Efficient and Dynamic Group Key Agreement in Ad hoc Networks

Raghav Bhaskar, Paul Mühlethaler, Daniel Augot, Cédric Adjih, Saadi Boudjit, Anis Laouiti

INRIA

INSTITUT NATIONAL DE RECHERCHE EN INFORMATIQUE ET EN AUTOMATIQUE

Efficient and Dynamic Group Key Agreement in Ad hoc Networks

Raghav Bhaskar — Paul.Mühlethaler — Daniel Augot — Cédric Adjih — Saadi Boudjit

— Anis Laouiti

N° 5915

Mai 2006

Thème SYM

Rapport de recherche

Efficient and Dynamic Group Key Agreement in Ad hoc Networks

Raghav Bhaskar* , Paul.Mühlethaler* , Daniel Augot* , Cédric Adjih * , Saadi Boudjit * , Anis Laouiti *

Abstract: Confidentiality, integrity and authentication are more relevant issues in Ad hoc networks than in wired fixed networks. One way to address these issues is the use of symmetric key cryptography, relying on a secret key shared by all members of the network. But establishing and maintaining such a key (also called the session key) is a non-trivial problem. We show that Group Key Agreement (GKA) protocols are suitable for establishing and maintaining such a session key in these dynamic networks. We take an existing GKA protocol, which is robust to connectivity losses and discuss all the issues for good functioning of this protocol in Ad hoc networks. We give implementation details and network parameters, which significantly reduce the computational burden of using public key cryptography in such networks.

Key-words: Public-Key Cryptogtraphy, Diffie-Hellman Protocol, Discrete Logarithm Problem, Ad Hoc Networks

* INRIA-Rocquencourt

Un protocole efficace et dynamique de mise en accord de clé pour les réseaux Ad Hoc

Résumé : Les problèmes de confidentialité, d'intégrité et d'authentification sont plus saillants dans les réseaux Ad Hoc que dans les réseaux à infrastructure fixe. Une manière d'attaquer ces problèmes est d'utiliser la cryptographie symétrique, en se reposant sur une seule clé partagée entre tous les membres du réseau. Mais établir et maintenir une telle clé partagée devient un problème non trivial. Les protocoles de mise en accord de clé (Group Key Agreement : GKA) sont bien adaptés pour établir et maintenir une clé de session dans de tels réseaux dynamiques. Nous considérons un protocole existant, qui est robuste aux pertes de connectivité, et nous présentons tous les problèmes relatifs au bon fonctionnement de ce protocole dans les réseaux Ad Hoc. Nous donnons aussi des détails d'implémentation et des paramètres réseaux, qui permettent de réduire significativement la charge de calcul dûe à l'usage de la cryptographie à clé publique

Mots-clés : Cryptographie à clé publique, protocole de Diffie-Hellman, problème du logarithme discret, réseaux Ad Hoc

Efficient and Dynamic Group Key Agreement in Ad hoc Networks

May 9, 2006

Confidentiality, integrity and authentication are more relevant issues in Ad hoc networks than in wired fixed networks. One way to address these issues is the use of symmetric key cryptography, relying on a secret key shared by all members of the network. But establishing and maintaining such a key (also called the session key) is a non-trivial problem. We show that Group Key Agreement (GKA) protocols are suitable for establishing and maintaining such a session key in these dynamic networks. We take an existing GKA protocol, which is robust to connectivity losses and discuss all the issues for good functioning of this protocol in Ad hoc networks. We give implementation details and network parameters, which significantly reduce the computational burden of using public key cryptography in such networks.

1   Introduction

A Mobile Ad hoc NETwork (MANET) is a collection of mobile nodes connected via a wireless medium forming an arbitrary topology. Implicit herein is the ability for the network topology to change over time as links in the network appear and disappear. To maintain the network connectivity, a routing protocol must be used. An important security issue is that of the integrity of the network itself. Quite a lot of studies have been already done to resolve security issues in existing routing protocols (see [12],[20],[2],[1]).

An orthogonal security issue is that of maintaining confidentiality and integrity of data exchanged between nodes in the network. The task of ensuring end-to-end security of data communications in MANETs is equivalent to that of securing end-to-end security in traditional wired networks. Many studies have been carried out to solve this problem. One widespread solution is to create a virtual private network (VPN) in a tunnel between the two communicating nodes. IPSec is a well known security architecture which allows such VPNs to be built between two communicating nodes. However this solution requires a different secret key for each end-to-end connection. Moreover the VPN solution can simply handle unicast traffic. An alternative solution is the use of a shared secret key. There are many issues with such an approach. First this key must be distributed among the network nodes. Second, to avoid the compromise of this key it is required to renew the key often. A solution

---

*INRIA-Rocquencourt

to these two issues is the use a Group Key Agreement protocol, which relies on the principles of the public key cryptography.

