging to different networks/security domains
Zb	Interface between SEGs and NEs within the same network/security domain
Zc	Interface between NEs within the same network/security domain

Zd	Interface between KACs belonging to different networks/security domains
Ze	Interface between KACs and MAP-NEs within the same network
Zf	Interface between networks/security domains for secure interoperation. MAP-NE \leftrightarrow MAP-NE.

3.3 Abbreviations

For the purposes of the present document, the following abbreviations apply:

AAA	Authentication Authorization Accounting
AES	Advanced Encryption Standard
AH	Authentication Header
BG	Border Gateway
CS	Circuit Switched
DES	Data Encryption Standard
DoI	Domain of Interpretation
ESP	Encapsulating Security Payload
GTP	GPRS Tunnelling Protocols
IETF	Internet Engineering Task Force
IESG	Internet Engineering Steering Group
IKE	Internet Key Exchange
IP	Internet Protocol
IPsec	IP security - a collection of protocols and algorithms for IP security incl. key mngt.
ISAKMP	Internet Security Association Key Management Protocols
IV	Initialization Vector
KAC	Key Administration Centre
MAC	Message Authentication Code
MAP	Mobile Application Part
MAPsec	MAP security – the MAP protocol with security enhancements
NAT	Network Address Translator
NDS	Network Domain Security
NE	Network Entity
PS	Packet Switched
RNS	Radio Network Subsystem
SA	Security Association
SAD	Security Association Database (sometimes also referred to as SADB)
SEG	Security Gateway
SPD	Security Policy Database (sometimes also referred to as SPDB)
SPI	Security Parameters Index
TVP	Time Variant Parameter
USP	UMTS Security Profile

4 Overview over UMTS network domain security

4.1 Introduction

The scope of this section is to outline the basic principles for the network domain security architecture. A central concept introduced in this specification is the notion of a network security domain. The security domains are networks that are managed by a single administrative authority. Within a security domain the same level of security and usage of security services will be typical. Typically, a network operated by a single operator will constitute one security domain although an operator may at will subsection its network into separate sub-networks and hence separate security domains.

In this specification a distinction between protocols using SS7 and IP based networks as their transport are made. Ideally no such distinction should have had to be made, but the technical differences between the SS7 and IP architectures has forced the following high-level sub-sectioning:

- **If native IP based protocols are protected they shall be protected at the network level by means of the IPsec protocols**

The UMTS network domain control plane is also sectioned into security domains and typically these coincide with operator borders. The border between the security domains is protected by Security Gateways (SEGs). The SEGs are responsible for enforcing the security policy of a security domain towards other SEGs in the destination security domain. The network operator may have more than one SEG in its network in order to avoid a single point of failure or for performance reasons. A SEG may be defined for interaction towards all reachable security domain destinations or it may be defined for only a subset of the reachable destinations.

The UMTS network domain security does not extend to the user plane and consequently the security domains and the associated security gateways towards other domains do not encompass the user plane Gi interface towards other, possibly external to UMTS, IP networks.

- **If SS7 based protocols are protected they shall be protected at the application level**

As the main rule, protocols that can be transported by either SS7 or IP networks shall be protected at the application layer. SS7 or mixed SS7/IP based protocols will commonly be referred to as legacy protocols in this specification.

For legacy protocols, the necessary security associations between networks are negotiated between Key Administration Centre entities. The negotiated SA will be effective network-wide and distributed to all affected network elements. Signalling traffic protected at the application layer will for routing purposes be indistinguishable from unprotected traffic to all parties except for the sending and receiving entities. The network operator may have more than one KAC in its network in order to avoid a single point of failure or for performance reasons. A KAC may be defined for interaction towards all reachable security domain destinations or it may be defined for only a subset of the reachable destinations.

4.2 Security for SS7 and mixed SS7/IP based protocols

Legacy protocols shall be protected at the application layer. This implies changes to the application protocols themselves to allow for the necessary security functionality. This specification contains the stage-2 specification for the security protection of the legacy protocols. The actual implementation (stage-3) specification can be found in the specification for the target protocol.

Overview over security protected SS7 based protocols for Rel4:

- **Mobile Application Part**

Security for MAP shall be provided by the MAP security protocol. The MAP security protocol stage-2 specification is found in section 7 and Annex B.1 and stage-3 specification is found in TS 29.002 [4].

NOTE: It has been recognised that legacy protocols may also be protected at the network layer when using IP as the transport protocol. However, whenever interworking with networks using SS7-based transport is necessary then protection at the application layer shall be used.

4.3 Security for native IP based protocols

For native IP-based protocols, security shall be provided at the network layer. The security protocols to be used at the network layer are the IPsec security protocols as specified in RFC-2401 [13]. All network domain entities supporting native IP-based control plane protocols shall support IPsec.

A chained-tunnel/hub-and-spoke approach is used which facilitates hop-by-hop based security protection. This allows for lawful interception points and NATs in the networks.

All secure communication between security domains shall take place through Security Gateways (SEGs)

Although IPsec allows for manual entry of SAs, key management for IPsec between security domains shall always be automated in order to support IPsec anti-replay protection.

4.4 Security domains

4.4.1 Security domains and interfaces

The UMTS network domain shall be logically and physically divided into security domains. These control plane security domains, which may closely correspond to the core network of a single operator, shall be separated by means of security gateways.

