

Supporting Document

Mandatory Technical Document



PP-Module for MDM Agents

Version: 1.0

2019-04-25

National Information Assurance Partnership

Foreword

This is a Supporting Document (SD), intended to complement the Common Criteria version 3 and the associated Common Evaluation Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation.

SDs may be “Guidance Documents”, that highlight specific approaches and application of the standard to areas where no mutual recognition of its application is required, and as such, are not of normative nature, or “Mandatory Technical Documents”, whose application is mandatory for evaluations whose scope is covered by that of the SD. The usage of the latter class is not only mandatory, but certificates issued as a result of their application are recognized under the CCRA.

Technical Editor:

National Information Assurance Partnership (NIAP)

Document history:

Version	Date	Comment
1.0	2013-10-21	Initial Release
1.1	2014-02-07	Typographical changes and clarifications to front-matter
2.0	2014-12-31	Separation of MDM Agent SFRs. Updated cryptography, protocol, X.509 requirements. Added objective requirement for Agent audit storage. New requirement for unenrollment prevention. Initial Release of MDM Agent EP.
3.0	2016-11-21	Updates to align with Technical Decisions. Added requirements to support BYOD use case.
4.0	2019-03-01	Convert to PP-Module.

General Purpose:

The purpose of this SD is to define evaluation methods for the functional behavior of Mobile Device Management Agent products.

Acknowledgements:

This SD was developed with support from NIAP MDM Agents Technical Community members, with representatives from industry, government agencies, Common Criteria Test Laboratories, and members of academia.

Table of Contents

[1Introduction](#)[1.1Technology Area and Scope of Supporting Document](#)[1.2Structure of the Document](#)[1.3Terms](#)[1.3.1Common Criteria Terms](#)[1.3.2Technical Terms](#)[2Evaluation Activities for SFRs](#)[2.1Mobile Device Fundamentals Protection Profile](#)[2.1.1Modified SFRs](#)[2.1.2Additional SFRs](#)[2.1.2.1Cryptographic Support \(FCS\)](#)[2.1.2.2Trusted Path/Channels \(FTP\)](#)[2.2Mobile Device Management Protection Profile](#)[2.2.1Modified SFRs](#)[2.2.2Additional SFRs](#)[2.2.2.1Cryptographic Support \(FCS\)](#)[2.2.2.3TOE SFR Evaluation Activities](#)[2.2.4Security Audit \(FAU\)](#)[2.2.5Identification and Authentication \(FIA\)](#)[2.2.6Security Management \(FMT\)](#)[3Evaluation Activities for Optional SFRs](#)[4Evaluation Activities for Selection-Based SFRs](#)[5Evaluation Activities for Objective SFRs](#)[5.1Security Audit \(FAU\)](#)[5.2Protection of the TSF \(FPT\)](#)[6Evaluation Activities for SARs](#)[7Required Supplementary Information](#)[Appendix A - References](#)

1 Introduction

1.1 Technology Area and Scope of Supporting Document

The scope of the MDM Agents PP-Module is to describe the security functionality of Mobile Device Management Agent products in terms of [CC] and to define functional and assurance requirements for them. The PP-Module is intended for use with the following Base-PPs:

- [Mobile Device Fundamentals, Version 3.1](#)
- [Mobile Device Management, Version 4.0](#)

This SD is mandatory for evaluations of TOEs that claim conformance to a PP-Configuration that includes the PP-Module for MDM Agents, Version 1.0. Although Evaluation Activities are defined mainly for the evaluators to follow, in general they also help developers to prepare for evaluation by identifying specific requirements for their TOE. The specific requirements in Evaluation Activities may in some cases clarify the meaning of Security Functional Requirements (SFR), and may identify particular requirements for the content of Security Targets (ST) (especially the TOE Summary Specification), user guidance documentation, and possibly supplementary information (e.g. for entropy analysis or cryptographic key management architecture).

1.2 Structure of the Document

Evaluation Activities can be defined for both SFRs and Security Assurance Requirements (SAR), which are themselves defined in separate sections of the SD.