A group key agreement protocol is a key establishment technique in which a shared secret is derived by more than two participants as a function of information publicly contributed by each of them. They are especially well suited to moderate sized groups with no central authority to distribute keys. An authenticated group key agreement protocol provides the property of key authentication (also called implicit key authentication), whereby each participant is assured that no other party besides the participants can gain access to the computed key. GKA protocols are different from group key distribution (or key transport) protocols wherein one participant chooses the group key and communicates it to all others. GKA protocols help in deriving keys which are composed of each one's contribution. This ensures that the resulting key is fresh (for a given session) and is not favorable to one participant in any way. The following security goals can be identified for any GKA protocol.

1) **Key Secrecy**: The key can be computed only by the participants.

2) **Key Independence**: Knowledge of any set of group keys does not lead to the knowledge of any other group key not in this set (see [5]).

3) **Forward Secrecy**: Knowledge of some long term secret does not lead to the knowledge of past group keys.

An important advantage of a group key agreement protocol over a simple group key distribution scheme is the forward secrecy. This property can be particularly interesting in situations where some nodes are likely to be compromised (eg. in military scenarios). In such a case, the knowledge of the long term secret of this node does not compromise all past session keys. From a functional point of view, it is desirable to have procedures to handle the dynamism in the network. These procedures enable efficient merging or partitioning of two groups in the network.

2   Related Work

Key establishment protocols for networks can be broadly classified into three classes: *Key transport using symmetric cryptography*, *Key transport using asymmetric cryptography* and *Key agreement using asymmetric cryptography*. In key transport protocols, one participant chooses the group key and securely transfers it to other participants using a priori shared secrets (symmetric or asymmetric). These protocols are not suitable for ad hoc networks for two reasons; firstly, they require a single trusted authority to distribute keys and secondly, compromise of the a priori secret of any participant breaches the security of all past group keys, thus failing to provide forward secrecy. Most group key agreement protocols are derived from the two-party Diffie-Hellman key exchange protocol. GKA protocols, not based on Diffie-Hellman, are few and include [19, 24, 6]. Both protocols of Li [19] and Boyd [6] fail to provide *forward secrecy* while protocol of Tzeng [24] is quite resource-intensive and prone to certain attacks [6]. Forward Secrecy is a very desirable property for key establishment protocols in ad hoc networks, as some nodes can be easily compromised due to low physical security

of nodes. Thus it is essential that compromise of one single node does not compromise all past session keys. We summarize and compare in Table 1 existing GKA protocols based on Diffie-Hellman protocols. We compare essentially the unauthenticated versions of the protocols, as most achieve authentication by using digital signatures in a similar manner and thus have similar costs for achieving authentication. We compare the efficiency of these protocols based on the following parameters:

- **Number of synchronous rounds**: In a single synchronous round, multiple independent messages can be sent in the network. The total time required to run a round-efficient GKA protocol can be much less than other GKA protocols that have the same number of total messages but more rounds. This is because the nodes spend less time waiting for other messages before sending their own.

- **Number of messages:** This is the total number of messages (unicast or broadcast) exchanged in the network to derive the group key. For multiple hop ad hoc networks, the distinction between unicast and broadcast messages is important as the latter can be much more energy consuming (for the whole network) than the former.

- **Number of exponentiations**: All Diffie-Hellman based GKA protocols require a number of modular exponentiations to be performed by each participant. Relative to all cryptographic operations, a modular operation is the most computationally intensive operation and thus gives a good indication of the computational cost for each node.

Communication costs still remain the critical factor for choosing energy-efficient protocols for most ad hoc networks. A modular exponentiation (over an elliptic curve) can be performed in a few tens of milliseconds on most palmtops, whereas message propagation in multi-hop ad hoc networks can be easily of the order of few seconds and has energy implications for multiple nodes in the network. As can be seen in Table 1, most existing GKA protocols require $O(m)$ rounds of communication for m participants in the protocol. Such protocols do not scale well in ad hoc networks. Even tree-based GKA protocols with $O(\log m)$ rounds can be quite demanding for medium to large sized ad hoc networks. Therefore constant-round protocols are better suited for ad hoc networks.

Among the constant round protocols, Octopus [3], BDB [14] and KLL [15] require special ordering of the participants. This results in messages sent by some participant being dependent on that of others. In such a case, failure of a single node can often halt the protocol. Thus such protocols are not robust enough to adapt well to the dynamism of ad hoc networks. BCEP protocol [8] fails to provide forward secrecy if the long-term secret of the base station is revealed. Catalano protocol [7] is computationally demanding with $O(m)$ exponentiations for each participant. Another drawback is that if any participant's message is lost in first round, the whole protocol is brought to a halt, as the secret sharing schemes implies all m contributions are required to compute the key. NKYW [17] though efficient, does not provide any procedure to handle group composition changes and therefore requires a complete re-run in case of group changes. The STR protocol [22, 16] was proposed by Steer et al. in [22] for static groups. Perrig et al. proposed procedures to handle group changes in [16]. But the protocol remains a bit expensive with up to $m - i$ exponentiations for participant M_i and $2m$ exponentiations for the sponsor node (lowermost). The protocol lacks a proof of security against active adversaries.

