

# PP-Module for MACsec Ethernet Encryption



Version: 1.0  
2023-03-02

**National Information Assurance Partnership**

# Revision History

Version	Date	Comment
1.0	2023-03-02	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
  - 5.0.1 Security Audit (FAU)
  - 5.0.2 Cryptographic Support (FCS)
  - 5.0.3 Identification and Authentication (FIA)
  - 5.0.4 Security Management (FMT)
  - 5.0.5 Protection of the TSF (FPT)
  - 5.0.6 Trusted Path/Channels (FTP)
  - 5.0.7 Identification and Authentication (FIA)
  - 5.0.8 Protection of the TSF (FPT)
  - 5.0.9 Trusted Path/Channels (FTP)
  - 5.0.10 Cryptographic Support (FCS)
  - 5.0.11 Security Management (FMT)
- Appendix A - Implicitly Satisfied Requirements
- Appendix B - Allocation of Requirements in Distributed TOEs
- Appendix C - Entropy Documentation and Assessment

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Overview

The scope of this Protection Profile Module (PP-Module) is to describe the security functionality of Media Access Control Security (MACsec) encryption in terms of the Common Criteria [CC] and to define functional and assurance requirements for such products. This PP-Module is intended for use with the following Base Protection Profiles (Base-PPs):

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

This Base-PP is valid because a device that implements MACsec encryption is a specific type of network device, and there is nothing about the implementation of MACsec that would prevent any of the security capabilities defined by the Base-PP from being satisfied.

A Target of Evaluation (TOE) that conforms to a PP-Configuration containing this PP-Module may be a 'Distributed TOE' as defined in the NDcPP. This PP-Module does not prohibit the TOE from implementing other security functionality in a distributed manner. For example, a TOE may be deployed in such a manner that distributed nodes establish MACsec connectivity with physically separated networks while a centralized management device is used to configure the behavior of individual nodes.

## 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	A requirement to assure the security of the TOE.

(SAR)	
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

Carrier Ethernet	Metro Ethernet Forum (MEF) Carrier Ethernet standards define technology-agnostic layer-2 services. The standards include services aimed at end users (Subscriber Ethernet Services) and service providers (Operator Ethernet Services). Other related terms include Metro Ethernet Services, Provider Bridging and Provider Backbone Bridging.
Connectivity Association Key (CAK)	A symmetric key that is used as the master key for MACsec connectivity and is shared between connected MACsec endpoints.
Connectivity Association Key Name (CKN)	A unique identifier for a specific Connectivity Association Key.
Ethernet Private Line (EPL)	A service transporting customer data form one User Network Interface (UNI) to another UNI.
Ethernet Virtual Private Line (EVPL)	A Virtual Local Area Network (VLAN)-based service transporting customer data. The UNI is capable of service multiplexing.
Extended Packet Numbering (XPN)	A scheme that allows MACsec communications to persist using a single Secure Association Key for a larger number of frames to reduce overhead and latency associated with key agreement.
Extensible Authentication Protocol over LAN (EAPOL)	A port authentication protocol specified in IEEE 802.1X that is used to facilitate network authentication.
MACsec Key Agreement (MKA)	A key agreement protocol used for distribution of MACsec keys to distributed peers.
MACsec Protocol Data Unit (MPDU)	The basic MACsec frame structure that contains protocol and payload data.
Media Access Control (MAC) Security Entity	An entity (e.g., computer) that is implementing MACsec.
Media Access Control Security (MACsec)	A standard for connectionless data confidentiality and integrity protection at the data link layer of a network connection. Formally defined in IEEE 802.1AE.
Metro Ethernet	A non-profit international industry consortium.

Forum (MEF)	
Packet Number (PN)	A monotonically increasing value that is guaranteed to be unique for each MACsec frame transmitted using a given Secure Association Key (SAK)
SecTag	MAC Security Tag - a protocol header comprising a number of octets, beginning with an EtherType, that is prepended to the service data unit supplied by the client of the protocol and is used to provide security guarantees.
Secure Association (SA)	A mechanism that uses a SAK to provide the MACsec service guarantees and security services for a sequence of transmitted frames.
Secure Association Key (SAK)	A key derived from the CAK that is used to encrypt and decrypt traffic for a given SA.
Secure Channel (SC)	A unidirectional channel (one to one or one to many) that uses symmetric key cryptography to provide a (possibly long lived) Secure Channel.
Secure Device Identifier	A device authentication credential that can be used for EAPOL and is formally defined in IEEE 802.1AR.

