

# ETSI TS 133 210 V15.2.2 (2019-10)



**Digital cellular telecommunications system (Phase 2+) (GSM);  
Universal Mobile Telecommunications System (UMTS);  
LTE;  
3G security;  
Network Domain Security (NDS);  
IP network layer security  
(3GPP TS 33.210 version 15.2.2 Release 15)**



---

**Reference**

RTS/TSGS-0333210vf22

---

**Keywords**

GSM,LTE,SECURITY,UMTS

**ETSI**

---

650 Route des Lucioles  
F-06921 Sophia Antipolis Cedex - FRANCE

Tel.: +33 4 92 94 42 00 Fax: +33 4 93 65 47 16

Siret N° 348 623 562 00017 - NAF 742 C  
Association à but non lucratif enregistrée à la  
Sous-Préfecture de Grasse (06) N° 7803/88

---

**Important notice**

The present document can be downloaded from:

<http://www.etsi.org/standards-search>

The present document may be made available in electronic versions and/or in print. The content of any electronic and/or print versions of the present document shall not be modified without the prior written authorization of ETSI. In case of any existing or perceived difference in contents between such versions and/or in print, the prevailing version of an ETSI deliverable is the one made publicly available in PDF format at [www.etsi.org/deliver](http://www.etsi.org/deliver).

Users of the present document should be aware that the document may be subject to revision or change of status.

Information on the current status of this and other ETSI documents is available at

<https://portal.etsi.org/TB/ETSIDeliverableStatus.aspx>

If you find errors in the present document, please send your comment to one of the following services:

<https://portal.etsi.org/People/CommiteeSupportStaff.aspx>

---

**Copyright Notification**

No part may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and microfilm except as authorized by written permission of ETSI.

The content of the PDF version shall not be modified without the written authorization of ETSI.

The copyright and the foregoing restriction extend to reproduction in all media.

© ETSI 2019.

All rights reserved.

**DECT™**, **PLUGTESTS™**, **UMTS™** and the ETSI logo are trademarks of ETSI registered for the benefit of its Members.

**3GPP™** and **LTE™** are trademarks of ETSI registered for the benefit of its Members and of the 3GPP Organizational Partners.

**oneM2M™** logo is a trademark of ETSI registered for the benefit of its Members and of the oneM2M Partners.

**GSM®** and the GSM logo are trademarks registered and owned by the GSM Association.

---

## Intellectual Property Rights

### Essential patents

IPRs essential or potentially essential to normative deliverables may have been declared to ETSI. The information pertaining to these essential IPRs, if any, is publicly available for **ETSI members and non-members**, and can be found in ETSI SR 000 314: "*Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs); Essential, or potentially Essential, IPRs notified to ETSI in respect of ETSI standards*", which is available from the ETSI Secretariat. Latest updates are available on the ETSI Web server (<https://ipr.etsi.org/>).

Pursuant to the ETSI IPR Policy, no investigation, including IPR searches, has been carried out by ETSI. No guarantee can be given as to the existence of other IPRs not referenced in ETSI SR 000 314 (or the updates on the ETSI Web server) which are, or may be, or may become, essential to the present document.

### Trademarks

The present document may include trademarks and/or tradenames which are asserted and/or registered by their owners. ETSI claims no ownership of these except for any which are indicated as being the property of ETSI, and conveys no right to use or reproduce any trademark and/or tradename. Mention of those trademarks in the present document does not constitute an endorsement by ETSI of products, services or organizations associated with those trademarks.

---

## Legal Notice

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

The present document may refer to technical specifications or reports using their 3GPP identities. These shall be interpreted as being references to the corresponding ETSI deliverables.

The cross reference between 3GPP and ETSI identities can be found under <http://webapp.etsi.org/key/queryform.asp>.

---

## Modal verbs terminology

In the present document "**shall**", "**shall not**", "**should**", "**should not**", "**may**", "**need not**", "**will**", "**will not**", "**can**" and "**cannot**" are to be interpreted as described in clause 3.2 of the [ETSI Drafting Rules](#) (Verbal forms for the expression of provisions).

"**must**" and "**must not**" are **NOT** allowed in ETSI deliverables except when used in direct citation.

# Contents

Intellectual Property Rights .....	2
Legal Notice .....	2
Modal verbs terminology.....	2
Foreword.....	5
Introduction .....	5
1 Scope .....	6
2 References .....	6
3 Definitions, symbols and abbreviations .....	8
3.1 Definitions .....	8
3.2 Symbols.....	9
3.3 Abbreviations .....	9
4 Overview over network domain security for IP based protocols .....	10
4.1 Introduction .....	10
4.2 Protection at the network layer.....	10
4.3 Security for native IP based protocols.....	10
4.4 Security domains .....	10
4.4.1 Security domains and interfaces .....	10
4.5 Security Gateways (SEGs) .....	10
5 Key management and distribution architecture for NDS/IP.....	11
5.1 Security services afforded to the protocols.....	11
5.2 Security Associations (SAs).....	11
5.2.0 General.....	11
5.2.1 Security Policy Database (SPD) .....	12
5.2.2 Security Association Database (SAD) .....	12
5.3 Profiling of IPsec.....	12
5.3.0 General.....	12
5.3.1 Support of ESP .....	12
5.3.2 Support of tunnel mode.....	12
5.3.3 Support of ESP encryption transforms .....	12
5.3.4 Support of ESP authentication transforms .....	13
5.3.5 Requirements on the construction of the IV .....	13
5.4 Profiling of IKEv2.....	13
5.4.0 General.....	13
5.4.1 Void .....	13
5.4.2 Profiling of IKEv2 .....	13
5.4.3 Void .....	14
5.5 Security policy granularity .....	15
5.6 Network domain security key management and distribution architecture for native IP based protocols.....	15
5.6.1 Network domain security architecture outline .....	15
5.6.2 Interface description .....	16
6 Other 3GPP profiles .....	17
6.1 General .....	17
6.2 TLS protocol profiles .....	17
6.2.1 General .....	17
6.2.2 Profiling for TLS 1.3 .....	18
6.2.3 Profiling for TLS 1.2 and earlier .....	18
6.3 JWE and JWS profiles.....	19
6.3.1 General.....	19
6.3.2 JWE profile.....	20
6.3.3 JWS profile .....	20
<b>Annex A (informative): Other issues .....</b>	<b>21</b>

