

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: July 9, 2007

S. Kelly
Aruba Networks
S. Frankel
NIST
January 5, 2007

Using HMAC-SHA-256, HMAC-SHA-384, and HMAC-SHA-512 With IPsec
draft-kelly-ipsec-ciph-sha2-01

Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, each author represents that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which he or she is aware have been or will be disclosed, and any of which he or she becomes aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [Section 6 of BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/lid-abstracts.txt>.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

This Internet-Draft will expire on July 9, 2007.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2007).

Abstract

This specification describes the use of HMAC in conjunction with the SHA-256, SHA-384, and SHA-512 algorithms in IPsec. These algorithms may be used as the basis for data origin authentication and integrity verification mechanisms for the AH, ESP, IKE and IKEv2 protocols, and also as Pseudo-Random Functions (PRFs) for IKE and IKEv2. Truncated output lengths are specified for the authentication-related variants, with the corresponding algorithms designated as HMAC-SHA-256-128,

Internet-Draft HMAC-SHA256, SHA384 and SHA512 in IPsec January 2007

HMAC-SHA-384-192, and HMAC-SHA-512-256. The PRF variants are not truncated, and are called HMAC-SHA-PRF-256, HMAC-SHA-PRF-384, and HMAC-SHA-PRF-512.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	The HMAC-SHA-256+ Algorithms	3
2.1.	Keying Material	3
2.1.1.	Data Origin Authentication and Integrity Verification Usage	4
2.1.2.	Pseudo-Random Function (PRF) Usage	4
2.1.3.	Randomness and Key Strength	5
2.1.4.	Key Distribution	5
2.1.5.	Refreshing Keys	5
2.2.	Padding	6
2.3.	Truncation	6
2.4.	Using HMAC-SHA-256+ As PRFs in IKE and IKEv2	6
2.5.	Interactions with the ESP, IKE, or IKEv2 Cipher Mechanisms	7
2.6.	HMAC-SHA-256+ Parameter Summary	7
2.7.	Test Vectors	7
2.7.1.	PRF Test Vectors	7
2.7.2.	Authenticator Test Vectors	11
3.	Security Considerations	16
3.1.	HMAC Key Length vs Truncation Length	17
4.	IANA Considerations	18
5.	Acknowledgements	18
6.	Normative References	18
	Authors' Addresses	19
	Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements	21

Internet-Draft HMAC-SHA256, SHA384 and SHA512 in IPsec January 2007

1. Introduction

This document specifies the use of SHA-256, SHA-384, and SHA-512 [[SHA2-1](#)] combined with HMAC [[HMAC](#)] as data origin authentication and integrity verification mechanisms for the IPsec AH [[AH](#)], ESP [[ESP](#)], IKE [[IKE](#)], and IKEv2 [[IKEv2](#)] protocols. Output truncation is specified for these variants, with the corresponding algorithms designated as HMAC-SHA-256-128, HMAC-SHA-384-192, and HMAC-SHA-512-256. These truncation lengths are chosen in accordance with the birthday bound for each algorithm.

This specification also describes untruncated variants of these algorithms as PRFs for use with IKE and IKEv2, and those algorithms are called HMAC-SHA-PRF-256, HMAC-SHA-PRF-384, and HMAC-SHA-PRF-512. For ease of reference, these PRF algorithms and the authentication variants described above are collectively referred to below as "the HMAC-SHA-256+ algorithms."

The goal of the PRF variants is to provide secure pseudo-random functions suitable for generation of keying material and other protocol-specific numeric quantities, while the goal of the authentication variants is to ensure that packets are authentic and cannot be modified in transit. The relative security of HMAC-SHA-256+ when used in either case is dependent on the distribution scope and unpredictability of the associated secret key. If the key is unpredictable and known only by the sender and recipient, these algorithms ensure that only parties holding an identical key can derive the associated values.

2. The HMAC-SHA-256+ Algorithms

[[SHA2-1](#)] and [[SHA2-2](#)] describe the underlying SHA-256, SHA-384, and SHA-512 algorithms, while [[HMAC](#)] describes the HMAC algorithm. The HMAC algorithm provides a framework for inserting various hashing algorithms such as SHA-256, and [[SHA256+](#)] describes combined usage of

these algorithms. The following sections describe the various characteristics and requirements of the HMAC-SHA-256+ algorithms when used with IPsec.