	Expo per U_i	Messages	Broadcasts	Rounds
ITW [13]	m	$m(m-1)$	0	$m-1$
GDH.1 [23]	$i+1$	$2(m-1)$	0	$2(m-1)$
GDH.2 [23, 9]	$i+1$	$m-1$	1	m
GDH.3 [23]	3	$2m-3$	2	$m+1$
Perrig [18]	$\log_2 m + 1$	m	$m-2$	$\log_2 m$
Dutta [11]	$\log_3 m$	m	m	$\log_3 m$
Octopus [3]	4	$3m-4$	0	4
BDB [10, 14]	3	$2m$	m	2
BCEP [8]	$2^\dagger$	$2m$	0	2
Catalano [7]	$m+1$	$2m$	0	2
NKYW [17]	$2^\ddagger$	m	1	2
KLL [15]	3	$2m$	$2m$	2
STR [22, 16]	$(m-i)^*$	m	1	2
Ours	2^{**}	m	1	2

$\dagger$: m exponentiations for the base station.

$\ddagger$: $m+1$ exponentiations and m-1 inverse calculations for the parent node.

$*$: Up to $2m$ exponentiations for the sponsor node.

$**$: m exponentiations for the leader.

Table 1: Comparison of GKA protocols

The contributions of this paper are the following:

- an authenticated dynamic group key agreement protocol is recalled[1],

- the mechanisms that must be used in a MANET to implement this group key agreement protocol are described,

- a precise study of the cryptographic parameters that this group key agreement protocol must use in the context of an ad hoc network is carried out.

Finally the adapted version of the group key agreement protocol that we propose is among the very few protocols suitable for ad hoc networks.

The paper is organized as follows:

- Section 3 recalls the group key agreement protocol. We describe the basic functioning of the protocol only,

- Section 4 explains how this group key agreement protocol can be implemented in an ad hoc network. The main issues discussed in this section include the election of a leader in the ad hoc network and the actions that must be undertaken to handle splits and mergers in the ad hoc network,

- Section 5 discusses the overhead of cryptographic operations.

3 Presentation of our authenticated protocol

We recall an existing group key agreement protocol in this section. We first illustrate the basic principle of key exchange, followed by a detailed explanation of how it is employed to derive Initial Key Agreement, Join/Merge and Delete/Partition procedures to handle dynamism in ad hoc groups.

3.1 Notation

G: A subgroup (of prime order q with generator g) of some group.
U_i: i^{th} participant amongst the n participants in the current session.
U_l: The current group leader ($l \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$).
r_i: A random number (from $[1, q-1]$) generated by participant U_i. Also called the *secret* for U_i.
g^{r_i}: The *blinded secret* for U_i.
$g^{r_i r_l}$: The *blinded response* for U_i from U_l.
$\mathcal{M}$: The set of indices of participants (from $\mathcal{P}$) in the current session.
$\mathcal{J}$: The set of indices of the joining participants.
$\mathcal{D}$: The set of indices of the leaving participants.
$x \leftarrow y$: x is assigned y.
$x \xleftarrow{r} \mathcal{S}$: x is randomly drawn from the uniform distribution S.

---

[1]We do not cite this work for reasons of anonymity.

$U_i \longrightarrow U_j : \{M\}$: U_i sends message M to participant U_j.

$U_i \xrightarrow{B} \mathcal{M} : \{M\}$: U_i broadcasts message M to all participants indexed by $\mathcal{M}$.

N_i: Random nonce generated by participant U_i.

$\mathcal{V}_{PK_i}\{msg_i, \sigma_i\}$: Signature verification algorithm which returns 1 if σ_i is a valid signature on message msg_i else 0.

3.2 A Three Round Protocol

3.2.1 The formal description

Please note that in the following rounds each message is digitally signed by the sender (σ_i^j is signature on message msg_i^j in Tables 2- 4) and is verified (along with the nonces) by the receiver before following the protocol.

Protocol Steps:

Round 1: The chosen group leader, M_l makes a initial request (**INIT**) with his identity, U_l and a random nonce N_l to the group $\mathcal{M}$.

Round 2: Each interested M_i responds to the **INIT** request, with a **IREPLY** message which contains his identity U_i, a nonce N_l and a blinded secret g^{r_i} to M_l (see Table 2 for exact message contents).

Round 3: M_l collects all the received blinded secrets, raises each of them to its secret (r_l) and broadcasts them along with the original contributions to the group, i.e. it sends an **IGROUP** message which contains $\{U_i, N_i, g^{r_i}, g^{r_i r_l}\}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{l\}$.