A.1	Network Address Translators (NATs) and Transition Gateways (TrGWs).....	21
A.2	Filtering routers and firewalls .....	21
A.3	The relationship between BGs and SEGs.....	21
<b>Annex B (normative):</b>	<b>Security protection for GTP .....</b>	<b>22</b>
B.0	General .....	22
B.1	The need for security protection.....	22
B.2	Policy discrimination of GTP-C and GTP-U .....	22
B.3	Protection of GTP-C transport protocols and interfaces .....	23
<b>Annex C (normative):</b>	<b>Security protection of IMS protocols .....</b>	<b>24</b>
C.0	General .....	24
C.1	The need for security protection.....	24
C.2	Protection of IMS protocols and interfaces .....	24
<b>Annex D (normative):</b>	<b>Security protection of UTRAN/GERAN IP transport protocols.....</b>	<b>25</b>
D.0	General .....	25
D.1	The need for security protection.....	25
D.2	Protection of UTRAN/GERAN IP transport protocols and interfaces.....	25
<b>Annex E (informative):</b>	<b>RFC-4303 compared with RFC-2406.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Annex F (informative):</b>	<b>Change history .....</b>	<b>27</b>
History .....		29

---

## Foreword

This Technical Specification has been produced by the 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 GPRS systems is the absence of security in the core network. This was formerly perceived not to be a problem, since the GPRS networks previously 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 UMTS and fixed broadband 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.

Starting with LTE, but especially with 5G, security of signalling protocols moves onto the application layer. The current document is the central repository of the protection mechanisms and profiles for these protocols.

This document is the stage-2 specification for IP related security in the 3GPP and fixed broadband 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 network domain IP based control planes, which shall be applied to NDS/IP-networks (i.e. 3GPP and fixed broadband networks). The scope of network domain control plane security is to cover the control signalling on selected interfaces between network elements of NDS/IP networks. . The present document furthermore serves as a central repository for cryptographic profiles for security above IP layer.

---

# 2 References

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

- References are either specific (identified by date of publication, edition number, version number, etc.) or non-specific.
- For a specific reference, subsequent revisions do not apply.
- For a non-specific reference, the latest version applies. In the case of a reference to a 3GPP document (including a GSM document), a non-specific reference implicitly refers to the latest version of that document *in the same Release as the present document*.

- [1] 3GPP TS 21.133: "3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; 3G Security; Security Threats and Requirements".
- [2] 3GPP TR 21.905: "3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; Vocabulary for 3GPP Specifications".
- [3] 3GPP TS 23.002: "3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Services and Systems Aspects; Network architecture".
- [4] 3GPP TS 23.060: "3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; General Packet Radio Service (GPRS); Service description; Stage 2".
- [5] 3GPP TS 23.228: "3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; IP Multimedia Subsystem (IMS); Stage 2".
- [6] 3GPP TS 29.060: "3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Core Network; General Packet Radio Service (GPRS); GPRS Tunnelling Protocol (GTP) across the Gn and Gp Interface".
- [7] 3GPP TS 33.102: "3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; 3G Security; Security Architecture".
- [8] 3GPP TS 33.103: "3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; 3G security; Integration guidelines".
- [9] 3GPP TS 33.120: "3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; 3G Security; Security Principles and Objectives".
- [10] 3GPP TS 33.203: "3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; Access security for IP-based services".
- [11] -[25] Void.
- [26] RFC-3554: "On the Use of Stream Control Transmission Protocol (SCTP) with IPsec".
- [27] RFC-1750: "Randomness Recommendations for Security".
- [28] 3GPP TS 25.412: "3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Radio Access Network; UTRAN Iu interface signalling transport".
- [29] Void.

- [30] 3GPP TS 33.310: "3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; 3G Security; Network domain security; Authentication Framework".
- [31] RFC-4303: "IP Encapsulating Security Payload (ESP)"
- [32] Void.
- [33] Void
- [34] Void.
- [35] RFC-4301: "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol".
- [36] Void.
- [37] Void.
- [38] 3GPP TS 25.422: "3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Radio Access Network; UTRAN Iur interface signalling transport".
- [39] 3GPP TS 25.467: "3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Radio Access Network; UTRAN architecture for 3G Home Node B (HNB); Stage 2".
- [40] 3GPP TS 25.468: "3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Radio Access Network; UTRAN Iuh Interface RANAP User Adaption (RUA) signalling".
- [41] 3GPP TS 25.471: "3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Radio Access Network; UTRAN Iurh Interface RNSAP User Adaption (RNA) signalling".
- [42] RFC-6311: "Protocol Support for High Availability of IKEv2/IPsec".
- [43] RFC-7296: "Internet Key Exchange Protocol Version 2 (IKEv2)".
- [44] IANA: "Internet Key Exchange Version 2 (IKEv2) Parameters".
- [45] RFC-7321: "Cryptographic Algorithm Implementation Requirements and Usage Guidance for Encapsulating Security Payload (ESP) and Authentication Header (AH)".
- [46] IETF RFC 7515: "JSON Web Signature (JWS)".
- [47] IETF RFC 7516: "JSON Web Encryption (JWE)".
- [48] IETF RFC 7518: "JSON Web Algorithms (JWA)".
- [49] IETF RFC 6347: "Datagram Transport Layer Security Version 1.2".
- [50] IETF RFC 5246: "The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.2".
- [51] IETF RFC 8442: "ECDHE\_PSK with AES-GCM and AES-CCM Cipher Suites for TLS 1.2 and DTLS 1.2".
- [52] IETF RFC 2818: "HTTP Over TLS".
- [53] IETF RFC 2817: "Upgrading to TLS Within HTTP/1.1".
- [54] IETF RFC 5288: "AES Galois Counter Mode (GCM) Cipher Suites for TLS".
- [55] IETF RFC 5289: "TLS Elliptic Curve Cipher Suites with SHA-256/384 and AES Galois Counter Mode (GCM)".
- [56] IETF RFC 4492: "Elliptic Curve Cryptography (ECC) Cipher Suites for Transport Layer Security (TLS)".
- [57] IETF RFC 6066: "Transport Layer Security (TLS) Extensions: Extension Definitions".
- [58] IETF RFC 4366: "Transport Layer Security (TLS) Extensions".