[2.1.](#) Keying Material

Requirements for keying material vary depending on whether the algorithm is functioning as a PRF or as an authentication/integrity mechanism. In the case of authentication/integrity, key lengths are fixed according to the output length of the algorithm in use. In the case of PRFs, key lengths are variable, but guidance is given to ensure interoperability. These distinctions are described further

below.

Before describing key requirements for each usage, it is important to clarify some terms we use below:

Block size: the size of the data block the underlying hash algorithm operates upon; for SHA-256, this is 512 bits. For SHA-384 and SHA-512, this is 1024 bits.

Output length: the size of the hash value produced by the underlying hash algorithm. For SHA-256, this is 256 bits, for SHA-384 this is 384 bits, and for SHA-512, this is 512 bits.

Authenticator length: the size of the "authenticator" in bits. This only applies to authentication/integrity related algorithms, and refers to the bit length remaining after truncation. In this specification, this is always half the output length of the underlying hash algorithm.

[2.1.1.](#) Data Origin Authentication and Integrity Verification Usage

HMAC-SHA-256+ are secret key algorithms. While no fixed key length is specified in [\[HMAC\]](#), this specification requires that when used as an integrity/authentication algorithm, a fixed key length equal to the output length of the hash functions **MUST** be supported, and key lengths other than the output length of the associated hash function **MUST NOT** be supported.

These key length restrictions are based in part on the

recommendations in [[HMAC](#)] (key lengths less than the output length decrease security strength, and keys longer than the output length do not significantly increase security strength), and in part because allowing variable length keys for IPsec authenticator functions would create interoperability issues.

[2.1.2.](#) Pseudo-Random Function (PRF) Usage

IKE and IKEv2 use PRFs for generating keying material and for authentication of the IKE_SA. The IKEv2 specification differentiates between PRFs with fixed key sizes and those with variable key sizes, and so we give some special guidance for this below.

When a PRF described in this document is used with IKE or IKEv2, it is considered to have a variable key length, and keys are derived in the following ways (note that we simply reiterate that which is specified in [[HMAC](#)]):

- o If the length of the key is exactly the algorithm block size, use it as-is.
- o If the key is shorter than the block size, lengthen it to exactly the block size by padding it on the right with zero bits. However, note that [[HMAC](#)] strongly discourages a key length less than the output length. Nonetheless, we describe handling of shorter lengths here in recognition of shorter lengths typically chosen for IKE or IKEv2 preshared keys.
- o If the key is longer than the block size, shorten it by computing the corresponding hash algorithm output over the entire key value, and treat the resulting output value as your HMAC key. Note that this will always result in a key that is less than the block size in length, and this key value will therefore require 0-padding (as described above) prior to use.

[2.1.3.](#) Randomness and Key Strength

[HMAC] discusses requirements for key material, including a requirement for strong randomness. Therefore, a strong pseudo-random function MUST be used to generate the required key for use with HMAC-

SHA-256+. At the time of this writing there are no published weak keys for use with any HMAC-SHA-256+ algorithms.

[2.1.4.](#) Key Distribution

[ARCH] describes the general mechanism for obtaining keying material when multiple keys are required for a single SA (e.g. when an ESP SA requires a key for confidentiality and a key for authentication). In order to provide data origin authentication and integrity verification, the key distribution mechanism must ensure that unique keys are allocated and that they are distributed only to the parties participating in the communication.

[2.1.5.](#) Refreshing Keys

There are no currently practical attacks against the algorithms recommended here, and especially against the key sizes recommended here. However, as noted in [HMAC] "...periodic key refreshment is a fundamental security practice that helps against potential weaknesses of the function and keys, and limits the damage of an exposed key."

