

1 Peer review by adsec03

| Description | Max points | Awarded |
|--|------------|---------|
| A Report structure | 2 | 2 |
| B Product description + design requirements | 3 | 3 |
| C Assumptions | 3 | 3 |
| D High-level architectural overview | | |
| D1 General | 4 | 3 |
| D2 TOE and ST | 5 | 4 |
| E Security evaluation of design + summary | | |
| E1 General | 5 | 5 |
| E2 Evaluation | 4 | 3 |
| Total: | 26 | 23 |
| Score: | 8 | 7 |

1.1 Deduction motivations

Here, only requirements that were not deemed fulfilled are mentioned, as to save space.

- **A** Good.
- **B** A very short and general description of customer base. Product use with its environment and people using it is hardly specified, the one thing about this is in one assumption, A.WATCH.
- **C** -
- **D1** TPM is specified to use functions that require key storage, but no mention of the need to handle secret/auth values, minus 1 point.
- **D2** TOE is not mentioned but its content is reflected in the report, minus 1 point.
- **E1** -
- **E2** It could be argued here that TPM is not necessary when looking at Table 1, since the only threat it mitigates is one that has two other counter-measures, minus 0.5 point. The objective O.Sanitize is not mentioned in architectural overview, minus 0.5 point.

The length of the report's text, ~ 6 pages, are inside the specified limits ($7 \text{ pages} * 0.75 = 5.25 \text{ pages} < 6 \text{ pages}$).