

Internet Measurement of Quantum-Resistant IKEv2 in Constrained Networks

Geoff Twardokus
geoff.twardokus@mail.rit.edu
Rochester Institute of Technology

William Joslin
wjp3799@rit.edu
Rochester Institute of Technology

Benjamin Carini
btc5343@rit.edu
Rochester Institute of Technology

Hanif Rahbari
hanif.rahbari@rit.edu
Rochester Institute of Technology

William Layton
National Security Agency

ABSTRACT

Within 1–2 decades, quantum computers are expected to obsolesce current public-key cryptography, driving authorities such as IETF and NIST to push for adopting quantum-resistant cryptography (QRC) in ecosystems like Internet Protocol Security (IPsec). However, IPsec struggles to adopt QRC, primarily due to the limited ability of Internet Key Exchange Protocol Version 2 (IKEv2), which establishes IPsec connections, to tolerate the large public keys and digital signatures of QRC. Many solutions (e.g., IETF RFCs) are proposed to integrate QRC into IKEv2, but remain largely untested in practice. In this paper, we measure the performance of these proposals over the Internet by designing and implementing a novel, scalable, and flexible testbed for quantum-resistant IPsec, and we expose the serious shortcomings of existing proposals for quantum-resistant IKEv2 when deployed in constrained (e.g., lossy, rate-limited) networks. Through experimental deployments ranging from cloud-based virtual networks to hardware-in-the-loop wireless links between software-defined radios, as well as deployment on the international FABRIC testbed for next-generation networks, we show that today’s solutions for quantum-resistant IPsec are insufficient, necessitating development of better approaches.

1 INTRODUCTION

Internet Protocol (IP) networks are indispensable in modern society, with essential daily activities including electronic shopping, remote work, and virtual healthcare dependent on fast and reliable IP communication. IP also plays a vital role in national security, as government operations—ranging from real-time diplomacy to next-generation control systems for nuclear weapons [25]—depend on public and non-public IP networks. These sensitive communications occur over potentially constrained air-, land-, and space-based links that are vulnerable to interception, tampering, and other attacks; therefore, the ability to communicate confidentially with *authenticated* parties is essential [3]. Today, this ability is provided through the IP Security (IPsec) protocol, utilizing cryptographic algorithms approved by the National Institute

of Standards and Technology (NIST). IPsec establishes secure communication with rapid connection setup, a critical factor for time-sensitive or real-time operations, etc.

In fact, IPsec connection setup today requires the exchange of just four messages using the Internet Key Exchange Protocol Version 2 (IKEv2) [8]. Employing fast and lightweight cryptographic algorithms such as Diffie-Hellman Key Exchange (DHKE) and the Elliptic Curve Digital Signature Algorithm (ECDSA), IKEv2 has been designed and tested for efficiency [19]. However, the accelerating development of quantum computers imperils the future of IKEv2, and by extension, IPsec, as such computers will eventually be able to break the public-key algorithms used by current IKEv2. Anticipating this, NIST has recently standardized new *quantum-resistant* cryptographic algorithms, or QRC [20–23], to replace DHKE, ECDSA, and other “classical” algorithms. Underscoring the urgency, legislation and a presidential memo require the U.S. government to prepare immediately for transition to QRC [16, 32]. Some agencies are moving especially fast; e.g., the National Security Agency (NSA) will require IPsec in national security systems to transition to QRC by 2030 [24]. More broadly, the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) is currently considering several proposed standards (known as RFCs) moving towards quantum-resistant IPsec.

However, this momentum is now facing a serious hurdle: in practice, IPsec cannot easily adopt QRC. Notably, the much larger signatures and keys used in QRC significantly exceed the payload size limit of Layer 2 protocols such as Ethernet. Ordinarily, IP fragmentation would offer a straightforward solution; however, since intermediary network devices are often configured to drop fragmented IP packets [9], employing network-layer fragmentation for quantum-resistant IKEv2 would risk making connection establishment impossible over uncontrolled networks (e.g., the Internet). Likewise, the only current proposal to replace DHKE, which is integral to the efficiency of today’s IKEv2, is a draft RFC [14] that instead employs a NIST-approved, quantum-resistant key encapsulation mechanism (KEM) [22]. However, this requires using very large QRC keys, returning us to the first obstacle.