Putting this into perspective, this specification requires 256, 384, or 512-bit keys produced by a strong PRF for use as a MAC. A brute force attack on such keys would take longer to mount than the universe has been in existence. On the other hand, weak keys (e.g. dictionary words) would be dramatically less resistant to attack. It

is important to take these points, along with the specific threat model for your particular application and the current state of the art with respect to attacks on SHA-256, SHA-384, and SHA-512 into account when determining an appropriate upper bound for HMAC key lifetimes

[2.2.](#) Padding

The HMAC-SHA-256 algorithms operate on 512-bit blocks of data, while the HMAC-SHA-384 and HMAC-SHA-512 algorithms operate on 1024-bit blocks of data. Padding requirements are specified in [SHA2-1] as part of the underlying SHA-256, SHA-384, and SHA-512 algorithms, so if you implement according to [SHA2-1], you do not need to add any additional padding as far as the HMAC-SHA-256+ algorithms specified here are concerned. With regard to "implicit packet padding" as

defined in [AH], no implicit packet padding is required.

[2.3.](#) Truncation

The HMAC-SHA-256+ algorithms each produce a nnn-bit value, where nnn corresponds to the output bit length of the algorithm, e.g. HMAC-SHA-*nnn*. For use as an authenticator, this nnn-bit value can be truncated as described in [HMAC]. When used as a data origin authentication and integrity verification algorithm in ESP, AH, IKE, or IKEv2, a truncated value using the first $nnn/2$ bits -- exactly half the algorithm output size -- MUST be supported. No other authenticator value lengths are supported by this specification.

Upon sending, the truncated value is stored within the authenticator field. Upon receipt, the entire nnn-bit value is computed and the first $nnn/2$ bits are compared to the value stored in the authenticator field, with the value of 'nnn' depending on the negotiated algorithm.

[HMAC] discusses potential security benefits resulting from truncation of the output MAC value, and in general, encourages HMAC users to perform MAC truncation. In the context of IPsec, a truncation length of $nnn/2$ bits is selected because it corresponds to the birthday attack bound for each of the HMAC-SHA-256+ algorithms, and it simultaneously serves to minimize the additional bits on the wire resulting from use of this facility.

[2.4.](#) Using HMAC-SHA-256+ As PRFs in IKE and IKEv2

The HMAC-SHA-PRF-256 algorithm is identical to HMAC-SHA-256-128, except that variable-length keys are permitted, and the truncation step is NOT performed. Likewise, the implementations of HMAC-SHA-PRF-384 and HMAC-SHA-PRF-512 are identical to those of HMAC-SHA-384-

192 and HMAC-SHA-512-256 respectively, except that again, truncation is NOT performed.

[2.5.](#) Interactions with the ESP, IKE, or IKEv2 Cipher Mechanisms

As of this writing, there are no known issues which preclude the use of the HMAC-SHA-256+ algorithms with any specific cipher algorithm.

[2.6.](#) HMAC-SHA-256+ Parameter Summary

The following table serves to summarize the various quantities associated with the HMAC-SHA-256+ algorithms.

Algorithm ID	Block Size	Output Length	Trunc. Length	Key Length	Algorithm Type
HMAC-SHA-256-128	512	256	128	256	auth/integ
HMAC-SHA-384-192	1024	384	192	384	auth/integ
HMAC-SHA-512-256	1024	512	256	512	auth/integ
HMAC-SHA-256-PRF	512	256	(none)	variable	PRF
HMAC-SHA-384-PRF	1024	384	(none)	variable	PRF
HMAC-SHA-512-PRF	1024	512	(none)	variable	PRF

[2.7.](#) Test Vectors

The following test cases include the key, the data, and the resulting authenticator and/or PRF values for each algorithm. The values of keys and data are either ASCII character strings (surrounded by double quotes) or hexadecimal numbers. If a value is an ASCII character string, then the HMAC computation for the corresponding test case DOES NOT include the trailing null character ('\0') of the string. The computed HMAC values are all hexadecimal numbers.

