Collaborative Protection Profile for Network Devices

Version: 2.2e
2020-03-23
National Information Assurance Partnership

Foreword

1 Acknowledgements

blah

2 Preface

2.1 Objectives of Document

Words

2.2 Scope of Document

Words

2.3 Intended Readership

Words

2.4 Related Documents

Words

Revision History

Version	Date	Comment
0.1	2014-09-05	Draft published for Public review
0.2	2014-10-13	Internal draft in response to public review comments, for iTC review
0.3	2014-10-17	Draft version released to accompany CCDB review of Supporting Document.
0.4	2015-01-26	Incorporated comments received from the CCDB review
1.0	2015-02-27	Released for use
1.1	2016-07-21	Updated draft published for public review
2.0	2017-05-05	Released for use
2.1	2018-09-24	Released for use
2.2	2019-12-20	Released for use
2.2e	2020-03-23	Released for use

Contents

3 Introduction

3.1 PP Overview

words

3.2 TOE Use Cases

Words

4 Conformance Claims

Conformance Statement

An ST must claim exact conformance to this PP, as defined in the CC and CEM addenda for Exact Conformance, Selection-based SFRs, and Optional SFRs (dated May 2017).

CC Conformance Claims

This PP is conformant to Parts 2 (extended) and 3 (conformant) of Common Criteria Version 3.1, Revision 5.

PP Claim

This PP does not claim conformance to any Protection Profile.

Package Claim

This PP does not claim conformance to any packages.

5 Introduction to Distributed TOEs

words

5.1 Supported Distributed TOE Use Cases

words

5.2 Unsupported Distributed TOE Use Cases

words

5.3 Registration of Components of a Distributed TOE

words

5.4 Allocation of Requirements in Distributed TOEs

words

6 Security Problem Description

A Network Device has a network infrastructure role that it is designed to provide. In doing so, the Network Device communicates with other Network Devices and other network entities (i.e. entities not defined as Network Devices because they do not have an infrastructure role) over the network. At the same time, it must provide a minimal set of common security functionality expected by all Network Devices. The security problem to be addressed by a compliant Network Device is defined as this set of common security functionality that addresses the threats that are common to Network Devices, as opposed to those that might be targeting the specific functionality of a specific type of Network Device. The set of common security functionality addresses communication with the Network Device, both authorized and unauthorized, the ability to perform valid and secure updates, the ability to audit device activity, the ability to securely store and utilize device and Administrator credentials and data, and the ability to self-test critical device components for failures.

6.1 Threats

T.NETWORK_ATTACK
> An attacker is positioned on a communications channel or elsewhere on the network infrastructure. Attackers may engage in communications with applications and services running on or part of the OS with the intent of compromise. Engagement may consist of altering existing legitimate communications.

T.NETWORK_EAVESDROP
> An attacker is positioned on a communications channel or elsewhere on the network infrastructure. Attackers may monitor and gain access to data exchanged between applications and services that are running on or part of the OS.

T.LOCAL_ATTACK
> An attacker may compromise applications running on the OS. The compromised application may provide maliciously formatted input to the OS through a variety of channels including unprivileged system calls and messaging via the file system.

T.LIMITED_PHYSICAL_ACCESS
> An attacker may attempt to access data on the OS while having a limited amount of time with the physical device.

6.2 Assumptions

A.PLATFORM
> The OS relies upon a trustworthy computing platform for its execution. This underlying platform is out of scope of this PP.

A.PROPER_USER
> The user of the OS is not willfully negligent or hostile, and uses the software in compliance with the applied enterprise security policy. At the same time, malicious software could act *as* the user, so requirements which confine malicious subjects are still in scope.

A.PROPER_ADMIN
> The administrator of the OS is not careless, willfully negligent or hostile, and administers the OS within compliance of the applied enterprise security policy.

6.3 Organizational Security Policies

P.ENTERPRISE
> If the OS is bound to a directory or management server, the configuration of the OS software must be capable of adhering to the enterprise security policies distributed by them.

7 Security Objectives

7.1 Security Objectives for the TOE

O.ACCOUNTABILITY

Conformant OSes ensure that information exists that allows administrators to discover unintentional issues with the configuration and operation of the operating system and discover its cause. Gathering event information and immediately transmitting it to another system can also enable incident response in the event of system compromise.

O.INTEGRITY

Conformant OSes ensure the integrity of their update packages. OSes are seldom if ever shipped without errors, and the ability to deploy patches and updates with integrity is critical to enterprise network security. Conformant OSes provide execution environment-based mitigations that increase the cost to attackers by adding complexity to the task of compromising systems.

O.MANAGEMENT

To facilitate management by users and the enterprise, conformant OSes provide consistent and supported interfaces for their security-relevant configuration and maintenance. This includes the deployment of applications and application updates through the use of platform-supported deployment mechanisms and formats, as well as providing mechanisms for configuration and application execution control.

O.PROTECTED_STORAGE

To address the issue of loss of confidentiality of credentials in the event of loss of physical control of the storage medium, conformant OSes provide data-at-rest protection for credentials. Conformant OSes also provide access controls which allow users to keep their files private from other users of the same system.

O.PROTECTED_COMMS

To address both passive (eavesdropping) and active (packet modification) network attack threats, conformant OSes provide mechanisms to create trusted channels for CSP and sensitive data. Both CSP and sensitive data should not be exposed outside of the platform.

7.2 Security Objectives for the Operational Environment

The following security objectives for the operational environment assist the OS in correctly providing its security functionality. These track with the assumptions about the environment.

OE.PLATFORM

The OS relies on being installed on trusted hardware.

OE.PROPER_USER

The user of the OS is not willfully negligent or hostile, and uses the software within compliance of the applied enterprise security policy. Standard user accounts are provisioned in accordance with the least privilege model. Users requiring higher levels of access should have a separate account dedicated for that use.

OE.PROPER_ADMIN

The administrator of the OS is not careless, willfully negligent or hostile, and administers the OS within compliance of the applied enterprise security policy.

7.3 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.NETWORK_ATTACK	O.PROTECTED_COMMS	The threat T.NETWORK_ATTACK is countered by O.PROTECTED_COMMS as this provides for integrity of transmitted data.
	O.INTEGRITY	The threat T.NETWORK_ATTACK is countered by O.INTEGRITY as this provides for integrity of software that is installed onto the system from the network.
	O.MANAGEMENT	The threat T.NETWORK_ATTACK is countered by O.MANAGEMENT as this provides for the ability to configure the OS to defend against network attack.