If any Evaluation Activity cannot be successfully completed in an evaluation, then the overall verdict for the evaluation is a 'fail'. In rare cases there may be acceptable reasons why an Evaluation Activity may be modified or deemed not applicable for a particular TOE, but this must be approved by the Certification Body for the evaluation.

In general, if all Evaluation Activities (for both SFRs and SARs) are successfully completed in an evaluation then it would be expected that the overall verdict for the evaluation is a 'pass'. To reach a 'fail' verdict when the Evaluation Activities have been successfully completed would require a specific justification from the evaluator as to why the Evaluation Activities were not sufficient for that TOE.

Similarly, at the more granular level of assurance components, if the Evaluation Activities for an assurance component and all of its related SFR Evaluation Activities are successfully completed in an evaluation then it would be expected that the verdict for the assurance component is a 'pass'. To reach a 'fail' verdict for the assurance component when these Evaluation Activities have been successfully completed would require a specific justification from the evaluator as to why the Evaluation Activities were not sufficient for that TOE.

1.3 Terms

The following sections list Common Criteria and technology terms used in this document.

1.3.1 Common Criteria Terms

Assurance	Grounds for confidence that a TOE meets the SFRs .
Base Protection Profile (Base-PP)	Protection Profile used to build a PP-Configuration.
Common Criteria (CC)	Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation (International Standard ISO/IEC 15408).
Common Criteria Testing Laboratory	Within the context of the Common Criteria Evaluation and Validation Scheme (CCEVS), an IT security evaluation facility, accredited by the National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program (NVLAP) and approved by the NIAP Validation Body to conduct Common Criteria-based evaluations.
Common Evaluation Methodology (CEM)	Common Evaluation Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation.
Distributed TOE	A TOE composed of multiple components operating as a logical whole.
Operational Environment (OE)	Hardware and software that are outside the TOE boundary that support the TOE functionality and security policy.
Protection Profile (PP)	An implementation-independent set of security requirements for a category of products.
Protection Profile Configuration (PP-Configuration)	A comprehensive set of security requirements for a product type that consists of at least one Base-PP and at least one PP-Module.
Protection Profile	An implementation-independent statement of security needs for a TOE type complementary to one or

Module (PP-Module)	more Base Protection Profiles.
Security Assurance Requirement (SAR)	A requirement to assure the security of the TOE.
Security Functional Requirement (SFR)	A requirement for security enforcement by the TOE.
Security Target (ST)	A set of implementation-dependent security requirements for a specific product.
TOE Security Functionality (TSF)	The security functionality of the product under evaluation.
TOE Summary Specification (TSS)	A description of how a TOE satisfies the SFRs in an ST.
Target of Evaluation (TOE)	The product under evaluation.

1.3.2 Technical Terms

Administrator	The person who is responsible for management activities, including setting the policy that is applied by the enterprise on the mobile device.
Enrolled State	The state in which a mobile device is managed by a policy from an MDM.
Mobile Application Store (MAS)	Mobile Application Store
Mobile Device Management (MDM)	Mobile Device Management
Mobile Device User	The person who uses and is held responsible for a mobile device.
Operating System	Software which runs at the highest privilege level and can directly control hardware resources. Modern mobile devices typically have at least two primary operating systems: one which runs on the cellular baseband processor and one which runs on the application processor. The platform of the application processor handles most user interaction and provides the execution environment for apps. The platform of the cellular baseband processor handles communications with the cellular network and may control other peripherals. The term OS, without context, may be assumed to refer to the platform of the application
Unenrolled State	The state in which a mobile device is not managed by an MDM system.
User	See Mobile Device User.

2 Evaluation Activities for SFRs

The EAs presented in this section capture the actions the evaluator performs to address technology specific aspects covering specific SARs (e.g. ASE_TSS.1, ADV_FSP.1, AGD_OPE.1, and ATE_IND.1) – this is in addition to the CEM work units that are performed in [Section 6 Evaluation Activities for SARs](#).

Regarding design descriptions (designated by the subsections labelled TSS, as well as any required supplementary material that may be treated as proprietary), the evaluator must ensure there is specific information that satisfies the EA. For findings regarding the TSS section, the evaluator’s verdicts will be associated with the CEM work unit ASE_TSS.1-1. Evaluator verdicts associated with the supplementary evidence will also be associated with ASE_TSS.1-1, since the requirement to provide such evidence is specified in ASE in the cPP.