[2.7.1.](#) PRF Test Vectors

These test cases were borrowed from [RFC 4231](#) [[HMAC-TEST](#)]. For reference implementations of the underlying hash algorithms, see [[SHA256+](#)]. Note that for testing purposes, PRF output is considered to be simply the untruncated algorithm output.


```
HMAC-SHA-512-PRF = b0ba465637458c6990e5a8c5f61d4af7
e576d97ff94b872de76f8050361ee3db
a91ca5c11aa25eb4d679275cc5788063
a5f19741120c4f2de2adebeeb10a298dd
```

Internet-Draft HMAC-SHA256, SHA384 and SHA512 in IPsec January 2007

Test Case PRF-5:

```
Key =      aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa  
           aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa  
           aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa  
           aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa  
           aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa  
           aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa  
           aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa  
           aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa  
           aaaaaa                                     (131 bytes)
```

```
Data = 54657374205573696e67204c61726765 ("Test Using Large")
       72205468616e20426c6f636b2d53697a ("r Than Block-Siz")
       65204b6579202d2048617368204b6579 ("e Key - Hash Key")
       204669727374 (" First")
```

```
HMAC-SHA-256-PRF = 60e431591ee0b67f0d8a26aacbf5b77f
                    8e0bc6213728c5140546040f0ee37f54
```

```
HMAC-SHA-384-PRF = 4ece084485813e9088d2c63a041bc5b4
                     4f9ef1012a2b588f3cd11f05033ac4c6
                     0c2ef6ab4030fe8296248df163f44952
```

```
HMAC-SHA-512-PRF = 80b24263c7c1a3ebb71493c1dd7be8b4
9b46d1f41b4aeec1121b013783f8f352
6b56d037e05f2598bd0fd2215d6a1e52
95e64f73f63f0aec8b915a985d786598
```

Internet-Draft HMAC-SHA256, SHA384 and SHA512 in IPsec January 2007

Test Case PRF-6:

[illegible]

```
Data = 54686973206973206120746573742075 ("This is a test u")
73696e672061206c6172676572207468 ("sing a larger th")
616e20626c6f636b2d73697a65206b65 ("an block-size ke")
7920616e642061206c61726765722074 ("y and a larger t")
68616e20626c6f636b2d73697a652064 ("han block-size d")
6174612e20546865206b6579206e6565 ("ata. The key nee")
647320746f2062652068617368656420 ("ds to be hashed ")
6265666f7265206265696e6720757365 ("before being use")
642062792074686520484d414320616c ("d by the HMAC al")
676f726974686d2e ("gorithm.")
```

```
HMAC-SHA-256-PRF = 9b09ffa71b942fcb27635fbcd5b0e944
                    bfdc63644f0713938a7f51535c3a35e2
```

```
HMAC-SHA-384-PRF = 6617178e941f020d351e2f254e8fd32c
                     602420feb0b8fb9adccebb82461e99c5
                     a678cc31e799176d3860e6110c46523e
```

```
HMAC-SHA-512-PRF = e37b6a775dc87dbaa4dfa9f96e5e3ffd
                    debd71f8867289865df5a32d20cdc944
```



```
Key =      aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
           aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa (32 bytes)
```

```
HMAC-SHA-256-PRF = cdcbl220d1ecccea91e53aba3092f962
                    e549fe6ce9ed7fdc43191fbde45c30b0
```

[Page 12]

```
Key =      0102030405060708090a0b0c0d0e0f10
           1112131415161718191a1b1c1d1e1f20  (32 bytes)
```

```
HMAC-SHA-256-PRF = 372efcf9b40b35c2115b1346903d2ef4
                    2fced46f0846e7257bb156d3d7b30d3f
```

Test Case AUTH384-1:

0b0b0b0b0b0b0b0b0b0b0b0b0b0b0b0b (64 bytes)

Data = 4869205468657265 ("Hi There")

HMAC-SHA-512-PRF = 637edc6e01dce7e6742a99451aae82df
23da3e92439e590e43e761b33e910fb8
ac2878ebd5803f6f0b61dbce5e251ff8
789a4722c1be65aea45fd464e89f8f5b

HMAC-SHA-512-256 = 637edc6e01dce7e6742a99451aae82df
23da3e92439e590e43e761b33e910fb8

Test Case AUTH512-2:

Key = 4a6566654a6566654a6566654a656665 ("JefeJefeJefeJefe")
4a6566654a6566654a6566654a656665 ("JefeJefeJefeJefe")
4a6566654a6566654a6566654a656665 ("JefeJefeJefeJefe")
4a6566654a6566654a6566654a656665 ("JefeJefeJefeJefe")

Data = 7768617420646f2079612077616e7420 ("what do ya want ")
666f72206e6f7468696e673f ("for nothing?")

