

Messaging Layer Security  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Informational  
Expires: 21 September 2026

R. Mahy  
Rohan Mahy Consulting Services  
20 March 2026

Ways to convey the Ratchet Tree in Messaging Layer Security  
draft-ietf-mls-ratchet-tree-options-00

## Abstract

The Messaging Layer Security (MLS) protocol needs to share its ratchet\_tree object to welcome new clients into a group and in external joins. While the protocol only defines a mechanism for sharing the entire tree, most implementations use various optimizations to avoid sending this structure repeatedly in large groups. This document describes a way to convey these improvements in a standardized way and to convey the parts of a GroupInfo object that are not visible to an intermediary server.

## About This Document

This note is to be removed before publishing as an RFC.

The latest revision of this draft can be found at <https://messaginglayersecurity.rocks/mls-ratchet-tree-options/draft-ietf-mls-ratchet-tree-options.html>. Status information for this document may be found at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-mls-ratchet-tree-options/>.

Discussion of this document takes place on the Messaging Layer Security Working Group mailing list (<mailto:mls@ietf.org>), which is archived at <https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/browse/mls/>. Subscribe at <https://www.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/mls/>.

Source for this draft and an issue tracker can be found at <https://github.com/mlswg/mls-ratchet-tree-options>.

## Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on 21 September 2026.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2026 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Revised BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Revised BSD License.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction . . . . .	3
2. Conventions and Definitions . . . . .	3
3. Conveying the Ratchet Tree . . . . .	3
3.1. Conveying the ratchet tree using HTTPS . . . . .	4
4. Conveying the GroupInfo . . . . .	5
5. Security Considerations . . . . .	6
6. IANA Considerations . . . . .	7
6.1. ratchet_tree_source_domains MLS Extension Type . . . . .	7
7. References . . . . .	7
7.1. Normative References . . . . .	7
7.2. Informative References . . . . .	8
Appendix A. Change Log . . . . .	8
A.1. Changes between draft-mahy-...-04 and draft-ietf-...-00 . . . . .	8
A.2. Changes between -03 and -04 . . . . .	8
A.3. Changes between -02 and -03 . . . . .	9
A.4. Changes between -01 and -02 . . . . .	9
A.5. Changes between -00 and -01 . . . . .	9
Acknowledgments . . . . .	9
Author's Address . . . . .	9

## 1. Introduction

In the Messaging Layer Security (MLS) protocol [RFC9420], the members of a group are organized into a ratchet tree, the full representation of which is described in the ratchet\_tree extension. The protocol specifies that the full ratchet\_tree can be included in Welcome messages or shared externally, but describes no concrete way to convey it externally. Likewise, when non-member clients want to join a group, they can do so using an external commit. They require the GroupInfo and the ratchet\_tree.

Many MLS implementations allow external commits to get the GroupInfo from a central server. In the MIMI architecture [I-D.ietf-mimi-arch], this server is called the hub, and for brevity we will use that term generically to refer to any central server that provides either GroupInfo or ratchet\_tree objects to new members (i.e. welcomed clients or externally joining clients).

When all handshake messages (commits and proposals) are sent as PublicMessages (or SemiPrivateMessages [I-D.mahy-mls-semiprivatemessage]), the hub can construct its own version of the ratchet\_tree and most of the GroupInfo object as proposals and commits arrive.

## 2. Conventions and Definitions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

This document assumes familiarity with terms and structs from the MLS specification ([RFC9420]).

