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**Comments**

This pCR is for the introduction of new text related to assumptions. For the transition to PQC the guidelines and requirements from the different regulatory and governmental agencies must be considered. These inputs to the 3GPP transition to PQC are relevant, because these provide guidance on the preferred PQ security levels and with that implicit refer to the preferred post-quantum algorithms.

The proposal is to collect and summarize any preference related to post-quantum algorithms and with that to prepare the ground for the post-quantum selection process.

[1] TR 33.703, “Study on Transitioning to Post Quantum Cryptography (PQC) in 3GPP”
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## 3.3 Abbreviations

For the purposes of the present document, the abbreviations given in TR 21.905 [1] and the following apply. An abbreviation defined in the present document takes precedence over the definition of the same abbreviation, if any, in TR 21.905 [1].

ANSSI Agence Nationale de la Sécurité des Systèmes d'Information

BSI Bundesamt für Sicherheit in der Informationstechnik

ECIES Elliptic Curve Integrated Encryption Scheme

ISO International Organization for Standardization

MIKEY-SAKKE Multimedia Internet KEYing – Sakai-Kasahara Key Encryption

NSA National Security Agency

NCSC National Cyber Security Centre

NSM National Security Memorandum

NSS National Security Systems

PKC Public Key Cryptography

PQC Post Quantum Cryptography

SDO Standards Development Organizations

SECG Security Engineering & Consulting Group

SUCI Subscription Concealed Identifier
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# 4 Overview

## 4.1 Background Information

### 4.1.x Summary of Security Agency Views

Editor’s Note: Timeline information from other organizations.

## ~~4.2 General Assumptions~~

~~Editor's Note: This clause contains overall assumption and/or security assumptions for this study.~~

In the following views from several agencies on the use of PQC is described.

**ANSSI (Agence Nationale de la Sécurité des Systèmes d'Information)**

The ANSSI view on the Post-Quantum Cryptography transition provides recommendations and is documented by a follow-up paper (2023 follow up) [x1]. The ANSSI still strongly emphasizes the necessity of hybridization wherever post-quantum migration is needed both in short and medium term. The ANSSI encourages to dimension the parameters of symmetric primitives as to ensure conjectured post-quantum security. In practice at least the same security level as AES-256 for block ciphers and at least the same security level as SHA2-384 for hash functions.

ANSSI does not provide a closed list of recommended NIST algorithms.

ANSSI still strongly emphasizes the necessity of hybridization wherever post-quantum mitigation is needed both in the short and medium term.

ANSSI also encourages to dimension the parameters of symmetric primitives as to ensure a conjectured post-quantum security in practice at least the same security level as AES-256 for block ciphers and at least the same security level as SHA2-384 for hash functions.

For the ML-KEM, ANSSI recommends to use the highest NIST security level as possible, preferably level-5 NIST security Level 5 (i.e., equivalent to AES-256) or Level 3 (i.e., equivalent to AES-192) [x1].

For the ML-DSA, ANSSI recommends to use the highest NIST security level as possible, preferably Level 5 (i.e., equivalent to AES-256) or Level 3 (i.e., equivalent to AES-192) [x1].

For the SLH-DSA, ANSSI recommends to use NIST security Level 5 (i.e., equivalent to AES-256) or Level 3 (i.e., equivalent to AES-192) [x1].

**BSI (Bundesamt für Sicherheit in der Informationstechnik)**

The German BSI has developed technical guidelines for different PQC issue, i.e., recommendations on key lengths (BSI TR-02102-1), use of TLS (BSI TR-02102-2), use of IKEv2 (BSI TR-02102-3), use of secure shell (BSI TR-02102-4).

To ensure the long-term security of a key agreement, this Technical Guideline therefore recommends the use of a hybrid key agreement mechanism that combines a quantum-safe and a classical mechanism. The hybrid key agreement should remain secure as long as one of the methods used is secure.

For the ML-KEM, BSI recommends to use NIST security Level 5 (i.e., ML-KEM-1024, which is equivalent to AES-256) or Level 3 (i.e., ML-KEM-768, which is equivalent to AES-192) [x9].

For the ML-DSA, BSI recommends to use NIST security Level 5 (i.e., ML-DSA-87, which is equivalent to AES-256) or Level 3 (i.e., ML-DSA-65, which is equivalent to AES-192). The ML-DSA schemes to be used in the ‘hedged’ variant [x9].

For the SLH-DSA, BSI recommends to use NIST security Level 5 (SLH-DSA-SHA2/SHAKE-256s/f, which is equivalent to AES-256) or Level 3 (SLH-DSA-SHA2/SHAKE-192s, which is equivalent to AES-192). The SLH-DSA schemes to be used in the ‘hedged’ variant. The ‘pure’ version of SLH-DSA is preferred and for special applications, the ‘pre-hash’ version of SLH-DSA can also be used in accordance with the remarks in FIPS-205 [x9].

The FN-DSA schemes are not considered.

**US NSA (US National Security Agency)**

The NSM 10 states that, the United States must prioritize the timely and equitable transition of cryptographic systems to quantum-resistant cryptography, with the goal of mitigating as much of the quantum risk as is feasible by 2035."[x3]. For traditional cryptographic algorithms, the document (SP 800-131A) is intended to provide more detail about the transitions associated with the use of cryptography by Federal Government agencies for the protection of sensitive, but unclassified information [x4]. For the transition to PQC, the NIST IR 8547 provides timelines [x5]. The transition to PQC for classified National Security Systems (NSS) is set out by US NSA in the Commercial National Security Algorithm Suite 2.0 (CNSA 2.0) [x6] and is therefore not particularly well-suited for the transition to PQC for telecommunications systems.

**NCSC (National Cyber Security Centre)**

The NCSC guidance [x2] sets out the necessary steps towards PQC migration, describes how preparatory work might vary across different sectors, and provides advice on timescales for key activities on the long journey to PQC.

The NCSC guidance on ‘Next steps in preparing for post-quantum cryptography’ helps system and risk owners in commercial enterprises, public sector organizations and critical national infrastructure to think about how to best prepare for the migration to post-quantum cryptography [x10].

If a PQ/T hybrid scheme is chosen, the NCSC recommends it is used as an interim measure, and it should be used within a flexible framework that enables a straightforward migration to PQC-only in the future.

The security of symmetric cryptography is not significantly impacted by quantum computers, and existing symmetric algorithms with at least 128-bit keys (such as AES) can continue to be used. The security of hash functions such as SHA-256 is also not significantly affected, and secure hash functions can also continue to be used.

NCSC recommendsML-KEM-768 and ML-DSA-65 as providing appropriate levels of security and efficiency for most use cases

The SLH-DSA relies on different security assumptions than ML-DSA. This is not suitable for general purpose use as the signatures are large, and the algorithm is much slower than ML-DSA.

The SLH-DSA signatures are seen to be not suitable for general purpose use cases as the signatures are large and the algorithms are much slower than ML-DSA.

The FN-DSA schemes are not considered.
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