- [59] IETF RFC 5077: "Transport Layer Security (TLS) Session Resumption without Server-Side State".
- [60] IETF RFC 5746: "Transport Layer Security (TLS) Renegotiation Indication Extension".
- [61] IETF RFC 7627: "Transport Layer Security (TLS) Session Hash and Extended Master Secret Extension".
- [62] IETF RFC 7919: "Negotiated Finite Field Diffie-Hellman Ephemeral Parameters for Transport Layer Security (TLS)".
- [63] IETF RFC 4279: "Pre-Shared Key Ciphersuites for Transport Layer Security (TLS)".
- [64] IETF RFC 5489: "ECDHE\_PSK Cipher Suites for Transport Layer Security (TLS)".
- [65] IETF RFC 5487: "Pre-Shared Key Cipher Suites for TLS with SHA-256/384 and AES Galois Counter Mode".
- [66] IETF RFC 8446: "The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.3".
- [67] IETF RFC 4346: "The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.1".

---

## 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.

**NDS/IP Traffic:** Traffic that requires protection according to the mechanisms defined in this specification.

**NDS/IP-networks:** 3GPP and fixed broadband networks.

**IPsec Security Association:** A unidirectional logical connection created for security purposes. All traffic traversing a SA is provided the same security protection. The SA itself is a set of parameters to define security protection between two entities. A IPsec Security Association includes the cryptographic algorithms, the keys, the duration of the keys, and other parameters.

**Security Domain:** 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.

**Transit Security Domain:** A security domain, which is transmitting NDS/IP traffic between other security domains.

**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:

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
Mm	Interface between a CSCF and an IP multimedia network
Mw	Interface between a CSCF and another CSCF
Za	Interface between SEGs belonging to different networks/security domains
Zb	Interface between SEGs and NEs and interface between NEs within the same network/security domain

## 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
CSCF	Call Session Control Function
DES	Data Encryption Standard
DoI	Domain of Interpretation
ESP	Encapsulating Security Payload
GTP	GPRS Tunnelling Protocols
IESG	Internet Engineering Steering Group
IETF	Internet Engineering Task Force
IKE	Internet Key Exchange
IKEv2	Internet Key Exchange version 2
IP	Internet Protocol
IPsec	IP security - a collection of protocols and algorithms for IP security incl. key mngt.
ISAKMP	Internet Security Association Key Management Protocol
IV	Initialisation Vector
MAC	Message Authentication Code
NAT	Network Address Translator
NDS	Network Domain Security
NDS/IP	NDS for IP based protocols
NE	Network Entity
PS	Packet Switched
SA	Security Association
SAD	Security Association Database (sometimes also referred to as SADB)
SEG	Security Gateway
SIP	Session Initiation Protocol
SPD	Security Policy Database (sometimes also referred to as SPDB)
SPI	Security Parameters Index
TISPAN	Telecoms & Internet converged Services & Protocols for Advanced Networks
TrGW	Transition Gateway

---

## 4 Overview over network domain security for IP based protocols

### 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 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 network operator or a single transit operator will constitute one security domain although an operator may at will subsection its network into separate sub-networks.

### 4.2 Protection at the network layer

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 IETF defined IPsec security protocols as specified in RFC-4301 [35] and in RFC-2401 [12].

### 4.3 Security for native IP based protocols

The network domain control plane of an NDS/IP-network is 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 network domain security of an NDS/IP-network 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, IP networks.

A chained-tunnel/hub-and-spoke approach is used which facilitates hop-by-hop based security protection between security domains.

Within a security domain the use of Transport Mode is allowed. All NDS/IP traffic shall pass through a SEG before entering or leaving the security domain.

### 4.4 Security domains

#### 4.4.1 Security domains and interfaces

The network domain of an NDS/IP-network shall be logically and physically divided into security domains. These control plane security domains may closely correspond to the core network of a single operator and shall be separated by means of security gateways.

### 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 the Za-interface, which is located between SEGs from different IP security domains.

All NDS/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 NDS/IP 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 points of failure. 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.

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.

---

## 5 Key management and distribution architecture for NDS/IP

### 5.1 Security services afforded to the protocols

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

For NDS/IP-networks the IPsec security protocol shall always be ESP. For NDS/IP-networks it is further mandated that integrity protection/message authentication together with anti-replay protection shall always be used.

The security services provided by NDS/IP:

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

### 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].

## 5.2.1 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 or that shall be discarded by IPsec.

The SPD plays a central role when defining security policies, both within the internal security domain and towards external security domains. The security policy towards external security domains will be subject to roaming agreements.

## 5.2.2 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 shall be automatically created.

# 5.3 Profiling of IPsec

## 5.3.0 General

This section gives an overview of the features of IPsec that are used by NDS/IP. 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 NDS/IP 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 section although there should be no security or functional reason to do so.

**NOTE:** Clause 5.3 contains the general 3GPP IPsec ESP profile. Other 3GPP specifications (e.g. TS 33.203 [10], etc.) may point to clause 5.3. Thus parts of clause 5.3 may also apply to devices and network nodes as specified in other specifications. New specifications using ESP should refer to this profile with as few exceptions as possible.