In this paper, we take a measurement-based approach to shed light on practical obstacles, establishing the specific bottlenecks that existing solutions would create in today’s Internet and deriving key insights to drive future efforts towards overcoming those challenges. Many such existing solutions attempt to cleanly integrate QRC into IKEv2. However, such proposals (e.g., several RFCs [9–13]) have never been rigorously tested under real-world conditions. In particular, no prior work has attempted to measure the performance of IKEv2 with QRC beyond limited paper exercises (e.g., [28]) or small-scale, isolated scenarios (e.g., two PCs directly connected by Ethernet [1]), neither of which can accurately determine how quantum-resistant IKEv2 will perform in the real world. To fill this gap, we take steps to analyze whether the problem of integrating QRC into IKEv2 has been solved from a practical perspective—i.e., whether existing proposals perform satisfactorily when realistic constraints (limited bandwidth, throttled data rates, etc.) may be present.

To this end, we develop the first comprehensive and reproducible measurement framework for quantum-resistant IKEv2 that facilitates performance studies in real Internet scenarios, wireless networks with hardware in the loop, mobile networks, and other practical scenarios. We then use our open-source testbed to reveal the serious shortcomings of existing proposed RFCs for quantum-resistant IKEv2, e.g., by measuring a 56,000-fold increase in communication overhead for IPsec setup in certain constrained environments. Our specific contributions are as follows:

- We compile state-of-the-art, interconnected RFC proposals for quantum-resistant IKEv2 (e.g., [9–13]) and analyze their challenges in constrained networks.
- We design and implement a highly flexible open-source testbed for quantum-resistant IKEv2 that supports a range of customizable real-world experiments. Featuring our configurations and enhancements¹ of the strongSwan IPsec client [30] and an automated deployment framework², we use our testbed to experiment in virtual cloud frameworks, on a testbench with software-defined radios (SDRs) for wireless experiments, and even on the large-scale distributed FABRIC Internet testbed [2] to collect real-world data.
- Our measurement of IPsec performance when using quantum-resistant IKEv2 exposes significant, potentially catastrophic problems across a variety of realistic scenarios. These results reveal massive increases in overhead and significant added latency when setting up connections using QRC, leading us to deduce that current RFCs, which converge around leveraging IKEv2 fragmentation [9] to facilitate quantum

¹Available at <https://bitbucket.org/imc-quantum-artifacts/pq-strongswan>

²Available at <https://bitbucket.org/imc-quantum-artifacts/openstack-ikev2>




Figure 1: Classical IKEv2 IPsec connection setup.

resistance, are simply insufficient to make quantum-resistant IKEv2 ready for practical deployments.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we provide technical context for quantum-resistant IKEv2. We present our testbed and measurement results in Sections 3 and 4, respectively, and conclude with Section 5.

2 IPsec IN TRANSITION

IPsec is defined across a large number of IETF RFCs centered on [7], but it broadly breaks down into two constituent protocols. First, connection setup, including key establishment and endpoint authentication, is accomplished using the four-message IKEv2 process shown in Figure 1. Keys are established using DHKE via the initialization messages (IKE_SA_INIT), allowing subsequent messages to be encrypted, while authentication is completed using certificates, digitally signed with ECDSA or Rivest-Shamir-Adleman (RSA), that are exchanged in the IKE_AUTH messages. Note that these algorithms are based on discrete logarithms or prime factorization, both problems easily solvable by quantum computers as early as in the next decade [17], making IKEv2 a potential Achilles’ heel for IPsec in the quantum era.

Successful IKEv2 setup produces an authenticated and encrypted *security association*, or SA, within which secure data communication can commence using Encapsulating Security Payload (ESP), the second major protocol within IPsec. The encryption algorithm used to protect ESP (and IKE_AUTH) is nearly always AES (usually AES-256). Since AES, like all symmetric-key algorithms, is widely believed to be inherently quantum-resistant, ESP is of far less concern than IKEv2 when it comes to mitigating quantum attacks.

2.1 Proposals for Quantum-Resistant IKEv2

As briefly mentioned in Section 1, a number of proposals have been put forward that attempt to solve different challenges related to adopting QRC in IKEv2. Here, we briefly review the three proposals that are most relevant—i.e., [9, 11, 13], which

are de facto accepted—as well as two less mature proposals [12, 14]. Further, we analyze the various shortcomings of these RFCs that cast doubt on whether they are viable for deployment in constrained scenarios. We support the following RFCs in our testbed, with one exception (explained below). Less relevant RFCs are discussed in Appendix A and B.