### 1.3 Compliant Targets of Evaluation

---

This PP-Module specifically addresses MACsec, which allows authorized systems using Ethernet Transport to maintain confidentiality of transmitted data and to take measures against frames that are transmitted or modified by unauthorized devices.

MACsec protects communication between trusted components of the network infrastructure, thus protecting the network operation. It facilitates maintenance of correct network connectivity and services as well as isolation of denial of service attacks.

The hardware, firmware, and software of the MACsec device define the physical boundary. All of the security functionality is contained and executed within the physical boundary of the device. For example, given a device with an Ethernet card, the whole device is considered to be within the boundary.

Since this PP-Module builds on the NDcPP, conformant TOEs are obligated to implement the functionality required in the NDcPP along with the additional functionality defined in this PP-Module in response to the threat environment discussed later in this document.

### 1.4 TOE Boundary

---

The physical boundary for a TOE that conforms to this PP-Module is a hardware appliance that also provides generalized network device functionality, such as auditing, I&A, and cryptographic services for network communications. The TOE's logical boundary includes all functionality required by the claimed Base-PP as well as the MACsec functionality and related capabilities that are defined in this PP-Module. Any functionality that is provided by the network device that is not relevant to the security requirements defined by this PP-Module or the Base-PP is considered to be outside the scope of the TOE.

### 1.5 Use Cases

---

A pair of MACsec devices connected by a physical medium can protect Ethernet frames switched or routed from one device to the other. The two MACsec devices are provided with a CAK and use the MKA protocol to create a secure tunnel. MKA is used by the two MACsec devices to agree upon MACsec keys. A policy should be installed to protect traffic between the devices, with the exception of the MKA or Ethernet control traffic such as Extensible Authentication Protocol (EAP) over LAN (EAPOL) frames.

This PP-Module defines two potential use cases for the MACsec TOE.

#### [USE CASE 1] Classic Hop by Hop Deployment

MACsec can be deployed in a hop by hop manner between Ethernet devices. Two devices will protect traffic originating in protected networks traversing an untrusted link between them. The devices will first exchange MKA frames, which serve to determine the peer is an authorized peer, and agree upon a shared key and MACsec ciphersuite used to set up a transmit (Tx) SA and a receive (Rx) SA. Once the SAs are set up, MACsec-protected frames traverse the unprotected link.

#### [USE CASE 2] Over Carrier Ethernet Services

In some markets network service providers have standardized their offerings according to various versions of the MEF specifications. One recent MEF specification is the "E-Line" (\*) service type which is based on the use of point-to-point (P2P) Ethernet Virtual Circuits. A port-based service is known as an EPL and a VLAN-based service is known as an EVPL. EPL provides a P2P Ethernet virtual connection between a pair of dedicated user-network interfaces (UNIs), with a high degree of transparency. EVPL

provides a P2P or point-to-multipoint connection between UNIs. A difference between the EVPL and EPL is the degree of transparency - while EPL is highly transparent, filtering only the pause frames, EVPL is required to either peer or drop most of the Layer 2 Control Protocols. The MEF has also defined other service types such as E-LAN and E-Tree.

(\*) From MEF 6.3 - Subscriber Ethernet Services Definition - November 2019 - Table 3

# 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).

The following PP-Modules are allowed to be specified in a PP-Configuration with this PP-Module:

- PP-Module for Stateful Traffic Filter Firewalls Version 1.4 + Errata 20200625 (MOD\_FW)
- PP-Module for Virtual Private Network (VPN) Gateways Version 1.2 (MOD\_VPNGW)

## 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.DATA\_INTEGRITY**

An attacker may modify data transmitted over the layer 2 link in a way that is not detected by the recipient.

Devices on a network may be exposed to attacks that attempt to corrupt or modify data in transit without authorization. If malicious devices are able to modify and replay data that is transmitted over a layer 2 link, then the data contained within the communications may be susceptible to a loss of integrity.

### **T.NETWORK\_ACCESS**

An attacker may send traffic through the TOE that enables them to access devices in the TOE's operational environment without authorization.

A MACsec device may sit on the periphery of a network, which means that it may have an externally-facing interface to a public network. Devices located in the public network may attempt to exercise services located on the internal network that are intended to be accessed only from within the internal network or externally accessible only from specifically authorized devices. If the MACsec device allows unauthorized external devices access to the internal network, these devices on the internal network may be subject to compromise. Similarly, if two MACsec devices are deployed to facilitate end-to-end encryption of traffic that is contained within a single network, an attacker could use an insecure MACsec device as a method to access devices on a specific segment of that network such as an individual LAN.