Key Calculation: Each M_i checks if its contribution is included correctly and obtains g^{r_l} by computing $(g^{r_i r_l})^{r_i^{-1}}$. The group key is

$$Key = g^{r_l} * \Pi_{i \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{l\}} g^{r_i r_l} = g^{r_l(1 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{l\}} r_i)}.$$

Note:

1) The original contributions g^{r_i} are included in the last message as they are required for key calculation in case of group modifications (see below), and also, because it may be possible that a particular contribution has not been received by some member.

2) Even though $\Pi_{i \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{l\}} g^{r_i r_l}$ is publicly known, it is included in key computation, to derive a key composed of everyone's contribution. This ensures that the key is not pre-determined and is unique to this session.

3) Even though the current group leader chooses his contribution after others, he cannot pre-determine the group key.

The protocol is formally defined in Table 2. Table 3 (respectively Table 4) show how the protocol is run when a group wants to join (respectively leave) an existing group

3.2.2 Example runs of the protocol

We now see how this protocol can be used to derive Initial Key Agreement (IKA), Join/Merge and Delete/Partition procedures for ad hoc networks.

$$\boxed{\textbf{Round 1}}$$
$l \xleftarrow{r} \mathcal{M}, N_l \xleftarrow{r} \{0,1\}^k$

$U_l \xrightarrow{B} \mathcal{M} : \{msg_l^1 = \{ \textbf{ INIT }, U_l, N_l\}, \sigma_l^1\}$

$\boxed{\textbf{Round } 2}$
$\forall i \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{l\}, if(\mathcal{V}_{PK_l}\{msg_l^1, \sigma_l\} == 1), r_i \xleftarrow{r} [1, q-1], N_i \xleftarrow{r} \{0,1\}^k,$

$U_i \longrightarrow U_l : \{msg_i = \{ \textbf{IREPLY}, U_l, N_l, U_i, N_i, g^{r_i}\}, \sigma_i\}$

$\boxed{\textbf{Round } 3}$
$r_l \xleftarrow{r} [1, q-1],$
$\forall i \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{l\}, if(\mathcal{V}_{PK_i}\{msg_i, \sigma_i\} == 1)$ and N_l is as contributed

$U_l \xrightarrow{B} \mathcal{M} : \{msg_l^2 = \{\textbf{IGROUP}, U_l, N_l, \{U_i, N_i, g^{r_i}, g^{r_i r_l}\}_{i \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{l\}}\}, \sigma_l^2\}$

$\boxed{\textbf{Key Computation}}$
$if(\mathcal{V}_{PK_l}\{msg_l^2, \sigma_l^2\} == 1)$ and g^{r_i} and N_i are as contri buted
$Key = g^{r_l(1 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{l\}} r_i)}$

<div align="center">Table 2: IKA</div>

Initial Key Agreement   Secure ad hoc group formation procedures typically involve peer discovery and connectivity checks before a group key is derived. Thus, an $INIT$ request is issued by a participant and all interested peers respond. The responses are collected and connectivity checks are carried out to ensure that all participants can listen/broadcast to the group (see for instance [21]). After the group membership is defined, GKA procedures are implemented to derive a group key. Such an approach is quite a drain on the limited resources of ad hoc network devices. Thus an approach which integrates the two separate procedures of group formation and group key agreement is required. The above protocol fits well with this approach. Round 1 and Round 2 of the above protocol can be incorporated into the group formation procedures. In this way, blinded secrets, g^{r_i}'s, of all potential members, U_i's, are collected before the group composition is defined. When the fully connected ad hoc group is defined, a single broadcast message (Round 3 in Table 2) from the group leader, U_l, (using contributions of only the joining participants) helps every participant to compute the group key. An example is provided below.

Suppose U_1 initiates the group discovery and initially 5 participants express interest and send g^{r_2}, g^{r_3}, g^{r_4}, g^{r_5} and g^{r_6} respectively along with their identities and nonces. Finally only 3 join because of the full-connectivity constraint. Suppose the participants who finally join are U_2, U_4 and U_5. Then the group leader, U_1, broadcasts the following message: $\{g^{r_2}, g^{r_4}, g^{r_5}, (g^{r_2})^{r_1}, (g^{r_4})^{r_1}, (g^{r_5})^{r_1}\}$. On receiving this message, each participant can derive g^{r_1} using his respective secret. Thus the key $g^{r_1(1+r_2+r_4+r_5)}$ can be computed.