For ensuring the guidance documentation provides sufficient information for the administrators/users as it pertains to SFRs, the evaluator’s verdicts will be associated with CEM work units ADV_FSP.1-7, AGD_OPE.1-4, and AGD_OPE.1-5.

Finally, the subsection labelled Tests is where the authors have determined that testing of the product in the context of the associated SFR is necessary. While the evaluator is expected to develop tests, there may be instances where it is more practical for the developer to construct tests, or where the developer may have existing tests. Therefore, it is acceptable for the evaluator to witness developer-generated tests in lieu of executing the tests. In this case, the evaluator must ensure the developer’s tests are executing both in the manner declared by the developer and as mandated by the EA. The CEM work units that are associated with the EAs specified in this section are: ATE_IND.1-3, ATE_IND.1-4, ATE_IND.1-5, ATE_IND.1-6, and ATE_IND.1-7.

2.1 Mobile Device Fundamentals Protection Profile

The EAs defined in this section are only applicable in cases where the TOE claims conformance to a PP-Configuration that includes the MDF PP.

2.1.1 Modified SFRs

The PP-Module does not modify any requirements when the MDF PP is the base.

2.1.2 Additional SFRs

2.1.2.1 Cryptographic Support (FCS)

FCS_STG_EXT.4 Cryptographic Key Storage

TSS

The evaluator will verify that the [TSS](#) lists each persistent secret (credential, secret key) and private key needed to meet the requirements in the [ST](#). For each of these items, the evaluator will confirm that the [TSS](#) lists for what purpose it is used, and, for each platform listed as supported in the [ST](#), how it is stored. The evaluator shall verify that the Agent calls a platform-provided API to store persistent secrets and private keys.

2.1.2.2 Trusted Path/Channels (FTP)

FTP_ITC_EXT.1/TRUSTCHAN Trusted Channel Communication

TSS

The evaluator shall examine the [TSS](#) to determine that the methods of Agent-Server communication are indicated, along with how those communications are protected. The evaluator shall also confirm that all protocols listed in the [TSS](#) in support of remote [TOE](#) administration are consistent with those specified in the requirement, and are included in the requirements in the [ST](#).

Guidance

The evaluator shall confirm that the operational guidance contains instructions for configuring the communication channel between the MDM Agent and the MDM Server and conditionally, the MAS Server for each supported method.

Tests

For each supported identifier type (excluding DNs), the evaluator shall repeat the following tests:

- **Test 1:** The evaluators shall ensure that communications using each specified (in the operational guidance) Agent-Server communication method is tested during the course of the evaluation, setting up the connections as described in the operational guidance and ensuring that communication is successful.
- **Test 2:** The evaluator shall ensure, for each method of Agent-Server communication, the channel data is not sent in plaintext.
- **Test 3:** The evaluator shall ensure, for each communication channel with the MDM Server, that a protocol analyzer identifies the traffic as the protocol under testing.

Further evaluation activities are associated with the specific protocols.

FTP_TRP.1/TRUSTPATH Trusted Path (for Enrollment)

TSS

The evaluator shall examine the [TSS](#) to determine that the methods of remote enrollment are indicated, along with how those communications are protected. The evaluator shall also confirm that all protocols listed in the [TSS](#) in support of enrollment are consistent with those specified in the requirement, and are included in the requirements in the [ST](#).

Guidance

The evaluator shall confirm that the operational guidance contains instructions for establishing the enrollment sessions for each supported method.

Tests

For each [MDM](#) Agent/platform listed as supported in the [ST](#):

- **Test 1:** The evaluators shall ensure that communications using each specified (in the operational guidance) enrollment method is tested during the course of the evaluation, setting up the connections as described in the operational guidance and ensuring that communication is successful.
- **Test 2:** For each method of enrollment supported, the evaluator shall follow the operational guidance to ensure that there is no available interface that can be used by a remote user to establish enrollment sessions without invoking the trusted path.

- **Test 3:** The evaluator shall ensure, for each method enrollment, the channel data is not sent in plaintext.