## 5.3.1 Support of ESP

When NDS/IP is applied, the ESP security protocol shall be used. IPsec ESP shall be supported according to RFC-4303 [31]. For compatibility with earlier 3GPP releases, it shall be possible to communicate with nodes supporting only RFC-2406 [17].

**NOTE:** Annex E describes the main differences between RFC-4303 [31] and RFC-2406 [17] and the features which require RFC-4303 [31] implementation.

## 5.3.2 Support of tunnel mode

Since security gateways are an integral part of the NDS/IP architecture, tunnel mode shall be supported. For NDS/IP inter-domain communication, security gateways shall be used and consequently only tunnel mode (RFC-4301 [35]) is applicable for this case.

## 5.3.3 Support of ESP encryption transforms

The implementation conformance requirements for ESP encryption transforms (including authenticated encryption transforms) in RFC 7321 [45] shall be followed.

Only the ESP encryption algorithms (including authenticated encryption algorithms) mentioned in RFC 7321 [45] shall be used. Algorithms marked with "MUST" shall be supported. AES-256 should be supported. AES-GCM with a 16 octet ICV shall be supported.

### 5.3.4 Support of ESP authentication transforms

The implementation conformance requirements for ESP authentication transforms in RFC 7321 [45] shall be followed.

Only the ESP authentication algorithms mentioned in RFC 7321 [45] shall be used. Algorithms marked with "MUST" shall be supported. AES-GMAC with AES-128 shall be supported.

ESP shall always be used to provide integrity, data origin authentication, and anti-replay services, thus the NULL authentication algorithm is explicitly not allowed for use, unless an authenticated encryption algorithm is used.

### 5.3.5 Requirements on the construction of the IV

The following strengthening of the requirements on how to construct the IV shall take precedence over the description given in RFC-2451 [24] section 3 and all other descriptions that allow for predictable IVs.

- For CBC mode: the IV field shall be the same size as the block size of the cipher algorithm being used. The IV shall be chosen at random, and shall be unpredictable to any party other than the originator.
- For CTR, GCM, CCM, and GMAC mode: the IV field shall be 8 octets. The IV must be generated in a manner that ensures uniqueness. The same IV and key combination shall not be used more than once. The IV shall be chosen at random, and shall be unpredictable to any party other than the originator.
- It is explicitly not allowed to construct the IV from the encrypted data of the preceding encryption process.

The common practice of constructing the IV from the encrypted data of the preceding encryption process means that the IV is disclosed before it is used. A predictable IV exposes IPsec to certain attacks irrespective of the strength of the underlying cipher algorithm. The second bullet point forbids this practice in the context of NDS/IP.

These requirements imply that the network elements must have a capability to generate random data. RFC-1750 [27] gives guidelines for hardware and software pseudorandom number generators.

## 5.4 Profiling of IKEv2

### 5.4.0 General

**NOTE:** Clause 5.4 contains the general 3GPP IKEv2 profile. Other 3GPP specifications may 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.

### 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: ENCR\_AES\_CBC with 128-bit key length;
- Confidentiality: AES-GCM with a 16 octet ICV with 128-bit key length;
- Pseudo-random function: PRF\_HMAC\_SHA1;
- Pseudo-random function: PRF\_HMAC\_SHA2\_256;
- Integrity: AUTH\_HMAC\_SHA1\_96;
- Integrity: AUTH\_HMAC\_SHA256\_128;
- Diffie-Hellman group 14 (2048-bit MODP);
- 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).

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:**

- Perfect Forward Secrecy is optional.

**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.

## 5.4.3 Void

## 5.5 Security policy granularity

The policy control granularity afforded by NDS/IP is determined by the degree of control with respect to the ESP Security Association between the NEs or SEGs. The normal mode of operation is that only one ESP Security Association 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/IP concept of security domains, which should have the same security policy in force for all traffic within the security domain. The actual inter-security domain policy is determined by roaming agreements when the security domains belong to different operators or may be unilaterally decided by the operator when the security domains both belong to him. IPsec security policy enforcement for inter-security domain communication is a matter for the SEGs of the communicating security domains.

## 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.

### 5.6.2 Interface description

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

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

The Za-interface covers all NDS/IP traffic between security domains. On the Za-interface, authentication/integrity protection is mandatory and encryption is recommended. ESP shall be used for providing authentication/integrity protection and encryption. The SEGs use IKEv2 to negotiate, establish and maintain a secure ESP tunnel between them. The tunnel is subsequently used for forwarding NDS/IP traffic between security domain A and security domain B. Inter-SEG tunnels can be available at all times, but they can also be established as needed.

One SEG of security domain A can be dedicated to only serve a certain subset of security domains that security domain A needs to communicate with. This will limit the number of SAs and tunnels that need to be maintained.

All security domains compliant with the present document shall operate the Za-interface.

NOTE 1: It is possible to use transit security domains between other security domains. The Za interface is used to protect the interface between the transit security domain and other security domains. If there are multiple transit security domains between two security domains then Za-interface is used to protect interfaces between transit security domains.

NOTE 2: Further details about the usage of encryption in specific cases are provided in the (normative) Annexes of the present document and in other 3GPP specifications referencing the present document.

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

The Zb-interface is located between SEGs and NEs and between NEs within the same security domain. The Zb-interface is optional for implementation. If implemented, it shall implement ESP in tunnel mode and IKE as described in clause 5.4. The support of ESP in Transport mode is optional.

On the Zb-interface, ESP shall always be used with authentication/integrity protection. The use of encryption is optional. The ESP Security Association shall be used for all control plane traffic that needs security protection.

Whether the Security Association is established when needed or a priori is for the security domain operator to decide. The Security Association is subsequently used for exchange of NDS/IP traffic between the nodes.

NOTE 3: The security policy established over the Za-interface may be subject to roaming agreements. This differs from the security policy enforced over the Zb-interface, which is unilaterally decided by the security domain operator.

NOTE 4: There is normally 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. This is particularly relevant when different security policies are employed within the security domain and towards external destinations.