Join/Merge   Suppose new participants, U_9 and U_{10} join the group of U_1, U_2, U_4 and U_5 with their contributions g^{r_9} and $g^{r_{10}}$ respectively. Then the previous group leader (U_1) changes its secret to r_1' and sends $g^{r_1'}$, g^{r_2}, g^{r_4}, g^{r_5}, g^{r_9}, $g^{r_{10}}$ to U_{10} (say the new group leader). U_{10} generates a new

Round 1
$\forall i \in \mathcal{J}, r_i \xleftarrow{r} [1, q-1], N_i \xleftarrow{r} \{0,1\}^k,$
$U_i \xrightarrow{B} \mathcal{M} : \{msg_i = \{ \textbf{JOIN}, U_i, N_i, g^{r_i} \}, \sigma_i \}$
Round 2
$\forall i \in \mathcal{J}, if(\mathcal{V}_{PK_i}\{msg_i, \sigma_i\} == 1) \; r_l \xleftarrow{r} [1, q-1], l' \xleftarrow{r} \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{J}$
$U_l \longrightarrow U_{l'} : \{msg_l = \{ \textbf{JREPLY}, \{U_i, N_i, g^{r_i}\}_{\forall i \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{J}} \}, \sigma_l \}$
Round 3
$if(\mathcal{V}_{PK_i}\{msg_l, \sigma_l\} == 1), l \leftarrow l', r_l \xleftarrow{r} [1, q-1], \mathcal{M} \leftarrow \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{J}$
$U_l \xrightarrow{B} \mathcal{M} : \{msg_l^2 = \{ \textbf{JGROUP}, U_l, N_l, \{U_i, N_i, g^{r_i}, g^{r_i r_l}\}_{i \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{l\}} \}, \sigma_l^2 \}$
Key Computation
$if(\mathcal{V}_{PK_l}\{msg_l^2, \sigma_l^2\} == 1)$ and g^{r_i} and N_i are as contributed
$Key = g^{r_l(1 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{l\}} r_i)}$

Table 3: Join/Merge

Round 1
$\forall i \in \mathcal{D}, U_i \longrightarrow U_l : \{msg_i = \{ \textbf{DEL}, U_i, N_i \}, \sigma_i \}$
Round 2
$\forall i \in \mathcal{D}, if(\mathcal{V}_{PK_i}\{msg_i, \sigma_i\} == 1), r_l \xleftarrow{r} [1, q-1], \mathcal{M} \leftarrow \mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{D}$
$U_l \xrightarrow{B} \mathcal{M} : \{msg_l = \{ \textbf{DGROUP}, U_l, N_l, \{U_i, N_i, g^{r_i}, g^{r_i r_l}\}_{i \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{l\}} \}, \sigma_l \}$
Key Computation
$if(\mathcal{V}_{PK_l}\{msg_l, \sigma_l\} == 1)$ and g^{r_i} and N_i are as contribute d
$Key = g^{r_l(1 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{l\}} r_i)}$

Table 4: Delete/Partition

secret r'_{10} and broadcasts the following message to the group: $\{g^{r'_1}, g^{r_2}, g^{r_4}, g^{r_5}, g^{r_9}, g^{r'_{10}r'_1}, g^{r'_{10}r_2},$ $g^{r'_{10}r_4}, g^{r'_{10}r_5}, g^{r'_{10}r_9} \}$. And the new key is $g^{r'_{10}(1 + r'_1 + r_2 + r_4 + r_5 + r_9)}$.

Delete/Partition   When participants leave the group, they send a **DEL** message, the group leader changes his secret contribution and sends an **IKA** Round 3 like message to the group, omitting the leaving participants' contributions. Refer to Table 4 and below for an example.

Suppose a participant, U_2, leaves the group of U_1, U_2, U_4, U_5, U_9 and U_{10}. Then the leader, U_{10} changes its secret to r''_{10} and broadcasts $\{g^{r'_1}, g^{r_4}, g^{r_5}, g^{r_9}, (g^{r'_1})^{r''_{10}}, (g^{r_4})^{r''_{10}}, (g^{r_5})^{r''_{10}}, (g^{r_9})^{r''_{10}} \}$ to the group. And the new key is $g^{r''_{10}(1 + r'_1 + r_4 + r_5 + r_9)}$.

4   Using this GKA protocol within an ad hoc network

In the following we are considering a multi-hop ad hoc network. We are not assuming any particular property of the routing protocol which ensures the connectivity of the network. However, we will assume that we have a broadcast mechanism to flood message within the ad hoc network. We are not assuming that the flooding mechanism is reliable.

A key point in the GKA protocol described above is the existence of group leader. Thus it is necessary to have a robust mechanism to elect such a leader in an ad hoc network. That is the first issue that we study.

4.1   Election of a group leader

A key requirement is that all members of a group agree on the same group leader. A simple solution is that the group leader periodically broadcasts messages. These messages then serve as a proof, for nodes that are within reach of the group leader, that a group leader exists and operates properly. We can simply use the **INIT** message of GKA protocol to demonstrate the existence and the correct functioning of the group leader. When the other nodes in the network receive this **INIT** message each replies with an **IREPLY** message. Using these **IREPLY** messages, the group leader defines a group and sends to all members of the group an **IGROUP** message. The **INIT** message can be seen as an **IGROUP** message when the group is not yet defined. In the following we will only use the term **IGROUP** message.