Further evaluation activities are associated with the specific protocols.

2.2 Mobile Device Management Protection Profile

The EAs defined in this section are only applicable in cases where the TOE claims conformance to a PP-Configuration that includes the MDM PP.

2.2.1 Modified SFRs

The PP-Module does not modify any requirements when the MDM PP is the base.

2.2.2 Additional SFRs

2.2.2.1 Cryptographic Support (FCS)

FCS_STG_EXT.1/KEYSTO Cryptographic Key Storage

TSS

The evaluator will verify that the [TSS](#) lists each persistent secret (credential, secret key) and private key needed to meet the requirements in the [ST](#). For each of these items, the evaluator will confirm that the [TSS](#) lists for what purpose it is used, and, for each platform listed as supported in the [ST](#), how it is stored. The evaluator shall verify that the Agent calls a platform-provided API to store persistent secrets and private keys.

2.2.3 TOE SFR Evaluation Activities

2.2.4 Security Audit (FAU)

FAU_ALT_EXT.2 Agent Alerts

TSS

The evaluator shall examine the [TSS](#) and verify that it describes how the alerts are implemented.

The evaluator shall examine the [TSS](#) and verify that it describes how the candidate policy updates are obtained and the actions that take place for successful (policy update installed) and unsuccessful (policy update not installed) cases. The software components that are performing the processing must also be identified in the [TSS](#) and verified by the evaluator.

The evaluator also ensures that the [TSS](#) describes how reachability events are implemented, and if configurable are selected in FMT_SMF_EXT.4.2. The evaluator verifies that this description clearly indicates who ([MDM](#) Agent or [MDM](#) Server) initiates reachability events.

The evaluator shall ensure that the [TSS](#) describes under what circumstances, if any, the alert may not be generated (e.g., the device is powered off or disconnected from the trusted channel), how alerts are queued, and the maximum amount of storage for queued messages.

Tests

- **Test 1:** The evaluator shall perform a policy update from the test environment [MDM](#) server. The evaluator shall verify the [MDM](#) Agent accepts the update, makes the configured changes, and reports the success of the policy update back to the [MDM](#) Server.
- **Test 2:** The evaluator shall perform each of the actions listed in FAU_ALT_EXT.2.1 and verify that the alert does in fact reach the [MDM](#) Server.
- **Test 3:** The evaluator shall configure the [MDM](#) Agent to perform a network reachability test, both with and without such connectivity and ensure that results reflect each.
- **Test 4:** The evaluator shall remove network connectivity from the MDM Agent and generate an alert/event as defined in FAU_ALT_EXT.2.1. The evaluator shall restore network connectivity to the MDM Agent and verify that the alert generated while the [TOE](#) was disconnected is sent by the MDM Agent upon re-establishment of the connectivity.

FAU_GEN.1/AUDITGEN Audit Data Generation

TSS

The evaluator shall check the [TSS](#) and ensure that it provides a format for audit records. Each audit record format type must be covered, along with a brief description of each field.

If "invoke platform-provided functionality" is selected, the evaluator shall examine the [TSS](#) to verify that it describes (for each supported platform) how this functionality is invoked (it should be noted that this may be through a

mechanism that is not implemented by the [MDM](#) Agent; nonetheless, that mechanism will be identified in the [TSS](#) as part of this evaluation activity).

Tests

The evaluator shall use the [TOE](#) to perform the auditable events defined in the Auditable Events table in FAU_GEN.1.1(2) and observe that accurate audit records are generated with contents and formatting consistent with those described in the [TSS](#). Note that this testing can be accomplished in conjunction with the testing of the security mechanisms directly.

FAU_SEL.1/EVENTSEL Security Audit Event Selection

TSS

If "invoke platform-provided functionality" is selected, the evaluator shall examine the [TSS](#) of the [ST](#) to verify that it describes (for each supported platform) how this functionality is invoked (it should be noted that this may be through a mechanism that is not implemented by the MDM Agent; nonetheless, that mechanism will be identified in the [TSS](#) as part of this evaluation activity).