The specific network domain security interfaces is found in table 1. Section 5.2 contains a detailed description of the Z-interfaces.

Table 1: Network domain security specific interfaces

Interface	Description	Network type
Za	Network domain security interface between SEGs. The interface is used for both the negotiation of security associations and for the set-up of ESP protected tunnels between SEGs (no third party negotiation).	IP
Zb	Network domain security interface between SEGs and NEs within the same network. The interface is used for both the negotiation of security associations and for the set-up of an ESP protected tunnel.	IP
Zc	Network domain security interface between NEs within the same network. The interface is used for both the negotiation of security associations and for the set-up of an ESP protected tunnel.	IP
Zd	Network domain security interface between networks. The Zd-interface is defined for negotiation of MAP security associations between KACs.	IP
Ze	Network domain security interface between KAC and MAP-NE within the same network. The interface is security protected by means of an IPsec ESP tunnel.	IP
Zf	Network domain security interface between MAP-NEs engaged in security protected signalling (applies to MAP-NEs belonging to different or even to the same security domain)	SS7/MAP

The interfaces, which affects/is affected by the network domain security specification, are described in the table below. Notice that when security protection is employed over an interface, this specification will refer to the Z-interface name.

Table 2: Interfaces that are affected by network domain security

Interface	Description	Affected protocol	Security implication
C	Interface between HLR and MSC	MAP	MAPsec shall be supported
D	Interface between HLR and VLR	MAP	MAPsec shall be supported
E	Interface between MSC and MSC	MAP	MAPsec shall be supported
F	Interface between MSC and EIR	MAP	MAPsec shall be supported
G	Interface between VLR and VLR	MAP	MAPsec shall be supported
J	Interface between HLR and gsmSCF	MAP	MAPsec shall be supported
Gc	Optional interface between GGSN and HLR	MAP	MAPsec shall be supported
Gd	Interface between SMS-MSCs and SGSN	MAP	MAPsec shall be supported
Gf	Interface between SGSN and EIR	MAP	MAPsec shall be supported
Gn	Interface between GSNs within the same network	GTP	ESP shall be supported
Gp	Interface between GSNs in different PLMNs.	GTP	IPsec shall be supported. Security Gateways shall be present at the domain borders.
Gr	Interface between SGSN and HLR	MAP	MAPsec shall be supported
Gs	Interface between SGSN and VLR/MSC	MAP	MAPsec shall be supported

NOTE: The requirement for MAPsec support is dependent on the MAPsec security profile.

4.4.2 Security termination points

By a terminating point one here understand a network point where the signalling traffic will be present in unprotected form at some stage. Security protection is terminated in the following entities:

SS7 based protocols:

MAP security is effective end-to-end. The sending and the receiving MAP-NEs will be the terminating points.

Native IP based protocols:

IP security in the UMTS network domain control plane is based on a chained-tunnels. This implies that every end-point of a tunnel must be viewed as a termination point unless one uses nested tunnels. The only defined tunnel termination points are the communicating entities themselves and possibly one or more SEGs.

NOTE: Only network entities belonging to the security domains of the communicating entities can be security termination points. This holds irrespective of the fact that there may be intermediate networks between the communicating parties.

4.5 Security Gateways (SEGs)

Security Gateways (SEGs) are entities on the borders of the IP security domains and will be used for securing native IP based protocols. The SEGs are defined to handle communication over these interfaces:

- the Za-interface, which is located between SEGs from different IP security domains. The IKE and ESP protocols shall be used over this interface.
- the Zb-interface, which is located between a SEG and an NE within the same security domain. The IKE and ESP protocols may be used over this interface.

All NDS related IP traffic shall pass through a SEG before entering or leaving the security domain. Each security domain can have one or more SEGs. Each SEG will be defined to handle all traffic in or out of the security domain towards a well-defined set of reachable IP security domains.

The number of SEGs in a security domain will depend on the need to differentiate between the externally reachable destinations, the need to balance the traffic load and to avoid single point of failures. The security gateways shall be responsible for enforcing security policies for the interworking between networks. The security may include filtering policies and firewall functionality not required in this specification. More information on SEGs can be found in 5.2 and section 6.

SEGs are responsible for security sensitive operations and shall be physically secured. They shall offer capabilities for secure storage of long-term keys used for IKE authentication.

4.6 Key Administration Centres (KACs)

Key Administration Centres (KACs) are entities that are used for negotiating MAPsec SAs on behalf of MAP-NEs. The KACs are defined to handle communication over these interfaces:

- the Zd-interface, which is located between KACs from different MAP security domains. The IKE protocol with support for MAPsec DoI shall be used over this interface.
- the Ze-interface, which is located between a KAC and a MAP-NE within the same MAP security domain is used to transfer MAPsec SAs from KACs to MAP-NEs. The IKE and ESP protocols may be used to negotiate and secure the connection between the KAC and the MAP-NE.

When MAP-NEs need to establish a secure connection towards another MAP-NEs they will request a MAPsec SA from the KAC. The KAC will then either provide an existing MAPsec SAs or negotiate a new MAPsec SA, before returning the MAPsec SA to the MAP-NE.