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. It is observed that SEGs are responsible for enforcing security policies towards external destinations and that a combined NE/SEG would have the same responsibility towards external destinations. The exact SEG functionality required to allow for secure inter-domain NE $\leftrightarrow$ NE communication will be subject to the actual security policies being employed. Thus, it will be possible to have secure direct inter-domain NE $\leftrightarrow$ NE communication within the framework of NDS/IP if both NEs have implemented SEG functionality. If a NE and SEG is combined in one physical entity, the SEG functionality of the combined unit should not be used by other NEs towards external security domains.

---

## 6 Other 3GPP profiles

### 6.1 General

The present document also serves as a repository for 3GPP profiles of protocols above the IP layer. These are collected in the present clause.

### 6.2 TLS protocol profiles

#### 6.2.1 General

The present clause contains the general 3GPP TLS profile. Other 3GPP specifications point to the present clause. Thus, parts of the present clause may also apply to devices and network nodes as specified in other specifications. New specifications using TLS should refer to this profile with as few exceptions as possible.

NOTE: DTLS 1.2 as specified in RFC 6347 [49] is based on TLS 1.2. Hence all requirements defined in this profile apply to DTLS protocol as well.

TLS end points shall support TLS with the following restrictions and extensions:

#### **TLS versions**

- SSL 1.0, SSL 2.0, SSL 3.0, TLS 1.0 and DTLS 1.0 shall not be supported.
- TLS 1.1 as specified in RFC 4346 [67] shall be supported. TLS 1.2 as specified in RFC 5246 [50] shall be supported. TLS 1.3 as specified in RFC 8446 [66] shall be supported by the network and should be supported by the ME. If DTLS is supported then DTLS 1.2 as specified in RFC 6347 [49] shall be supported.
- Use of TLS 1.1 is not recommended and shall be possible to disable in network nodes.

## Other

- If the TLS connection is used to transport HTTP over TLS as specified in RFC 2818 [52], then the client shall not establish a connection "upgraded to TLS Within HTTP/1.1" per RFC 2817 [53], but shall only establish the tunnel over a raw TCP connection.

## 6.2.2 Profiling for TLS 1.3

TLS 1.3 shall support the following restrictions and extensions:

### TLS cipher suites and Diffie-Hellman groups

- The rules on allowed and mandatory cipher suites given in TLS 1.3 RFC 8446[66] shall be followed.

### TLS extensions

- The rules on allowed and mandatory extensions given in TLS 1.3 RFC 8446 [66] shall be followed.

## 6.2.3 Profiling for TLS 1.2 and earlier

TLS 1.2 and earlier versions shall support the following restrictions and extensions:

### TLS cipher suites

- The rules on allowed and mandatory cipher suites given in TLS 1.2 (RFC 5246 [50]) shall be followed.
- In addition, the following cipher suites are mandatory to support and recommended to use:
  - TLS\_ECDHE\_ECDSA\_WITH\_AES\_128\_GCM\_SHA256 as defined in RFC 5289 [55]
  - TLS\_DHE\_RSA\_WITH\_AES\_128\_GCM\_SHA256 as defined in RFC 5288 [54]
- Support of the following cipher suites is recommended:
  - TLS\_ECDHE\_ECDSA\_WITH\_AES\_256\_GCM\_SHA384 as defined in RFC 5289 [55]
  - TLS\_ECDHE\_RSA\_WITH\_AES\_256\_GCM\_SHA384 as defined in RFC 5289 [55]
- Non-AEAD cipher suites should not be used and shall be possible to disable in network nodes. Non-PFS cipher suites should not be used and shall be possible to disable in network nodes. Implementations shall prefer cipher suites offering forward secrecy.
- For interworking with pre-Release 13 elements, it may be necessary to allow fall back to cipher suite TLS\_RSA\_WITH\_AES\_128\_CBC\_SHA.
- Cipher suites with NULL integrity protection shall not be supported. Cipher suites with RC4 shall not be supported. Anonymous cipher suites shall not be supported.

### Diffie-Hellman groups

- For ECDHE, the curve secp256r1 (P-256) as defined in RFC 4492 [56] shall be supported, secp384r1 (P-384) as defined in RFC 4492 [56] should be supported. Elliptic curve groups of less than 255 bits shall not be supported.
- For DHE, Diffie-Hellman groups of at least 4096 bits should be supported. Diffie-Hellman groups smaller than 2048 bits shall not be supported.

### TLS compression

- The "null" compression method as specified in TLS 1.2 RFC 5246 [50] is mandatory to support. All other compression methods shall not be supported.

### TLS extensions

- If TLS Extensions are used in conjunction with TLS, then for TLS 1.2 RFC 6066 [57] shall apply, and for TLS versions lower than TLS 1.2 RFC 4366 [58] shall apply.
- The Server Name Indication (SNI) extension defined in RFC 6066 [57] shall be supported.
- The Truncated HMAC extension, defined in RFC 6066 [57] shall not be supported.
- TLS Session Resumption based on RFC 5246 [50] or RFC 5077 [59] should be supported.
- TLS servers and TLS clients shall support RFC 5746 [60]. The server shall accept client-initiated renegotiation only if secured according to RFC 5746 [60].
- Session hash and Extended Master Secret, defined in RFC 7627 [61] should be supported.
- Negotiated Finite Field Diffie-Hellman Ephemeral Parameters, defined in RFC 7919 [62] should be supported.

### PSK cipher suites

- If pre-shared key (psk) cipher suites are implemented in TLS, then RFC 4279 [63] and RFC 5489 [64] shall apply and the following cipher suites are mandatory to support and recommended to use:
  - TLS\_DHE\_PSK\_WITH\_AES\_128\_GCM\_SHA256 as defined in RFC 5487 [65].
  - TLS\_ECDHE\_PSK\_WITH\_AES\_128\_GCM\_SHA256 as defined in RFC 8442 [51].
- Support of the following cipher suite is recommended:
  - TLS\_ECDHE\_PSK\_WITH\_AES\_256\_GCM\_SHA384 as defined in RFC 8442 [51].
- For interworking with pre-Release 13 elements, it may be necessary to allow fall back to cipher suite TLS\_PSK\_WITH\_AES\_128\_CBC\_SHA.

