

## 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
<b>D High-level architectural overview</b>		
D1 General	4	3
D2 TOE and ST	5	4
<b>E Security evaluation of design + summary</b>		
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 countermeasures, 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,  $\sim 6$  pages, are inside the specified limits ( $7 \text{ pages} * 0.75 = 5.25 \text{ pages} < 6 \text{ pages}$ ).