2.1.1 IKEv2 Message Fragmentation. RFC 7383 [9] attempts to resolve the general problem of sending IKEv2 messages that exceed the maximum transmission unit (MTU) of Layer 2 by fragmenting the data at the *application* layer. While this approach obviates the need to fragment IP packets, as such fragments might be dropped by intermediary network devices at the network layer, it comes with a major caveat—only *encrypted* IKEv2 messages can be fragmented using the approach. This means that while large IKE_AUTH messages can be handled with this approach, it does not work for the unencrypted IKE_SA_INIT messages that are used to establish the secure channel (see Figure 1). Avoiding IP layer fragmentation of unencrypted IKE_SA_INIT messages that contain large QRC keys remains an unresolved challenge.

2.1.2 Intermediate Key Exchanges. RFC 9242 [11] introduces IKE_INTERMEDIATE messages, which use the above IKEv2 fragmentation (RFC 7383) to exchange quantum-resistant certificates after the IKE_SA_INIT and prior to the IKE_AUTH exchange that completes SA establishment. This utilizes an additional notification (INTERMEDIATE_EXCHANGE_SUPPORTED) in IKE_SA_INIT that triggers exchanging a series of small IKE_INTERMEDIATE messages containing fragments of the public key and certificate to avoid Layer 3 fragmentation, thereby supporting QRC (with its large signatures and keys) without risking packets being dropped by intermediary devices. However, this introduces exchanging many IKEv2 messages—far more than the current four.

2.1.3 Multiple Key Exchanges. RFC 9370 [13] extends RFC 9242 to enable multiple key exchanges during the IKEv2 setup process. This method introduces IKE_FOLLOWUP_KEY messages and the ADDITIONAL_KEY_EXCHANGE notification to facilitate, e.g., the use of hybrid classical/quantum-resistant configurations where at least two keys need to be shared between peers. While an essential part of complying with certain mandates, e.g., the NSA requirement to move IPsec to hybrid security by 2030 [24], multiple key exchanges only exacerbate the problem of increased message quantity and size introduced by intermediate key exchanges in RFC 9242.

2.1.4 Quantum-resistant KEMs. To eliminate quantum-vulnerable DHKE, it has recently been proposed to employ a quantum-resistant KEM for IKE_SA_INIT messages [14]. The idea is to use the Module Lattice-based Key Encapsulation Mechanism (ML-KEM), recently standardized as NIST’s

only approved quantum-resistant KEM [22], to securely establish shared encryption keys while still only requiring an exchange of two messages between peers. However, this is not a clean solution, as it again requires using large QRC keys that bring us back to the fragmentation problem discussed above. We explore this further in Section 4.

2.1.5 Transport-Layer Changes to IPsec. In addition to RFCs that specifically focus on accommodating the overhead of QRC, proposals have been put forward to change the transport-layer protocol for IPsec from UDP to TCP (either partially or completely, depending on the proposal). This could indirectly help with certain challenges of adopting QRC; e.g., using TCP would eliminate the need to fragment at the IP layer and render techniques such as IKEv2 fragmentation (RFC 7383) unnecessary. However, there are serious problems with these proposals—most notably, applications using the secure ESP data flow would have to establish TCP sessions within the outer IPsec TCP connection, resulting in classic “TCP-in-TCP” connection meltdowns. Proposals for TCP-based IPsec have not been generally accepted as feasible, so we omit a detailed discussion here. The interested reader can refer to Appendix B for more discussion on this.

3 A FLEXIBLE TESTBED FOR QUANTUM-RESISTANT IKEv2

We now describe the architecture of our novel testbed framework (that supports hardware in the loop) for quantum-resistant IKEv2. Our testbed provides five key capabilities—scalability, flexibility, reproducibility, automated deployment and measurement, and hardware integration—to deliver on our objective of enabling highly realistic measurements.

3.1 Testbed Core: Software

The core of our testbed is largely based on the well-known strongSwan implementation that facilitates setting up virtual private network (VPN) connections secured using IPsec. In its latest beta version³, strongSwan supports the three “mainstream” proposals for quantum-resistant IKEv2 described in Section 2, namely, IKEv2 fragmentation, intermediate key exchanges, and multiple key exchanges.

We expand on this foundation by integrating ML-KEM into strongSwan. This aligns our testbed’s capabilities with the most recent NIST standards, and also enables evaluating cutting-edge proposals such as adopting ML-KEM for IKEv2 [14]. We further implement a completely functional TCP socket integration with the basic strongSwan client as well as implementation of the IKE_SA_INIT message exchange over TCP, which we release in open source for the

³At time of writing, version 6.0.0beta6.