## 3. Conveying the Ratchet Tree

The ratchet tree can be conveyed inline in its entirety. Alternatively, this document describes how it can be referred to via an HTTPS URI, or signaled that it is communicated out-of-band or reconstructed by the distribution service.

```
enum {  
    reserved(0),  
    full(1),  
    httpsUri(2),  
    outOfBand(3),  
    distributionService(4),  
    (255)  
} RatchetTreeRepresentation;
```

```
struct {  
    RatchetTreeRepresentation representation;  
    select (representation) {  
        case full:  
            Node ratchet_tree<V>;  
        case httpsUrl:  
            /* an HTTPS URL */  
            opaque ratchet_tree_url<V>;  
        case outOfBand:  
            struct {};  
        case distributionService:  
            struct {};  
    };  
} RatchetTreeOption;
```

- \* full indicates that the complete ratchet\_tree extension is included in the RatchetTreeOption object.
- \* httpsUri indicates that the ratchet\_tree can be downloaded from a URI using the https: scheme.
- \* outOfBand indicates that the ratchet\_tree is communicated or reconstructed via an unspecified out-of-band application protocol.
- \* distributionService indicates that the ratchet\_tree is reconstructed by the Distribution Service (DS) from the handshake in the group. This is not possible if any handshake messages are sent as an MLS PrivateMessage.

### 3.1. Conveying the ratchet tree using HTTPS

This document defines a new MLS GroupContext extension `ratchet_tree_source_domains`. When present, it contains a list of at least one domain name.

```
struct {  
    opaque domain<V>;  
} Domain;
```

```
struct {  
    Domain domains<V>  
} DomainList;
```

```
DomainList ratchet_tree_source_domains;
```

When this extension is included in the GroupContext of a group, the URL where the ratchet\_tree is fetched MUST come from one of the domains in the ratchet\_tree\_source\_domains.domains list.

#### 4. Conveying the GroupInfo

In some systems the GroupInfo is sent to a hub with a full ratchet\_tree extension always included with every commit. This is used in systems where the hub may or may not track the membership of the group, but does not keep the entire ratchet\_tree data structure. As group size increases, the size of the ratchet\_tree extension in the GroupInfo scales roughly linearly. Even using basic credentials, this object gets large quickly. If x509 credentials are used, the size increases much more rapidly, and if a post-quantum ciphersuite (for example [I-D.ietf-mls-pq-ciphersuites]) is used, the size will increase even more rapidly with each new member.

In some systems that require unencrypted handshake messages, the hub tracks commits as they are sent and constructs changes to the ratchet\_tree as each handshake is accepted. The hub could also recreate most of the fields of a GroupInfo, with the exception of the GroupInfo signature and the GroupInfo extensions, by inspecting those same unencrypted handshake messages. This document defines a PartialGroupInfo struct that contains these missing fields. PartialGroupInfo can be included with a commit and any referenced proposals to reconstruct a GroupInfo and ratchet\_tree from the GroupInfo and ratchet\_tree included in the previous epoch.

```
enum {
    no_ratchet_tree(0),
    present(1),
    removed(2),
    added(3),
    (255)
} RatchetTreePresence;

struct {
    RatchetTreePresence ratchet_tree_presence;
    /* GroupInfo extensions excluding ratchet_tree */
    Extension group_info_extensions<V>;
    opaque signature<V>;
} PartialGroupInfo;
```

The value of `ratchet_tree_presence` is defined as follows:

- \* `no_ratchet_tree`: the `ratchet_tree` extension appears in neither the current nor previous epochs.
- \* `present`: there is a `ratchet_tree` extension in both the current and previous epochs.
- \* `removed`: there was a `ratchet_tree` extension in the previous epoch but none in the current epoch.
- \* `added`: there is a `ratchet_tree` extension in the current epoch but there was none in the previous epoch.

The `group_info_extensions` object is the list of `GroupInfo` extensions, omitting any `ratchet_tree` extension (if present). The only other `GroupInfo` extension defined in the base protocol is `external_pub`, the public key of the external committer. The `group_info_extensions` is often an empty list.

The signature in the `PartialGroupInfo` is the signature produced by the committer (represented by its leaf index in the `GroupInfo` as the signer).

## 5. Security Considerations

The Security Considerations of the MLS protocol [RFC9420] and the MLS architecture [RFC9750] apply.

