

**From:** [Bassham, Lawrence E \(Fed\)](#)  
**To:** [Moody, Dustin \(Fed\)](#); [Perlner, Ray A. \(Fed\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: draft PQC-Forum post: Planned API change to eliminate separate KAT calls  
**Date:** Friday, August 11, 2017 10:01:02 AM

---

I agree

---

On: 11 August 2017 09:34, "Moody, Dustin (Fed)" <[dustin.moody@nist.gov](mailto:dustin.moody@nist.gov)> wrote:  
Fine by me. Larry?

---

**From:** Perlner, Ray (Fed)  
**Sent:** Friday, August 11, 2017 9:32 AM  
**To:** Moody, Dustin (Fed) <[dustin.moody@nist.gov](mailto:dustin.moody@nist.gov)>; Bassham, Lawrence E (Fed) <[lawrence.bassham@nist.gov](mailto:lawrence.bassham@nist.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: draft PQC-Forum post: Planned API change to eliminate separate KAT calls

If the new API guidance and scripts will be a while, can I post the following to the forum?:

We have received a number of comments about the necessity of having separate "KAT calls" in our API (See <http://csrc.nist.gov/groups/ST/post-quantum-crypto/documents/example-files/api-notes.pdf>). In response, we plan to use the "eBATS calls" from our API for both performance testing and known answer tests.

Submitters have been previously instructed in our FAQ (see <http://csrc.nist.gov/groups/ST/post-quantum-crypto/faq.html#Q15>) to use the function `randombytes()` where secure randomness is required. In the test environment, we expect this function to point to the AES-256 CTR DRBG generate function specified in section 10.2.1.5.1 of SP 800-90A revision 1 (<http://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.800-90Ar1.pdf>). To provide KAT vectors, Submitters will then be asked to provide inputs to the `Instantiate` function (specified in section 10.2.1.3.1 of SP 800-90A revision 1), that result in the specified test outputs.

We plan to have updated API guidance and scripts for generating KAT calls ready by September 1<sup>st</sup>.

Does this plan seem sensible?

Thanks,  
Ray Perlner

---

**From:** Perlner, Ray (Fed)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 08, 2017 12:29 PM  
**To:** Moody, Dustin ([dustin.moody@nist.gov](mailto:dustin.moody@nist.gov)) <[dustin.moody@nist.gov](mailto:dustin.moody@nist.gov)>; Bassham, Lawrence E (Fed) <[lawrence.bassham@nist.gov](mailto:lawrence.bassham@nist.gov)>  
**Subject:** draft PQC-Forum post: Planned API change to eliminate separate KAT calls

We have received a number of questioning about the necessity of having separate KAT calls in our API (See <http://csrc.nist.gov/groups/ST/post-quantum-crypto/documents/example-files/api-notes.pdf> ). In response, we plan to use the eBATS API for both performance testing and known answer tests.

Submitters have been previously instructed in our FAQ (see <http://csrc.nist.gov/groups/ST/post-quantum-crypto/faq.html#Q15> ) to use the function `randombytes()` where secure randomness is required. In the test environment, we expect this function to point to the AES-256 CTR DRBG generate function specified in section 10.2.1.5.1 of SP 800-90A revision 1 ( <http://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.800-90Ar1.pdf> ). To provide KAT vectors, Submitters will then be asked to provide inputs to the Instantiate function (specified in section 10.2.1.3.1 of SP 800-90A revision 1), that result in the specified test outputs, when the appropriate eBATS call immediately follows the specified instantiation of the AES-256 CTR DRBG instance called by `randombytes()`.

We plan to have updated API guidance by September 1<sup>st</sup>.

Does this plan seem sensible?

Thanks,

Ray Perlner