### **T.UNTRUSTED\_MACSEC\_COMMUNICATION\_CHANNELS**

An attacker may acquire sensitive TOE or user data that is transmitted to or from the TOE because an untrusted communication channel causes a disclosure of data in transit.

A generic network device may be threatened by the use of insecure communications channels to transmit sensitive data. The attack surface of a MACsec device also includes the MACsec trusted channels.

Inability to secure communications channels, or failure to do so correctly, would expose user data that is assumed to be secure to the threat of unauthorized disclosure.

## 3.2 Assumptions

---

All assumptions for the OE of the Base-PP also apply to this PP-Module. A.NO\_THRU\_TRAFFIC\_PROTECTION is still operative, but only for the interfaces in the TOE that are defined by the Base-PP and not the PP-Module. This document does not define any additional assumptions.

## 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.AUTHENTICATION\_MACSEC

To further address the issues associated with unauthorized disclosure of information, a compliant TOE’s authentication ability (MKA) will allow a MACsec peer to establish connectivity associations (CAs) with another MACsec peer. MACsec endpoints authenticate each other to ensure they are communicating with an authorized MAC Security Entity (SecY) entity. **Addressed by:** [FCS\\_MACSEC\\_EXT.4](#), [FCS\\_MKA\\_EXT.1](#), [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1](#), [FCS\\_DEVID\\_EXT.1](#) (selection-based), [FCS\\_EAP-TLS\\_EXT.1](#) (selection-based)

### O.AUTHORIZED\_ADMINISTRATION

All network devices are expected to provide services that allow the security functionality of the device to be managed. The MACsec device, as a specific type of network device, has a refined set of management functions to address its specialized behavior. In order to further mitigate the threat of a compromise of its security functionality, the MACsec device prescribes the ability to limit brute-force authentication attempts by enforcing lockout of accounts that experience excessive failures and by limiting access to security-relevant data that administrators do not need to view. **Addressed by:** [FMT\\_SMF.1/MACSEC](#), [FPT\\_CAK\\_EXT.1](#), [FIA\\_AFL\\_EXT.1](#) (optional), [FTP\\_TRP.1/MACSEC](#) (optional), [FMT\\_SNMP\\_EXT.1](#) (selection-based)

### O.CRYPTOGRAPHIC\_FUNCTIONS\_MACSEC

To address the issues associated with unauthorized modification and disclosure of information, compliant TOEs will implement cryptographic capabilities. These capabilities are intended to maintain confidentiality and allow for detection and modification of data that is transmitted outside of the TOE. **Addressed by:** [FCS\\_COP.1/CMAC](#), [FCS\\_COP.1/MACSEC](#), [FCS\\_MACSEC\\_EXT.2](#), [FCS\\_MACSEC\\_EXT.3](#), [FTP\\_ITC.1/MACSEC](#), [FTP\\_TRP.1/MACSEC](#) (optional), [FCS\\_SNMP\\_EXT.1](#) (selection-based)

### O.PORT\_FILTERING\_MACSEC

To further address the issues associated with unauthorized network access, a compliant TOE’s port filtering capability will restrict the flow of network traffic through the TOE based on layer 2 frame characteristics and whether or not the traffic represents valid MACsec frames and MACsec Key Agreement Protocol Data Units (MKPDUs). **Addressed by:** [FCS\\_MACSEC\\_EXT.1](#), [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1](#), [FPT\\_DDP\\_EXT.1](#)

### O.REPLAY\_DETECTION

A MACsec device is expected to help mitigate the threat of MACsec data integrity violations by providing a mechanism to detect and discard replayed traffic for MPDUs. **Addressed by:** [FPT\\_RPL.1](#), [FPT\\_RPL\\_EXT.1](#) (optional)

### O.SYSTEM\_MONITORING\_MACSEC

To address the issues of administrators being able to monitor the operations of the MACsec device, compliant TOEs will implement the ability to log the flow of Ethernet traffic. Specifically, the TOE will provide the means for administrators to configure rules to ‘log’ when Ethernet traffic grants or restricts access. As a result, the ‘log’ will result in informative event logs whenever a match occurs. In addition, the establishment of security CAs is auditable, not only between MACsec devices, but also with MAC Security Key Agreement Entities (KaYs). **Addressed by:** [FAU\\_GEN.1/MACSEC](#)

### O.TSF\_INTEGRITY

To mitigate the security risk that the MACsec device may fail during startup, it is required to fail-secure if any self-test failures occur during startup. This ensures that the device will only operate when it is in a known state. **Addressed by:** [FPT\\_FLS.1](#)

## 4.2 Security Objectives for the Operational Environment

All objectives for the operational environment of the Base-PP also apply to this PP-Module. OE.NO\_THRU\_TRAFFIC\_PROTECTION is still operative, but only for the interfaces in the TOE that are defined by the Base-PP and not the PP-Module.