	O.ACCOUNTABILITY	The threat T.NETWORK_ATTACK is countered by O.ACCOUNTABILITY as this provides a mechanism for the OS to report behavior that may indicate a network attack has occurred.
T.NETWORK_ EAVESDROP	O.PROTECTED_ COMMS	The threat T.NETWORK_EAVESDROP is countered by O.PROTECTED_COMMS as this provides for confidentiality of transmitted data.
	O.MANAGEMENT	The threat T.NETWORK_EAVESDROP is countered by O.MANAGEMENT as this provides for the ability to configure the OS to protect the confidentiality of its transmitted data.
T.LOCAL_ ATTACK	O.INTEGRITY	The objective O.INTEGRITY protects against the use of mechanisms that weaken the TOE with regard to attack by other software on the platform.
	O.ACCOUNTABILITY	The objective O.ACCOUNTABILITY protects against local attacks by providing a mechanism to report behavior that may indicate a local attack is occurring or has occurred.
T.LIMITED_ PHYSICAL_ ACCESS	O.PROTECTED_ STORAGE	The objective O.PROTECTED_STORAGE protects against unauthorized attempts to access physical storage used by the TOE.
A.PLATFORM	OE.PLATFORM	The operational environment objective OE.PLATFORM is realized through A.PLATFORM.
A.PROPER_ USER	OE.PROPER_USER	The operational environment objective OE.PROPER_USER is realized through A.PROPER_USER.
A.PROPER_ ADMIN	OE.PROPER_ADMIN	The operational environment objective OE.PROPER_ADMIN is realized through A.PROPER_ADMIN.
P.ENTERPRISE	O.MANAGEMENT	The organizational security policy P.ENTERPRISE is enforced through the objective O.MANAGEMENT as this objective represents how the enterprise and user assert management over the OS.

8 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 ~~strikethrough 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."

The individual security functional requirements are specified in the sections below. SFRs in this section are mandatory SFRs that any conformant TOE must meet. Based on selections made in these SFRs it will also be necessary to include some of the selection-based SFRs in Appendix B. Additional optional SFRs may also be adopted from those listed in Appendix A.

For a distributed TOE, the ST author should reference Table 1 for guidance on how each SFR should be met. The table details whether SFRs should be met by all TOE components, by at least one TOE component or whether they are dependent upon the feature being implemented by the TOE component. The ST for a distributed TOE must include a mapping of SFRs to each of the components of the TOE. (Note that this deliverable is examined as part of the ASE_TSS.1 and AVA_VAN.1 Evaluation Activities as described in [SD, 5.1.2] and [SD, 5.6.1.1] respectively.

The Evaluation Activities defined in [SD] describe actions that the evaluator will take in order to determine compliance of a particular TOE with the SFRs. The content of these Evaluation Activities will therefore provide more insight into deliverables required from TOE Developers.

8.1 Conventions

The conventions used in descriptions of the SFRs are as follows:

8.2 SFR Architecture

Insert section 6.2 here.

8.3 Security Functional Requirements

8.3.1 Security Audit (FAU)

FAU_GEN.1 Audit data generation

FAU_GEN.1.1

The TOE shall [**selection**: *Dummy, Other*]

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▽

> *FAU_GEN.1*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FAU_GEN.2 User identity association

FAU_GEN.2.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▽

> *FAU_GEN.2*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FAU_GEN_EXT.1 Security Audit Generation

> ***This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from***
> ***FAU_GEN.1.1.***

FAU_GEN_EXT.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ⌄

> *FAU_GEN_EXT.1*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FAU_STG.1 Protected Audit Trail Storage

> ***This is an optional component. However, applied modules or packages might redefine it***
> ***as mandatory.***

FAU_STG.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ⌄

> *FAU_STG.1*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FAU_STG_EXT.1 Protected Audit Event Storage

FAU_STG_EXT.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ⌄

> *FAU_STG_EXT.1*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FAU_STG_EXT.2/LocSpace Protected Audit Event Storage

> ***This is an optional component. However, applied modules or packages might redefine it***
> ***as mandatory.***

FAU_STG_EXT.2.1/LocSpace

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

FAU_STG_EXT.2/LocSpace
Something
TSS
ABC

FAU_STG_EXT.3/LocSpace Action in Case of Possible Audit Data Loss

This is an optional component. However, applied modules or packages might redefine it as mandatory.

FAU_STG_EXT.3.1/LocSpace
The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

FAU_STG_EXT.3/LocSpace
Something
TSS
ABC

FAU_STG_EXT.4 Protected Local Audit Event Storage for Distributed TOEs

This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from FAU_GEN.1.1.

FAU_STG_EXT.4.1
The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

FAU_STG_EXT.4
Something
TSS
ABC

FAU_STG_EXT.5 Protected Remote Audit Event Storage for Distributed TOEs

This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from FAU_GEN.1.1.

FAU_STG_EXT.5.1
The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

FAU_STG_EXT.5
Something
TSS
ABC

8.3.2 Communication (FCO)

FCO_CPC_EXT.1 Component Registration Channel Definition

> *This is an optional component. However, applied modules or packages might redefine it as mandatory.*

FCO_CPC_EXT.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCO_CPC_EXT.1*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

8.3.3 Cryptographic Support (FCS)

FCS_CKM.1 Cryptographic Key Generation (Refinement)

FCS_CKM.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCS_CKM.1*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FCS_CKM.2 Cryptographic Key Establishment (Refinement)

FCS_CKM.2.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCS_CKM.2*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FCS_CKM.4 Cryptographic Key Destruction

FCS_CKM.4.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCS_CKM.4*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FCS_COP.1/DataEncryption Cryptographic Operation (AES Data Encryption/Decryption)

FCS_COP.1.1/DataEncryption

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCS_COP.1/DataEncryption*
> *Something*
> ***TSS***
> *ABC*

FCS_COP.1/SigGen Cryptographic Operation (Signature Generation and Verification)

FCS_COP.1.1/SigGen

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCS_COP.1/SigGen*
> *Something*
> ***TSS***
> *ABC*

FCS_COP.1/Hash Cryptographic Operation (Hash Algorithm)