A MAPsec SA is valid for all MAP communication between the two security domains for which it is negotiated. That is, the same MAPsec SA shall be provided to all MAP-NE in security domain A when communication with MAP-NEs in security domain B. Each security domain can have one or more KACs. Each KAC will be defined to MAPsec SAs towards a well-defined set of reachable MAP security domains. The number of KACs in a security domain will depend on the need to differentiate between the externally reachable destinations, the need to balance the traffic load and to avoid single point of failures.

The following are the most important tasks for a KAC:

- Perform MAP-SA negotiation with KACs belonging to other security domains. This action is triggered either by request for a MAP-SA by a NE or by policy enforcement when MAP-SAs always should be available.
- Perform refresh of MAP-SAs. Triggered internally by MAP-SA lifetime supervision, which is depending on the policies set by the operator and if, it is decided during the negotiation.
- Distribute valid MAP-SAs to requesting nodes belonging to the same network as the KAC. This is done according to the MAP-SA transport procedures defined in section 7.2.4.
- Establish ESP protected communication between itself and other NEs in its own network

More information on KACs can be found in 5.3 and section 7.

KACs are responsible for security sensitive operations and shall be physically secured. They shall offer capabilities for the secure storage of long-term keys used for IKE authentication.

5 Key management and distribution architecture for the UMTS core network

5.1 Security Associations (SAs)

In the UMTS network domain security architecture the key management and distribution between SEGs and between KACs is handled by the IPsec protocol Internet Key Exchange (IKE) [19,20,21]. The main purpose of IKE 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. The SAs defines uni-directional "connections" which serves to provide the security protocols ESP and AH with keys etc.

An SA can be established for either AH or ESP, but not both. If both AH and ESP protection is required to protect a connection, then two (or more) SAs will be needed. To secure typical, bi-directional communication between two hosts, or between two security gateways, two Security Associations (one in each direction) are required.

Security associations are uniquely defined by the following parameters:

- A Security Parameter Index (SPI)
- An IP Destination Address
- A security protocol (AH or ESP) identifier

With regard to the use of security associations in the UMTS network domain control plane the following is noted:

- The destination address shall always be a unicast address (in compliance with IPsec requirements)
- NDS only requires support for tunnel mode SAs. IPsec requirements for transport mode SAs does not apply for NDS.
- NDS only requires support for ESP SAs. IPsec requirements for AH SAs does not apply for NDS.

The IPsec specification of SAs can be found in RFC-2401 [13].

NOTE: The above description assumes IPsec SAs. For MAPsec the SAs will be different. Details of the MAPsec SAs are found in section 5.3, section 7 and Annex B.1.

5.1.1 Security Association functionality

IPsec offers a set of security services, which is determined by the negotiated security associations. That is, the SA defines which security protocol to be used, the SA mode and the endpoints of the SA.

In the UMTS NDS the IPsec security protocol shall always be ESP and the SA mode shall always be tunnel mode. In NDS it is further mandated that integrity protection/message authentication together with anti-replay protection shall always be used.

The security service functionality that can be provided given the NDS requirements are:

- data integrity;
- data origin authentication;
- anti-replay protection;
- confidentiality (optional);
- limited protection against traffic flow analysis when confidentiality is applied;

5.1.2 Security Policy Database (SPD)

The Security Policy Database (SPD) is a policy instrument to decide which security services are to be offered and in what fashion.

The SPD shall be consulted during processing of both inbound and outbound traffic. This also includes traffic that shall not/need not be protected by IPsec. In order to achieve this the SPD must have unique entries for both inbound and outbound traffic such that the SPD can discriminate among traffic that shall be protected by IPsec that shall bypass IPsec.

The processing options are:

- **Discard**
This option is used to explicitly disallow certain types of traffic to exit or enter the host or traverse the security gateway
- **Bypass IPsec**
This option is used for traffic that is allowed to pass without IPsec protection
- **Apply IPsec**
This option is used for traffic that shall be protected by IPsec. For such traffic the SPD must specify the security services to be provided, protocols to be employed, algorithms to be used, etc.

If IPsec processing is to be applied, the SPD entry will include information on the following:

- the SA or SA bundle to be used
- the IPsec protocol(s) to be used ; (only ESP shall be used for NDS)
- the mode(s); (only tunnel mode shall be used for NDS)
- the algorithms to be employed; (the ESP_DES transform shall not be used for NDS)
- any nesting requirements

5.1.3 Security Association Database (SAD)

The Security Association Database (SAD) contains parameters that are associated with the active security associations. Every SA has an entry in the SAD. For outbound processing, a lookup in the SPD will point to an entry in the SAD. If an SPD entry does not point to an SA that is appropriate for the packet, an SA (or SA-bundle) shall be automatically created or fetched from an SEG or KAC.

For inbound processing the following IP header fields are used for looking up the SA in the SAD:

- Outer Header's Destination IP address; (either the IPv4 or IPv6 destination address)
- IPsec Protocol; (for the UMTS network domain control plane this shall always be ESP)
- SPI; (a32-bit value used to distinguish among different SAs terminating at the same destination and using the same IPsec protocol)

The following SAD fields are used during IPsec processing (AH specific fields omitted):

- Sequence Number Counter; (a 32-bit value used to generate the Sequence Number field in the ESP header)
- Sequence Counter Overflow; (a flag to indicate the appropriate action when sequence number overflows occur)
- Anti-Replay Window; (a 32-bit counter used to determine whether an inbound ESP packet is a replay)
- ESP Encryption algorithm, keys, IV mode, IV, etc; (for NDS the ESP_DES transform shall not be used)
- ESP authentication algorithm, keys, etc; (for NDS this field shall not be null)
- Lifetime of this Security Association; (the lifetime interval may be expressed as a time or byte count, or both, the first lifetime to expire taking precedence)
- IPsec protocol mode; (for NDS only tunnel mode shall be used)
- Path MTU

NOTE: The SAD processing rules to and the SAD fields mentioned above does not apply to MAPsec.