Guidance

The evaluator shall examine the operational guidance to determine that it contains instructions on how to define the set of auditable events as well as explains the syntax for multi-value selection (if applicable). The evaluator shall also verify that the operational guidance shall identify those audit records that are always recorded, regardless of the selection criteria currently being enforced.

Tests

- **Test 1:** For each attribute listed in the requirement, the evaluator shall devise a test to show that selecting the attribute causes only audit events with that attribute (or those that are always recorded, as identified in the administrative guidance) to be recorded.
- **Test 2:** [conditional]: If the TSF supports specification of more complex audit pre-selection criteria (e.g., multiple attributes, logical expressions using attributes) then the evaluator shall devise tests showing that this capability is correctly implemented. The evaluator shall also, in the test plan, provide a short narrative justifying the set of tests as representative and sufficient to exercise the capability.

2.2.5 Identification and Authentication (FIA)

FIA_ENR_EXT.2 Agent Enrollment of Mobile Device into Management

TSS

The evaluator shall examine the [TSS](#) to verify that it describes which types of reference identifiers are acceptable and how the identifier is specified (e.g. preconfigured in the [MDM](#) Agent, by the user, by the [MDM](#) server, in a policy).

Guidance

The evaluator shall examine the operational guidance to verify that it describes how to configure reference identifier of the [MDM](#) Server's certificate and, if different than the reference identifier, the Domain Name or IP address (for connectivity) of the [MDM](#) Server.

Tests

The evaluator shall follow the operational guidance to establish the reference identifier of the [MDM](#) server on the [MDM](#) Agent and in conjunction with other evaluation activities verify that the [MDM](#) Agent can connect to the [MDM](#) Server and validate the [MDM](#) Server's certificate.

2.2.6 Security Management (FMT)

FMT_POL_EXT.2 Agent Trusted Policy Update

TSS

The evaluator ensures that the [TSS](#) describes how the candidate policies are obtained by the [MDM](#) Agent, the processing associated with verifying the digital signature of the policy updates, and the actions that take place for successful (signature was verified) and unsuccessful (signature could not be verified) cases. The software components that are performing the processing must also be identified in the [TSS](#) and verified by the evaluators.

Tests

This evaluation activity is performed in conjunction with the evaluation activity for FIA_X509_EXT.1 and FIA_X509_EXT.2 as defined in the [Base-PPs](#).

- **Test 1:** The evaluator shall perform a policy update from an available configuration interface (such as through a test [MDM](#) Server). The evaluator shall verify the update is signed and is provided to the [MDM](#) Agent. The evaluator shall verify the [MDM](#) Agent accepts the digitally signed policy.
- **Test 2:** The evaluator shall perform a policy update from an available configuration interface (such as through a test [MDM](#) Server). The evaluator shall provide an unsigned and an incorrectly signed policy to the [MDM](#) Agent.

The evaluator shall verify the [MDM](#) Agent does not accept the digitally signed policy.

FMT_SMF_EXT.4 Specification of Management Functions

TSS

The evaluator shall verify that the any assigned functions are described in the [TSS](#) and that these functions are documented as supported by the platform. The evaluator shall examine the [TSS](#) to verify that any differences between management functions and policies for each supported mobile device are listed.

The evaluator shall verify that the [TSS](#) describes the methods in which the MDM Agent can be enrolled.

The [TSS](#) description shall make clear if the MDM Agent supports multiple interfaces for enrollment and configuration (for example, both remote configuration and local configuration).

Guidance

The evaluator shall verify the AGD guidance includes detailed instructions for configuring each function in this requirement.

If the [MDM](#) Agent is a component of the [MDM](#) system (i.e. [MDM](#) Server is the [Base-PP](#)), the evaluator shall verify, by consulting documentation for the claimed mobile device platforms, that the configurable functions listed for this Agent are supported by the platforms.

If the [MDM](#) Agent supports multiple interfaces for configuration (for example, both remote configuration and local configuration), the AGD guidance makes clear whether some functions are restricted to certain interfaces.