HMAC-SHA-512-PRF = cb370917ae8a7ce28cfd1d8f4705d614
1c173b2a9362c15df235dfb251b15454
6aa334ae9fb9afc2184932d8695e397b
fa0ffb93466cfcceaae38c833b7dba38

HMAC-SHA-512-256 = cb370917ae8a7ce28cfd1d8f4705d614
1c173b2a9362c15df235dfb251b15454

Test Case AUTH512-3:

```
Key =      aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
           aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
           aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
           aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa (64 bytes)
```

```
Data =      ddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddd
            ddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddd
            ddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddddd
            dddd                                     (50 bytes)
```

```
HMAC-SHA-512-PRF = 2ee7acd783624ca9398710f3ee05ae41
b9f9b0510c87e49e586cc9bf961733d8
623c7b55cebefccf02d5581acc1c9d5f
b1ff68a1de45509fbe4da9a433922655
```

```
HMAC-SHA-512-256 = 2ee7acd783624ca9398710f3ee05ae41
                    b9f9b0510c87e49e586cc9bf961733d8
```

Test Case AUTH512-4:

```
Key = 0a0b0c0d0e0f10111213141516171819
      0102030405060708090a0b0c0d0e0f10
      1112131415161718191a1b1c1d1e1f20
      2122232425262728292a2b2c2d2e2f30
      3132333435363738393a3b3c3d3e3f40 (64 bytes)
```

```
Data =      cdcddcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcd  
             cdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcd  
             cdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcdcd  
            cdcd                                     (50 bytes)
```

```
HMAC-SHA-512-PRF = 5e6688e5a3daec826ca32eaea224eff5
e700628947470e13ad01302561bab108
b8c48cbc6b807dcfbd850521a685bab
c7eae4a2a2e660dc0e86b931d65503fd2
```

```
HMAC-SHA-512-256 = 5e6688e5a3daec826ca32eaea224eff5
                    e700628947470e13ad01302561bab108
```

3. Security Considerations

In a general sense, the security provided by the HMAC-SHA-256+ algorithms is based both upon the strength of the underlying hash

construct. At the time of this writing there are no practical cryptographic attacks against SHA-256, SHA-384, SHA-512 or HMAC. However, as with any cryptographic algorithm, an important component of these algorithms' strength lies in the correctness of the algorithm implementation, the security of the key management mechanism, the strength of the associated secret key, and upon the correctness of the implementation in all of the participating systems. This specification contains test vectors to assist in verifying the correctness of the algorithm implementation, but these in no way verify the correctness (or security) of the surrounding security infrastructure.

[3.1.](#) HMAC Key Length vs Truncation Length

There are important differences between the security levels afforded by HMAC-SHA1-96 and the HMAC-SHA-256+ algorithms, but there are also considerations which are somewhat counter-intuitive. There are two different axes along which we gauge the security of these algorithms: HMAC output length and HMAC key length. If we assume the HMAC key is a well-guarded secret which can only be determined through offline attacks on observed values, and that its length is less than or equal to the output length of the underlying hash algorithm, then the key's strength is directly proportional to its length. And if we assume an adversary has no knowledge of the HMAC key, then the probability of guessing a correct MAC value for any given packet is directly proportional to the HMAC output length.

This specification defines truncation to output lengths of either 128, 192, or 256 bits. It is important to note that at this time, it is not clear that HMAC-SHA-256 with a truncation length of 128 bits is any more secure than HMAC-SHA1 with the same truncation length, assuming the adversary has no knowledge of the HMAC key. This is because in such cases, the adversary must predict only those bits which remain after truncation. Since in both cases that output length is the same (128 bits), the adversary's odds of correctly guessing the value are also the same in either case: 1 in 2^{128} . Again, if we assume the HMAC key remains unknown to the attacker, then only a bias in one of the algorithms would distinguish one from the other. Currently, no such bias is known to exist in either HMAC-SHA1 or HMAC-SHA-256+.

If, on the other hand, the attacker is focused on guessing the HMAC key, and we assume that the hash algorithms are indistinguishable when viewed as PRF's, then the HMAC key length provides a direct measure of the underlying security: the longer the key, the harder it is to guess. This means that with respect to passive attacks on the HMAC key, size matters - and the HMAC-SHA-256+ algorithms provide more security in this regard than HMAC-SHA1-96.