5.1.4 SA bundles and SA combinations

The traffic over an individual SA is protected by exactly one security protocol, either AH or ESP, but not both. Sometimes a security policy has requirements that cannot be handles by a single SA. In such cases it is necessary to employ more than one SA to satisfy the security policy. The term "SA bundle" is used for cases were more than one SA is required to satisfy a security policy. Note that the SAs that comprise a bundle may terminate at different endpoints. Security associations may be combined into bundles in two ways namely transport adjacency and iterated tunneling.

A basic set of combinations and configurations is defined in [13]. These include minimum functionality for passing security gateways and nesting of tunnels etc.

For the UMTS network domain control plane the requirements for nesting and combinations of SAs are covered in section 5.2 and section 6.

5.2 Use of the Internet Key Exchange protocol

The Internet Key Exchange protocol shall be used for negotiation of both MAPsec SAs and IPsec SAs.

UMTS NDS compliant IKE protocols shall support the use of pre-shared secrets for IKE SA authentication.

5.3.2 Interface description

The following interfaces is defined for protection of native IP based protocols:

- **Za-interface (SEG-SEG)**

The Za-interface covers all secure IP communication between security domains. The SEGs uses IKE to negotiate, establish and maintain a secure tunnel between them. Subject to roaming agreements, the inter-SEG tunnels would normally be available at all times, but they can also be established as needed. This tunnel is subsequently used for forwarding secured traffic between security domain A and security domain B.

One SEG can be dedicated to only serve a certain subset of all roaming partners. This will limit the number of SAs and tunnels that need to be maintained. The number of SEGs within a network will normally be limited.

- **Zb-interface (NE-SEG)**

The Zb-interface is located between NEs and a SEG from the same security domain. The NE and the SEG are able to establish and maintain ESP-tunnels between them. Whether the tunnel is established when needed or a priori is for the security domain operator to decide. The tunnel is subsequently used for exchange of secured traffic between the NE and the SEG.

Normally ESP shall be used with both encryption and authentication/integrity, but an authentication/integrity only mode is allowed.

All control plane traffic towards external destinations shall be routed via a SEG.

- **Zc-interface (NE-NE)**

The Zc-interface is located between NEs from the same security domain. The NEs are able to establish and maintain ESP-tunnels between them. Whether the tunnel is established when needed or a priori is for the security domain operator to decide. The tunnel is subsequently used for exchange of secured traffic between the NEs.

Normally ESP shall be used with both encryption and authentication/integrity, but an authentication/integrity only mode is allowed.

The ESP tunnel shall be used for all control plane traffic that needs security protection.

NOTE-1: The security policy established over the Za-interface is subject to roaming agreements. This differs from the security policy enforced over the Zb- and the Zc-interface, which is unilaterally decided by the security domain operator.

NOTE-2: There is no NE-NE interface for NEs belonging to separate security domains. This is because it is important to have a clear separation between the security domains. The restriction not to allow secure inter-domain NE-NE communication does not preclude a single physical entity to contain both NE and SEG functionality. A combined NE/SEG entity need not support an external Zb-interface provided that the entity itself is physically secured.

5.4 UMTS key management and distribution architecture for SS7 and mixed SS7/IP-based protocols

The following section specifies the generic parts of the key management and distribution architecture for SS7 and mixed SS7/IP-based protocols. Due to the fact that the security mechanisms are found on the application layer a number of the issues are unique to the application. Section 7 contains detailed and specific requirements for the applicable application protocols.




Figure 2: Overview of the Zd, Ze and Zf interfaces

For Rel4 the only SS7 protocol to be protected is the MAP protocol. References to MAP security (MAPsec) may therefore be extended to be more generic in later releases.

The following interfaces are defined MAPsec.

- **Zd-interface (KAC-KAC)**

The Z-d-interface is used to negotiate MAPsec Security Associations (SAs) between MAP security domains. The traffic over Zd consists only of IKE negotiations. The negotiated MAPsec SAs are valid on a security domain to security domain basis.

- **Ze-interface (KAC-NE)**

The Ze-interface is located between MAP-NEs and a KAC from the same MAP security domain. The KAC and the MAP-NE are able to establish and maintain an ESP tunnel between them. Whether the tunnel is established when needed or a priori is for the MAP security domain operator to decide. The tunnel is subsequently used for transport of MAPsec SAs from the KAC to the MAP-NE.

- **The Zf-interface (NE-NE)**

The Zf-interface is located between MAP-NEs. The MAP-NEs may be from the same security domain or from different security domains (as shown in figure 2). The MAP-NEs use MAPsec SAs received from a KAC to protect the MAP operations. The MAP operations within the MAP dialogue are protected selectively as specified in the applied MAPsec security profile.

6 Security for native IP based protocols

6.1 Security services afforded to the protocols

The security services provided by using ESP in tunnel mode are:

- data integrity;
- data origin authentication;
- anti-replay protection;
- confidentiality (optional);
- limited protection against traffic flow analysis when confidentiality is applied;

6.2 Security for GTP

6.2.2 The need for protecting GTP-C

The GPRS Tunnelling Protocol (GTP) is defined in 3G TS 29.060 [5]. The GTP protocol includes both the GTP control plane signalling (GTP-C) and user plane data transfer (GTP-U) procedures. GTP is defined for Gn interface, i.e. the interface between GSNs within a PLMN, and for the Gp interface between GSNs in different PLMNs.

GTP-C is used for traffic that that is sensitive in various ways including traffic that is:

- critical with respect to both the internal integrity and consistency of the network
- essential in order to provide the user with the required services
- crucial in order to protect the user data in the access network and that might compromise the security of the user data should it be revealed

Amongst the data that clearly can be considered sensitive are the mobility management messages, the authentication data and MM context data. Therefore, it is necessary to apply security protection to GTP signalling messages (GTP-C).

Network domain security does not cover protection of user plane data and hence GTP-U is not protected by NDS procedures.

6.2.2 Policy discrimination of GTP-C and GTP-U

SGNs must be able to discriminate between GTP-C messages, which shall receive protection, and other messages, including GTP-U, that shall not be protected. Since GTP-C is assigned a unique UDP port-number [5] IPsec can easily distinguish GTP-C datagrams from other datagrams that may not need IPsec protection.

As discussed in section 5.1.2 the Security Policy Database (SPD) is consulted for all traffic (both incoming and outgoing) and it processes the datagrams in the following ways:

- discard the datagram
- bypass the datagram (do not apply IPsec)
- apply IPsec

Under this regime GTP-U will simply bypass IPsec while GTP-C will be further processed by IPsec in order to provide the required level of protection. The SPD has a pointer to an entry in the Security Association Database (SAD) which details the actual protection to be applied to the datagram.

NOTE: Selective protection of GTP-C relies on the ability to uniquely distinguish GTP-C datagrams from GTP-U datagrams. For R99 on onwards this is achieved by having unique port number assignments to GTP-C and GTP-U. For previous version of GTP this is not the case.

6.2.3 Security policy granularity

The policy control granularity afforded by NDS is determined by the degree of control with respect to the ESP tunnels between the NEs or SEGs. The normal mode of operation is that only one ESP tunnel is used between any two NEs or SEGs, and therefore the security policy will be identical to all secured traffic passing between the NEs.

This is consistent with the overall NDS concept of security domains, which should have the same security policy in force for all traffic within the security domain. Security policy enforcement for inter-domain communication is matter for the communication security domains and will be enforced by the SEGs of the communicating security domains.

7 Security for SS7 and mixed SS7/IP based protocols

7.1 Security services afforded to the protocols

The security services required for SS7 and mixed SS7/IP-based protocols are:

- data integrity;
- data origin authentication;
- anti-replay protection;
- confidentiality (optional);

7.2 MAP security (MAPsec)

This section describes mechanisms for establishing secure signalling links between MAP network entities

7.2.1 MAPsec Domain of Interpretation

Key management and distribution between operators for MAPsec is done by means of the Internet Key Exchange (IKE). To adapt IKE for use with MAPsec a MAPsec Domain of Interpretation (DoI) document is required. Such document is to defined and published within the IETF framework as a separate RFC. Since the MAPsec DoI RFC is only concerned with non-IP issues it will an informational RFC, but it shall nevertheless be normative for UMTS MAPsec purposes.

[EDITOR: What exactly is the status of the MAPsec RFC ?. Has it got a number yet so that we can reference it? I guess the RFC cannot be produced until we have agreed on this TS.]

7.2.1.1 MAPsec DoI requirements

ISAKMP (RFC-2408, [20]) places the following significant requirements on a DoI definition:

- Define the interpretation for the Situation field
- Define the set of applicable security policies
- Define the syntax for DoI-specific SA Attributes (Phase II)
- Define the syntax for DoI-specific payload contents
- Define additional Key Exchange types, if necessary
- Define additional Notification Message types, if needed

IANA will not normally assign a DoI value without referencing some public specification, such as an Internet RFC. Without a DoI value assigned by IANA, the MAP SA negotiation over the interface Z_D is not possible. MAPsec DoI for ISAKMP draft *must* be written, since the new DoI is an essential part of the key management architecture.

The following sections define briefly the requirements for MAPsec DoI for ISAKMP.

7.2.1.2 MAPsec Situation definition

Within ISAKMP, the Situation provides information that the responder can use to determine how to process incoming SA request. For the MAPsec DoI, the Situation field is always left empty.

7.2.1.3 MAPsec Security Policy Requirements

The MAPsec DoI does not impose specific security policy requirements on any implementation.

MAPSec Assigned Numbers

The following sections list the Assigned Numbers for the MAPsec DoI: protocol identifiers and transform identifiers.

- **MAPsec Protocol Identifier** defines a value for the Security Protocol Identifier referenced in an ISAKMP Proposal Payload for the MAPsec DoI.

Protocol ID	Value
-----	-----
PROTO_MAPSEC	5

- **MAPsec Transform Identifier** defines at least one mandatory transform used to provide data confidentiality.

Transform ID	Value
-----	-----
RESERVED	0
MAPSEC_AES	1

The following attributes are needed

- Protection Profile
- Authentication algorithm for integrity and authentication
- Encryption algorithm for confidentiality
- Encryption and authentication keys
- SA lifetime

7.2.1.4 MAPsec Security Association Attributes

The following attributes are needed

- Protection Profile
- Authentication algorithm for integrity and authentication

- Encryption algorithm for confidentiality
- Encryption and authentication keys
- SA lifetime

7.2.1.5 MAPsec Payload Contents

Defining different MAPsec payloads is outside the scope of this document. At least the following payloads require modifications or a redefinition:

- Security association payload
- Identification payload

7.2.1.6 MAPsec Key Exchange Requirements

MAPsec DoI does not introduce additional key exchange types.

7.2.2 MAPsec required modifications to standard IKE

In Phase 1 there are no changes to main mode.

A new Phase 2 mode - the MAP mode, must be introduced. The MAP mode differs from the existing IKE quick mode in the following respects:

- Payloads included to the messages of MAP mode are the same as in Quick Mode but the contents of the payloads differ in the case SA payload and ID payloads.
- Either the identity is never sent or if sent it will be the PLMDID in fqdn or der_gn encoded form (or the key_id).

KEYMAT for MAPsec SA template (as in the present Quick mode).

7.2.3 Policy requirements for the MAPsec SPD

The policy is described as in the RFC-2401 [13] with following changes:

- The lifetime of the MAP SA is not defined as an amount of data transferred, but as absolute lifetime in seconds.
- The generated MAP SA will not be used for processing inbound and outbound traffic in KACs and thus processing choices *discard*, *bypass IPsec* and *apply IPsec* does not apply.
- The operator defines for which networks MAP SA's are negotiated.

The security policies for MAPsec key management are specified in the KACs' SPD by the network operator. The SPDs in the network elements are derived from the SPD of the KAC in the network. There can be no local security policy definitions for individual NEs.

The SPD may be implemented as a text file to ease the porting to different systems. Text-file based implementation is also easier to alter by possible third parties than a GUI interface. The SPD file contains the information required to implement the security policy and does not require a lot of memory. It can be easily cached to improve the performance of the system (real time requirements).

7.2.4 MAPsec SA transport protocol for the Ze-interface

The stage-3 description for MAPsec SA transport protocol is defined in [some ref] .

Two different modes are defined for this interface:

- The PUSH mode where the MAP-NE subscribes to the MAPsec SA from a particular security domain

- The PULL mode where the MAP-NE explicitly requests a MAPsec SA from a particular security domain

7.2.4.1 MAPsec SA PUSH procedure

The MAPsec SA PUSH procedure is used when the MAP-NE has substantial and frequent traffic towards a security domain. In case like this it makes sense to automatically receive an updated MAPsec SA when the old one is about to expire. The KAC will automatically re-negotiate the SAs.

Two procedures are defined for managing the MAPsec SA subscriptions. Own addresses will be part of the addressing of the requests.



Figure 3: SubscribeSA procedure

A subscription is valid until it is cancelled by the *UnsubscribeSA* procedure. A subscription is valid for exactly one security domain. The MAP-NE may have as many active subscriptions as needed.



Figure 4: UnSubscribeSA procedure

The *UnsubscribeSA* procedure cancels exactly one SA subscription. An invocation of the *UnsubscribeSA* procedure without the a preceding *SubscriptionSA* is invalid and shall be ignored by the KAC.




Figure 5: UpdateSA procedure

The *UpdateSA* procedure is executed whenever a subscribed to MAPsec SA is renegotiated by the KAC. The *UpdateSA* procedure then transfers the fresh MAPsec SA from the KAC to the MAP-NE and the new MAPsec SA is then used for all subsequent dialogues from the MAP-NE towards other MAP-NEs in the security domain indicated by the MAPsec SA.

7.2.4.2 MAPsec SA PULL procedure

The MAPsec SA PULL procedure is used when the MAP-NE need close control of the MAPsec SA updating or when the amount of traffic towards a security domain is infrequent.




Figure 6: RequestSA procedure

In case like this the MAP-NE only request an SA when it is actually needed or when the MAP-NE detects that the SA is about to expire. When receiving the request the KAC will either directly provide the MAP-NE with an already present SA or it will negotiate an SA with the external security domain before proceeding to return the SA to the MAP-NE.


7.2.5 MAPsec structure of protected operations

7.2.5.1 MAPsec protection modes

MAPsec provides for three different protection modes and these are defined as follows:

- Protection Mode 0: No Protection
- Protection Mode 1: Integrity, Authenticity
- Protection Mode 2: Confidentiality, Integrity, and Authenticity

MAP operation protected by means of MAPsec consists of a Security Header and the Protected Payload. Secured MAP operations have the following structure:



In all three protection modes, the security header is transmitted in cleartext.

In protection mode 2 providing confidentiality, the protected payload is essentially the encrypted payload of the original MAP operation . For integrity and authenticity in protection modes 1 and 2, the message authentication code is calculated on the security header and the payload of the original MAP operation in cleartext is included in the protected payload. In protection mode 0 no protection is offered, therefore the protected payload is identical to the payload of the original MAP operation.