These **IGROUP** messages are sent periodically; depending on the dynamics of the group, the group leader will send a new **IGROUP** message or exactly the same message as before. If the network only comprises of the group leader, the latter will send periodically empty **IGROUP** messages. It will stop sending this message when a node joins its network by replying to its **IGROUP** message with an **IREPLY** message. The mechanism to elect a group leader simply follows from the property that, in a network with a group leader, periodic messages are broadcast by the group leader and are, in principle, received by the group members. If a node does not receive a message for a fixed period T, known a priori by the network nodes, this node sets a random timer. At the expiration of this timer and if no **IGROUP** message has been received meanwhile, the node becomes the group leader. It then sends an empty **IGROUP** message.

There may be a collision on **IGROUP** messages if two nodes or more have selected the same value for their random timer. In such a case, there may be **IGROUP** messages generated by two (or more) group leaders. To select a group leader, we can use additional rules. The first rule is that when a group leader A receives an **IGROUP** message from a group leader B which has a smaller ID than its own ID, the group leader A just stops to send its periodic messages. The group members that will receive periodic messages from more than two group leaders will only consider the message issued by the group leader with the smallest index. Thus if an **IGROUP** message showing a larger ID than a previously received **IGROUP** message is received, then this message is simply discarded and no **IREPLY** message is issued. On the contrary if an **IGROUP** message showing a smaller ID is received then the node issues a **IREPLY** message.

Another issue is how the GKA protocol takes into account the dynamism of an ad hoc network. For instance a node may leave the network without being able to send the group leader a message pointing out its departure from the network. This issue is handled in the next subsection

4.2   Handling join and withdrawal of a node

A node which joins the network will receive the periodic **IGROUP** message of the group leader. He will just have to send **JREPLY** message to join the group. The group leader will incorporate this new contribution in its next **IGROUP** message. Actually there is no need in the protocol to differentiate between **JREPLY** and **IREPLY**. Thus, for simplicity sake, we will only keep the **IREPLY** message.

In an ad hoc network, the only conceivable way for the group leader to be sure that a node remains in a group is to receive a message from it. Thus to handle the dynamism of a group, the group leader will use the periodic reception of the **IREPLY** messages. The period with which an **IREPLY** message is sent by member of the group should be the same for all the nodes of the group. If the group leader is not receiving a **IREPLY** message for a given number of periods (greater than 1 to handle possible packet loss), the lack of reception of these messages should be handled as the reception of a **DEL** message. In such a case the group leader will change its own contribution in the **IGROUP** message and will re-send the **IGROUP** message.

When a node deliberately wishes to withdraw from a group it can use the **DEL** message to announce this wish to the group leader. Upon the reception of such a message the group leader will change its own contribution in the **IGROUP** message and will re-send the **IGROUP** message. The use of the **DEL** message will speed up the taking into account of the node withdrawal.

4.3   Handling merge or split of groups

The merger of groups (two or more) leads group leaders to receive **IGROUP** messages from other group leaders. The scheme used in the group leader election can be used to resolve the conflict. When the conflict is resolved only one group leader remains in the group. If a group splits, a part of the group will remain without group leader. The technique used in the group leader election can be used in the subgroups without leader to elect a new leader.

4.4   Renewing its contribution

The group leader and group members will have to renew their contribution periodically. For the group leader, the change of its contribution or of some member of the group will lead to a change in the content of the **IGROUP** message. To simplify we can assume that the group leader and the group members change their contribution at the same rate.

We have given all the principles of the protocol. We precise the details of the whole protocol in the next section.

4.5   Implementation issues

We will consider a given period T. To simplify, this period will be used both by the group leader or by the member of the group as a period to send their GKA messages.

   A node can be in one of the following two states : **member state** or **group leader state**. A node in a member state will enter the process to become a group leader if it has not received **IGROUP** message for a duration kT. A node which has not received any message from a group leader for a duration kT with $k \geq 2$ will suppose that there is no group leader and starts the procedure to become a leader. Since a node may not have received a packet of the group leader because this packet has been lost, k must be selected so that the probability that $k - 1$ successive transmissions of a GKA message are lost is small. To become a group leader, the node selects a random integer i_r between 1 and a given number l and initializes a timer at $i_r t_{rtd}$. t_{rtd} is a predefined duration computed to be at least the round trip delay of a message throughout the ad hoc network. With such a figure for t_{rtd} we can be sure that if two nodes draw different integers i_r and $i_{r'}$, the node having selected the larger integer will receive the **IGROUP** message of the other node and then will stop its election process. l must be chosen with respect to the total number of nodes in the network so that the probability that two nodes choose the same integer is small. This back-off procedure is performed to avoid possibly multiple group leader candidates, for instance, when a group is set up or split into two subgroups.


Figure 1: Transition between the member and the leader state

   When the node in the state member sends its first **IGROUP** message, it is in the group leader state, see Figure 1. In the group leader state, a node must collect **IREPLY** messages and form the related **IGROUP** message. When there is a change in the group (arrival or withdrawal) the group leader must change its contribution. Additionally irrespective of the modification of the composition of the group, the group leader must change its contribution periodically.