FCS_COP.1.1/Hash

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCS_COP.1/Hash*
> *Something*
> ***TSS***
> *ABC*

FCS_COP.1/KeyedHash Cryptographic Operation (Keyed Hash Algorithm)

FCS_COP.1.1/KeyedHash

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCS_COP.1/KeyedHash*
> *Something*
> ***TSS***
> *ABC*

FCS_DTLSC_EXT.1 DTLS Client Support without Authentication

> ***This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from***
> ***FAU_GEN.1.1.***

FCS_DTLSC_EXT.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCS_DTLSC_EXT.1*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FCS_DTLSC_EXT.2 DTLS Client Support for Mutual Authentication

> ***This is an optional component. However, applied modules or packages might redefine it as mandatory.***

FCS_DTLSC_EXT.2.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCS_DTLSC_EXT.2*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FCS_DTLSS_EXT.1 DTLS Server Support without Authentication

> ***This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from FAU_GEN.1.1.***

FCS_DTLSS_EXT.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCS_DTLSS_EXT.1*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FCS_DTLSS_EXT.2 DTLS Server Support for Mutual Authentication

> ***This is an optional component. However, applied modules or packages might redefine it as mandatory.***

FCS_DTLSS_EXT.2.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCS_DTLSS_EXT.2*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FCS_HTTPS_EXT.1 HTTPS Protocol

> ***This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from [FAU_GEN.1.1](#).***

FCS_HTTPS_EXT.1.1

> The TOE shall

> **Application Note:**

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *[FCS_HTTPS_EXT.1](#)*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FCS_IPSEC_EXT.1 IPsec Protocol

> ***This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from [FAU_GEN.1.1](#).***

FCS_IPSEC_EXT.1.1

> The TOE shall

> **Application Note:**

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *[FCS_IPSEC_EXT.1](#)*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FCS_NTP_EXT.1 NTP Protocol

> ***This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from [FAU_GEN.1.1](#).***

FCS_NTP_EXT.1.1

> The TOE shall

> **Application Note:**

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *[FCS_NTP_EXT.1](#)*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FCS_RBG_EXT.1 Random Bit Generation

FCS_RBG_EXT.1.1

> The TOE shall

> **Application Note:**

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *[FCS_RBG_EXT.1](#)*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FCS_SSHC_EXT.1 SSH Client Protocol

> ***This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from FAU_GEN.1.1.***

FCS_SSHC_EXT.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCS_SSHC_EXT.1*
> *Something*
> ***TSS***
> *ABC*

FCS_SSHS_EXT.1 SSH Server Protocol

> ***This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from FAU_GEN.1.1.***

FCS_SSHS_EXT.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCS_SSHS_EXT.1*
> *Something*
> ***TSS***
> *ABC*

FCS_TLSC_EXT.1 TLS Client Protocol

> ***This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from FAU_GEN.1.1.***

FCS_TLSC_EXT.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCS_TLSC_EXT.1*
> *Something*
> ***TSS***
> *ABC*

FCS_TLSC_EXT.2 TLS Client Support for Mutual Authentication

> ***This is an optional component. However, applied modules or packages might redefine it as mandatory.***

FCS_TLSC_EXT.2.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCS_TLSC_EXT.2*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FCS_TLSS_EXT.1 TLS Server Protocol

> ***This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from FAU_GEN.1.1.***

FCS_TLSS_EXT.1.1

       The TOE shall

       Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCS_TLSS_EXT.1*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FCS_TLSS_EXT.2 TLS Server Support for Mutual Authentication

> ***This is an optional component. However, applied modules or packages might redefine it as mandatory.***

FCS_TLSS_EXT.2.1

       The TOE shall

       Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FCS_TLSS_EXT.2*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

8.3.4 Identification and Authentication (FIA)

FIA_AFL.1 Authentication Failure Management (Refinement)

FIA_AFL.1.1

       The TOE shall

       Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FIA_AFL.1*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FIA_PMG_EXT.1 Password Management

FIA_PMG_EXT.1.1

       The TOE shall

       Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FIA_PMG_EXT.1*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FIA_UIA_EXT.1 User Identification and Authentication

FIA_UIA_EXT.1.1

> The TOE shall

> **Application Note:**

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FIA_UIA_EXT.1*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FIA_UAU_EXT.2 Password-based Authentication Mechanism

FIA_UAU_EXT.2.1

> The TOE shall

> **Application Note:**

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FIA_UAU_EXT.2*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FIA_UAU.7 Protected Authentication Feedback

FIA_UAU.7.1

> The TOE shall

> **Application Note:**

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FIA_UAU.7*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FIA_X509_EXT.1/ITT Certificate Validation

> ***This is an optional component. However, applied modules or packages might redefine it as mandatory.***

FIA_X509_EXT.1.1/ITT

> The TOE shall

> **Application Note:**

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FIA_X509_EXT.1/ITT*

> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FIA_X509_EXT.1/Rev X.509 Certificate Validation

> ***This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from FAU_GEN.1.1.***

FIA_X509_EXT.1.1/Rev

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FIA_X509_EXT.1/Rev*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FIA_X509_EXT.2 X.509 Certificate Authentication

> ***This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from FAU_GEN.1.1.***

FIA_X509_EXT.2.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FIA_X509_EXT.2*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FIA_X509_EXT.3 X.509 Certificate Requests

> ***This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from FAU_GEN.1.1.***

FIA_X509_EXT.3.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FIA_X509_EXT.3*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

8.3.5 Security Management (FMT)

FMT_MOF.1/ManualUpdate Management of Security Functions Behaviour

FMT_MOF.1.1/ManualUpdate

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

FMT_MOF.1/ManualUpdate
Something
TSS
ABC

FMT_MOF.1/Services Management of Security Functions Behaviour

This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from FAU_GEN.1.1.

FMT_MOF.1.1/Services
The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

FMT_MOF.1/Services
Something
TSS
ABC

FMT_MOF.1/AutoUpdate Management of Security Functions Behaviour

This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from FAU_GEN.1.1.

FMT_MOF.1.1/AutoUpdate
The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

FMT_MOF.1/AutoUpdate
Something
TSS
ABC

FMT_MOF.1/Functions Management of Security Functions Behaviour

This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from FAU_GEN.1.1.