[4.](#) IANA Considerations

This document does not specify the conventions for using SHA256+ for IKE Phase 1 negotiations. For IKE Phase 2 negotiations, IANA has assigned the following authentication algorithm identifiers:

HMAC-SHA2-256: 5

HMAC-SHA2-384: 6

HMAC-SHA2-512: 7

For use of HMAC-SHA-256+ as a PRF in IKEv2, IANA has assigned the following IKEv2 Pseudo-random function (type 2) transform identifiers:

PRF_HMAC_SHA2_256 [TBA-1]

PRF_HMAC_SHA2_384 [TBA-2]

PRF_HMAC_SHA2_512 [TBA-3]

For the use of HMAC-SHA-256+ algorithms for data origin authentication and integrity verification in IKEv2, ESP or AH, IANA has assigned the following IKEv2 integrity (type 3) transform identifiers:

AUTH_HMAC_SHA2_256_128 [TBA-4]

AUTH_HMAC_SHA2_384_192 [TBA-5]

AUTH_HMAC_SHA2_512_256 [TBA-6]

5. Acknowledgements

Portions of this text were unabashedly borrowed from [[HMAC-SHA1](#)], and from [[HMAC-TEST](#)]. Thanks to Hugo Krawczyk for comments and recommendations on early revisions of this document, and thanks also to Russ Housley and Steve Bellovin for various security-related comments and recommendations.

6. Normative References

[AH] Kent, S., "IP Authentication Header", [RFC 4302](#), December 2005.

Kelly & Frankel

Expires July 9, 2007

[Page 18]

Internet-Draft HMAC-SHA256, SHA384 and SHA512 in IPsec January 2007

[ARCH] Kent, S. and K. Seo, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol", [RFC 4301](#), December 2005.

[ESP] Kent, S., "IP Encapsulating Security Payload (ESP)", [RFC 4303](#), December 2005.

[HMAC] Krawczyk, H., Bellare, M., and R. Canetti, "HMAC: Keyed-Hashing for Message Authentication", [RFC 2104](#), February 1997.

[HMAC-SHA1] Madsen, C. and R. Glenn, "The Use of HMAC-SHA-1-96 within ESP and AH", [RFC 2404](#), November 1998.

[HMAC-TEST] Nystrom, M., "Identifiers and Test Vectors for HMAC-SHA-224, HMAC-SHA-256, HMAC-SHA-384, and HMAC-SHA-512", [RFC 4231](#), December 2005.

[IKE] Harkins, D. and D. Carrel, "The Internet Key Exchange (IKE)", [RFC 2409](#), November 1998.

[IKEv2] Kaufman, C., "Internet Key Exchange (IKEv2) Protocol", [RFC 4306](#), December 2005.

[SHA2-1] NIST, "FIPS PUB 180-2 'Specifications for the Secure Hash

Standard'", 2004 FEB, <<http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/fips/fips180-2/fips180-2withchangenotice.pdf>>.

[SHA2-2] NIST, "Descriptions of SHA-256, SHA-384, and SHA-512", 2001 MAY, <<http://csrc.nist.gov/cryptval/shs/sha256-384-512.pdf>>.

[SHA256+] Eastlake, D. and T. Hansen, "US Secure Hash Algorithms (SHA and HMAC-SHA)", [RFC 4634](#), July 2006.

Authors' Addresses

Scott G. Kelly
Aruba Networks
1322 Crossman Ave
Sunnyvale, CA 94089
US

Email: scott@hyperthought.com

Kelly & Frankel

Expires July 9, 2007

[Page 19]

Internet-Draft HMAC-SHA256, SHA384 and SHA512 in IPsec January 2007

Sheila Frankel
NIST
Bldg. 222 Room B264
Gaithersburg, MD 20899
US

Email: sheila.frankel@nist.gov

Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2007).

This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in [BCP 78](#), and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED,

INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Intellectual Property

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at <http://www.ietf.org/ipr>.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at ietf-ipr@ietf.org.

Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is provided by the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA).