

# PP-Module for Authentication Servers



Version: 1.0  
2022-08-12

**National Information Assurance Partnership**

## Revision History

---

Version	Date	Comment
1.0	2022-08-12	Initial Release

## Contents

---

1	Introduction
1.1	Overview
1.2	Terms
1.2.1	Common Criteria Terms
1.2.2	Technical Terms
1.3	Compliant Targets of Evaluation
1.4	TOE Boundary
1.5	Use Cases
2	Conformance Claims
3	Security Problem Description
3.1	Threats
3.2	Assumptions
3.3	Organizational Security Policies
4	Security Objectives
4.1	Security Objectives for the TOE
4.2	Security Objectives for the Operational Environment
4.3	Security Objectives Rationale
5	Security Requirements
5.1	NDcPP Security Functional Requirements Direction
5.1.1	Modified SFRs
5.1.1.1	Identification and Authentication (FIA)
5.2	TOE Security Functional Requirements
5.2.1	Security Audit (FAU)
5.2.2	Communications (FCO)
5.2.3	Cryptographic Support (FCS)
5.2.4	Identification and Authentication (FIA)
5.2.5	Security Management (FMT)
5.2.6	TOE Access (FTA)
5.2.7	Trusted Path/Channels (FTP)
5.3	TOE Security Functional Requirements Rationale
5.4	TOE Security Assurance Requirements
6	Consistency Rationale
6.1	Collaborative Protection Profile for NDs
6.1.1	Consistency of TOE Type
6.1.2	Consistency of Security Problem Definition
6.1.3	Consistency of Objectives
6.1.4	Consistency of Requirements
Appendix A - Optional SFRs	
A.1	Strictly Optional Requirements
A.2	Objective Requirements
A.3	Implementation-dependent Requirements
Appendix B - Selection-based Requirements	
B.1	Cryptographic Support (FCS)
B.2	Identification and Authentication (FIA)
Appendix C - Extended Component Definitions	
C.1	Extended Components Table
C.2	Extended Component Definitions
C.2.1	Cryptographic Support (FCS)
C.2.1.1	FCS_EAPTLS_EXT EAP-TLS Protocol
C.2.1.2	FCS_RADIUS_EXT Authentication Protocol
C.2.1.3	FCS_STG_EXT Cryptographic Key Storage
C.2.1.4	FCS_RADSEC_EXT RadSec
C.2.2	Identification and Authentication (FIA)
C.2.2.1	FIA_HOTP_EXT HMAC-Based One-Time Password Pre-Shared Keys
C.2.2.2	FIA_PSK_EXT Pre-Shared Keys
C.2.2.3	FIA_TOTP_EXT Time-Based One-Time Password Pre-Shared Keys
Appendix D - Implicitly Satisfied Requirements	
Appendix E - Allocation of Requirements in Distributed TOEs	
Appendix F - Entropy Documentation and Assessment	
Appendix G - Acronyms	
Appendix H - Bibliography	

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Overview

An authentication server provides assertions to a relying party that a particular request for access is from an authentic digital identity associated with various identity attributes, such as a registered account within an information system, or a certified identity as validated by a trusted certification authority or both. The digital identities can represent people, devices or processes. Authentication servers validate various authenticators controlled by the entities represented by the presented digital identity. When the entity is a person, authenticators can provide indications of what the entity knows (e.g., a password, pin or passphrase), what the entity has (e.g., a registered device in the control of the user), or what the entity is (a biometric). NIST SP 800-63-3 Part B provides recommendations about how these authenticators can be leveraged individually or in combinations to provide assurance that the entity is authentic and describes requirements for validation of the authenticators to various assurance levels. A relying party may delegate verification of authenticator(s) to an authentication server; such delegation creates a relationship between the relying party and the authentication server that is referred to as an identity federation. Assertions to a federated relying party can be via bearer assertions or via direct communication with the relying party. The latter mechanism is modeled after that used by Authentication, Access and Accounting (AAA) servers, which used the RADIUS protocol. RADIUS has been largely replaced by DIAMETER, a protocol that addresses many of the security issues with RADIUS. These provide direct, back-end assertions protected by an authenticated and encrypted channel to a Network Access Server that further governs accesses to resources on a network.

This PP-module describes the security functionality of authentication servers supporting RADIUS/DIAMETER and other messaging protocols intended for direct communications with relying parties via authenticated, real-time protected channels.

The scope of this PP-Module is to describe the security functionality of an authentication server in terms of [CC] and to define functional and assurance requirements for such products. This PP-Module is intended for use with the following Base-PP:

- collaborative Protection Profile for Network Devices, Version 2.2e (NDcPP)

This Base-PP is valid because an authentication server can be deployed as a dedicated network appliance. The use case of deploying the authentication server as an application on a general-purpose computer is outside the scope of this PP-Module. Authentication server products allow enterprises to provide a centralized and standardized method of evaluating user authentication requests made throughout the enterprise. This enables a centralized definition for user identity and credential data and allows for uniform application of authentication policies that define what credentials and user attributes are necessary to gain access to various systems and applications in the enterprise environment.

Note that the NDcPP defines an optional architecture for a “distributed TOE” that allows for security functionality to be spread across multiple distinct components. This PP-Module does not require or prohibit the TOE from being a distributed system when the TOE conforms to the NDcPP; the TOE may be standalone or distributed in this case.

## 1.2 Terms

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

### 1.2.1 Common Criteria Terms

Assurance	Grounds for confidence that a TOE meets the SFRs [CC].
Base Protection Profile (Base-PP)	Protection Profile used as a basis to build a PP-Configuration.
Collaborative Protection Profile (cPP)	A Protection Profile developed by international technical communities and approved by multiple schemes.
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 Module (PP-Module)	An implementation-independent statement of security needs for a TOE type complementary to one or more Base-PPs.
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.
Target of Evaluation (TOE)	The product under evaluation.
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.

### 1.2.2 Technical Terms

Assertion	A statement from the TOE to an RP that contains information about a subscriber. Assertions may also contain verified attributes. For the purposes of this PP-Module, Assertions containing authentication status and identity attributes are made by EAP response messages in accordance with EAP-TLS or EAP-TTLS.
Authentication Policy	A policy that specifies which authenticator types are required for a particular entity. The policy may be implicit for all entities, or configurable.
Authenticator	Something the claimant possesses and controls (typically a cryptographic module or password) that is used to authenticate the claimant's identity.
Authenticator Output	The output value generated by an authenticator. The ability to generate valid authenticator outputs on demand proves that the claimant possesses and controls the authenticator. Protocol messages sent to the verifier are dependent upon the authenticator output, but they may or may not explicitly contain it.
Claimant	A subject whose identity is to be verified using one or more authentication protocols.
Credential	An object or data structure that authoritatively binds an identity - via an identifier or identifiers - and (optionally) additional attributes, to at least one authenticator possessed and controlled by a subscriber.
Federation Protocol	A protocol to establish a trusted relationship with a relying party, and for the purposes of this PP module, to communicate authentication status for entities requesting access to resources managed by the relying party. In this PP-module, Federation Protocols include RADIUS, DIAMETER, and other standard protocols used in direct communication between the relying party and the TOE. Federation protocols that only support bearer assertions are out of scope for this PP-Module.

Relying Party (RP)	An entity that relies upon the subscriber's authenticator(s) and credentials or a verifier's assertion of a claimant's identity, typically to process a transaction or grant access to information or a system.
--------------------	---

### 1.3 Compliant Targets of Evaluation

This PP-Module specifically addresses a dedicated network device that performs entity (device or user) authentication via direct, back-end connections with a relying party. The entity to be authenticated is referred to as the claimant, though different terms have been used for specific protocols (e.g., peer for RADIUS/DIAMETER). The relying party can manage a single resource or provide access control for resources within a network. For example, a Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN) Access System may use the services of a dedicated authentication server during tunnel establishment. In this use case, an authentication server must support IEEE 802.1X Port-Based Network Access Control and must fulfill the IEEE 802.11 authentication server role using Extensible Authentication Protocol (EAP) messaging.

Similarly, the authentication server may be used during Virtual Private Network (VPN) tunnel establishment. The relying party in this case is a VPN Gateway acting as a Network Access Server using passthrough between the VPN client and authentication server (the TOE), also using EAP messaging.

In general, any relying party using a direct authentication federation protocol that supports EAP-TLS or EAP-TTLS messaging is addressed by this PP-Module.

The combination of the NDcPP and this PP-Module is a network device that provides authentication server functionality in addition to all of the security functionality expected of a network device as mandated by the NDcPP.

This PP-Module describes the functional requirements and threats specific to authentication servers. A TOE that conforms to this PP-Module must also conform to the Base-PP.

### 1.4 TOE Boundary

This document specifies SFRs for an authentication server. An authentication server is designed to authenticate a claimant that attempts to access a relying party – an access gateway to a protected network, or individual resources and services – and provide assertions to one or more relying parties about the authentication state of the claimant. A claimant forwards one or more authenticator outputs to the authentication server; the authentication server verifies the authenticator outputs and may also provide additional identity attributes to allow the relying party to determine whether the claimant meets its authentication policy.

The authentication server defined by this PP-Module is one or more dedicated network appliances; the TOE is not intended to run as an application on a general-purpose computer. The authentication server can be co-located with an access management or privilege management system, or it may be separate from such services. Regardless of the deployment, access control functions and management of non-identity attributes are outside the scope of this PP-Module.

An authentication server may be part of a larger system that also provides authorization information, either as part of an AAA server, an authorization server, or a domain controller. This PP-Module specifies the functional requirements for authentication services only; as in the case where the TOE may be co-located with the relying party, the TOE's logical boundary only includes the authentication server functionality. However, the TOE boundary includes the ability to generate audit events that are specific to the authentication functionality but may be used to support other functions (e.g., AAA servers).



Figure 1: NAS with an Authentication Server



**Figure 2: Generic Authentication Server User Case**

## 1.5 Use Cases

This PP-Module defines potential use cases for the authentication server TOE, defined below. The first use case defines the physical embodiment of the TOE, while the latter three define its role in a network infrastructure.

### [USE CASE 1] Dedicated Appliance

The authentication server is integrated on a standalone network appliance. In this use case, conformance to the NDcPP and this PP-Module is sufficient to ensure security. This PP-Module does not cover the use case where the authentication server is an application that is installed on a general-purpose computer.

### [USE CASE 2] Standalone Server

The system on which the authentication server is deployed is solely responsible for acting as an authenticator. In this deployment, the authentication server's only network infrastructure role is to communicate with the relying party for receiving challenges and issuing responses.

### [USE CASE 3] Relying Party Co-Location

The system on which the authentication server is deployed acts as both the relying party or its proxy and the authentication server. In this deployment, the authentication server's interactions with the relying party are internal-only. Regardless of whether the relying party is a standalone component or the authentication server executable code also provides relying party functionality, the TOE's logical boundary still only includes the authentication server component. Additionally, if the authentication server is a software application that can be deployed independently of the relying party, the required external trusted communications must still be supported; an authentication server cannot use the fact that it can be deployed on the same physical server as the relying party as a way to exempt itself from implementation of IPsec, RadSec or mutually authenticated (D)TLS with an external relying party.

### [USE CASE 4] Integrated as an Authorization Server Component

The system on which the authentication server is deployed also acts as an authorization server (e.g., as part of an AAA server) that provides authorization services in addition to the authentication server. Assertions made via the direct connection can also include authorization information, and an unauthorized, but authenticated user may result in a negative response to the relying party. Regardless of whether these are all standalone components or whether the authentication server executable code also provides authorization functionality, the TOE's logical boundary still only includes the authentication server component. As in the case where the authentication server is co-located with the relying party, this deployment does not exempt the TOE from being able to implement all the functionality that this PP-Module requires.

# 2 Conformance Claims

## Conformance Statement

This PP-Module inherits exact conformance as required from the specified Base-PP and as defined in the CC and CEM addenda for Exact Conformance, Selection-Based SFRs, and Optional SFRs (dated May 2017).

No PPs or PP-Modules may be specified in a PP-Configuration with this PP-Module other than the Base-PP specified in [Section 1.1 Overview](#).

## CC Conformance Claims

This PP-Module is conformant to Parts 2 (extended) and 3 (conformant) of Common Criteria Version 3.1, Release 5 [CC].

## Package Claims

This PP-Module does not claim conformance to any packages.

# 3 Security Problem Description

The security problem is described in terms of the threats that the TOE is expected to address, assumptions about its operational environment, and any organizational security policies that the TOE is expected to enforce.

## 3.1 Threats

---

The following threats that are defined in this PP-Module extend the threats that are defined by the Base-PP.

### **T.FALSE\_ENDPOINTS**

A malicious actor may falsely impersonate the TOE or a federated relying party in order to cause the TOE to operate in an insecure manner or to extract security-relevant, or sensitive user data from the TOE or its Operational Environment.

### **T.INVALID\_USERS**

A malicious user may supply incorrect or insufficient credential data or an otherwise invalid authentication request that is approved or ignored by the TSF such that protected resources are subject to unauthenticated access.

## 3.2 Assumptions

---

These assumptions are made on the Operational Environment (OE) in order to be able to ensure that the security functionality specified in the PP-Module can be provided by the TOE. If the TOE is placed in an OE that does not meet these assumptions, the TOE may no longer be able to provide all of its security functionality. All assumptions for the OE of the Base-PP also apply to this PP-Module.

### **A.RP\_FEDERATION**

It is assumed that the TOE is federated with one or more relying parties that transmit authentication requests to it.

## 3.3 Organizational Security Policies

---

An organization deploying the TOE is expected to satisfy the organizational security policy listed below in addition to all organizational security policies defined by the claimed Base-PP.

This document does not define any additional OSPs.



# 4 Security Objectives

## 4.1 Security Objectives for the TOE

### O.TRUSTED\_RP

The TOE shall provide mechanisms to authenticate itself to a federated RP and authenticate a federated RP before providing an identity assertion.

### O.USER\_AUTH

The TOE shall provide a mechanism to assess authentication requests and respond with an authentication assertion based on data that is supplied in the request.

### O.SECURITY\_ASSOCIATION

The TOE shall provide the information to the relying party to enable the relying party to verify that the claimant has possession of an authentication key.

## 4.2 Security Objectives for the Operational Environment

All objectives for the OE of the Base-PP also apply to this PP-Module.

### OE.RP\_FEDERATION

The TOE will be deployed in such a manner that it is federated with one or more relying parties that transmit authentication requests to it.

## 4.3 Security Objectives Rationale

This section describes how the assumptions, threats, and organizational security policies map to the security objectives.

Table 1: Security Objectives Rationale		
Threat, Assumption, or OSP	Security Objectives	Rationale
T.FALSE_ENDPOINTS	O.TRUSTED_RP	The TOE’s enforcement of mutual authentication allows it and the relying party to identify and reject attempts for each component to be impersonated.
T.INVALID_USERS	O.SECURITY_ASSOCIATION	The TOE’s ability to maintain a security association ensures that a mechanism exists for the TSF to assert to an external entity that a given user is valid.
	O.USER_AUTH	The TOE’s proper implementation of the claimant authentication ensures that it will accurately process authentication attempts to allow only valid authentication attempts. The TOE’s ability to use trusted communications as part of the federation protocol implementation ensures that modification or disclosure of authentication data cannot be used as a method to gain access to credentials or modify an authentication result.
A.RP_FEDERATION	OE.RP_FEDERATION	The OE objective OE.RP_FEDERATION is realized through A.RP_FEDERATION.

# 5 Security Requirements

This chapter describes the security requirements which have to be fulfilled by the product under evaluation. Those requirements comprise functional components from Part 2 and assurance components from Part 3 of [CC]. The following conventions are used for the completion of operations:

- **Refinement** operation (denoted by **bold text** or ~~striketrough text~~): Is used to add details to a requirement (including replacing an assignment with a more restrictive selection) or to remove part of the requirement that is made irrelevant through the completion of another operation, and thus further restricts a requirement.
- **Selection** (denoted by *italicized text*): Is used to select one or more options provided by the [CC] in stating a requirement.
- **Assignment** operation (denoted by *italicized text*): Is used to assign a specific value to an unspecified parameter, such as the length of a password. Showing the value in square brackets indicates assignment.
- **Iteration** operation: Is indicated by appending the SFR name with a slash and unique identifier suggesting the purpose of the operation, e.g. "/EXAMPLE1."

## 5.1 NDcPP Security Functional Requirements Direction

In a PP-Configuration that includes the NDcPP, the TOE is expected to rely on some of the security functions implemented by the Authentication Server as a whole and evaluated against the NDcPP. The following sections describe any modifications that the ST author must make to the SFRs defined in the NDcPP in addition to what is mandated by [Section 5.2 TOE Security Functional Requirements](#).

### 5.1.1 Modified SFRs

The SFRs listed in this section are defined in the NDcPP and relevant to the secure operation of the TOE.

#### 5.1.1.1 Identification and Authentication (FIA)

##### FIA\_X509\_EXT.1/Rev X.509 Certificate Validation

FIA\_X509\_EXT.1.1/Rev  
This SFR is selection-based in the NDcPP. When the TOE conforms to this PP-Module it is mandatory because of the PP-Module's requirement for implementation of mutually-authenticated TLS or DTLS.

##### FIA\_X509\_EXT.2 X.509 Certificate Authentication

FIA\_X509\_EXT.2.1  
This SFR is selection-based in the NDcPP. When the TOE conforms to this PP-Module it is mandatory because of the PP-Module's requirement for implementation of mutually-authenticated TLS or DTLS.

##### FIA\_X509\_EXT.3 X.509 Certificate Requests

FIA\_X509\_EXT.3.1  
This SFR is selection-based in the NDcPP. When the TOE conforms to this PP-Module it is mandatory because of the PP-Module's requirement for implementation of mutually-authenticated TLS or DTLS.

## 5.2 TOE Security Functional Requirements

The following section describes the SFRs that must be satisfied by any TOE that claims conformance to this PP-Module. These SFRs must be claimed regardless of which PP-Configuration is used to define the TOE.

### 5.2.1 Security Audit (FAU)

#### FAU\_GEN.1/AuthSvr Audit Data Generation

FAU\_GEN.1.1/AuthSvr  
The TSF shall be able to generate an audit record of the following auditable events:

- a. Start-up and shutdown of the audit functions;
- b. All auditable events for the [*not specified*] level of audit; and
- c. [*Auditable events listed in the Auditable Events table (Table 2)*]

Requirement	Auditable Events	Additional Audit Record Contents
FCO_NRO.1	Claimant request for which the TOE does	Identity of the claimant, contents of EAP-response

	not have credential verification data	(if present)
FCO_NRR.1	None	
FCS_CKM.3	<p>[<i>selection: attempt to export plaintext key or CSI via defined interface, none</i>]</p> <p>Note: if no defined interfaces have access to persistent keys or CSI, select 'none'</p>	If attempt is detected, record process identifier, authorized user's identifier (if any)
FCS_EAPTLS_EXT.1	Protocol failures	If failure occurs, record a descriptive reason for the failure
	Successful authentication of claimant	Identifier of claimant
FCS_RADIUS_EXT.1	Protocol failures	If failure occurs, record a descriptive reason for the failure
	Success/failure of authentication	None
FCS_RADSEC_EXT.1 (selection-based)	None	
FCS_STG_EXT.1	None	
FIA_AFL.1/AuthSvr	<p>The reaching of the threshold for the unsuccessful authentication attempts</p> <p>Disabling an account due to the threshold being reached</p>	The claimed identity of the entity attempting to authenticate or the IP where the attempts originated
FIA_HOTP_EXT.1 (selection-based)	Generation of a HOTP seed value	Entity identifier
	Entity HOTP value comparison	Result of comparison - success or failure
FIA_PSK_EXT.1/AuthSvr (selection-based)	None	
FIA_PSK_EXT.2 (selection-based)	None	
FIA_PSK_EXT.3 (selection-based)	None	
FIA_TOTP_EXT.1 (selection-based)	Generation of a TOTP seed value	Entity identifier
	Entity TOTP value comparison	Result of comparison - success or failure
FIA_X509_EXT.1/AuthSvr	Certificate validation failure	Reason for failure
FIA_UAU.6	All use of the authentication mechanism	Origin of the attempt (e.g., IP address)
FMT_SMF.1/AuthSvr	All management actions	Identifier of initiator

FTA_TSE.1	Denial of session establishment due to the session establishment mechanism	Reason for denial, origin of establishment attempt
FTP_ITC.1/NAS	Initiation of the trusted channel	Identification of the initiator
	Termination of the trusted channel	Identification of the initiator
	Failure of the trusted channel functions	Target of failed trusted channels establishment attempt

Table 2: Auditable Events

**Application Note:** The auditable events defined in Table 2 are for the SFRs that are explicitly defined in this PP-Module and are intended to extend FAU\_GEN.1 in the Base-PP.

The events in the Auditable Events table should be combined with those of the NDcPP in the context of a conforming Security Target.

The Auditable Events (Table 2) includes selection-based SFRs. The auditing of selection-based SFRs is only required if that SFR is included in the ST.

Per FAU\_STG\_EXT.1 in the Base-PP, the TOE must support transfer of the audit data to an external IT entity using a trusted channel.

## 5.2.2 Communications (FCO)

### FCO\_NRO.1 Selective Proof of Origin

#### FCO\_NRO.1.1

The TSF shall be able to generate evidence of origin for transmitted [*identity authentication assertions, [selection: authentication requests, IKE authentication phase security associations, [assignment: claimant identity attributes], no other data ]*] at the request of the [*relying party, [selection: external authentication servers in support of pass-through, no other entities ]*].

**Application Note:** The intent of this requirement is for the TOE to provide source of origin (non-repudiation) for assertions and sensitive data associated to claimants it provides to relying parties. The ST author will claim ‘authentication requests’ and ‘external authentication servers...’ if the TSF supports pass-through communication with external authentication servers. The ST author claims additional information provided to a relying party via an authenticated channel as appropriate.

#### FCO\_NRO.1.2

The TSF shall be able to relate the [*authenticator*] of the originator of the information, and the [*authentication request*] of the information to which the evidence applies.

**Application Note:** The intent of this requirement is for the TOE to be able to associate authentication assertions it makes to requests made to it by a relying party. For pass-through functionality, the TOE relates requests and response messages it forwards between external entities via identity information asserted in the EAP headers.

#### FCO\_NRO.1.3

The TSF shall provide a capability to verify the evidence of origin of information to [*recipient*] given [*an authenticated channel is established with a trusted relying party*]].

### FCO\_NRR.1 Selective Proof of Receipt

#### FCO\_NRR.1.1

The TSF shall be able to generate evidence of receipt for received [*authentication requests, [selection: authentication responses and queries, none ]*] at the request of the [*originator*].

**Application Note:** The intent of this requirement is for the TOE to be able to return a valid response to the relying party upon receipt of an Access-Request. If the TSF supports pass-through functionality, the ST author claims ‘authentication responses and queries’ in the selection for authentication in communications with external authentication servers.

FCO\_NRR.1.2

The TSF shall be able to relate the [*claimant identifier, claimant authenticators*] of the recipient of the information, and the [*identity assertion, information requests and error responses*] of the information to which the evidence applies.

**Application Note:** The intent of this requirement is for the ST author to list the information supplied by the TOE in response to an authentication request that confirms receipt of the request, and identifies:

- the authentication request that is being responded to;
- the mutually authenticated channel between the trusted relying party and the TOE.

FCO\_NRR.1.3

The TSF shall provide a capability to verify the evidence of receipt of information to [*originator*] given [*establishment of a mutually authenticated channel with a trusted relying party*].

## 5.2.3 Cryptographic Support (FCS)

### FCS\_CKM.3 Cryptographic Key Access

FCS\_CKM.3.1

The TSF shall perform [*access control for persistent private and secret keys and security critical parameters required by this PP-Module*] in accordance with a specified cryptographic key access method [*ensuring only authorized security functionality can access plaintext keys or security critical information*] that meets the following: [*keys and security critical information are not exportable in plaintext, keys and security critical information are not viewable in plaintext*].

**Application Note:** Keys used for assertion signatures, including private keys associated to certificates used to establish a protected channel to relying parties and entities to be authenticated, one-time-password seed keys, and plaintext passwords can undermine or bypass the protections required for TOE functionality. The ST author describes the specific methods used to prevent unauthorized or unnecessary access to these keys and security critical information. This requirement is not intended to cover unanticipated exploits; it is only required that plaintext keys and security critical values not be exportable or viewable by defined interfaces. OTP seed key values are shared using out-of-band methods with the associated entities. This requirement implies that the method to export these values uses encrypted key transport methods.

### FCS\_EAPTLS\_EXT.1 EAP-TLS Protocol

FCS\_EAPTLS\_EXT.1.1

The TSF shall implement [**selection:** *EAP-TLS as specified in RFC 5216, EAP-TTLS as specified in RFC 5881* ] as updated by RFC 8996 with [**selection:** *TLS, DTLS* ] implemented using mutual authentication in accordance with [**selection:** *FCS\_TLSS\_EXT.1 and FCS\_TLSS\_EXT.2, FCS\_DTLSS\_EXT.1 and FCS\_DTLSS\_EXT.2* ].

FCS\_EAPTLS\_EXT.1.2

The TSF shall generate random values used in the [**selection:** *EAP-TLS, EAP-TTLS* ] exchange using the RBG specified in FCS\_RBG\_EXT.1.

FCS\_EAPTLS\_EXT.1.3

The TSF shall support claimant authentication using certificates and [**selection:** *static PSK, HOTP, TOTP, [assignment: other authentication-verification protocols], other authentication-verification protocols via pass-through functionality, no other authentication methods* ].

FCS\_EAPTLS\_EXT.1.4

The TSF shall not forward an EAP-success response to the relying party if the client certificate is not valid according to FIA\_X509\_EXT.1/Rev, if the [**selection:** *TLS, DTLS* ] session is not established, or if any of [**selection:** *PSK, HOTP value, TOTP value, no other authenticator* ] required by the authentication policy are not provided or if any of the required authenticators presented in the authentication request is not valid.

**Application Note:** The ST author should indicate support for EAP-TLS or EAP-TTLS in [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1.1](#). In the third selection, 'FCS\_TLSS\_EXT.1 and FCS\_TLSS\_EXT.2' or 'FCS\_DTLSS\_EXT.1 and FCS\_DTLSS\_EXT.2' is selected according to the TLS or DTLS support indicated in the second selection, with the expectation that the corresponding SFRs from the Base-PP are claimed.

The selection in [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1.2](#) matches the first selection in [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1.1](#).

The selections made in [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1.3](#) may trigger the inclusion of selection-based SFRs, as follows:

- Any of "static PSK," "HOTP," or "TOTP" requires inclusion of [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1/AuthSvr](#).
- "HOTP" requires inclusion of [FIA\\_HOTP\\_EXT.1](#).
- "TOTP" requires inclusion of [FIA\\_TOTP\\_EXT.1](#)

The ST author claims any additional supported authentication methods in [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1.3](#). Each supported method is claimed independently, even if combinations of the methods are required for individual claimant authentication. For any authentication methods that are only supported by pass-through functionality, the ST author should claim 'other authentication-verification protocols via pass-through functionality' without claiming the corresponding method in the same selection. Pass-through functionality can typically support any authentication method, including ones not specified in the SFR.

## **FCS\_RADIUS\_EXT.1 Authentication Protocol**

### **FCS\_RADIUS\_EXT.1.1**

The TSF shall implement the [**selection:** *RADIUS protocol as specified in RFC 2865, DIAMETER protocol as specified in RFC 6733, [assignment: other direct identity federation protocol]* ] for communication of identity and authentication information with a relying party.

### **FCS\_RADIUS\_EXT.1.2**

The TSF shall implement encapsulated EAP in accordance with [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1](#).

### **FCS\_RADIUS\_EXT.1.3**

The TSF shall provide [**selection:** *a key indicator, an encrypted parameter, an encrypted value* ] for a key held by the successfully authenticated claimant derived from the supported EAP mode and provided to the relying party in accordance with the protocol indicated in [FCS\\_RADIUS\\_EXT.1.1](#).

**Application Note:** The ST author describes how the TSF communicates with a relying party at the application layer to receive authentication requests and provide identity assertions. RADIUS and DIAMETER protocols are used with AAA servers when the relying party is a NAS, but other direct access identity federation protocols that support [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1](#) and identify a key held by the authenticated claimant that can be confirmed by the relying party are acceptable. If other protocols are claimed, the ST author includes the RFCs and indicates the messages used for authentication requests and assertions.

The ST author indicates which keys held by the authenticated claimant are available to the relying party for key-holder verification. For RADIUS/DIAMETER, the encrypted key is the derived from the EAP-TLS/EAP-TTLS master key established during the TLS handshake, and used by the relying party as the AUTH MSK/security association for the IPsec session established between the network access server and the authenticated claimant. More generally, a key indicator can be a reference identifier for a shared secret key, or a public key, certificate, or other identifier associated with a private asymmetric key controlled by the authenticated claimant.

## **FCS\_STG\_EXT.1 Cryptographic Key Storage**

### **FCS\_STG\_EXT.1.1**

Persistent private and secret keys shall be stored within the TSF [**selection:**

- *encrypted within a hardware protected key*
- *in a hardware cryptographic module*
- *within an isolated execution environment protected by a hardware key*

].

## **5.2.4 Identification and Authentication (FIA)**

### **FIA\_AFL.1/AuthSvr Authentication Failure Handling (Claimant)**

#### **FIA\_AFL.1.1/AuthSvr**

The TSF shall detect when [*an administrator configurable positive integer of **successive***] unsuccessful authentication attempts occur related to [*claimants attempting to authenticate*].

#### **FIA\_AFL.1.2/AuthSvr**

When the defined number of unsuccessful authentication attempts has been [*met*], the TSF shall [**selection, choose one of:** *prevent the offending remote entity from successfully authenticating until [assignment: action] is taken by a local Administrator, prevent the offending claimant from successfully*

authenticating until an administrator-defined time period has elapsed ].

**Application Note:** This requirement applies to claimant authentication attempts in support of an authentication service provided for a federated relying party. This requirement does not apply to login to the TOE by privileged users for administrative accesses; these cases are addressed by the Base-PP iteration of this SFR. Responses to authentication queries to aid the claimant in providing acceptable authenticators is not considered a preventative action and are allowed prior to reaching the lockout threshold. The “action” taken by a local administrator is implementation specific and is defined in the operational guidance (for example, lockout reset or password reset). The ST author chooses one of the selections for handling of authentication failures depending on how the TOE has implemented this handler.

## **FIA\_X509\_EXT.1/AuthSvr X.509 Certificate Validation (Claimant)**

FIA\_X509\_EXT.1.1/AuthSvr

The TSF shall validate certificates in accordance with the following rules:

- RFC 5280 **version 3** certificate validation and certification path validation supporting **[selection: a minimum path length of [assignment: value greater than or equal to 3], no prior constraints on path length ]**
- The certification path must terminate with a CA certificate **trusted by the TSF specifically for claimant authentication.**
- The TSF shall validate a certification path by ensuring that all CA certificates in the certification path contain the basicConstraints extension with the CA flag set to TRUE.
- The TSF shall validate the revocation status of **each certificate in the certificate path [selection:**
  - **containing an OCSP provider in the AIA extension using the Online Certificate Status Protocol (OCSP) as specified in RFC 6960**
  - **containing a CRL distribution point in the CRLDP extension or AIA extension using [selection: a Certificate Revocation List (CRL) as specified in RFC 5280 Section 6.3, a Certificate Revocation List (CRL) as specified in RFC 5759 Section 5 ]****].**
- The TSF shall validate the extendedKeyUsage field **is present and contains key usage values** according to the following rules: **[selection:**
  - **Certificates do not assert anyExtendedKeyUsage (OID 2.5.29.37.0)**
  - **Client certificates associated with authenticated entities presented for [selection: TLS, DTLS ] shall have the Client Authentication purpose (id-kp 2 with OID 1.3.6.1.5.5.7.3.2) in the extendedKeyUsage field.**
  - **[selection:**
    - **Server certificates presented for [selection: TLS, DTLS ] shall have the Server Authentication purpose (id-kp 1 with OID 1.3.6.1.5.5.7.3.1) in the extendedKeyUsage field.**
    - **Certificates presented for IPsec shall have the ipsec-IKE purpose (id-kp 17 with OID 1.3.6.1.5.5.7.3.17)**
    - **OCSP certificates presented for OCSP responses shall have the OCSP Signing purpose (id-kp 9 with OID 1.3.6.1.5.5.7.3.9) in the extendedKeyUsage field.****]**

**]**

**].**

- The TSF shall validate that each CA certificate in the certification path indicating a path length constraint in the basicConstraints extension does not have more than the specified number of subordinate CA certificates in the certification path from the end-entity certificate to the CA certificate indicating the constraint, not counting the CA certificate itself or any self-issued certificates in the certification path.
- The TSF shall process name constraints of type Directory Name and **[selection: rfc822Name, dnsName, UPN Name (Other Name = id-ms-san-sc-logon-upn), [assignment: other name type], no other name type ]** by verifying that each name of a supported name type present in the end-entity certificate subject field or subjectAlternateName extension, is allowed in each CA certificate in the certification path, is not disallowed by any of the CA certificates in the certification path, and that each name type included in the end-entity certificate



and constrained by a CA certificate in the certification path is processed.

- The TSF shall process the following certificate extensions:

[selection:

- *Certificate Policy extension in accordance with RFC 5280 and [selection:*
  - *Policy mapping extension in accordance with RFC 5280*
  - *Policy constraints extension in accordance with RFC 5280*
  - *Inhibit anyPolicy extension in accordance with RFC 5280*
  - *No other policy related extension*

*] in support of claimant authentication and [assignment: other intended purposes and limitations of policy related extension processing]*

- *[assignment: other standard extensions]*
- *no other extensions]*

].

**Application Note:** The ST author claims supported certificate validity checking options for each rule. For name constraints, all supported name types used to match names presented in a certificate to registered users and the associated standard matching method are described.

The ST author claims supported certificate policies. 'Policy Constraints...' is claimed if the TOE's authentication policy depends on the certificate policies for claimant certificates. Other policy related extensions within the selection are claimed if supported. The extension inhibitPolicyMapping is not claimed if the TSF does not support certificate chains of length 4 or more. The Policy related extensions, if supported, are primarily used in this PP-Module for claimant authentication, but are allowed for other certificate authentications. The ST author specifies the intended use and any limits of support for these extensions or specifies 'no other purposes or constraints' in the assignment of this selection.

The ST author specifies any additional supported X509 extensions, and the associated extension processing rules used to determine claimant identity attributes or conditions that can be used in the TOE's authentication policy.

FIA\_X509\_EXT.1.2/AuthSvr

The TSF shall only treat a certificate as a CA certificate if the basicConstraints extension is present and the CA flag is set to TRUE.

## **FIA\_UAU.6 Re-Authenticating**

FIA\_UAU.6.1

The TSF shall re-authenticate the **administrative** user under the conditions [when the user changes their password, [**selection:** following TSF-initiated session locking, [**assignment:** other conditions], no other conditions ]].

## **5.2.5 Security Management (FMT)**

### **FMT\_SMF.1/AuthSvr Specification of Management Functions (Authentication Server)**

FMT\_SMF.1.1/AuthSvr

The TSF shall be capable of performing the following management functions:

- Ability to configure claimant verification data
- Ability to manage relying party trust store data
- Ability to enable, disable, and determine and modify the behavior of all the security functions of the TOE identified in this PP-Module to include [**assignment:** list of supported functions]
- [**selection:**
  - *Ability to configure IPsec functionality*
  - *Ability to configure DTLS functionality*
  - *Ability to configure TLS functionality*
  - *Ability to manage claimant authentication policy*
  - *No other functions*

].

**Application Note:** This SFR defines additional management functions for the TOE beyond what is defined in the Base-PP as FMT\_SMF.1.

## **5.2.6 TOE Access (FTA)**

### **FTA\_TSE.1 TOE Session Establishment**



The TSF shall be able to deny **claimant** session establishment based on [*invalid certificate, [selection: [assignment: other identity attributes], no other attributes ]*].

**Application Note:** The intent of this SFR is to describe any circumstances that would cause a claimant's authentication request to be rejected. All compliant TOEs will reject authentication requests based on invalid credentials. A compliant TOE may also impose additional limitations such as suspended accounts or time of day restrictions, depending on the capabilities of the TSF's authentication mechanism.

## 5.2.7 Trusted Path/Channels (FTP)

### FTP\_ITC.1/NAS Inter-TSF Trusted Channel (Relying Party Communications)

FTP\_ITC.1.1/NAS

The TSF shall provide [**selection: an IPsec, a RadSec, a mutually authenticated TLS, a mutually authenticated DTLS ]** communication channel between itself and **a relying party** that is logically distinct from other communication channels and provides assured identification of its end points and protection of the channel data from modification or disclosure.

**Application Note:** If "a RadSec" is selected, the selection-based SFR [FCS\\_RADSEC\\_EXT.1](#) must be claimed.

FTP\_ITC.1.2/NAS

The TSF shall permit [*the TSF, or the relying party*] to initiate communication via the trusted channel.

FTP\_ITC.1.3/NAS

The TSF shall initiate communication via the trusted channel for [*responses to authentication request messages received from the relying party*].

## 5.3 TOE Security Functional Requirements Rationale

The following rationale provides justification for each security objective for the TOE, showing that the SFRs are suitable to meet and achieve the security objectives:

**Table 3: SFR Rationale**

Objective	Addressed by	Rationale
O.TRUSTED_RP	<a href="#">FCS_EAPTLS_EXT.1</a>	TBD
	<a href="#">FIA_PSK_EXT.1/AuthSvr</a>	TBD
	<a href="#">FTP_ITC.1/NAS</a>	TBD
O.USER_AUTH	<a href="#">FIA_AFL.1/AuthSvr</a>	TBD
	<a href="#">FIA_UAU.6</a>	TBD
	<a href="#">FTA_TSE.1</a>	TBD
O.SECURITY_ASSOCIATION	<a href="#">FCS_EAPTLS_EXT.1</a>	TBD

## 5.4 TOE Security Assurance Requirements

This PP-Module does not define any SARs beyond those defined within the Base-PP to which it can claim conformance. It is important to note that a TOE that is evaluated against this PP-Module is inherently evaluated against the NDcPP as well. This PP includes a number of EAs associated with both Security Functional Requirements (SFRs) and SARs. Additionally, this PP-Module includes a number of SFR-based EAs that similarly refine the SARs of the Base-PP. The evaluation laboratory will evaluate the TOE against the chosen Base-PP and supplement that evaluation with the necessary SFRs that are taken from this PP-Module.

# 6 Consistency Rationale

## 6.1 Collaborative Protection Profile for NDs

### 6.1.1 Consistency of TOE Type

When this PP-Module is used to extend the NDcPP, the TOE type for the overall TOE is still a network device. The TOE boundary is simply extended to include authentication server functionality that is provided by the network device.

### 6.1.2 Consistency of Security Problem Definition

PP-Module Threat, Assumption, OSP	Consistency Rationale
<a href="#">T.FALSE_ENDPOINTS</a>	This threat is similar to the T.WEAK_AUTHENTICATION_ENDPOINTS threat in the NDcPP but it applies specifically to the NAS, which is an environmental component that is defined specifically in this PP-Module.
<a href="#">T.INVALID_USERS</a>	This threat is similar to the T.UNAUTHORIZED_ADMINISTRATOR_ACCESS threat in the NDcPP but it applies to user authentication brokered by the TSF rather than to administrator authentication to the TOE itself. It is also similar to the T.UNTRUSTED_COMMUNICATION_CHANNELS threat in the NDcPP except that it applies specifically to the RADIUS communications and the protocols used to secure those, which is an interface that is defined specifically in this PP-Module.
<a href="#">A.RP_FEDERATION</a>	The NDcPP does not define any assumptions for the intended network architecture that the TOE is deployed into. Therefore, an assumption that the network can be set up in such a way that the TOE will have direct connectivity with one or more relying parties does not violate any assumptions of the NDcPP.

### 6.1.3 Consistency of Objectives

The objectives for the TOEs are consistent with the NDcPP based on the following rationale:

PP-Module TOE Objective	Consistency Rationale
<a href="#">O.TRUSTED_RP</a>	The NDcPP does not define any TOE objectives; instead, it maps SFRs directly to threats. The TOE objectives defined by this PP-Module are therefore assumed not to conflict with the NDcPP by virtue of the fact that the SFRs used to satisfy these objectives do not conflict with the NDcPP SFRs.
<a href="#">O.USER_AUTH</a>	The NDcPP does not define any TOE objectives; instead, it maps SFRs directly to threats. The TOE objectives defined by this PP-Module are therefore assumed not to conflict with the NDcPP by virtue of the fact that the SFRs used to satisfy these objectives do not conflict with the NDcPP SFRs.
<a href="#">O.SECURITY_ASSOCIATION</a>	The NDcPP does not define any TOE objectives; instead, it maps SFRs directly to threats. The TOE objectives defined by this PP-Module are therefore assumed not to conflict with the NDcPP by virtue of the fact that the SFRs used to satisfy these objectives do not conflict with the NDcPP SFRs.

The objectives for the TOE's OE are consistent with the NDcPP based on the following rationale:

PP-Module OE Objective	Consistency Rationale
<a href="#">OE.RP_FEDERATION</a>	The Base-PP does not define where in a particular network architecture a network device must be deployed since it is designed to be generic to various types of network devices. This PP-Module defines the expected architectural deployment specifically for a network device that acts as an authentication server.

### 6.1.4 Consistency of Requirements

This PP-Module identifies several SFRs from the NDcPP that are needed to support Authentication Servers functionality. This is considered to be consistent because the functionality provided by the NDcPP is being used for its intended purpose. The PP-Module also identifies a number of modified SFRs from the NDcPP that are used entirely to provide functionality for Authentication Servers. The rationale for why this does not conflict with the claims defined by the NDcPP are as follows:

PP-Module Requirement	Consistency Rationale
<b>Modified SFRs</b>	
<a href="#">FIA_X509_EXT.1/Rev</a>	This PP-Module modifies the Base-PP's definition of the SFR by making it mandatory rather than selection-based.
<a href="#">FIA_X509_EXT.2</a>	This PP-Module modifies the Base-PP's definition of the SFR by making it mandatory rather than selection-based.
<a href="#">FIA_X509_EXT.3</a>	This PP-Module modifies the Base-PP's definition of the SFR by making it mandatory rather than selection-based.
<b>Additional SFRs</b>	
This PP-Module does not add any requirements when the NDcPP is the base.	
<b>Mandatory SFRs</b>	
<a href="#">FAU_GEN.1/AuthSvr</a>	This SFR iterates the FAU_GEN.1 SFR defined in the Base-PP to define auditable events for the functionality that is specific to this PP-Module.
<a href="#">FCO_NRO.1</a>	This SFR applies to implementation of the supported authentication protocol, which is beyond the original scope of the Base-PP.
<a href="#">FCO_NRR.1</a>	This SFR applies to implementation of the supported authentication protocol, which is beyond the original scope of the Base-PP.
<a href="#">FCS_CKM.3</a>	The Base-PP requires confidentiality of cryptographic key data in FPT_SKP_EXT.1. This SFR defines more specific detail on how that function should be enforced.
<a href="#">FCS_EAPTLS_EXT.1</a>	This SFR applies to implementation of EAP-TLS; the Base-PP defines implementation requirements for (D)TLS, but EAP-TLS is beyond the original scope of the Base-PP.
<a href="#">FCS_RADIUS_EXT.1</a>	This SFR applies to implementation of authentication protocols, which is beyond the original scope of the Base-PP.
<a href="#">FCS_STG_EXT.1</a>	This SFR is consistent with the FPT_SKP_EXT.1 requirement of the Base-PP but requires the TSF to implement a specific method of protecting key data rather than a general statement that such data is not stored in plaintext.
<a href="#">FIA_AFL.1/AuthSvr</a>	This SFR defines functional behavior enforced on external users being authenticated by the TOE, which is functionality that is not covered by the Base-PP.
<a href="#">FIA_X509_EXT.1/AuthSvr</a>	The Base-PP defines X.509 validation requirements for external entities presenting certificates to the TOE. This PP-Module defines a separate iteration of this function to define the certificate validation behavior that is enforced against claimants requesting to be authenticated by the TOE. It is substantially refined from its original definition to address issues specific to the handling of claimant certificates.
<a href="#">FIA_UAU.6</a>	This SFR defines support for re-authentication of administrators, which expands on the authentication functionality defined in the Base-PP.
<a href="#">FMT_SMF.1/AuthSvr</a>	This SFR defines additional management functionality that is specific to the PP-Module's product type and would therefore not be expected to be present in the Base-PP.
<a href="#">FTA_TSE.1</a>	This SFR relates to the handling of claimants being authenticated by the TOE, which is functionality that is beyond the original scope of the Base-PP.
<a href="#">FTP_ITC.1/NAS</a>	This SFR iterates the FTP_ITC.1 SFR defined in the Base-PP to define trusted communication channels for the functionality that is specific to this PP-Module.
<b>Optional SFRs</b>	
This PP-Module does not define any Optional requirements.	
<b>Selection-based SFRs</b>	
<a href="#">FCS_RADSEC_EXT.1</a>	This SFR defines the implementation of RadSec and the peer authentication method that it uses. This relies on the TLS requirements defined by the Base-PP and may also use the X.509v3 certificate validation methods specified in the Base-PP, depending on the selected peer authentication method.

<a href="#">FIA_HOTP_EXT.1</a>	This SFR extends the functionality of the Base-PP by defining the use of pre-shared keys as an authenticator.
<a href="#">FIA_PSK_EXT.1/AuthSvr</a>	This SFR extends the functionality of the Base-PP by defining the use of pre-shared keys as an authenticator.
<a href="#">FIA_PSK_EXT.2</a>	This SFR extends the functionality of the Base-PP by defining the use of pre-shared keys as an authenticator.
<a href="#">FIA_PSK_EXT.3</a>	This SFR extends the functionality of the Base-PP by defining the use of pre-shared keys as an authenticator.
<a href="#">FIA_TOTP_EXT.1</a>	This SFR extends the functionality of the Base-PP by defining the use of pre-shared keys as an authenticator.

### **Objective SFRs**

This PP-Module does not define any Objective requirements.

### **Implementation-based SFRs**

This PP-Module does not define any Implementation-based requirements.

# Appendix A - Optional SFRs

## A.1 Strictly Optional Requirements

---

This PP-Module does not define any Strictly Optional SFRs.

## A.2 Objective Requirements

---

This PP-Module does not define any Objective SFRs.

## A.3 Implementation-dependent Requirements

---

This PP-Module does not define any Implementation-dependent SFRs.

# Appendix B - Selection-based Requirements

## B.1 Cryptographic Support (FCS)

---

### FCS\_RADSEC\_EXT.1 RadSec

*The inclusion of this selection-based component depends upon selection in [FTP\\_ITC.1.1/NAS](#).*

#### FCS\_RADSEC\_EXT.1.1

The TSF shall implement RadSec as specified in RFC 6614, as updated by RFC 8996, to communicate securely with a relying party.

#### FCS\_RADSEC\_EXT.1.2

The TSF shall perform relying party authentication using [**selection:** X.509v3 certificates, pre-shared keys ].

**Application Note:** It is recommended that both X.509v3 certificates and pre-shared keys be supported for resiliency purposes.

#### FCS\_RADSEC\_EXT.1.3

The TSF shall implement RadSec using [**selection:** TLS, DTLS ] with mutual authentication.

**Application Note:** This SFR is claimed if "a RadSec" is selected in [FTP\\_ITC.1.1/NAS](#).

## B.2 Identification and Authentication (FIA)

---

### FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1 HMAC-Based One-Time Password Pre-Shared Keys

*The inclusion of this selection-based component depends upon selection in [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1.3](#), [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.2/AuthSvr](#).*

#### FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1.1

The TSF shall support HMAC-Based One-Time Password authentication (HOTP) in accordance with RFC 4226.

#### FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1.2

The TSF shall generate a HOTP seed key according to FCS\_RBG\_EXT.1 of [**selection:** 128, 256 ] bits.

#### FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1.3

The TSF shall generate a new HOTP seed value for each claimant to be authenticated.

#### FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1.4

The TSF shall use [**selection:** SHA-1, SHA-256, SHA-384, SHA-512 ] with key sizes [**assignment:** key size (in bits) used in HMAC] and message digest sizes [**selection:** 160, 256, 384, 512 ] to derive a HOTP hash from the HOTP seed and counter.

#### FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1.5

The TSF shall truncate the HOTP hash per [FIA\\_HOTP\\_EXT.1.4](#) to create an HOTP of [**selection:**

- administrator configurable character length of at least 6
- preset character length of [**selection:** 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 ]

].

#### FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1.6

The TSF shall [**selection:**

- throttle invalid requests to [**selection:**
  - administrator configurable value
  - [**assignment:** value less than 10]]  
] per minute
- lock the associated account after [**selection:** administrator configurable value, [**assignment:** value less than 10 ] failed attempts until [**selection:** an administrator unlocks the account, a configurable time period has elapsed ]

].

#### FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1.7

The TSF shall not verify HOTP attempts outside of the counter look ahead window of [**assignment:** *a value less than or equal to 3*] [**selection:**

- *except for rescynchronization*
- *where a look ahead window of [**selection:** *a configurable value*, [**assignment:** *fixed value*] ] is used to reset the counter but which is not considered a valid HOTP value*
- *with no exception*

].

#### FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1.8

The TSF shall increment the counter after each successful authentication.

**Application Note:** This SFR is claimed if "HOTP" is selected in [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1.3](#) or if "HMAC based one-time password" is selected in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.2/AuthSvr](#).

The selection in [FIA\\_HOTP\\_EXT.1.4](#) must be consistent with the key size specified for the size of the keys used in conjunction with the keyed-hash message authentication.

In [FIA\\_HOTP\\_EXT.1.5](#) the ST author may either provide a configurable character length of at least 6 or a preset size between 6 and 10.

In [FIA\\_HOTP\\_EXT.1.6](#) the ST may select throttle requests, account lockout, or both.

The selections in [FIA\\_HOTP\\_EXT.1.7](#) indicate an optional resynchronization process that allows an arbitrary look-ahead to determine a new counter value by the verifier. This can be used for out-of-sync claimants or for initial use of a HOTP mechanism. The HOTP value presented for resynchronization does not serve to authenticate a user. A second verification using a small look ahead window (at most 3) is required after resynchronization to ensure the claimant and the TOE counter values are indeed synchronized so that arbitrary values are not considered valid. If such a resynchronization function is not supported, 'with no exception' is claimed.

The HOTP seed and all derived values are considered secret keys for purposes of protection.

### FIA\_PSK\_EXT.1/AuthSvr Pre-Shared Key Usage (Claimant Authentication)

***The inclusion of this selection-based component depends upon selection in [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1.3](#), [FCS\\_RADSEC\\_EXT.1.2](#).***

#### FIA\_PSK\_EXT.1.1/AuthSvr

The TSF shall be able to use pre-shared keys for [**selection:** *IPsec, RadSec, EAP-TTLS, TLS, DTLS, RADIUS, HOTP, TOTP* ].

#### FIA\_PSK\_EXT.1.2/AuthSvr

The TSF shall be able to accept the following as pre-shared keys: [**selection:** *generated bit-based, password-based, HMAC-based one-time password, time-based one-time password* ].

**Application Note:** This SFR is claimed if any other TOE functions require the use of pre-shared keys. Within the scope of this PP-Module, this includes the following:

- Any of "static PSK," "HOTP," or "TOTP" is selected in [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1.3](#).
- "pre-shared keys" is selected in [FCS\\_RADSEC\\_EXT.1.1](#).
- "pre-shared keys" is selected in [FCS\\_IPSEC\\_EXT.1.13](#) (from the Base-PP).

IPsec is claimed in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.1/AuthSvr](#) if IPsec is claimed in [FTP\\_ITC.1/NAS](#) and the selection for [FCS\\_IPSEC\\_EXT.1.13](#) in the Base-PP includes 'pre-shared keys'. PSK in IPsec may use any supported type of PSK - those supported are claimed in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.2/AuthSvr](#). Use of certificates in IPsec is preferred.

RadSec is claimed in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.1/AuthSvr](#) if RadSec is selected in [FTP\\_ITC.1/NAS](#) and the (D)TLS implementation in RadSec allows server-only authentication or supports a PSK ciphersuite. RadSec can use any type of PSK - those supported should be claimed in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.2/AuthSvr](#). Use of a

mutually authenticated (D)TLS channel using certificate-based authentication is preferred.

If a pre-shared key used for RADIUS is validated directly using legacy methods, RADIUS is claimed. It should not be claimed when RADIUS is used exclusively with RadSec since in that case, the legacy PSK used in RADIUS is replaced with a fixed value not used in authenticating the relying party. Use of a mutually authenticated channel using certificates to authenticate the relying party is preferred.

EAP-TTLS is claimed in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.1/AuthSvr](#) if it is claimed in [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1.1](#) and support for static PSK (alone or in combination) is indicated in [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1.3](#). When EAP-TTLS is claimed in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.1/AuthSvr](#), at least one of 'password-based,' 'HMAC based one-time-password,' or 'Time based one-time password' is claimed in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.2/AuthSvr](#). Multiple password types are claimed if the TSF supports validation of combinations of password types, even if presented in a single payload.

Note that even if presented by a claimant, PSK are ignored in EAP-TLS implementations.

TLS or DTLS, respectively, are claimed if a PSK-based ciphersuite is claimed in [FCS\\_TLSS\\_EXT.1](#) or [FCS\\_DTLSS\\_EXT.1](#) of the Base-PP.

HOTP or TOTP, respectively, are claimed if the respective entry is claimed in [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1.3](#) and the TSF validates the HOTP or TOTP values presented in an authentication request. If claimed, the PSK represents the seed key value generated by the TOE and shared via out-of-band mechanisms with the claimant as well as the HOTP or TOTP values presented by a claimant to be validated; the 'generated as bit-based PSK' as well as the respective HOTP or TOTP entries are claimed in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.2/AuthSvr](#). The selection-based SFRs [FIA\\_HOTP\\_EXT.1](#) and [FIA\\_TOTP\\_EXT.1](#) must also be claimed if HOTP or TOTP are claimed, respectively.

Note that if HOTP or TOTP mechanisms are supported, but the values are only validated by an external entity, the HOTP or TOTP entries are not claimed in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1/AuthSvr](#).

If "generated bit-based" is selected in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.2/AuthSvr](#), [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.2](#) must be claimed.

If "password-based" is selected in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.2/AuthSvr](#), [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.3](#) must be claimed.

## **FIA\_PSK\_EXT.2 Generated Pre-Shared Keys**

***The inclusion of this selection-based component depends upon selection in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.2/AuthSvr](#).***

FIA\_PSK\_EXT.2.1

The TSF shall be able to [**selection:**

- *accept externally generated pre-shared keys*
- *generate [**selection:** 128, 256 ] bit-based pre-shared keys via [FCS\\_RBG\\_EXT.1](#).*

].

**Application Note:** This SFR is claimed if "generated bit-based" is selected in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.2/AuthSvr](#).

Generated PSKs are expected to be shared between components via an out of band mechanism.

## **FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3 Password-Based Pre-Shared Keys**

***The inclusion of this selection-based component depends upon selection in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.2/AuthSvr](#).***

FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3.1

The TSF shall support a PSK of up to [**assignment:** *positive integer of 64 or more*] characters.



FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3.2

The TSF shall allow PSKs to be composed of any combination of uppercase characters, lowercase characters, numbers, the following special characters: "!", "@", "#", "\$", "%", "^", "&", "\*", "(", and ")", and **[selection: *[assignment: other supported special characters], no other characters* ]**.

FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3.3

The TSF shall perform Password-based Key Derivation Functions in accordance with a specified cryptographic algorithm HMAC-**[selection: *SHA-256, SHA-384, SHA-512* ]**, with **[assignment: *positive integer of 4096 or more*]** iterations, and output cryptographic key sizes **[selection: *128, 256* ]** bits that meet the following: *[NIST SP 800-132]*.

FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3.4

The TSF shall not accept PSKs failing to meet **[selection: *an administrator-defined, a fixed* ]** password policy indicating the maximum PSK length consistent with [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.3.1](#) and **[selection: *[assignment: password policy indicating minimum length and types of characters required]*, no additional password constraints ]**.

FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3.5

The TSF shall generate all salts using an RBG that meets FCS\_RBG\_EXT.1 and with entropy corresponding to the key size selected for PBKDF in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.3.3](#).

FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3.6

The TSF shall require the PSK to be entered in accordance with the **[selection: *user authentication policy, protocol authentication requirement* ]**.

FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3.7

The TSF shall **[selection: *provide a password strength meter, check the password against a denylist, perform no action to assist the user in choosing a strong password* ]**.

**Application Note:** This SFR is claimed if "password-based" is selected in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.2/AuthSvr](#).

For [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.3.1](#), the ST author assigns the maximum size of the PSK it supports; it must support at least 64 characters.

For [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.3.2](#), the ST author assigns any other supported characters; if there are no other supported characters, they should select "no other characters."

For [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.3.3](#), the ST author selects the parameters based on the PBKDF used by the TSF.

For [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.3.4](#), if the minimum length is settable, then the ST author chooses "a value settable by the administrator." If the minimum length is not settable, the ST author fills in the assignment with the minimum length the PSK must be. This requirement is to ensure bounds work properly.

For [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.3.7](#), the ST author may select one, both, or neither of the functions in alignment with NIST SP800-63b.

This requirement is selection-dependent on [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1/AuthSvr](#).

## FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1 Time-Based One-Time Password Pre-Shared Keys

***The inclusion of this selection-based component depends upon selection in [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1.3](#), [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.2/AuthSvr](#).***

FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.1

The TSF shall support Time-Based One-Time Password (TOTP) authentication in accordance with RFC 6238.

FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.2

The TSF shall generate a TOTP seed according to FCS\_RBG\_EXT.1 of **[selection: *128, 256* ]** bits.

FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.3

The TSF shall generate a new TOTP seed for each client.

FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.4

The TSF shall use **[selection: *SHA-1, SHA-256, SHA-384, SHA-512* ]** with key

sizes [**assignment:** *key size (in bits) used in HMAC*] and message digest sizes [**selection:** 160, 256, 384, 512 ] bits to derive a TOTP hash from the TOTP seed and current time provided by NTP.

FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.5

The TSF shall truncate the TOTP hash per [FIA\\_TOTP\\_EXT.1.4](#) to create a TOTP of [**selection:**

- *administrator configurable character length of at least 6*
- *preset character length of [**selection:** 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 ]*

].

FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.6

The TSF shall [**selection:**

- *throttle invalid requests to [**selection:** administrator configurable value, [**assignment:** value less than 10] ] per minute*
- *lock the associated account after [**selection:** administrator configurable value, [**assignment:** value less than 10] ] failed attempts until [**selection:** an administrator unlocks the account, a configurable time period has elapsed ]*

].

FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.7

The TSF shall set a time-step size of [**selection, choose one of:** *a configurable number of, [**assignment:** a value less than or equal to 30] ] seconds.*

FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.8

The TSF shall not validate a TOTP value calculated using a time drift of more than [**selection, choose one of:** *a configurable value, [**assignment:** a value less than or equal to 3] ] time-steps.*

FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.9

The TSF shall [**selection, choose one of:** *allow resynchronization by recording time drift within the limit of [FIA\\_TOTP\\_EXT.1.8](#), not permit resynchronization ]*.

**Application Note:** This SFR is claimed if "TOTP" is selected in [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1.3](#) or if "time based one-time password" is selected in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1.2/AuthSvr](#).

The selection [FIA\\_TOTP\\_EXT.1.4](#) must be consistent with the key size specified for the size of the keys used in conjunction with the keyed-hash message authentication.

In [FIA\\_TOTP\\_EXT.1.5](#), the ST author may either provide a configurable character length of at least 6 or a preset size between 6 and 10.

In [FIA\\_TOTP\\_EXT.1.6](#), the ST author may select throttle requests, account lockout, or both.

The TOTP seed and all derived values are considered secret keys for purposes of protection.

This requirement is selection-dependent on [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1.3](#).

# Appendix C - Extended Component Definitions

This appendix contains the definitions for all extended requirements specified in the Module.

## C.1 Extended Components Table

All extended components specified in the Module are listed in this table:

Table 4: Extended Component Definitions	
Functional Class	Functional Components
Cryptographic Support (FCS)	FCS_EAPTLS_EXT EAP-TLS Protocol FCS_RADIUS_EXT Authentication Protocol FCS_RADSEC_EXT RadSec FCS_STG_EXT Cryptographic Key Storage
Identification and Authentication (FIA)	FIA_HOTP_EXT HMAC-Based One-Time Password Pre-Shared Keys FIA_PSK_EXT Pre-Shared Keys FIA_TOTP_EXT Time-Based One-Time Password Pre-Shared Keys

## C.2 Extended Component Definitions

### C.2.1 Cryptographic Support (FCS)


This Module defines the following extended components as part of the FCS class originally defined by CC Part 2:

#### C.2.1.1 FCS\_EAPTLS\_EXT EAP-TLS Protocol

##### Family Behavior

This family defines requirements for how the TSF implements the Extensible Authentication Protocol (EAP) and EAP-Transport Layer Security.

##### Component Leveling



[FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1](#), EAP-TLS Protocol, requires the TSF to implement EAP and EAP-TLS according to appropriate standards.

##### Management: FCS\_EAPTLS\_EXT.1

No specific management functions are identified.

##### Audit: FCS\_EAPTLS\_EXT.1

The following actions should be auditable if FAU\_GEN Security audit data generation is included in the PP/ST:

- Protocol failures
- Establishment of a TLS session

##### FCS\_EAPTLS\_EXT.1 EAP-TLS Protocol

Hierarchical to: No other components.

Dependencies to: FCS\_RBG\_EXT.1 Random Bit Generation

[FCS\_TLSC\_EXT.1 TLS Client Protocol Without Mutual Authentication, or  
FCS\_DTLSC\_EXT.1 DTLS Client Protocol Without Mutual Authentication]

[FCS\_TLSC\_EXT.2 TLS Client Support for Mutual Authentication, or  
FCS\_DTLSC\_EXT.2 DTLS Client Support for Mutual Authentication]

FIA\_X509\_EXT.1 X.509 Certificate Validation

##### FCS\_EAPTLS\_EXT.1.1

The TSF shall implement [**selection:** *EAP-TLS as specified in RFC 5216, EAP-TTLS as specified in RFC 5881* ] as updated by RFC 8996 with [**selection:** *TLS, DTLS* ] implemented using mutual authentication in accordance with [**selection:** *FCS\_TLSS\_EXT.1 and FCS\_TLSS\_EXT.2, FCS\_DTLSS\_EXT.1 and FCS\_DTLSS\_EXT.2* ].

### FCS\_EAPTLS\_EXT.1.2

The TSF shall generate random values used in the [**selection:** *EAP-TLS, EAP-TTLS* ] exchange using the RBG specified in FCS\_RBG\_EXT.1.

### FCS\_EAPTLS\_EXT.1.3

The TSF shall support claimant authentication using certificates and [**selection:** *static PSK, HOTP, TOTP, [assignment: other authentication-verification protocols], other authentication-verification protocols via pass-through functionality, no other authentication methods* ].

### FCS\_EAPTLS\_EXT.1.4

The TSF shall not forward an EAP-success response to the relying party if the client certificate is not valid according to FIA\_X509\_EXT.1, if the [**selection:** *TLS, DTLS* ] session is not established, or if any of [**selection:** *PSK, HOTP value, TOTP value, no other authenticator* ] required by the authentication policy are not provided or if any of the required authenticators presented in the authentication request is not valid.

## C.2.1.2 FCS\_RADIUS\_EXT Authentication Protocol

### Family Behavior

Components in this family define requirements for implementation of authentication protocols.

### Component Leveling

FCS\_RADIUS\_EXT ————— 1

[FCS\\_RADIUS\\_EXT.1](#), Authentication Protocol, requires the TSF to implement the specified authentication protocols.

### Management: FCS\_RADIUS\_EXT.1

The following actions could be considered for the management functions in FMT:

- Ability to configure RADIUS shared secret
- Ability to define authorized NAS

### Audit: FCS\_RADIUS\_EXT.1

The following actions should be auditable if FAU\_GEN Security audit data generation is included in the PP/ST:

- Protocol failures
- Success/failure of authentication

### FCS\_RADIUS\_EXT.1 Authentication Protocol

Hierarchical to: No other components.

Dependencies to: FCS\_EAPTLS\_EXT.1 EAP-TLS Protocol

### FCS\_RADIUS\_EXT.1.1

The TSF shall implement the [**selection:** *RADIUS protocol as specified in RFC 2865, DIAMETER protocol as specified in RFC 6733, [assignment: other direct identity federation protocol]* ] for communication of identity and authentication information with a relying party.

### FCS\_RADIUS\_EXT.1.2

The TSF shall implement encapsulated EAP in accordance with [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1](#).

### FCS\_RADIUS\_EXT.1.3

The TSF shall provide [**selection:** *a key indicator, an encrypted parameter, an encrypted value* ] for a key held by the successfully authenticated claimant derived from the supported EAP mode and provided to the relying party in accordance with the protocol indicated in [FCS\\_RADIUS\\_EXT.1.1](#).

## C.2.1.3 FCS\_STG\_EXT Cryptographic Key Storage

### Family Behavior

Components in this family define requirements for secure storage of cryptographic keys.

### Component Leveling

FCS\_STG\_EXT ————— 1

[FCS\\_STG\\_EXT.1](#), Cryptographic Key Storage, requires the TSF to identify a mechanism used to securely store cryptographic keys.

#### **Management: FCS\_STG\_EXT.1**

No specific management functions are identified.

#### **Audit: FCS\_STG\_EXT.1**

There are no auditable events foreseen.

#### **FCS\_STG\_EXT.1 Cryptographic Key Storage**

Hierarchical to: No other components.

Dependencies to: None

##### **FCS\_STG\_EXT.1.1**

Persistent private and secret keys shall be stored within the TSF [**selection:**

- *encrypted within a hardware protected key*
- *in a hardware cryptographic module*
- *within an isolated execution environment protected by a hardware key*

].

### **C.2.1.4 FCS\_RADSEC\_EXT RadSec**

#### **Family Behavior**

Components in this family define requirements for the TSF to use RadSec to secure RADIUS data in transit.

#### **Component Leveling**

FCS\_RADSEC\_EXT ————— 1

[FCS\\_RADSEC\\_EXT.1](#), RadSec, defines implementation requirements for RadSec.

#### **Management: FCS\_RADSEC\_EXT.1**

No specific management functions are identified.

#### **Audit: FCS\_RADSEC\_EXT.1**

The following actions should be auditable if FAU\_GEN Security audit data generation is included in the PP/ST:

- Failure to establish RadSec session.

#### **FCS\_RADSEC\_EXT.1 RadSec**

Hierarchical to: No other components.

Dependencies to: FCS\_TLSC\_EXT.1 TLS Client Protocol

FCS\_RADIUS\_EXT.1 Authentication Protocol

FCS\_RBG\_EXT.1 Random Bit Generation

[FIA\_PSK\_EXT.1 Pre-Shared Key Composition, or

FIA\_X509\_EXT.1 X.509 Certificate Validation]

##### **FCS\_RADSEC\_EXT.1.1**

The TSF shall implement RadSec as specified in RFC 6614, as updated by RFC 8996, to communicate securely with a relying party.

##### **FCS\_RADSEC\_EXT.1.2**

The TSF shall perform relying party authentication using [**selection:** *X.509v3 certificates, pre-shared keys* ].

##### **FCS\_RADSEC\_EXT.1.3**

The TSF shall implement RadSec using [**selection:** *TLS, DTLS* ] with mutual authentication.

### **C.2.2 Identification and Authentication (FIA)**


This Module defines the following extended components as part of the FIA class originally defined by CC Part 2:

## C.2.2.1 FIA\_HOTP\_EXT HMAC-Based One-Time Password Pre-Shared Keys

### Family Behavior

Components in this family define requirements for use of HMAC-based One-Time Password authentication, including generation methods and usage restrictions.

### Component Leveling



[FIA\\_HOTP\\_EXT.1](#), HMAC-Based One-Time Password Pre-Shared Keys, defines the implementation of HOTP.

### Management: FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1

No specific management functions are identified.

### Audit: FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1

There are no auditable events foreseen.

### FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1 HMAC-Based One-Time Password Pre-Shared Keys

Hierarchical to: No other components.

Dependencies to: FCS\_COP.1 Cryptographic Operation

FCS\_RBG\_EXT.1 Random Bit Generation

#### FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1.1

The TSF shall support HMAC-Based One-Time Password authentication (HOTP) in accordance with RFC 4226.

#### FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1.2

The TSF shall generate a HOTP seed key according to FCS\_RBG\_EXT.1 of [**selection:** 128, 256 ] bits.

#### FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1.3

The TSF shall generate a new HOTP seed value for each claimant to be authenticated.

#### FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1.4

The TSF shall use [**selection:** SHA-1, SHA-256, SHA-384, SHA-512 ] with key sizes [**assignment:** key size (in bits) used in HMAC] and message digest sizes [**selection:** 160, 256, 384, 512 ] to derive a HOTP hash from the HOTP seed and counter.

#### FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1.5

The TSF shall truncate the HOTP hash per [FIA\\_HOTP\\_EXT.1.4](#) to create an HOTP of [**selection:**

- administrator configurable character length of at least 6
- preset character length of [**selection:** 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 ]

].

#### FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1.6

The TSF shall [**selection:**

- throttle invalid requests to [**selection:**
  - administrator configurable value
  - [**assignment:** value less than 10]]  
] per minute
- lock the associated account after [**selection:** administrator configurable value, [**assignment:** value less than 10] ] failed attempts until [**selection:** an administrator unlocks the account, a configurable time period has elapsed ]

].

#### FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1.7

The TSF shall not verify HOTP attempts outside of the counter look ahead window of [**assignment:** a value less than or equal to 3] [**selection:**

- except for rescynchronization
- where a look ahead window of [**selection:** a configurable value, [**assignment:** fixed value] ] is used to reset the counter but which is not considered a valid HOTP value
- with no exception

].

#### **FIA\_HOTP\_EXT.1.8**


The TSF shall increment the counter after each successful authentication.

### **C.2.2.2 FIA\_PSK\_EXT Pre-Shared Keys**

#### **Family Behavior**

Components in this family describe the requirements for pre-shared keys used for authentication.

#### **Component Leveling**



FIA\_PSK\_EXT.1, Pre-Shared Key Usage, defines the use and composition of pre-shared keys used for authentication.

[FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.2](#), Generated Pre-Shared Keys, defines the use and composition of generated pre-shared keys used for authentication.

[FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.3](#), Password-Based Pre-Shared Keys, defines the use and composition of password-based pre-shared keys used for authentication.

#### **Management: FIA\_PSK\_EXT.1**

No specific management functions are identified.

#### **Audit: FIA\_PSK\_EXT.1**

There are no auditable events foreseen.

#### **FIA\_PSK\_EXT.1 Pre-Shared Key Usage**

Hierarchical to: No other components.

Dependencies to: [FCS\_EAPTLS\_EXT.1 EAP-TLS Protocol, or  
FCS\_IPSEC\_EXT.1 IPsec]

##### **FIA\_PSK\_EXT.1.1**

The TSF shall be able to use pre-shared keys for [**assignment:** *protocols or authentication schemes that use pre-shared keys*].

##### **FIA\_PSK\_EXT.1.2**

The TSF shall be able to accept the following as pre-shared keys: [**assignment:** *types of supported pre-shared keys (e.g. randomly generated, password-based, OTP)*].

#### **Management: FIA\_PSK\_EXT.2**

No specific management functions are identified.

#### **Audit: FIA\_PSK\_EXT.2**

The following actions should be auditable if FAU\_GEN Security Audit Data Generation is included in the PP/ST:

- Failure of the randomization process

#### **FIA\_PSK\_EXT.2 Generated Pre-Shared Keys**

Hierarchical to: No other components.

Dependencies to: FIA\_PSK\_EXT.1 Pre-Shared Key Usage

##### **FIA\_PSK\_EXT.2.1**

The TSF shall be able to [**selection:**

- *accept externally generated pre-shared keys*
- *generate [**selection:** 128, 256 ] bit-based pre-shared keys via FCS\_RBG\_EXT.1.*

].

#### **Management: FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3**

No specific management functions are identified.

### **Audit: FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3**

No auditable events are foreseen.

### **FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3 Password-Based Pre-Shared Keys**

Hierarchical to: No other components.

Dependencies to: FCS\_COP.1 Cryptographic Operation

FCS\_RBG\_EXT.1 Random Bit Generation

FIA\_PSK\_EXT.1 Pre-Shared Key Usage

#### **FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3.1**

The TSF shall support a PSK of up to [**assignment:** *positive integer of 64 or more*] characters.

#### **FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3.2**

The TSF shall allow PSKs to be composed of any combination of uppercase characters, lowercase characters, numbers, the following special characters: "!", "@", "#", "\$", "%", "^", "&", "\*", "(", and ")", and [**selection:** [**assignment:** *other supported special characters*], *no other characters* ].

#### **FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3.3**

The TSF shall perform Password-based Key Derivation Functions in accordance with a specified cryptographic algorithm HMAC-**[selection:** *SHA-256, SHA-384, SHA-512* ], with **[assignment:** *positive integer of 4096 or more*] iterations, and output cryptographic key sizes **[selection:** *128, 256* ] bits that meet the following: *[NIST SP 800-132]*.

#### **FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3.4**

The TSF shall not accept PSKs failing to meet **[selection:** *an administrator-defined, a fixed* ] password policy indicating the maximum PSK length consistent with [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.3.1](#) and **[selection:** *[assignment:* *password policy indicating minimum length and types of characters required*], *no additional password constraints* ].

#### **FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3.5**

The TSF shall generate all salts using an RBG that meets FCS\_RBG\_EXT.1 and with entropy corresponding to the key size selected for PBKDF in [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.3.3](#).

#### **FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3.6**

The TSF shall require the PSK to be entered in accordance with the **[selection:** *user authentication policy, protocol authentication requirement* ].

#### **FIA\_PSK\_EXT.3.7**

The TSF shall **[selection:** *provide a password strength meter, check the password against a denylist, perform no action to assist the user in choosing a strong password* ].

## **C.2.2.3 FIA\_TOTP\_EXT Time-Based One-Time Password Pre-Shared Keys**

### **Family Behavior**

Components in this family define requirements for use of Time-Based One-Time password authentication, including generation methods and usage restrictions.

### **Component Leveling**

FIA\_TOTP\_EXT ———— 1

[FIA\\_TOTP\\_EXT.1](#), Time-Based One-Time Password Pre-Shared Keys, defines the implementation of TOTP.

### **Management: FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1**

No specific management functions are identified.

### **Audit: FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1**

There are no auditable events foreseen.

### **FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1 Time-Based One-Time Password Pre-Shared Keys**

Hierarchical to: No other components.

Dependencies to: FCS\_COP.1 Cryptographic Operation



#### **FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.1**

The TSF shall support Time-Based One-Time Password (TOTP) authentication in accordance with RFC 6238.

#### **FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.2**

The TSF shall generate a TOTP seed according to FCS\_RBG\_EXT.1 of **[selection: 128, 256 ]** bits.

#### **FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.3**

The TSF shall generate a new TOTP seed for each client.

#### **FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.4**

The TSF shall use **[selection: SHA-1, SHA-256, SHA-384, SHA-512 ]** with key sizes **[assignment: key size (in bits) used in HMAC]** and message digest sizes **[selection: 160, 256, 384, 512 ]** bits to derive a TOTP hash from the TOTP seed and current time provided by NTP.

#### **FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.5**

The TSF shall truncate the TOTP hash per [FIA\\_TOTP\\_EXT.1.4](#) to create a TOTP of **[selection:**

- *administrator configurable character length of at least 6*
- *preset character length of **[selection: 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 ]***

**].**

#### **FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.6**

The TSF shall **[selection:**

- *throttle invalid requests to **[selection: administrator configurable value, [assignment: value less than 10] ]** per minute*
- *lock the associated account after **[selection: administrator configurable value, [assignment: value less than 10] ]** failed attempts until **[selection: an administrator unlocks the account, a configurable time period has elapsed ]***

**].**

#### **FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.7**

The TSF shall set a time-step size of **[selection, choose one of: a configurable number of, [assignment: a value less than or equal to 30] ]** seconds.

#### **FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.8**

The TSF shall not validate a TOTP value calculated using a time drift of more than **[selection, choose one of: a configurable value, [assignment: a value less than or equal to 3] ]** time-steps.

#### **FIA\_TOTP\_EXT.1.9**

The TSF shall **[selection, choose one of: allow resynchronization by recording time drift within the limit of [FIA\\_TOTP\\_EXT.1.8](#), not permit resynchronization ]**.

# Appendix D - Implicitly Satisfied Requirements

This appendix lists requirements that should be considered satisfied by products successfully evaluated against this Module. These requirements are not featured explicitly as SFRs and should not be included in the ST. They are not included as standalone SFRs because it would increase the time, cost, and complexity of evaluation. This approach is permitted by [\[CC\]](#) Part 1, 8.2 Dependencies between components.

This information benefits systems engineering activities which call for inclusion of particular security controls. Evaluation against the PP provides evidence that these controls are present and have been evaluated.

This PP-Module has no implicitly satisfied requirements. All SFR dependencies are explicitly met either through SFRs defined by the PP-Module or inherited from the Base-PP.

# Appendix E - Allocation of Requirements in Distributed TOEs

For a distributed TOE, the security functional requirements in this PP-Module need to be met by the TOE as a whole, but not all SFRs will necessarily be implemented by all components. The following categories are defined in order to specify when each SFR must be implemented by a component:

- **All Components ("All")** —All components that comprise the distributed TOE must independently satisfy the requirement.
- **At least one Component ("One")** —This requirement must be fulfilled by at least one component within the distributed TOE.
- **Feature Dependent ("Feature Dependent")** — These requirements will only be fulfilled where the feature is implemented by the distributed TOE component (note that the requirement to meet the PP-Module as a whole requires that at least one component implements these requirements if they are claimed by the TOE).

The table below specifies how each of the SFRs in this PP-Module must be met, using the categories above.

Requirement	Description	Distributed TOE SFR Allocation
<a href="#">FAU_GEN.1/AuthSvr</a>	Audit Data Generation (Authentication Server)	All
<a href="#">FCO_NRO.1</a>	Selective Proof of Origin	Implementation-dependent
<a href="#">FCO_NRR.1</a>	Selective Proof of Receipt	Implementation-dependent
<a href="#">FCS_CKM.3</a>	Cryptographic Key Access	All
<a href="#">FCS_EAPTLS_EXT.1</a>	EAP-TLS Protocol	Implementation-dependent
<a href="#">FCS_RADIUS_EXT.1</a>	Authentication Protocol	Implementation-dependent
<a href="#">FCS_STG_EXT.1</a>	Cryptographic Key Storage	All
<a href="#">FIA_AFL.1/AuthSvr</a>	Authentication Failure Handling (Claimant)	Implementation-dependent
<a href="#">FIA_X509_EXT.1/AuthSvr</a>	X.509 Certificate Validation (Claimant)	Implementation-dependent
<a href="#">FIA_UAU.6</a>	Re-Authenticating	Implementation-dependent
<a href="#">FMT_SMF.1/AuthSvr</a>	Specification of Management Functions (Authentication Server)	All
<a href="#">FTA_TSE.1</a>	TOE Session Establishment	Implementation-dependent
<a href="#">FTP_ITC.1/NAS</a>	Inter-TSF Trusted Channel (Relying Party Communications)	Implementation-dependent
<a href="#">FCS_RADSEC_EXT.1</a> (selection-based)	RadSec	Implementation-dependent
<a href="#">FIA_HOTP_EXT.1</a> (selection-based)	HMAC-Based One-Time Password Pre-Shared Keys	Implementation-dependent
<a href="#">FIA_PSK_EXT.1/AuthSvr</a> (selection-based)	Pre-Shared Key Usage	Implementation-dependent
<a href="#">FIA_PSK_EXT.2</a> (selection-based)	Generated Pre-Shared Keys	Implementation-dependent
<a href="#">FIA_PSK_EXT.3</a> (selection-based)	Password-Based Pre-Shared Keys	Implementation-dependent
<a href="#">FIA_TOTP_EXT.1</a> (selection-based)	Time-Based One-Time Password Pre-Shared Keys	Implementation-dependent

# Appendix F - Entropy Documentation and Assessment

The TOE does not require any additional supplementary information to describe its entropy sources beyond the requirements outlined in the Base-PP.

# Appendix G - Acronyms

Acronym	Meaning
AAA	Authentication, Authorization, and Accounting
Base-PP	Base Protection Profile
CC	Common Criteria
CEM	Common Evaluation Methodology
cPP	Collaborative Protection Profile
CRL	Certificate Revocation List
CSI	Cryptographic Security Information
DTLS	Datagram Transport Layer Security
EAP	Extensible Authentication Protocol
HOTP	Hash-Based One-Time Password
IPsec	Internet Protocol Security
OCSP	Online Certificate Status Protocol
OE	Operational Environment
PBKDF	Password-Based Key Derivation Function
PP	Protection Profile
PP-Configuration	Protection Profile Configuration
PP-Module	Protection Profile Module
PSK	Pre-Shared Key
RADIUS	Remote Authentication Dial In User Service
RBG	Random Bit Generator
RP	Relying Party
SAR	Security Assurance Requirement
SFR	Security Functional Requirement
SSH	Secure Shell
ST	Security Target
TLS	Transport Layer Security
TOE	Target of Evaluation
TOTP	Time-Based One-Time Password
TSF	TOE Security Functionality
TSFI	TSF Interface
TSS	TOE Summary Specification
WLAN	Wireless Local Area Network

# Appendix H - Bibliography

Identifier	Title
[CC]	Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation - <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Part 1: Introduction and General Model</a>, CCMB-2017-04-001, Version 3.1 Revision 5, April 2017.</li><li>• <a href="#">Part 2: Security Functional Components</a>, CCMB-2017-04-002, Version 3.1 Revision 5, April 2017.</li><li>• <a href="#">Part 3: Security Assurance Components</a>, CCMB-2017-04-003, Version 3.1 Revision 5, April 2017.</li></ul>
[NDcPP]	<a href="#">collaborative Protection Profile for Network Devices</a> , Version 2.2e, March 23, 2020
[NDcPP SD]	<a href="#">Supporting Document - Evaluation Activities for Network Device cPP</a> , Version 2.2, December 2019