Tests

- **Test 1:** In conjunction with the evaluation activities in the [Base-PP](#), the evaluator shall attempt to configure each administrator-provided management function and shall verify that the mobile device executes the commands and enforces the policies.
- **Test 2:** The evaluator shall configure the MDM Agent authentication certificate in accordance with the configuration guidance. The evaluator shall verify that the MDM Agent uses this certificate in performing the tests for FPT_ITT.1(2) (from the MDM PP).
- **Test 3:** In conjunction with other evaluation activities, the evaluator shall attempt to enroll the MDM Agent in management with each interface identified in the [TSS](#), and verify that the MDM Agent can manage the device and communicate with the MDM Server.
- **Test 4:** [conditional] In conjunction with the evaluation activity for FAU_ALT_EXT.2.1, the evaluator shall configure the periodicity for reachability events for several configured time periods and shall verify that the MDM Server receives alerts on that schedule.
- **Test 5:** [conditional] The evaluator shall design and perform tests to demonstrate that the assigned function may be configured and that the intended behavior of the function is enacted by the mobile device.

FMT_UNR_EXT.1 User Unenrollment Prevention

TSS

The evaluator shall ensure that the [TSS](#) describes the mechanism used to prevent users from unenrolling or the remediation actions applied when unenrolled.

Guidance

The evaluator shall ensure that the administrative guidance instructs administrators in configuring the unenrollment prevention in each available configuration interface. If any configuration allows users to unenroll, the guidance also describes the actions that unenroll the Agent.

Tests

- **Test 1:** If 'prevent the unenrollment from occurring' is selected: The evaluator shall configure the Agent according to the administrative guidance for each available configuration interface, shall attempt to unenroll the device, and shall verify that the attempt fails.
- **Test 2:** If 'apply remediation actions' is selected: If any configuration allows the user to unenroll, the evaluator shall configure the Agent to allow user unenrollment, attempt to unenroll, and verify that the remediation actions are applied.

3 Evaluation Activities for Optional SFRs

The PP-Module does not define any optional requirements.

4 Evaluation Activities for Selection-Based SFRs

The PP-Module does not define any selection-based requirements.

5 Evaluation Activities for Objective SFRs

5.1 Security Audit (FAU)

FAU_STG_EXT.3 Security Audit Event Storage

TSS
The evaluator shall verify that the [TSS](#) description of the audit records indicates how the records are stored. The evaluator shall verify that the Agent calls a platform-provided API to store audit records.

5.2 Protection of the TSF (FPT)

FPT_NET_EXT.1 Network Reachability

TSS
The evaluator shall verify that the [TSS](#) contains a description of how the Agent determines how long it has been since the last successful connection with the Server (i.e., total number of missed reachability events or time). If total number of missed reachability events is selected, the evaluator shall verify that the [TSS](#) contains a description of how often the reachability events are sent.

Guidance
The evaluator shall verify that the AGD guidance instructs the administrator, if needed, how to configure the [TOE](#) to detect when the time since last successful connection with the server has been reached.

Tests
The evaluator shall configure the Server configuration policy of the Agent per FMT_SMF.1.1(1) function 56 within the Mobile Device Managment PP. The device shall be placed in airplane mode to prevent connectivity with the Server. The evaluator shall verify that after the configured time, the remediation actions selected in function 56 occur.

6 Evaluation Activities for SARs

The PP-Module does not define any SARs beyond those defined within the base-PP to which it must claim conformance. It is important to note that a TOE that is evaluated against the PP-Module is inherently evaluated against the Base-PP as well. The Base-PP includes a number of Evaluation Activities associated with both SFRs and SARs. Additionally, the PP-Module includes a number of SFR-based Evaluation Activities that similarly refine the SARs of the Base-PPs. The evaluation laboratory will evaluate the TOE against the chosen Base-PP and supplement that evaluation with the necessary SFRs that are taken from the PP-Module.

7 Required Supplementary Information

This Supporting Document has no required supplementary information beyond the ST, operational guidance, and testing.

Appendix A - References

Identifier	Title
Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation -	
[CC]	• Part 1: Introduction and General Model , CCMB-2017-04-001, Version 3.1 Revision 5, April 2017.
	• Part 2: Security Functional Components , CCMB-2017-04-002, Version 3.1 Revision 5, April 2017.
	• Part 3: Security Assurance Components , CCMB-2017-04-003, Version 3.1 Revision 5, April 2017.