FMT_MOF.1.1/Functions
The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

FMT_MOF.1/Functions
Something
TSS
ABC

FMT_MTD.1/CoreData Management of TSF Data

FMT_MTD.1.1/CoreData

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FMT_MTD.1/CoreData*
> *Something*
> ***TSS***
> *ABC*

FMT_MTD.1/CryptoKeys Management of TSF Data

> ***This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from .***

FMT_MTD.1.1/CryptoKeys

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FMT_MTD.1/CryptoKeys*
> *Something*
> ***TSS***
> *ABC*

FMT_SMF.1 Specification of Management Functions

FMT_SMF.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FMT_SMF.1*
> *Something*
> ***TSS***
> *ABC*

FMT_SMR.2 Restrictions on security roles

FMT_SMR.2.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FMT_SMR.2*
> *Something*
> ***TSS***
> *ABC*

8.3.6 Protection of the TSF (FPT)

FPT_SKP_EXT.1 Protection of TSF Data (for reading of all pre-shared, symmetric and private keys)

FPT_SKP_EXT.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FPT_SKP_EXT.1*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FPT_APW_EXT.1 Protection of Administrator Passwords

FPT_APW_EXT.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FPT_APW_EXT.1*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FPT_ITT.1 Basic internal TSF data transfer protection (Refinement)

> ***This is an optional component. However, applied modules or packages might redefine it as mandatory.***

FPT_ITT.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FPT_ITT.1*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FPT_STM_EXT.1 Reliable Time Stamps

FPT_STM_EXT.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FPT_STM_EXT.1*
> *Something*
> **TSS**
> *ABC*

FPT_TST_EXT.1 TSF Testing

FPT_TST_EXT.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

FPT_TST_EXT.1
Something
TSS
ABC

FPT_TUD_EXT.1 Trusted Update

FPT_TUD_EXT.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

FPT_TUD_EXT.1
Something
TSS
ABC

FPT_TUD_EXT.2 Trusted Update Based on Certificates

This is a selection-based component. Its inclusion depends upon selection from
FAU_GEN.1.1.

FPT_TUD_EXT.2.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

FPT_TUD_EXT.2
Something
TSS
ABC

8.3.7 TOE Access (FTA)

FTA_SSL_EXT.1 TSF-initiated Session Locking

FTA_SSL_EXT.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

FTA_SSL_EXT.1
Something
TSS
ABC

FTA_SSL.3 TSF-initiated Termination (Refinement)

FTA_SSL.3.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

<div style="border:1px solid gray; padding:10px;">

FTA_SSL.3
Something
TSS
ABC

</div>

FTA_SSL.4 User-initiated Termination (Refinement)

FTA_SSL.4.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

<div style="border:1px solid gray; padding:10px;">

FTA_SSL.4
Something
TSS
ABC

</div>

FTA_TAB.1 Default TOE Access Banners (Refinement)

FTA_TAB.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

<div style="border:1px solid gray; padding:10px;">

FTA_TAB.1
Something
TSS
ABC

</div>

8.3.8 Trusted Channel (FTP_ITC)

FTP_ITC.1 Inter-TSF Trusted Channel (Refinement)

FTP_ITC.1.1

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

<div style="border:1px solid gray; padding:10px;">

FTP_ITC.1
Something
TSS
ABC

</div>

FTP_TRP.1/Admin Trusted Path (Refinement)

FTP_TRP.1.1/Admin

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

<div style="border:1px solid gray; padding:10px;">

FTP_TRP.1/Admin
Something
TSS
ABC

</div>

FTP_TRP.1/Join Trusted Path (Refinement)

> ***This is an optional component. However, applied modules or packages might redefine it as mandatory.***

FTP_TRP.1.1/Join

The TOE shall

Application Note:

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *FTP_TRP.1/Join*
> *Something*
> ***TSS***
> *ABC*

8.3.9 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 2: SFR Rationale

Objective	Addressed by	Rationale
O.ACCOUNTABILITY	FAU_GEN.1	'cause FAU_GEN.1 is awesome
	FTP_ITC_EXT.1	Cause FTP reasons
O.INTEGRITY	FPT_SBOP_EXT.1	For reasons
	FPT_ASLR_EXT.1	ASLR For reasons
	FPT_TUD_EXT.1	For reasons
	FPT_TUD_EXT.2	For reasons
	FCS_COP.1/HASH	For reasons
	FCS_COP.1/SIGN	For reasons
	FCS_COP.1/KEYHMAC	For reasons
	FPT_ACF_EXT.1	For reasons
	FPT_SRP_EXT.1	For reasons
	FIA_X509_EXT.1	For reasons
	FPT_TST_EXT.1	For reasons
	FTP_ITC_EXT.1	For reasons
	FPT_W^X_EXT.1	For reasons
	FIA_AFL.1	For reasons
	FIA_UAU.5	For reasons
O.MANAGEMENT	FMT_MOF_EXT.1	For reasons
	FMT_SMF_EXT.1	For reasons
	FTA_TAB.1	For reasons
	FTP_TRP.1	For reasons
O.PROTECTED_STORAGE	FCS_STO_EXT.1, FCS_RBG_EXT.1, FCS_COP.1/ENCRYPT, FDP_ACF_EXT.1	Rationale for a big chunk

| O.PROTECTED_COMMS | FCS_RBG_EXT.1, FCS_CKM.1, FCS_CKM.2, FCS_CKM_EXT.4, FCS_COP.1/ENCRYPT, FCS_COP.1/HASH, FCS_COP.1/SIGN, FCS_COP.1/HMAC, FDP_IFC_EXT.1, FIA_X509_EXT.1, FIA_X509_EXT.2, FTP_ITC_EXT.1 | Rationale for a big chunk |

8.4 Security Assurance Requirements

The Security Objectives in Section 7 Security Objectives were constructed to address threats identified in Section 6.1 Threats. The Security Functional Requirements (SFRs) in Section 8.3 Security Functional Requirements are a formal instantiation of the Security Objectives. The PP identifies the Security Assurance Requirements (SARs) to frame the extent to which the evaluator assesses the documentation applicable for the evaluation and performs independent testing.

This section lists the set of SARs from CC part 3 that are required in evaluations against this PP. Individual Assurance Activities to be performed are specified both in Section 8.3 Security Functional Requirements as well as in this section.