[EDITOR: I got the impression that a container operation "SecureTransport" is being specified and that it would take a protected operations as its payload. This is not yet reflected in the most current version of TR 33.800 and the the material here may not be completely up to date. This affects 7.2.5.2-5.]

Input from companies with CN4 delegates is wanted.]

7.2.5.2 Protection Mode 0

Protection Mode 0 offers no protection at all. Therefore, the protected payload in protection mode 0 is functionally and security wise identical to the original MAP operation payload in cleartext.

For cases where Protection Mode 0 is to be used the protection level will be identical to the original unprotected MAP operation. It is therefore allowed as an implementation option to let Protection Mode 0 operations be sent without the security header.

7.2.5.3 Protection Mode 1

The protected payload of Secured MAP operations in protection mode 1 takes the following form:



where "Cleartext" is the payload of the original MAP operation in clear text. Therefore, in Protection Mode 1 the protected payload is a concatenation of the following information elements:

- Time Variant Parameter TVP
- Cleartext
- Integrity Check Value

Authentication of origin and message integrity are achieved by applying the message authentication code (MAC) function H with the integrity session key $KS_{XY}(int)$ to the concatenation of Time Variant Parameter TVP, Security Header and Cleartext.

The TVP used for replay protection of Secured MAP operations is a 32 bit time-stamp. The receiving network entity will accept an operation only if the time-stamp is within a certain time-window. The resolution of the clock from which the time-stamp is derived must be agreed as a system parameter, the size of the time-window at the receiving network entity need not be standardised.

7.2.5.4 Protection Mode 2

The Secured MAP Message Body in protection mode 2 takes the following form:

$$TVP || E_{KS_{XY}(con)}(Cleartext) || H_{KS_{XY}(int)}(TVP || MAP\ Header || Security\ Header || E_{KS_{XY}(con)}(Cleartext))$$

where "Cleartext" is the original MAP message in clear text. Message confidentiality is achieved by encrypting Cleartext with the confidentiality session key $KS_{XY}(con)$. Authentication of origin and message integrity are achieved by applying the message authentication code (MAC) function H with the integrity session key $KS_{XY}(int)$ to the concatenation of Time Variant Parameter TVP, MAP Header, Security Header and $E_{KS_{XY}(con)}(Cleartext)$.

The TVP used for replay protection of Secured MAP messages is a 32 bit time-stamp. The receiving network entity will accept a message only if the time-stamp is within a certain time-window. The resolution of the clock from which the time-stamp is derived must be agreed as a system parameter, the size of the time-window at the receiving network entity need not be standardised.

It is further recommended the use of protection mode 2 whenever possible as this makes replay attacks even more difficult.

7.2.6 MAPsec security header

The security header is a sequence of the following data elements:

- **Sending PLMN-Id:**
PLMN-Id is the ID number of the sending Public Land Mobile Network (PLMN). The value for the PLMN-Id is formed from the Mobile Country Code (MCC) and Mobile Network Code (MNC) of the destination network.
- **Security Parameter Index (SPI):**
SPI is an arbitrary 32-bit value that is used in combination with the sender's PLMNID to uniquely identify a MAP-SA.
- **Initialization Vector (IV):**
Initialization vectors are used with block ciphers in chained mode to force an identical plaintext to encrypt to different cipher texts. Using IVs prevents launching a codebook attack against encrypted traffic. The issue is discussed in more detail in RFC 2406. IV has only local significance in the NE.

NOTE: Whether the Initialisation Vector is needed depends on the mode of operation of the encryption algorithm.
- **Original Component identifier:**
Identifies the type of component within the MAP operation that is being securely transported (Operation identified by operation code, Error defined by Error Code or User Information).

7.2.7 MAPsec protection profiles

MAPsec specifies a set of protection profiles. These profiles specifies the required protection level pr MAP operation. The protection profile is then a set of attribute pairs (operation, protection level). Annex B.1 contains definitions for standard MAPsec protection profiles.

Table 3: Example of (Operation, Protection level) attribute pairs

MAP Operation	Protection Mode
SendAuthenticationInfo	2 (authenticity/integrity and confidentiality)
AuthenticationFailureReport	1 (authenticity/integrity)
CheckImei	1 (authenticity/integrity)

The protection level for a specified operation applies for the operation irrespective of the dialogue/application context that the operation is part of. Corollary, a dialogue/application context may contain operations with different protection level.

NOTE: Operations shall have the same protection level for both the request and the response phase.

7.2.8 MAPsec algorithms

Similarly to the case of identification of encryption and integrity algorithms in the access network there is a need for having more than one algorithm to choose from. An algorithm indication field is used to identify the actual algorithms to be used.

The MAPsec Integrity Algorithm (MIA) will be assigned to the MAPsec DoI TransformID.

Table 4: MAPsec Integrity Algorithm identifiers

MIA identifier	Description
00	Null
01	AES in CBC MAC mode (MANDATORY)
-not yet assigned-	-not yet assigned-

The MAPsec Encryption Algorithm (MEA) will be assigned to the MAPsec DoI TransformID

Table 5: MAPsec Encryption Algorithm identifiers

MEA identifier	Description
00	Null
01	AES (MANDATORY)
-not yet assigned-	-not yet assigned-

For both MIA and MEA the minimum key length shall be 128 bits.

[EDITOR: We need to make a clear distinction here: What goes into the MAPsec DoI RFC and what should remain in the TS. To have the same data both places seems undesirable.]