### Cipher suites without encryption

- TLS without encryption shall only be supported on interfaces where one of the endpoints is an UE.
- For UEs, TLS\_ECDHE\_ECDSA\_WITH\_NULL\_SHA and TLS\_ECDHE\_RSA\_WITH\_NULL\_SHA shall be supported. For network nodes, if TLS cipher suites without encryption are supported, TLS\_ECDHE\_ECDSA\_WITH\_NULL\_SHA and TLS\_ECDHE\_RSA\_WITH\_NULL\_SHA shall be supported.
- For UEs, if pre-shared key (psk) cipher suites are supported, then TLS\_ECDHE\_PSK\_WITH\_NULL\_SHA shall be supported. For network nodes, if pre-shared key (psk) cipher suites without encryption are supported, then TLS\_ECDHE\_PSK\_WITH\_NULL\_SHA shall be supported.
- For interworking with pre-Release 13 elements, it may be necessary to allow fall back to the cipher suites TLS\_RSA\_WITH\_NULL\_SHA, and TLS\_PSK\_WITH\_NULL\_SHA.
- Usage of TLS without encryption is not recommended and shall be possible to disable it in network nodes.

## 6.3 JWE and JWS profiles

### 6.3.1 General

JWS (JSON Web Signature) [46] and JWE (JSON Web Encryption) [47] are used to integrity protect and encrypt JSON objects. The JWE profile and JWS profile describe the restrictions and extensions to the RFCs for 3GPP entities or functions that support JWS and/or JWE.

The cipher suites used in clause 6.2 are described in RFC 7518 [48].

### 6.3.2 JWE profile

All entities and functions that support JWE according to RFC 7516 [47] shall follow the following restrictions and extensions:

"enc" parameter A128GCM (AES GCM with a 128-bit key) shall be supported. "enc" parameter A256GCM (AES GCM using 256-bit key) should be supported.

"alg" parameter "dir" (Direct use of a shared symmetric key as the CEK) shall be supported.

If ECDH is used as a key agreement protocol, the receiving party shall perform public key validation and check that the received public key is on the agreed upon curve.

### 6.3.3 JWS profile

All entities and functions that support JWS according to RFC 7515 [46] shall follow the following restrictions and extensions:

"alg" parameter ES256 (ECDSA using P-256 and SHA-256) shall be supported.

The "none" "alg" parameter shall not be supported.

The "kid" field shall be supported. End points may establish the expected signing algorithm and associated keys out-of-band (e.g. N32-c) and use this field to pass a key identifier. If the "kid" field is used the end point shall check the indicated "alg" matches that specified by the parameters.

If an end point has established a public key and algorithm out of band (e.g. N32-c) and the "kid" field is not used, then the end point shall check the indicated "alg" parameter against the established algorithm

The "jwk" field shall not be supported.

---

## Annex A (informative): Other issues

### A.1 Network Address Translators (NATs) and Transition Gateways (TrGWs)

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

NDS/IP provides no explicit support for Transition Gateways (TrGWs) to be used in the network domain control plane of NDS/IP-networks, but the NDS/IP architecture will not itself prohibit the use of TrGWs. However, the inclusion of TrGWs must be carefully executed in order not to create interoperability problems.

---

### A.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.

Simple filtering may be needed before the Security Gateway (SEG) functionality. The filtering policy must allow key protocols to allow DNS and NTP etc to pass. This will include traffic over the Za interface from IKEv1/IKEv2 and IPsec ESP in tunnel mode. Unsolicited traffic shall be rejected.

---

### A.3 The relationship between BGs and SEGs

It is observed that GPRS Border Gateways (BG) and NDS/IP Security Gateways (SEGs) will both reside at the border of an operator network.

## Annex B (normative): Security protection for GTP

### B.0 General

This section details how NDS/IP shall be used when GTP is to be security protected.

### B.1 The need for security protection

The GPRS Tunnelling Protocol (GTP) is defined in 3GPP TS 29.060 [6]. 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 is not intended to cover protection of user plane data and hence GTP-U is not protected by NDS/IP mechanisms.

Table 1 presents a list of GTP interfaces that shall be considered by NDS/IP.

**Table 1: GTP Interfaces that are affected by NDS/IP**

Interface	Description	Affected protocol
Gn	Interface between GSNs within the same network	GTP
Gp	Interface between GSNs in different PLMNs.	GTP

### B.2 Policy discrimination of GTP-C and GTP-U

It must be possible 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 in (TS29.060 [6]) IPsec can easily distinguish GTP-C datagrams from other datagrams that may not need IPsec protection.

Security policies shall be checked for all traffic (both incoming and outgoing) so datagrams can be processed 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 1: Selective protection of GTP-C relies on the ability to uniquely distinguish GTP-C datagrams from GTP-U datagrams. For R99 and 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 and provision of selective protection for the control plane parts of pre-R99 versions of GTP is not possible. Although NDS/IP was not designed for protection of pre-R99 versions of GTP, it is recognized that NDS/IP may also be used for protection of GTP pre-R99. It should be noted that NDS/IP support for pre-R99 versions of GTP is not mandatory.

NOTE 2: NDS/IP has been designed to protect control plane protocols. However, it is recognized that NDS/IP may also be used to protect GTP-U. It should be noted that NDS/IP support for GTP-U is outside the scope of this specification.

---

## B.3 Protection of GTP-C transport protocols and interfaces

IPSec ESP shall be used with both encryption and integrity protection for all GTP-C messages traversing inter-security domain boundaries.