The general model for evaluation of OSs against STs written to conform to this PP is as follows:

After the ST has been approved for evaluation, the ITSEF will obtain the OS, supporting environmental IT, and the administrative/user guides for the OS. The ITSEF is expected to perform actions mandated by the Common Evaluation Methodology (CEM) for the ASE and ALC SARs. The ITSEF also performs the Assurance Activities contained within Section 8.3 Security Functional Requirements, which are intended to be an interpretation of the other CEM assurance requirements as they apply to the specific technology instantiated in the OS. The Assurance Activities that are captured in Section 8.3 Security Functional Requirements also provide clarification as to what the developer needs to provide to demonstrate the OS is compliant with the PP.

8.4.1 Class ASE: Security Target

As per ASE activities defined in [CEM].

8.4.2 Class ADV: Development

The information about the OS is contained in the guidance documentation available to the end user as well as the TSS portion of the ST. The OS developer must concur with the description of the product that is contained in the TSS as it relates to the functional requirements. The Assurance Activities contained in Section 8.3 Security Functional Requirements should provide the ST authors with sufficient information to determine the appropriate content for the TSS section.

ADV_FSP.1 Basic Functional Specification (ADV_FSP.1)

The functional specification describes the TSFI. It is not necessary to have a formal or complete specification of these interfaces. Additionally, because OSs conforming to this PP will necessarily have interfaces to the Operational Environment that are not directly invokable by OS users, there is little point specifying that such interfaces be described in and of themselves since only indirect testing of such interfaces may be possible. For this PP, the activities for this family should focus on understanding the interfaces presented in the TSS in response to the functional requirements and the interfaces presented in the AGD documentation. No additional "functional specification" documentation is necessary to satisfy the assurance activities specified. The interfaces that need to be evaluated are characterized through the information needed to perform the assurance activities listed, rather than as an independent, abstract list.

Developer action elements:

ADV_FSP.1.1D

> The developer shall provide a functional specification.

Content and presentation elements:

ADV_FSP.1.1C

> The developer shall provide a tracing from the functional specification to the SFRs.
>
> **Application Note:** As indicated in the introduction to this section, the functional specification is comprised of the information contained in the AGD_OPE and AGD_PRE documentation. The developer may reference a website accessible to application developers and the evaluator. The assurance activities in the functional requirements point to evidence that should exist in the documentation and TSS section; since these are directly associated with the SFRs, the tracing in element ADV_FSP.1.2D is implicitly already done and no additional documentation is necessary.

ADV_FSP.1.2C

> The functional specification shall describe the purpose and method of use for each SFR-enforcing and SFR-supporting TSFI.

ADV_FSP.1.3C

> The functional specification shall identify all parameters associated with each

SFR-enforcing and SFR-supporting TSFI.

ADV_FSP.1.4C

The functional specification shall provide rationale for the implicit categorization of interfaces as SFR-non-interfering.

ADV_FSP.1.5C

The tracing shall demonstrate that the SFRs trace to TSFIs in the functional specification.

Evaluator action elements:

ADV_FSP.1.1E

The evaluator shall confirm that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

ADV_FSP.1.2E

The evaluator shall determine that the functional specification is an accurate and complete instantiation of the SFRs.

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *ADV_FSP.1*
> *There are no specific assurance activities associated with these SARs, except ensuring the information is provided. The functional specification documentation is provided to support the evaluation activities described in Section 8.3 Security Functional Requirements, and other activities described for AGD, ATE, and AVA SARs. The requirements on the content of the functional specification information is implicitly assessed by virtue of the other assurance activities being performed; if the evaluator is unable to perform an activity because there is insufficient interface information, then an adequate functional specification has not been provided.*

8.4.3 Class AGD: Guidance Documentation

The guidance documents will be provided with the ST. Guidance must include a description of how the IT personnel verifies that the Operational Environment can fulfill its role for the security functionality. The documentation should be in an informal style and readable by the IT personnel. Guidance must be provided for every operational environment that the product supports as claimed in the ST. This guidance includes instructions to successfully install the TSF in that environment; and Instructions to manage the security of the TSF as a product and as a component of the larger operational environment. Guidance pertaining to particular security functionality is also provided; requirements on such guidance are contained in the assurance activities specified with each requirement.

AGD_OPE.1 Operational User Guidance (AGD_OPE.1)

Developer action elements:

AGD_OPE.1.1D

The developer shall provide operational user guidance.

Application Note: The operational user guidance does not have to be contained in a single document. Guidance to users, administrators and application developers can be spread among documents or web pages. Rather than repeat information here, the developer should review the assurance activities for this component to ascertain the specifics of the guidance that the evaluator will be checking for. This will provide the necessary information for the preparation of acceptable guidance.

Content and presentation elements:

AGD_OPE.1.1C

The operational user guidance shall describe, for each user role, the user-accessible functions and privileges that should be controlled in a secure processing environment, including appropriate warnings.

Application Note: User and administrator are to be considered in the definition of user role.

AGD_OPE.1.2C

The operational user guidance shall describe, for each user role, how to use the available interfaces provided by the OS in a secure manner.

AGD_OPE.1.3C

The operational user guidance shall describe, for each user role, the available functions and interfaces, in particular all security parameters under the control

of the user, indicating secure values as appropriate.

Application Note: This portion of the operational user guidance should be presented in the form of a checklist that can be quickly executed by IT personnel (or end-users, when necessary) and suitable for use in compliance activities. When possible, this guidance is to be expressed in the eXtensible Configuration Checklist Description Format (XCCDF) to support security automation. Minimally, it should be presented in a structured format which includes a title for each configuration item, instructions for achieving the secure configuration, and any relevant rationale.

AGD_OPE.1.4C

The operational user guidance shall, for each user role, clearly present each type of security-relevant event relative to the user-accessible functions that need to be performed, including changing the security characteristics of entities under the control of the TSF.

AGD_OPE.1.5C

The operational user guidance shall identify all possible modes of operation of the OS (including operation following failure or operational error), their consequences, and implications for maintaining secure operation.

AGD_OPE.1.6C

The operational user guidance shall, for each user role, describe the security measures to be followed in order to fulfill the security objectives for the operational environment as described in the ST.

AGD_OPE.1.7C

The operational user guidance shall be clear and reasonable.