Figure 2: Example testbed configuration: two PCs, and two USRP X310 SDRs for over-the-air experiments.

community⁴. `strongSwan`, like other open-source IPsec implementations (e.g. [29]), has no native support for TCP; in fact, its entire architecture is predicated on only ever using UDP. Enabling any TCP functionality at all is arduous, requiring a complete overhaul of the transport layer and low-level socket implementations of `strongSwan`, and we limit our efforts towards complete TCP encapsulation of IKEv2 given that even the authors of such proposals doubt their practicality [12, Sec. 9.1]. By releasing the fruits of our effort to overhaul `strongSwan` and enable TCP, we hope to pave the way for investigations of challenging future directions that build on our foundation, such as evaluation of more promising future solutions that make use of TCP (e.g., [15]).

3.2 Flexible and Automated Deployment

To support a wide range of potential experimental scenarios, we provide a highly customizable and reconfigurable architecture. Our testbed is provided in the form of our enhanced `strongSwan` client, bundled with an automated deployment capability built using Ansible. As the fundamental requirement for `strongSwan` is merely a Linux-based operating system with network access, our testbed can be deployed practically anywhere, including on FABRIC (see Section 4.3).

In the simplest configuration, “real-world” experiments using actual computers and networks can be set up by just installing our `strongSwan` client on the host PCs, connecting the desired network topology, and proceeding to conduct experiments. For more specific scenarios beyond simple wired networks, our `strongSwan` client is also compatible with any peripheral devices that operate below the transport layer; for example, commercial Wi-Fi NICs and cellular eSIM devices are supported. In some of our experiments, we use NI-USRP SDRs (see Figure 2) for over-the-air wireless experiments.

For large-scale network experiments, our testbed can also be deployed in entirely virtual environments by leveraging the power of OpenStack infrastructure for cloud-based configurations. In our experiments, for example, we perform some measurements using cloud-based deployments of our testbed to hosts on an OpenStack cluster at our university’s

cybersecurity institute. Such experiments allow granular control over network lossiness, intermediary device behavior, etc., which are high-impact factors that are difficult to control for in Internet measurements. In general, cloud-based deployment facilitates much more scalable experiments than are affordable or feasible with actual hardware, expanding our testbed capabilities while lowering the barrier to entry for other investigators. We provide a fully automated configuration and deployment framework for OpenStack [27], again leveraging Ansible to do so. This *Infrastructure as Code* (IaC) approach allows us to spin up and tear-down virtual machines in specified network topologies as needed resulting in a highly customizable environment. Along with our source code for quantum-resistant `strongSwan`, we will release our deployment framework and documentation in open source as an accompanying artifact.

3.3 IPsec Simulation Module

In addition to our cloud- and hardware-in-the-loop testbed architecture and `strongSwan`-based IPsec implementation, we develop and present a simulation framework for quantum-resistant IPsec based on the venerable, open-source OMNeT++ discrete-time network simulator [26]. OMNeT++, along with its `inet` extension, provides a complete TCP/IP stack with interchangeable Layer 2 and Layer 3 protocols, enabling experiments with Wi-Fi [6], 4G and 5G cellular [18], etc, thus supporting a broad range of scenarios irrespective of hardware availability. However, OMNeT++ and its extensions do not currently offer an IPsec implementation; therefore, we have implemented the network-level functionalities (i.e., message formats and sizes) of IPsec in a custom module that facilitates experiments in OMNeT++ to collect network performance data as desired. We do not collect hardware or device-level metrics (e.g., cryptography execution time) in OMNeT++ as this is not the intended use of the tool.

4 RESULTS: ADOPTING QRC IN IKEv2

We now use our testbed to measure how quantum-resistant IKEv2 performs under constrained network conditions.

4.1 Objectives, Methodology, and Metrics

Our experimental objective is to quantify the impact of adopting current proposals for quantum-resistant IKEv2 (see Section 2), with a particular focus on whether or not these proposals are viable for constrained network scenarios that are vital to the modern digital world. To do this, we first simulate IPsec with quantum-resistant IKEv2 in scenarios that are representative of common use cases (small Wi-Fi networks, a 5G cell with one base station and multiple user devices, etc.), yielding preliminary conclusions and setting expectations for our subsequent hardware and Internet experiments.

⁴<https://bitbucket.org/imc-quantum-artifacts/pq-strongswan>

Table 1: IPsec Simulation Configurations.