Gn and Gp control plane traffic shall be routed via a SEG when it takes place between different security domains. In order to do so, operators shall operate NDS/IP Za-interface between SEGs. If a network node has implemented SEG functionality within the same physical entity, transport mode IPsec is optional for implementation and use on the Gn and Gp interfaces.

It will be for the operator to decide whether and where to deploy Zb-interfaces in order to protect the GTP-C messages over the Gn and Gp interfaces within the same security domain.



---

## Annex C (normative): Security protection of IMS protocols

### C.0 General

This section details how NDS/IP shall be used to protect IMS protocols and interfaces. The network domain security for IMS in 3GPP2 networks shall be as specified in Annex S.5 of TS 33.203[10].

---

### C.1 The need for security protection

The security architecture of the IP multimedia Core Network Subsystem (IMS) is specified in 3GPP TS 33.203 [10]. 3GPP TS 33.203 [10] defines that the confidentiality and integrity protection for SIP-signalling are provided in a hop-by-hop fashion.

The first hop i.e. between the UE and the P-CSCF through the IMS access network (i.e. Gm reference point) is protected by security mechanisms specified in 3GPP TS 33.203 [10].

The other hops, within the IMS core network including interfaces within the same security domain or between different security domains are protected by NDS/IP security mechanisms as specified by this Technical Specification.

3GPP TS 23.002 [3] specifies the different reference points defined for IMS.

---

### C.2 Protection of IMS protocols and interfaces

IMS control plane traffic within the IMS core network shall be routed via a SEG when it takes place between different security domains (in particular over those interfaces that may exist between different IMS operator domains). In order to do so, IMS operators shall operate NDS/IP Za-interface between SEGs as described in clause 5.6.2.

When SEGs are deployed to secure a Za reference point potentially carrying IMS session keys (i.e. in IMS roaming scenarios, when SEGs are deployed between a P-CSCF and I-CSCF located in different security domains), IPSec ESP shall be used with both encryption and integrity protection for all SIP signalling traversing inter-security domain boundaries.

It will be for the IMS operator to decide whether and where to deploy Zb-interfaces in order to protect the IMS control plane traffic over those IMS interfaces within the same security domain.

---

## Annex D (normative): Security protection of UTRAN/GERAN IP transport protocols

### D.0 General

This annex details how NDS/IP shall be used to protect UTRAN/GERAN IP transport protocols and interfaces.

---

### D.1 The need for security protection

The control plane in question is used to transfer signalling messages in UTRAN/GERAN IP transport network. The UTRAN IP transport option is specified in Rel-5 UTRAN Technical Specifications. UTRAN Iu interface signalling transport is specified in 3GPP TS 25.412 [28] and Iur interface signalling transport in TS 25.422 [38]. The architecture for the UTRAN Iuh/Iurh interfaces is specified in 3GPP TS 25.467 [39], stage 3 specification is contained in 3GPP TS 25.468 [40] and TS 25.471 [41]. Based on the known security threats in IP networking, the traffic shall be protected properly. This is in order not to restrict the application of IP in UTRAN and GERAN only to closed network environments.

The security solution for IP based UTRAN/GERAN transport shall follow the principles introduced in the NDS/IP since the IPSec provides application independent security solution for all IP traffic.

Iu/Iuh and Iur/Iurh interfaces are carrying information that is classified as sensitive. Iu/Iuh and Iur/Iurh are used for conveying e.g. subscriber specific security keys. These keys are vital for the end-user security. Hence Iu/Iuh and Iur/Iurh shall be encrypted along with the integrity check.

---

### D.2 Protection of UTRAN/GERAN IP transport protocols and interfaces

IPSec ESP shall be used with both encryption and integrity protection for all RANAP and RNSAP messages traversing inter-security domain boundaries.

Iu/Iuh and Iur/Iurh control plane traffic shall be routed via a SEG when it takes place between different security domains (in particular over those interfaces that may exist between different operator domains). In order to do so, operators shall operate NDS/IP Za-interface between SEGs. If a UTRAN node has implemented SEG functionality within the same physical entity, transport mode IPSec is optional for implementation and use on the Iur/Iurh interface.

It will be for the operator to decide whether and where to deploy Zb-interfaces in order to protect the RANAP and RNSAP messages over the Iu/Iuh and Iur/Iurh interfaces within the same security domain.

---

## Annex E (informative): RFC-4303 compared with RFC-2406

If none of the new features available in RFC-4303[31] are employed, then the format of an ESP packet is identical to the format of those packets which are generated following RFC-2406[17]. RFC-4303[31] provides a detailed description.

The new features of RFC-4303 [31] that affect the format are:

1) Use of combined mode encryption algorithm

However, a peer who implements only RFC-2406 [17] would never negotiate such an algorithm, as they are defined for use only in RFC-4303 [31].

2) ESN (Extended Sequence Numbering)

This feature requires an extension to IKEv1 in order to be able to negotiate it and can be negotiated through IKEv2. This feature is useful for very high bandwidth environments.

3) Better support of traffic flow confidentiality (TFC) in RFC-4303 [31].

NOTE 1: RFC-4303 [31] section 8 describes how an RFC-2406 [17] receiver needs to behave when receiving an ESP packet with the Next Header field set to a value of "59".

NOTE 2: The implementation of RFC-4303 [31] is functionally required if IPsec multicast needs to be supported on an interface.