Evaluator action elements:

AGD_OPE.1.1E

The evaluator shall confirm that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

Evaluation Activities ▽

> *AGD_OPE.1*
> *Some of the contents of the operational guidance are verified by the assurance activities in Section 8.3 Security Functional Requirements and evaluation of the OS according to the [CEM]. The following additional information is also required. If cryptographic functions are provided by the OS, the operational guidance shall contain instructions for configuring the cryptographic engine associated with the evaluated configuration of the OS. It shall provide a warning to the administrator that use of other cryptographic engines was not evaluated nor tested during the CC evaluation of the OS. The documentation must describe the process for verifying updates to the OS by verifying a digital signature – this may be done by the OS or the underlying platform. The evaluator will verify that this process includes the following steps: Instructions for obtaining the update itself. This should include instructions for making the update accessible to the OS (e.g., placement in a specific directory). Instructions for initiating the update process, as well as discerning whether the process was successful or unsuccessful. This includes generation of the hash/digital signature. The OS will likely contain security functionality that does not fall in the scope of evaluation under this PP. The operational guidance shall make it clear to an administrator which security functionality is covered by the evaluation activities.*

AGD_PRE.1 Preparative Procedures (AGD_PRE.1)

Developer action elements:

AGD_PRE.1.1D

The developer shall provide the OS, including its preparative procedures.

Application Note: As with the operational guidance, the developer should look to the assurance activities to determine the required content with respect to preparative procedures.

Content and presentation elements:

AGD_PRE.1.1C

The preparative procedures shall describe all the steps necessary for secure acceptance of the delivered OS in accordance with the developer's delivery procedures.

AGD_PRE.1.2C

The preparative procedures shall describe all the steps necessary for secure

installation of the OS and for the secure preparation of the operational environment in accordance with the security objectives for the operational environment as described in the ST.

Evaluator action elements:

AGD_PRE.1.1E

> The evaluator shall confirm that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

AGD_PRE.1.2E

> The evaluator shall apply the preparative procedures to confirm that the OS can be prepared securely for operation.

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *AGD_PRE.1*
> *As indicated in the introduction above, there are significant expectations with respect to the documentation—especially when configuring the operational environment to support OS functional requirements. The evaluator shall check to ensure that the guidance provided for the OS adequately addresses all platforms claimed for the OS in the ST.*

8.4.4 Class ALC: Life-cycle Support

At the assurance level provided for OSs conformant to this PP, life-cycle support is limited to end-user-visible aspects of the life-cycle, rather than an examination of the OS vendor's development and configuration management process. This is not meant to diminish the critical role that a developer's practices play in contributing to the overall trustworthiness of a product; rather, it is a reflection on the information to be made available for evaluation at this assurance level.

ALC_CMC.1 Labeling of the TOE (ALC_CMC.1)

This component is targeted at identifying the OS such that it can be distinguished from other products or versions from the same vendor and can be easily specified when being procured by an end user.

Developer action elements:

ALC_CMC.1.1D

> The developer shall provide the OS and a reference for the OS.

Content and presentation elements:

ALC_CMC.1.1C

> The OS shall be labeled with a unique reference.

> **Application Note:** Unique reference information includes:
> - OS Name
> - OS Version
> - OS Description
> - Software Identification (SWID) tags, if available

Evaluator action elements:

ALC_CMC.1.1E

> The evaluator shall confirm that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *ALC_CMC.1*
> *The evaluator will check the ST to ensure that it contains an identifier (such as a product name/version number) that specifically identifies the version that meets the requirements of the ST. Further, the evaluator will check the AGD guidance and OS samples received for testing to ensure that the version number is consistent with that in the ST. If the vendor maintains a web site advertising the OS, the evaluator will examine the information on the web site to ensure that the information in the ST is sufficient to distinguish the product.*

ALC_CMS.1 TOE CM Coverage (ALC_CMS.1)

Given the scope of the OS and its associated evaluation evidence requirements, this component's assurance activities are covered by the assurance activities listed for ALC_CMC.1.

Developer action elements:

ALC_CMS.1.1D

> The developer shall provide a configuration list for the OS.

Content and presentation elements:

ALC_CMS.1.1C

> The configuration list shall include the following: the OS itself; and the evaluation evidence required by the SARs.

ALC_CMS.1.2C

> The configuration list shall uniquely identify the configuration items.

Evaluator action elements:

ALC_CMS.1.1E

> The evaluator shall confirm that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

Evaluation Activities ▼

> *ALC_CMS.1*
> *The "evaluation evidence required by the SARs" in this PP is limited to the information in the ST coupled with the guidance provided to administrators and users under the AGD requirements. By ensuring that the OS is specifically identified and that this identification is consistent in the ST and in the AGD guidance (as done in the assurance activity for ALC_CMC.1), the evaluator implicitly confirms the information required by this component. Life-cycle support is targeted aspects of the developer's life-cycle and instructions to providers of applications for the developer's devices, rather than an in-depth examination of the TSF manufacturer's development and configuration management process. This is not meant to diminish the critical role that a developer's practices play in contributing to the overall trustworthiness of a product; rather, it's a reflection on the information to be made available for evaluation.*
> *The evaluator will ensure that the developer has identified (in guidance documentation for application developers concerning the targeted platform) one or more development environments appropriate for use in developing applications for the developer's platform. For each of these development environments, the developer shall provide information on how to configure the environment to ensure that buffer overflow protection mechanisms in the environment(s) are invoked (e.g., compiler and linker flags). The evaluator will ensure that this documentation also includes an indication of whether such protections are on by default, or have to be specifically enabled. The evaluator will ensure that the TSF is uniquely identified (with respect to other products from the TSF vendor), and that documentation provided by the developer in association with the requirements in the ST is associated with the TSF using this unique identification.*

ALC_TSU_EXT.1 Timely Security Updates

This component requires the OS developer, in conjunction with any other necessary parties, to provide information as to how the end-user devices are updated to address security issues in a timely manner. The documentation describes the process of providing updates to the public from the time a security flaw is reported/discovered, to the time an update is released. This description includes the parties involved (e.g., the developer, carriers(s)) and the steps that are performed (e.g., developer testing, carrier testing), including worst case time periods, before an update is made available to the public.

Developer action elements:

ALC_TSU_EXT.1.1D

> The developer shall provide a description in the TSS of how timely security updates are made to the OS.

ALC_TSU_EXT.1.2D

> The developer shall provide a description in the TSS of how users are notified when updates change security properties or the configuration of the product.