Configuration	Feature		RFC				
	QRC?	TCP?	7383	9242	9370	KEM Draft [14]	9329
Current	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Partially QR	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Fully QR	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y


We proceed to conduct those experiments, both in virtual environments (using OpenStack infrastructure) as well as in the physical world, employing SDRs for wireless over-the-air experiments (see Figure 2) and ultimately deploying our testbed to the large-scale FABRIC testbed [2] for real-world tests using globally distributed Internet nodes.

Metrics— In the literature, encryption and key generation times [1], data rate throttling [31], and connection setup delays [1, 4, 5, 33] have been used to measure the impact of adopting QRC in network security protocols. The first two are not helpful here, as QRC execution time is not our focus. Data rate is also not very meaningful as IKEv2 is only used for connection setup, not sustained communication. Therefore, we first select *connection setup time* as a metric of interest, and we hypothesize it will be significantly degraded by adopting QRC due to the need to send more and larger packets over a potentially lossy link. We then consider connection setup *efficiency*—how much data must be transmitted to establish a connection—as a second metric. This is a particular concern in rate-limited or low-bandwidth networks, where using UDP to send the large number of IKEv2 messages required for QRC (see Section 2) can cause significant congestion.

4.2 Simulating Quantum-Resistant IKEv2

We use our IPsec implementation in OMNeT++ (see Section 3) to measure and compare the performance of three IKEv2 configurations: (1) current IKEv2, as defined in [8, 24]; (2) partially quantum-resistant IKEv2, which adopts the three mainstream RFCs that allow IKE_AUTH messages to be protected with QRC (see Section 2); and (3) fully quantum-resistant IKEv2, which uses ML-KEM to ensure IKE_SA_INITs are also quantum-resistant and employs TCP encapsulation of IPsec (RFC 9329 [12]) in place of IKEv2 fragmentation (RFC 7383) to avoid IP layer fragmentation. The specifics of each configuration are given in Table 1. For each configuration, we consider four experimental scenarios that are representative of common real-world use cases: two hosts directly connected by 1 Gbps Ethernet, two hosts communicating wirelessly using IEEE 802.11 (Wi-Fi) via an access point, 100 nodes communicating using a single Wi-Fi access point in a confined (100 m²) space, and 100 nodes communicating wirelessly using 5G cellular through a single base station.

When just two devices and a wired link are considered, adopting QRC has minimal impact, keeping connection setup

**Figure 3: OMNeT++ simulation results.**

times to roughly 1 second (or less) in the wired and wireless scenarios for both Partially and Fully QR configurations. However, one can see that for a heavily used Wi-Fi access point with 100 clients in a small area—a scenario that naturally leads to some packet loss and processing latency—the increased number of packets for IKEv2 transmitted under the Partially QR configuration causes a ~3-fold increase in setup time. The Fully QR configuration, with TCP and ML-KEM instead of UDP and IKEv2 fragmentation, actually performs comparably to current IKEv2 in this scenario. However, in the high-density 5G cellular scenario, we can see the potential for serious difficulties when employing TCP under [12]. Due primarily to the aggressively conservative congestion control in TCP when even minor packet loss is encountered⁵, along with the need to send a large number of fragmented packets when employing ML-KEM, connection setup time spikes to around 12 seconds, on average, when employing the Fully QR configuration in this more lossy and mobile environment. While perhaps not always a problem, for particularly latency-sensitive applications (e.g., real-time mission control) this level of added delay may be intolerable, and it is certainly noteworthy for future design of quantum-resistant IKEv2.


4.3 Real-world Experiments

We now turn our attention to measuring the real-world performance of IPsec with quantum-resistant IKEv2. Again, we consider three configurations for comparison—one implementation that is typical of enterprise (“commercial”) security, one that complies with the Commercial National Security Algorithm Suite (CNSA) that is currently used in national security systems, and one that matches the NSA’s stated plans for quantum-resistant CNSA version 2.0 [24]. Detailed implementation parameters are given in Table 2. Note that where we use ML-KEM, we assume IP fragmentation can be used (i.e., that intermediary devices will not drop IP layer fragments). This is necessary, for now, due to the dubious practicality of TCP and lack of alternatives for quantum-resistant IKE_SA_INIT messages (see Section 2), but should be noted as an area of study for future work.

⁵For example, additive increase multiplicative decrease (AIMD).

Table 2: Experimental configurations.