## Annex F (informative): Change history

Change history								
Date	TSG #	TSG Doc.	CR	Rev	Subject/Comment	Old	New	WI
03-2002	SA_15	SP-020117	-	-	Approved at TSG SA#15 and placed under change control	2.0.0	5.0.0	
06-2002	SA_16	SP-020355	0001		NDS/IP Confidentiality protection for IMS session keys	5.0.0	5.1.0	
06-2002	SA_16	SP-020356	0002		Strengthening the requirements on IV construction to prevent attacks based on predictable IV	5.0.0	5.1.0	
12-2002	SA_18	SP-020719	0003		Adding requirement to provide mandatory support for 3DES encryption in NDS/IP. Remove AES references and dependencies	5.1.0	5.2.0	
12-2002	SA_18	SP-020720	0004		Securing UTRAN/GERAN IP Transport interfaces and specifically the lu interface with NDS/IP mechanisms (Implemented after Rel-5 CR 003 included)	5.1.0	6.0.0	SECNDSIP
03-2003	SA_19	SP-030104	0006		Za-interface and roaming agreements	6.0.0	6.1.0	SECNDSIP
03-2003	SA_19	SP-030105	0008		Clarification to the re-keying aspects of network domain security	6.0.0	6.1.0	SECNDSIP
06-2003	SA_20	SP-030225	0010		Use of IPsec ESP with encryption on the Za-interface	6.1.0	6.2.0	SECNDSIP
09-2003	SA_21	SP-030488	0012		Change of IKE profiling	6.2.0	6.3.0	SECNDSIP
09-2003	SA_21	SP-030489	0014		Update draft-ietf-ipsec-sctp-04.txt reference to new standard RFC: RFC 3554	6.2.0	6.3.0	SECNDSIP
03-2004	SA_23	SP-040153	0015	-	Addition of AES transform	6.3.0	6.4.0	SECNDSIP
06-2004	SA_24	SP-040374	0016	-	Diffie-Hellman groups in NDS/IP	6.4.0	6.5.0	SEC-NDS-IP
2005-12	SP-30	SP-050841	0017	2	Extension of scope to encompass TISPAN NGN	6.5.0	7.0.0	FBI
2006-09	SP-33	SP-060492	0019	-	Clarifying the use of RFC3554	7.0.0	7.1.0	SEC1-NDS
2006-12	SP-34	SP-060808	0020	1	Clarifying the use of transit security domains	7.1.0	7.2.0	SEC7-NDS
2006-12	SP-34	SP-060808	0021	1	Addition of reference to NDS/AF specification	7.1.0	7.2.0	SEC7-NDS
2007-09	SP-37	SP-070590	0022	1	Clarification on the use of the IPsec mode for the Zb-reference point	7.2.0	7.3.0	SEC1-NDS
2008-03	SP-39	SP-080142	0024	-	Introducing the support of IKEv2 for EPS	7.3.0	8.0.0	SAES
2008-03	SP-39	SP-080142	0025	1	Introducing the support of RFC-4303 for EPS	7.3.0	8.0.0	SAES
2008-09	SP-41	SP-080544	0023	3	Introduction of Network Domain Security support for 3GPP2 IMS	8.0.0	8.1.0	IMS-Sec
2008-12	SP-42	SP-080747	0026	-	Update of IKEv2 SA profile	8.1.0	8.2.0	TEI8
2009-06	SP-44	SP-090273	0027	--	Clarification about the encryption on Za reference point	8.2.0	8.3.0	TEI8
2009-12	-	-	-	-	Update to Rel-9 version (MCC)	8.3.0	9.0.0	-
2010-06	SP-48	SP-100251	0028	-	Correction of explanations of abbreviations CSCF and IKEvx	9.0.0	9.1.0	TEI9
2010-10	SP-49	SP-100474	0029	2	IPsec Alignment	9.1.0	10.0.0	TEI10
2010-10	SP-49	SP-100482	0031	-	Clarification on usage of ESP authentication and encryption transforms	9.1.0	10.0.0	TEI10
2010-12	SP-50	SP-100731	0033	-	NDS corrections	10.0.0	10.1.0	TEI10
2010-12	SP-50	SP-100833	0034	2	Correction of IKEv2 references and IKE usage	10.1.0	11.0.0	TEI11
2011-03	SP-51	SP-110019	0036	1	Correction of lur security	11.0.0	11.1.0	TEI10
2011-03	SP-51	SP-110020	0038	1	IKEv1 usage	11.0.0	11.1.0	TEI11
2011-06	SP-52	SP-110269	0039	-	Clarification of algorithm names and DH group usage in IKEv2	11.1.0	11.2.0	TEI10
2011-06	SP-52	SP-110264	0041	-	Correction of luh/lurh security	11.1.0	11.2.0	TEI11
2011-12	SP-54	SP-110848	0032	-	Introduction of reference to RFC 4301 in overview clause	11.2.0	11.3.0	Sec11
2012-06	SP-56	SP-120338	0042	1	Implementation requirements for IPsec authentication transforms	11.3.0	12.0.0	SEC12
2012-09	SP-57	SP-120605	0044	-	Clarification of integrity and confidentiality requirements for GTP-C [Rel-12]	12.0.0	12.1.0	SEC11
2012-12	SP-58	SP-120856	0045	1	Specification of missing IKEv2 reauthentication	12.1.0	12.2.0	SEC12
2015-12	SP-70	SP-150731	0046	1	Updating IKEv2 profiles in TS 33.210	12.2.0	13.0.0	SEC13
			0047	1	Updating ESP profiles in TS 33.210			
			0048	-	Removing IKEv1 from TS 33.210			

<b>Change history</b>							
<b>Date</b>	<b>Meeting</b>	<b>TDoc</b>	<b>CR</b>	<b>Rev</b>	<b>Cat</b>	<b>Subject/Comment</b>	<b>New version</b>
2016-12	SA#74	SP-160788	0049	1	F	3GPP security profile update – IPsec	14.0.0
2018-06	-	-	-	-	-	Update to Rel-15 version (MCC)	15.0.0
2018-09	SA#81	SP-180706	0050	1	B	Update NDS/IP scope with application layer crypto profiles	15.1.0
2018-12	SA#82	SP-181022	0055	-	F	Adding references for the TLS Protocol Profiles clause	15.2.0
2019-09	SA#85					Update of table of contents	15.2.1
2019-09	SA#85					Update of table of contents (MCC)	15.2.2

---

# History

<b>Document history</b>		
V15.0.0	July 2018	Publication
V15.1.0	October 2018	Publication
V15.2.0	April 2019	Publication
V15.2.2	October 2019	Publication