Content and presentation elements:

ALC_TSU_EXT.1.1C

> The description shall include the process for creating and deploying security updates for the OS software.

ALC_TSU_EXT.1.2C

> The description shall include the mechanisms publicly available for reporting security issues pertaining to the OS.

Note: The reporting mechanism could include web sites, email addresses, as well as a means to protect the sensitive nature of the report (e.g., public keys that could be used to encrypt the details of a proof-of-concept exploit).

Evaluator action elements:

ALC_TSU_EXT.1.1E

The evaluator shall confirm that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

Evaluation Activities ▽

> *ALC_TSU_EXT.1*
> *The evaluator will verify that the TSS contains a description of the timely security update process used by the developer to create and deploy security updates. The evaluator will verify that this description addresses the entire application. The evaluator will also verify that, in addition to the OS developer's process, any third-party processes are also addressed in the description. The evaluator will also verify that each mechanism for deployment of security updates is described.*
> *The evaluator will verify that, for each deployment mechanism described for the update process, the TSS lists a time between public disclosure of a vulnerability and public availability of the security update to the OS patching this vulnerability, to include any third-party or carrier delays in deployment. The evaluator will verify that this time is expressed in a number or range of days. The evaluator will verify that this description includes the publicly available mechanisms (including either an email address or website) for reporting security issues related to the OS. The evaluator shall verify that the description of this mechanism includes a method for protecting the report either using a public key for encrypting email or a trusted channel for a website.*

8.4.5 Class ATE: Tests

Testing is specified for functional aspects of the system as well as aspects that take advantage of design or implementation weaknesses. The former is done through the ATE_IND family, while the latter is through the AVA_VAN family. At the assurance level specified in this PP, testing is based on advertised functionality and interfaces with dependency on the availability of design information. One of the primary outputs of the evaluation process is the test report as specified in the following requirements.

ATE_IND.1 Independent Testing – Conformance (ATE_IND.1)

Testing is performed to confirm the functionality described in the TSS as well as the administrative (including configuration and operational) documentation provided. The focus of the testing is to confirm that the requirements specified in Section 8.3 Security Functional Requirements being met, although some additional testing is specified for SARs in Section 8.4 Security Assurance Requirements. The Assurance Activities identify the additional testing activities associated with these components. The evaluator produces a test report documenting the plan for and results of testing, as well as coverage arguments focused on the platform/OS combinations that are claiming conformance to this PP. Given the scope of the OS and its associated evaluation evidence requirements, this component's assurance activities are covered by the assurance activities listed for ALC_CMC.1.

Developer action elements:

ATE_IND.1.1D

The developer shall provide the OS for testing.

Content and presentation elements:

ATE_IND.1.1C

The OS shall be suitable for testing.

Evaluator action elements:

ATE_IND.1.1E

The evaluator *shall confirm* that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

ATE_IND.1.2E

The evaluator shall test a subset of the TSF to confirm that the TSF operates as specified.

Application Note: The evaluator will test the OS on the most current fully patched version of the platform.

Evaluation Activities ▽

8.4.6 Class AVA: Vulnerability Assessment

For the first generation of this protection profile, the evaluation lab is expected to survey open sources to discover what vulnerabilities have been discovered in these types of products. In most cases, these vulnerabilities will require sophistication beyond that of a basic attacker. Until penetration tools are created and uniformly distributed to the evaluation labs, the evaluator will not be expected to test for these vulnerabilities in the OS. The labs will be expected to comment on the likelihood of these vulnerabilities given the documentation provided by the vendor. This information will be used in the development of penetration testing tools and for the development of future protection profiles.

AVA_VAN.1 Vulnerability Survey (AVA_VAN.1)

Developer action elements:

AVA_VAN.1.1D

> The developer shall provide the OS for testing.

Content and presentation elements:

AVA_VAN.1.1C

> The OS shall be suitable for testing.

Evaluator action elements:

AVA_VAN.1.1E

> The evaluator shall confirm that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

AVA_VAN.1.2E

> The evaluator shall perform a search of public domain sources to identify potential vulnerabilities in the OS.
>
> **Application Note:** Public domain sources include the Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures (CVE) dictionary for publicly-known vulnerabilities. Public domain sources also include sites which provide free checking of files for viruses.

AVA_VAN.1.3E

> The evaluator shall conduct penetration testing, based on the identified potential vulnerabilities, to determine that the OS is resistant to attacks performed by an attacker possessing Basic attack potential.

Evaluation Activities ▼

AVA_VAN.1

The evaluator will generate a report to document their findings with respect to this requirement. This report could physically be part of the overall test report mentioned in ATE_IND, or a separate document. The evaluator performs a search of public information to find vulnerabilities that have been found in similar applications with a particular focus on network protocols the application uses and document formats it parses. The evaluator documents the sources consulted and the vulnerabilities found in the report.

For each vulnerability found, the evaluator either provides a rationale with respect to its non-applicability, or the evaluator formulates a test (using the guidelines provided in ATE_IND) to confirm the vulnerability, if suitable. Suitability is determined by assessing the attack vector needed to take advantage of the vulnerability. If exploiting the vulnerability requires expert skills and an electron microscope, for instance, then a test would not be suitable and an appropriate justification would be formulated.

Appendix A - Implementation-based Requirements

Implementation-based Requirements are dependent on the TOE implementing a particular function. If the TOE fulfills any of these requirements, the vendor must either add the related SFR or disable the functionality for the evaluated configuration.

Appendix B - Entropy Documentation and Assessment

blah

Appendix C - Glossary

C.1 Terms

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

C.1.1 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.
Extended Package (EP)	A deprecated document form for collecting SFRs that implement a particular protocol, technology, or functionality. See Functional Packages.
Functional Package (FP)	A document that collects SFRs for a particular protocol, technology, or functionality.
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	The product under evaluation.

(TOE)

Term	Definition
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.

C.1.2 Technical Terms

Term	Definition
Address Space Layout Randomization (ASLR)	An anti-exploitation feature which loads memory mappings into unpredictable locations. ASLR makes it more difficult for an attacker to redirect control to code that they have introduced into the address space of a process.
Administrator	An administrator is responsible for management activities, including setting policies that are applied by the enterprise on the operating system. This administrator could be acting remotely through a management server, from which the system receives configuration policies. An administrator can enforce settings on the system which cannot be overridden by non-administrator users.
Application (app)	Software that runs on a platform and performs tasks on behalf of the user or owner of the platform, as well as its supporting documentation.
Application Programming Interface (API)	A specification of routines, data structures, object classes, and variables that allows an application to make use of services provided by another software component, such as a library. APIs are often provided for a set of libraries included with the platform.
Credential	Data that establishes the identity of a user, e.g. a cryptographic key or password.
Critical Security Parameters (CSP)	Information that is either user or system defined and is used to operate a cryptographic module in processing encryption functions including cryptographic keys and authentication data, such as passwords, the disclosure or modification of which can compromise the security of a cryptographic module or the security of the information protected by the module.
DAR Protection	Countermeasures that prevent attackers, even those with physical access, from extracting data from non-volatile storage. Common techniques include data encryption and wiping.
Data Execution Prevention (DEP)	An anti-exploitation feature of modern operating systems executing on modern computer hardware, which enforces a non-execute permission on pages of memory. DEP prevents pages of memory from containing both data and instructions, which makes it more difficult for an attacker to introduce and execute code.
Developer	An entity that writes OS software. For the purposes of this document, vendors and developers are the same.
General Purpose Operating System	A class of OSes designed to support a wide-variety of workloads consisting of many concurrent applications or services. Typical characteristics for OSes in this class include support for third-party applications, support for multiple users, and security separation between users and their respective resources. General Purpose Operating Systems also lack the real-time constraint that defines Real Time Operating Systems (RTOS). RTOSes typically power routers, switches, and embedded devices.
Host-based Firewall	A software-based firewall implementation running on the OS for filtering inbound and outbound network traffic to and from processes running on the OS.
Operating System (OS)	Software that manages physical and logical resources and provides services for applications. The terms *TOE* and *OS* are interchangeable in this document.
Personally Identifiable Information (PII)	Any information about an individual maintained by an agency, including, but not limited to, education, financial transactions, medical history, and criminal or employment history and information which can be used to distinguish or trace an individual's identity, such as their name, social security number, date and place of birth, mother's maiden name, biometric records, etc., including any other personal information which is linked or linkable to an individual.[OMB]
Sensitive Data	Sensitive data may include all user or enterprise data or may be specific application data such as PII, emails, messaging, documents, calendar items, and contacts. Sensitive data must minimally include credentials and keys. Sensitive data shall be identified in the OS's TSS by the ST author.
User	A user is subject to configuration policies applied to the operating system by administrators. On some systems under certain configurations, a normal user can

temporarily elevate privileges to that of an administrator. At that time, such a user should be considered an administrator.

Virtual Machine (VM)	Blah Blah Blah

Appendix D - Acronyms

Acronym	Meaning
AES	Advanced Encryption Standard
API	Application Programming Interface
API	Application Programming Interface
ASLR	Address Space Layout Randomization
Base-PP	Base Protection Profile
CC	Common Criteria
CEM	Common Evaluation Methodology
CESG	Communications-Electronics Security Group
CMC	Certificate Management over CMS
CMS	Cryptographic Message Syntax
CN	Common Names
CRL	Certificate Revocation List
CSA	Computer Security Act
CSP	Critical Security Parameters
DAR	Data At Rest
DEP	Data Execution Prevention
DES	Data Encryption Standard
DHE	Diffie-Hellman Ephemeral
DNS	Domain Name System
DRBG	Deterministic Random Bit Generator
DSS	Digital Signature Standard
DSS	Digital Signature Standard
DT	Date/Time Vector
DTLS	Datagram Transport Layer Security
EAP	Extensible Authentication Protocol
ECDHE	Elliptic Curve Diffie-Hellman Ephemeral
ECDSA	Elliptic Curve Digital Signature Algorithm
EP	Extended Package
EST	Enrollment over Secure Transport
FIPS	Federal Information Processing Standards
FP	Functional Package
HMAC	Hash-based Message Authentication Code
HTTP	Hypertext Transfer Protocol
HTTPS	Hypertext Transfer Protocol Secure
IETF	Internet Engineering Task Force
IP	Internet Protocol
ISO	International Organization for Standardization

IT	Information Technology
ITSEF	Information Technology Security Evaluation Facility
NIAP	National Information Assurance Partnership
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
OCSP	Online Certificate Status Protocol
OE	Operational Environment
OID	Object Identifier
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OS	Operating System
PII	Personally Identifiable Information
PKI	Public Key Infrastructure
PP	Protection Profile
PP	Protection Profile
PP-Configuration	Protection Profile Configuration
PP-Module	Protection Profile Module
RBG	Random Bit Generator
RFC	Request for Comment
RNG	Random Number Generator
RNGVS	Random Number Generator Validation System
S/MIME	Secure/Multi-purpose Internet Mail Extensions
SAN	Subject Alternative Name
SAR	Security Assurance Requirement
SFR	Security Functional Requirement
SHA	Secure Hash Algorithm
SIP	Session Initiation Protocol
ST	Security Target
SWID	Software Identification
TLS	Transport Layer Security
TOE	Target of Evaluation
TSF	TOE Security Functionality
TSFI	TSF Interface
TSS	TOE Summary Specification
URI	Uniform Resource Identifier
URL	Uniform Resource Locator
USB	Universal Serial Bus
VM	Virtual Machine
XCCDF	eXtensible Configuration Checklist Description Format
XOR	Exclusive Or
app	Application
cPP	Collaborative Protection Profile

Appendix E - Bibliography

Identifier	Title
[CC]	Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation - • Part 1: Introduction and General Model, CCMB-2017-04-001, Version 3.1 Revision 5, April 2017. • Part 2: Security Functional Components, CCMB-2017-04-002, Version 3.1 Revision 5, April 2017. • Part 3: Security Assurance Components, CCMB-2017-04-003, Version 3.1 Revision 5, April 2017.
[CEM]	Common Evaluation Methodology for Information Technology Security - Evaluation Methodology, CCMB-2012-09-004, Version 3.1, Revision 4, September 2012.
[CESG]	CESG - End User Devices Security and Configuration Guidance
[CSA]	Computer Security Act of 1987, H.R. 145, June 11, 1987.
[OMB]	Reporting Incidents Involving Personally Identifiable Information and Incorporating the Cost for Security in Agency Information Technology Investments, OMB M-06-19, July 12, 2006.