The integrity of the ratchet tree is assured using the MLS `GroupContext.tree_hash` (see Section 7.8 of [RFC9420]). The tree hash allows the receiver to verify that the ratchet tree is valid whether it is transmitted in the `ratchet_tree` extension or out-of-band.

In some systems such as the MIMI protocol [I-D.ietf-mimi-protocol], the DS receives a GroupInfo with each tentative commit message. The DS cannot verify the correctness of a GroupInfo because it does not have the GroupInfo.extensions. This is no different with a partial GroupInfo message. In both partial and full GroupInfo presentation, given a specific GroupInfo.signature, the DS can merely verify that the extensions and the signature are consistent with each other and with the GroupContext.

## 6. IANA Considerations

### 6.1. ratchet\_tree\_source\_domains MLS Extension Type

This document registers the ratchet\_tree\_source\_domains Extension Type, using the template below:

- \* Value: TBD1 (new assignment by IANA)
- \* Name: ratchet\_tree\_source\_domains
- \* Messages: GC
- \* Recommended: Y
- \* Reference: RFC XXXX

## 7. References

### 7.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8174>>.
- [RFC9420] Barnes, R., Beurdouche, B., Robert, R., Millican, J., Omara, E., and K. Cohn-Gordon, "The Messaging Layer Security (MLS) Protocol", RFC 9420, DOI 10.17487/RFC9420, July 2023, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9420>>.
- [RFC9750] Beurdouche, B., Rescorla, E., Omara, E., Inguva, S., and A. Duric, "The Messaging Layer Security (MLS) Architecture", RFC 9750, DOI 10.17487/RFC9750, April 2025, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9750>>.

## 7.2. Informative References

### [I-D.ietf-mimi-arch]

Barnes, R., "An Architecture for More Instant Messaging Interoperability (MIMI)", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-mimi-arch-02, 20 October 2025, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-mimi-arch-02>>.

### [I-D.ietf-mimi-protocol]

Barnes, R., Hodgson, M., Kohbrok, K., Mahy, R., Ralston, T., and R. Robert, "More Instant Messaging Interoperability (MIMI) using HTTPS and MLS", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-mimi-protocol-05, 20 October 2025, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-mimi-protocol-05>>.

### [I-D.ietf-mls-pq-ciphersuites]

Mahy, R. and R. Barnes, "ML-KEM and Hybrid Cipher Suites for Messaging Layer Security", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-mls-pq-ciphersuites-04, 18 March 2026, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-mls-pq-ciphersuites-04>>.

### [I-D.mahy-mls-semiprivatemessage]

Mahy, R., "Semi-Private Messages in the Messaging Layer Security (MLS) Protocol", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-mahy-mls-semiprivatemessage-06, 16 October 2025, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-mahy-mls-semiprivatemessage-06>>.

### [I-D.robert-mimi-delivery-service]

Robert, R. and K. Kohbrok, "MIMI Delivery Service", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-robert-mimi-delivery-service-06, 6 November 2023, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-robert-mimi-delivery-service-06>>.

## Appendix A. Change Log

### A.1. Changes between draft-mahy-...-04 and draft-ietf-...-00

- \* No changes except for renaming the draft

### A.2. Changes between -03 and -04

- \* Added Security Considerations



- \* Removed unneeded tree\_signature

A.3. Changes between -02 and -03

- \* No changes except for the publication dates

A.4. Changes between -01 and -02

- \* Added ratchet\_tree\_source\_domains extension

A.5. Changes between -00 and -01

- \* Removed ratchet tree patch options and notation.
- \* Added ratchet\_tree\_presence options for out-of-band, via HTTPS, and reconstructed by the delivery service.

Acknowledgments

The PartialGroupInfo was first introduced in [I-D.robert-mimi-delivery-service].

Author's Address

Rohan Mahy  
Rohan Mahy Consulting Services  
Email: rohan.ietf@gmail.com