When a group leader is elected, the latter may choose to wait additional periods before sending a **IGROUP** containing the contributions of the group members. Doing so, the group leader may avoid unnecessary changes to the session key due to the lack of receipt of all contributions in time.

In the group leader state, a node will also look out for **IGROUP** messages from another group leader. If it receives such a message from another group leader holding a smaller node index, the node changes its state to the member state.

In the group member state, a node will have to send **IREPLY** messages periodically. Like the group leader, a group member must change its contribution periodically with a period P. We will assume that P is a large multiple of T. To simplify the procedure and to avoid unnecessary computations we can assume that the group leader does not instantly include a new contribution of a group member in the **IGROUP** message, instead it will wait for the change of its own contribution to take into account all new contributions of nodes. This is possible since the contribution of the node member is included in the **IGROUP** message, see figure 2.


Figure 2: Renewing members' and the leader's contribution

Both **IGROUP** and **IREPLY** messages must be sent periodically for each interval T. To reduce the probability of collision of these messages, we add a jitter to times when the GKA messages shall be sent by the group members and the group leader.

In the table 5, we have given examples of figures for our GKA protocol. We can notice that l and t_{rtd} will heavily depend of the number of nodes in the network and of the topology of the network.

5 Computational overhead

To test the performance of this new GKA protocol (only the unauthenticated version), we incorporated it in the group management protocol of [4]. The group management of [4] consists of three communication rounds: $DISC$, $JOIN$ and $GROUP$. The $DISC$ stage initiates the group formation by calling for interested participants. Each interested participant responds with a $JOIN$

Parameter	Value	Constraint
P	20 min	
T	5 s	
k	3	large enough to be sure the message is not simply lost
l	20	large enough to avoid collision during the group leader election
t_{rtd}	100 ms	more than a round trip delay

Table 5: Protocol parameters

Size	LT-L-noGKA	LT-nL-noGKA	LT-L-GKA	LT-nL-GKA
2	95	57	259	394
3	189	141	389	426
4	522	301	598	511
5	692	412	950	713
6	889	541	1397	821

Table 6: Execution times of a group discovery protocol w and w/out GKA on laptop

message. The group membership is defined and announced by the group leader (chosen randomly) by the $GROUP$ message. The design of our GKA protocol allowed us to piggy-back GKA data on group management messages, thus member contributions towards the group key are collected during $JOIN$ messages while the $GROUP$ message carries the message from the group leader which enables everyone to compute the group key. Thus no additional communication round is required to derive a group key, irrespective of the group size.

A comparison of the computation times on a device in the absence and presence of GKA procedures is plotted in tables 6,7. The data shown is for an experimental setup consisting of laptops (Compaq 500 MHz running Linux) and palmtops (Compaq ipaq 400MHz running Linux familiar 0.7). All random contributions for the group key were chosen from a Diffie-Hellman group of prime order of 1024 bits. The code was written in Java except the exponentiation function which was implemented in native code with the GMP library[2]. Table 6 shows computation time (in milliseconds) for different group sizes with and without GKA on laptop and table 7 plots the same for a palmtop. There are separate entries for the cases when the device was a leader/non-leader. Leader for group management was randomly chosen. As expected, the time for non-leader members increases (when employing GKA protocol) by an almost constant factor (order of time to perform two 1024 bit exponentiations) , while for a leader it increases linearly as the group size increases. As most ad hoc networks are expected to be composed of devices of unequal computing power, more powerful devices (like laptops) can assume the role of a leader more often.

---

[2]http://www.swox.com/gmp/

Size	PDA-L-noGKA	PDA-nL-noGKA	PDA-L-GKA	PDA-nL-GKA
2	1628	1338	2798	2334
3	3600	2427	3951	2919
4	5092	3410	6101	3911
5	5705	4819	9876	5345
6	6710	5339	13151	6204

Table 7: Execution times of a group discovery protocol w and w/out GKA on palmtop

Size of Diffie-Hellman Group: As the key derived from GKA will be used for short-lived sessions, therefore keys which can resist attacks during the lifetime of the session may be sufficient. Thus a somewhat smaller DH group can be used rather than a group with exp(2,1024) elements as currently used. It will reduce computation times.

6   Conclusion

We have discussed a group key agreement protocol for handling ad hoc group of small to moderate size. We have fully specified the implementation details needed for actual use of the protocol, relying on know network techniques such as self election, periodic broadcast, back-off techniques. The protocol is robust in the sense that connectivity losses does not impair its functioning. We have experienced that the computational cost of public key cryptography is kept reasonably low. If we consider constraints in ad hoc networks: no network structure, high dynamism, restricted bandwidth the presented protocol is among the few GKA protocols which is suitable for ad hoc networks. (We mention to the referee that a security proof of the theoretical protocol has been established but we do not give the reference for anonymity reasons).