8 Security for the lu/lur-interfaces

ffs

Annex A (normative): Usage and support of IPsec in the UMTS network domain control plane

This annex gives an overview of the features of IPsec that is used by in the UMTS network domain. The overview given here defines a minimum set of features that must be supported. In particular, this minimum set of features is required for interworking purposes and constitutes a well-defined set of simplifications.

The accumulated effect of the simplifications is quite significant in terms of reduced complexity. This is achieved without sacrificing security in any way. It shall be noted explicitly that the simplifications are specified for the UMTS network domain control plane and that they may not necessarily be valid for other network constellations and usages.

Within their own network, operators are free to use IPsec features not described in this annex although there should be no security or functional reason to do so.

A.1 Usage of IPsec payload compression

Standard IPsec allows for packet payload compression to be used in conjunction with ESP and AH (RFC-2393, [12]). For the purpose of the UMTS network domain control plane, use of stateless packet-by-packet compression in general offers no benefits since the compression is not effective for small packets.

However, the disadvantages of introducing payload compression are added complexity for the SA negotiation phase since separate compression SAs must be negotiated and added complexity in the packet processing for both the sending and the receiving side.

Therefore IPsec payload compression shall not be used for interworking traffic over the Za-interface.

A.2 Support of ESP

When IPsec is applied, the ESP (RFC-2406, [18]) security protocol shall be used for all interworking traffic. Furthermore, ESP shall always be used with integrity, data origin authentication, and anti-replay services. That is, the NULL authentication algorithm is explicitly not allowed for use in the UMTS network domain control plane.

A.3 Support of tunnel mode

Since security gateways are an integral part of the UMTS network domain control plane architecture tunnel mode shall be supported. For interworking purposes, security gateways shall be used and consequently only tunnel mode (RFC-2401, [13]) is applicable for this case.

The operators may support transport mode within their own network, but it shall be noted that tunnel mode alone will be sufficient for all cases. There is therefore no explicit need for support of transport mode in the UMTS network domain control plane.

A.4 Support of ESP encryption transforms

IPsec offers a fairly wide set of confidentiality transforms. The only transform that compliant IPsec implementation is required to support is the ESP_DES transform. However, the Data Encryption Standard (DES) transform is no longer considered to sufficiently strong in terms of cryptographic strength. This is also noted by IESG in a note in RFC-2407 [19] to the effect that the ESP_DES transform is likely to be deprecated as a mandatory transform in the near future. A new Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) is being standardized to replace the aging DES.

It is therefore explicitly noted that for use in the UMTS network domain control plane the ESP_DES transform shall not be used and instead the ESP_AES transform shall be used.

Annex B (normative): UMTS Security Profiles

The security profiles are partially standardised security associations. That is, a limited set of available security association options is negotiable with the scope of the UMTS network domain security architecture. The security profiles defines the both the negotiable and the non-negotiable parts of UMTS security associations.

The security associations comes in two distinctive variants:

- Security Associations for use with IPsec
- Security Associations for use with MAPsec

For each native IP-based protocol, profiles for the use of IPsec are specified. These may differ for different interfaces or may be identical. A security profile is a selection of options for the use of IPsec in the UMTS core network. When defining security policies and security associations for the use of IPsec, the options selected in the security profile shall be used, thus reducing the IPsec configurations which need to be supported by the UMTS core network. A security profile need not completely determine the choice of security policies and security associations.

A security profile contains following items:

- Security features: integrity/message authentication w/anti-replay protection shall always be used. Confidentiality is optional
- Security protocol: ESP shall always be used.
- Mode: tunnel mode shall always be used.
- Security mechanisms: a set of cryptographic algorithms which must be supported
- Selectors: the selectors which shall be used for security associations
- Support for SA lifetime handling
- Combination of security associations (if applicable)
- Failure handling

B.1 UMTS Security Profile for MAP

[Editor: It seems unwise to proceed with the MAPsec profiles before we have a clear idea of what the MAPsec DoI RFC will contain.]

B.2 UMTS Security Profile for GTP

[Editor: Formally GTP protection is part of R5 so this part is not so urgent. Nevertheless, we'd still like to complete this section at SA#17. (this requires some input though)]

Annex C (informative): Network Address Translators (NATs), filtering routers and firewalls

C.1 Network Address Translators (NATs)

Network Address Translators (NATs) are not designed to be part of the UMTS network domain control plane. Since network domain security employs a chained-tunnel approach it may be possible to use NATs provided that the network is carefully configured.

C.2 Filtering routers and firewalls

In order to strengthen the security for IP based networks, border gateways and access routers would normally use packet filtering strategies to prevent certain types of traffic to pass in or out of the network. Similarly, firewalls are used as an additional measure to prevent certain types of accesses towards the network.

The rationale behind the application of packet filters and firewalls should be found in the security policy of the network operator. Preferably, the security policy should be an integral part of the network management strategy as a whole.

While network operators are strongly encouraged to use filtering routers and firewalls, the usage, implementation and security policies associated with these are considered outside the scope of this specification.

Annex D (informative): Change history

It is usual to include an annex (usually the final annex of the document) for specifications under TSG change control which details the change history of the specification using a table as follows:

Change history							
Date	TSG #	TSG Doc.	CR	Rev	Subject/Comment	Old	New