Configuration	Encryption	Signatures	KEM	Key Exchange
Commercial	AES/GCM-256	ECDSA P.256	N/A	DHKE P.256
CNSA 1.0	AES/GCM-256	ECDSA P.384	N/A	DHKE P.384
QR-IKEv2	AES/GCM-256	ML-DSA [21] (Level 3)	ML-KEM (Level 3)	N/A

**Figure 4: Connection setup time for IPsec in various configurations. PDFs calculated over 1,000 iterations.**

4.3.1 Connection Setup Time: Cloud Networks. We start by again considering connection setup time, but instead of simulation we employ actual quantum-resistant IKEv2 within the strongSwan software described previously, deploying two virtual Ubuntu 22.04 hosts in OpenStack that are directly connected by an emulated 1 Gbps Ethernet link over the cloud. We configure each host to run our enhanced variant of strongSwan, as well as standard strongSwan (in the commercial configuration from Table 2) for comparison. As in our simulations, we run 1,000 iterations establishing an IPsec connection between the hosts, but this time we embed timing hooks in our customized strongSwan source code to precisely record how long it takes for the IPsec daemons to initialize, establish the connection, and reach the state of being prepared to process secure ESP traffic.

Our results are shown in Figure 4(a), which shows a probability density function (PDF) of the results for each configuration. One can see that the commercial and CNSA 1.0 implementations perform quite similarly; this is expected, as the differences between the two are in classical key size rather than any change in network behaviors. However, when adopting QRC as per CNSA 2.0, Figure 4(a) shows that connection time increases from around 25 ms to around 75 ms on average. This corroborates our simulation results, which suggested a ~ 3 -fold increase in connection setup time when employing QRC.

4.3.2 Connection Setup Time: Over-the-Air Wireless. Now, seeking insights into how a less reliable connection may aggravate the impacts of adopting QRC, we repeat the same experiments but replace the Ethernet link with an over-the-air wireless link between SDRs connected to Ubuntu host PCs (see Figure 2), adjusting the transmission power of the SDRs such that a low signal-to-noise ratio provides a packet loss

**Figure 5: FABRIC configuration for preliminary evaluations of quantum-resistant IKEv2.****Figure 6: IKEv2 connection setup efficiency vs. packet loss rate for classical (CNSA 1.0) vs. QRC (CNSA 2.0) security. Results are averages over 1,000 iterations.**

rate of approximately 20%. The results of this effort, shown in Figure 4(b), clearly indicate that when a link is less reliable, not only is connection setup time further increased when using QRC, it is also much less consistent. The greater spread of the distribution and further increased setup time at $\sim 20\%$ packet loss strongly suggest that for time-critical systems in constrained scenarios, introducing QRC into IKEv2 could lead to unacceptably (and unpredictably) long setup times.

4.3.3 Connection Setup Efficiency: FABRIC Testbed. For real-world Internet measurement, we deploy our strongSwan-based IPsec client on FABRIC [2], a large-scale testbed for next-generation network protocols that is based on high-performance computing clusters deployed across the United States, as well as internationally.

We deploy two hosts on FABRIC (e.g., in the topology shown in Figure 5) and install our strongSwan client on them, and then iteratively attempt to establish a connection while varying packet loss probability between 0–20%. Our results, shown in Figure 6, illustrate that as packet loss increases from 0–20%, the amount of data transmitted during IKEv2 setup increases *exponentially* when using QRC. In fact, at 20% packet loss, an average of ~ 130 MB must be transmitted to complete an IKEv2 connection with QRC, as opposed to just 2.3 KB with classical IKEv2—an increase of more than 56,500%! This massive increase in overhead to establish an

IKEv2 connection is likely to be intolerable for time-sensitive applications in constrained scenarios, a critical consideration for the design of future IKEv2.

5 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we used network measurements to expose the challenges of integrating quantum-resistant security into IKEv2. We presented our novel testbed for evaluating proposals for quantum-resistant IPsec, and we used our testbed to enumerate the shortcomings of existing proposals when they are deployed in constrained networks. Our experimental results, including those derived from real data on the FABRIC testbed, demonstrate (among other things) that IKEv2 with today's QRC proposals can suffer a 50% penalty in connection setup time compared with classical approaches. Moreover, we showed that adopting QRC under current RFCs can increase the data transmission overhead for connection setup by several orders of magnitude when even moderate packet loss is experienced. Our results conclusively demonstrate the insufficiency of current proposals, calling for a new approach to quantum-resistant security in IKEv2 and IPsec.