Contents

References

[1] C. Adjih, T. Clausen, Anis Laouiti, Paul Muhlethaler, and Daniele Raffo. Securing the OLSR routing protocol with or without compromised nodes. *Rapport INRIA*, RR-5494:55, February 2005. http://www.inria.fr/rrrt/rr-5494.html.

[2] Cedric Adjih, Thomas Clausen, Philippe Jacquet, Anis Laouiti, Paul Muhlethaler, and Daniele Raffo. Securing the OLSR protocol. In *Proceedings of the 2nd IFIP Annual Mediterranean Ad Hoc Networking Workshop (Med-Hoc-Net 2003)*, Mahdia, Tunisia, June 25–27 2003.

[3] K. Becker and U. Wille. Communication complexity of group key distribution. In *Proceedings of 5th ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1–6. ACM Press, 1998.

[4] M. Boulkenafed and V. Issarny. AdHocFS: Sharing files in WLANs. In *2nd International Symposium on Network Computing and Applications*, pages 156–163. IEEE Computer Society, 2003.

[5] C. Boyd and A. Mathuria. *Protocols for Authentication and Key Establishment*. Springer-Verlag, 2003.

[6] C. Boyd and J.M.G. Nieto. Round-optimal contributory conference key agreement. In *Public Key Cryptography '03*, pages 161–174. LNCS 2567, 2003.

[7] E. Bresson and D. Catalano. Constant round authenticated group key agreement via distribut ed computation. In *Proceedings of Public Key Cryptography*, pages 115–119. LNCS 2567, 2004.

[8] E. Bresson, O. Chevassut, A. Essiari, and D. Pointcheval. Mutual authentication and group key agreement for low-power mobile devices. In *Proceedings of the 5th IFIP-TC6 International Conference on Mobile and Wireless Communication Networks*, pages 59–62. World Scientific Publishing, 2003.

[9] E. Bresson, O. Chevassut, and D. Pointcheval. Dynamic group Diffie Hellman key exchange under standard assumptions. In *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT '02*, pages 321–326. LNCS 2332, 2002.

[10] M. Burmester and Y. Desmedt. A secure and efficient conference key distribution system. In *Proceedings of Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT*, volume 839, pages 275–286. LNCS, 1994.

[11] R. Dutta and R. Barua. Dynamic group key agreement in tree-based setting. In *ACISP*, pages 101–112, 2005.

[12] Y. Hu, A. Perrig, and D. Johnson. Ariadne:: A secure on-demand routing protocol for ad hoc networks. In *MobiCom '02: Proceedings of the 8th annual international Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking*, pages 12–23. ACM Press, 2002.

[13] I. Ingemarsson, D. T. Tang, and C.K. Wong. A conference key distribution system. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 28(5):714–720, 1982.

[14] J. Katz and M. Yung. Scalable protocols for authenticated group key exchange - full version. In *Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO '03*, pages 110–125. LNCS 2729, 2003.

[15] H-J. Kim, Lee S-M, and D.H. Lee. Constant-round authenticated group key exchange for dynamic groups. In *Proceedings of Advances in Cryptology - ASIACRYPT*, volume 3329, pages 245–259. LNCS, 2004.

[16] Y. Kim, A. Perrig, and G. Tsudik. Group key agreement efficient in communication. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 53(7):905–921, July 2004.

[17] J. Nam, J. Lee, S. Kim, and D. Won. DDH based group key agreement for mobile computing. http://eprint.iacr.org/2004/127, 2004.

[18] A. Perrig. Efficient collaborative key management protocols for secure autonomous group communication. In *Proceedings of International workshop on cryptographic techniques and electronic commerce*, pages 192–202, 1999.

[19] J. Pieprzyk and C.-H. Li. Multiparty key agreement protocols. *IEE Proceedings - Computers and Digital Techniques*, 147(4):229–236, 2000.

[20] Ricardo Staciarini Puttini, Ludovic Me, and Rafael Timóteo de Sousa. Certification and authentication services for securing MANET routing protocols. In *Proceedings of the 5th IFIP TC6 International Conference on Mobile and Wireless Communications Networks*, Singapore, October 2003.

[21] G-C. Roman, Q. Huang, and A. Hazemi. Consistent group membership in ad hoc networks. In *ICSE '01: Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 381–388. IEEE Computer Society, 2001.

[22] D.G. Steer, L. Strawczynski, W. Diffie, and M. Wiener. A secure audio tele-conference system. In *Proceedings of Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO*, volume 403, pages 520–528. LNCS, 1988.

[23] M. Steiner, G. Tsudik, and M. Waidner. Diffie-hellman key distribution extended to group communication. In *Proceedings of 3rd ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 31–37. ACM Press, 1996.

[24] W.-G. Tzeng and Z.-J. Tzeng. Round-efficient conference key agreement protocols with provable security. In *Proceedings of Advances in Cryptology - ASIACRYPT*, volume 1976, pages 614–627. LNCS, 2000.