REFERENCES

- [1] Seungyeon Bae, Yousung Chang, Hyeongjin Park, Minseo Kim, Youngjoo Shin, Seung-Hyun Seo, and Hwaejeong Seo. 2022. A Performance Evaluation of IPsec with Post-Quantum Cryptography. In *Proc. Int. Conf. Information Security and Cryptology*. Seoul, South Korea.
- [2] Ilya Baldin, Anita Nikolich, James Griffioen, Indermohan Inder S Monga, Kuang-Ching Wang, Tom Lehman, and Paul Ruth. 2019. FABRIC: A national-scale programmable experimental network infrastructure. *IEEE Internet Computing* 23, 6 (2019), 38–47.
- [3] Hitesh Dhall, Dolly Dhall, Sonia Batra, and Pooja Rani. 2012. Implementation of IPsec Protocol. In *Proc. Int. Conf. Advanced Computing & Communication Technologies*. Rohtak, India, 176–181.
- [4] Stefan-Lukas Gazdag, Sophia Grundner-Culemanna, Daniel Herzinger Tobias Heider, Felix Schärfl, Joo Yeon Cho, Tobias Guggemos, and Daniel Loebenberger. 2023. Quantum-resistant MACsec and IPsec for virtual private networks. In *Proc. Int. Conf. Security Standardisation Research*. Lyon, France.
- [5] Daniel Herzinger, Stefan-Lukas Gazdag, and Daniel Loebenberger. 2021. Real-World Quantum-Resistant IPsec. In *Proc. International Conference on Security of Information and Networks*. Edinburgh, United Kingdom.
- [6] INET Contributors. 2024. INET Framework. <https://inet.omnetpp.org> Accessed: Sept. 27, 2024.
- [7] Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). 2011. IP Security (IPsec) and Internet Key Exchange (IKE) Document Roadmap. RFC 6071.
- [8] Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). 2014. Internet Key Exchange Protocol Version 2. RFC 7296.
- [9] Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). 2014. Internet Key Exchange Protocol Version 2 (IKEv2) Message Fragmentation. RFC 7383.
- [10] Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). 2020. Mixing Preshared Keys in the Internet Key Exchange Protocol Version 2 (IKEv2) for Post-quantum Security. RFC 8784.
- [11] Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). 2022. Intermediate Exchange in the Internet Key Exchange Protocol Version 2 (IKEv2). RFC 9242.
- [12] Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). 2022. TCP Encapsulation of Internet Key Exchange Protocol (IKE) and IPsec Packets. RFC 9329.
- [13] Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). 2023. Multiple Key Exchanges in the Internet Key Exchange Protocol Version 2 (IKEv2). RFC 9370.
- [14] Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). 2024. Post-quantum Hybrid Key Exchange with ML-KEM in the Internet Key Exchange Protocol Version 2 (IKEv2). Draft RFC by Kampanakis and Ravago.
- [15] Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). 2024. Use of Reliable Transport in the Internet Key Exchange Protocol Version 2 (IKEv2). Draft RFC by Valery Smyslov.
- [16] Joseph R. Biden Jr. 2022. Promoting United States Leadership in Quantum Computing While Mitigating Risks to Vulnerable Cryptographic Systems. National Security Memorandum 10.
- [17] Michele Mosca and Marco Piani. 2023. Quantum Threat Timeline Report 2023. <https://globalriskinstitute.org/publication/2023-quantum-threat-timeline-report/> Accessed: Mar. 5, 2024.
- [18] Giovanni Nardini, Dario Sabella, Giovanni Stea, Purvi Thakkar, and Antonio Viridis. 2020. Simu5G—An OMNeT++ Library for End-to-End Performance Evaluation of 5G Networks. *IEEE Access* 8 (Oct. 2020), 181176–181191.
- [19] National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). 2020. Guide to IPsec VPNs. Special Publication 800-77 Revision 1.
- [20] National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). 2022. Status Report on the Third Round of the NIST Post-Quantum Cryptography Standardization Process. Internal Report 8413.
- [21] National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). 2024. Module-Lattice-Based Digital Signature Standard. FIPS 204.
- [22] National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). 2024. Module-Lattice-Based Key-Encapsulation Mechanism Standard. FIPS 203.
- [23] National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). 2024. Stateless Hash-Based Digital Signature Standard. FIPS 205.
- [24] National Security Agency (NSA). 2024. The Commercial National Security Algorithm Suite 2.0 and Quantum Computing FAQ. <https://tinyurl.com/5d6pydj3> Accessed: Sept. 25, 2024.
- [25] Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear Matters. 2020. *Nuclear Matters Handbook 2020*. U.S. Dept. of Defense, Washington, D.C. <https://tinyurl.com/mrxpbryd>
- [26] OMNeT++. 2024. OMNeT++ Discrete Event Simulator. <https://omnetpp.org/>
- [27] OpenStack. 2023. The OpenStack project. <https://www.openstack.org> Accessed: April. 21, 2024.
- [28] Andrea Paziienza, Eufemia Lella, Pietro Noviello, and Felice Vitulano. 2022. Analysis of Network-level Key Exchange Protocols in the Post-Quantum Era. In *Proc. IEEE Workshop on Low Temperature Electronics*. Matera, Italy.
- [29] The Libreswan Project. 2024. Libreswan. <https://libreswan.org>
- [30] The strongSwan Team. 2024. strongSwan. <https://strongswan.org/documentation.html> Accessed: Sept. 25, 2024.
- [31] Sami Ullah, Joontae Choi, and Heekuck Oh. 2020. IPsec for high speed network links: Performance analysis and enhancements. *Future Generation Computer Systems* 107 (June 2020), 112–125.
- [32] United States Congress. 2022. Quantum Computing Cybersecurity Preparedness Act. U.S. Public Law 117-260 (44 U.S.C. 3502, 3552 and 3553 Chapter 3).
- [33] Jieyu Zheng, Haoliang Zhu, Yifan Dong, Zhenyu Song, Zhenhao Zhang, Yafang Yang, and Yunlei Zhao. 2024. Faster Post-quantum TLS 1.3 Based on ML-KEM: Implementation and Assessment. In *Proc. European Symposium on Research in Computer Security*. Bydgoszcz, Poland.

A ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS FOR QUANTUM-RESISTANT IKEv2

In this appendix, we provide a brief overview of proposals for quantum-resistant IKEv2 that are less mainstream and/or practical.

A.1 Pre-shared Key Mixing

RFC 8784 [10] formalizes the idea of removing DHKE and, rather than replacing it, using a pre-shared quantum-resistant key in order to facilitate authentication using QRC without requiring an exchange of keys. A pre-shared key is selected during the IKE_SA_INIT phase, broken into pieces, and combined with (“mixed into”) the classical IKEv2 exchanges, thereby adding quantum-resistant security without any exchange of quantum-resistant keys. This approach certainly achieves quantum-resistant security; however, it comes at the significant cost of requiring the pre-configuration of pre-shared secrets on endpoints. Further, this approach introduces new problems related to secure and reliable key refreshment, which may not always be possible or practical (e.g., for satellite communications, in distributed sensor networks).

B PROPOSALS TO ADOPT TCP IN IPsec

We now provide further discussion of recent proposals to adopt TCP in place of UDP for IPsec and elaborate on why these proposals have not seen widespread adoption.

B.1 TCP Encapsulation of IPsec

Under RFC 9329 [12], it is proposed to simply move IPsec in its entirety (IKEv2 and ESP) from UDP to TCP. This was proposed because network controls (firewalls, intrusion detection systems, etc.) are often configured to block UDP traffic while allowing TCP [12], which can significantly interfere with establishing and maintaining IPsec connections that need to pass through these secure environments. However, TCP encapsulation of IPsec introduces myriad performance challenges including head-of-line-blocking, which can rapidly throttle a connection, as well as TCP meltdowns that result from applications establishing their own TCP connections inside of the existing IPsec TCP connection. New security problems are also raised that would open up TCP-encapsulated IPsec to a range of trivially easy and catastrophic denial-of-service attacks, in addition to exposing IPsec to the plethora of existing attacks against TCP. For all of these reasons, even the authors of RFC 9329 recommend only using TCP encapsulation as a last resort—hardly an encouraging endorsement, if this technique were considered for general adoption to help accommodate QRC.

B.2 TCP Encapsulation of IKEv2

In light of the crippling problems associated with RFC 9329 [12], Smyslov recently proposed a new approach that would move only IKEv2 to TCP, leaving ESP using UDP [15]. This would ensure reliable key establishment and remedy the fragmentation problem for QRC-secured IKE_SA_INIT messages without incurring the performance or security problems of [12], making for an appealing approach. However, non-proprietary IPsec implementations (e.g., strongSwan [30], Libreswan [29]) have never supported (or no longer support) using TCP for IPsec under RFC 9329, much less the novel partial encapsulation Smyslov proposes, and maintainers appear (generally) to have little or no interest in implementing these proposals. In our testbed development (see Section 3) we develop strongSwan towards a more “TCP-ready” state with a partial implementation of RFC 9329 and [15]. While not a major focus of this work, since TCP encapsulation is not directly linked with supporting QRC in IPsec, we hope our efforts will assist future investigators with a steppingstone towards further study into these proposals.

C ETHICS

This work does not raise any ethical issues.