## 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
<a href="#">T.DATA_INTEGRITY</a>	<a href="#">O.CRYPTOGRAPHIC_FUNCTIONS</a>	The TOE mitigates the threat of data integrity violations by implementing cryptographic functionality that includes

	MACSEC	integrity protection.
	O.REPLAY_DETECTION	The TOE mitigates the threat of data integrity violations by providing a mechanism to detect and discard replayed traffic for MPDUs.
T.NETWORK_ACCESS	O.PORT_FILTERING_MACSEC	The TOE's port filtering capability reduces the threat of unauthorized access to devices in the TOE's operational environment by restricting the flow of network traffic entering through the TOE interfaces based on layer 2 frame characteristics and whether or not the traffic represents valid MACsec frames and MKPDUs.
T.UNTRUSTED_MACSEC_COMMUNICATION_CHANNELS	O.CRYPTOGRAPHIC_FUNCTIONS_MACSEC	The TOE mitigates the threat of unauthorized disclosure of information via untrusted thru traffic by providing MKA authentication functions to authorize endpoints.
T.UNAUTHORIZED_ADMINISTRATOR_ACCESS	O.AUTHORIZED_ADMINISTRATION	The TOE further mitigates this threat originally defined in the Base-PP by defining additional management functions that require authorization and additional interfaces that can be used securely to execute management activities.
T.UNDETECTED_ACTIVITY	O.SYSTEM_MONITORING_MACSEC	The TOE further mitigates this threat originally defined in the Base-PP by implementing measures to generate audit records for security-relevant events that are specific to the functionality defined by this PP-Module.

# 5 Security Requirements

<https://www.niap-ccevs.org/profile/Info.cfm?PPID=447&id=447> 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 MACsec functionality that is provided by the network device. The threats defined by this PP-Module (see section 3.1) supplement those defined in the NDcPP as follows: This PP-Module does not define any environmental objectives, but does note that OE.NO\_THRU\_TRAFFIC\_PROTECTION from the NDcPP only applies to the Base-PP external interfaces. This is because the MACsec interface defined by this PP-Module does enforce through-traffic protection. The threat of data integrity compromise at the layer 2 level is a specific threat that can be countered by MACsec technology. The threat of a malicious entity accessing protected network resources without authorization is a specific example of the T.UNTRUSTED\_COMMUNICATION\_CHANNELS threat defined in the Base-PP. The threat of disclosure of data in protected communications channels is the same as the T.UNTRUSTED\_COMMUNICATION\_CHANNELS threat in the NDcPP. This PP-Module expands on that by introducing additional logical interfaces (MACsec, SNMP) that this threat applies to. The Base-PP does not define any TOE objectives so PP-Module objectives do not conflict with it. The Base-PP does not define any TOE objectives so PP-Module objectives do not conflict with it. The Base-PP does not define any TOE objectives so PP-Module objectives do not conflict with it. The Base-PP does not define any TOE objectives so PP-Module objectives do not conflict with it. The Base-PP does not define any TOE objectives so PP-Module objectives do not conflict with it. The Base-PP does not define any TOE objectives so PP-Module objectives do not conflict with it. The Base-PP does not define any TOE objectives so PP-Module objectives do not conflict with it.

## 5.0.1 Security Audit (FAU)

### FAU\_GEN.1/MACSEC Audit Data Generation (MACsec)

FAU\_GEN.1.1/MACSEC

- 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;
  - c. **All administrative actions;**
  - d. **[Specifically defined auditable events listed in the Auditable Events table (Table 2)]**

Requirement	Auditable Events	Additional Audit Record Contents
<a href="#">FCS_MACSEC_EXT.1</a>	Session establishment	Secure Channel Identifier (SCI)
<a href="#">FCS_MACSEC_EXT.3</a>	Creation and update of SAK	Creation and update times
<a href="#">FCS_MACSEC_EXT.4</a>	Creation of CA	Connectivity Association Key Names (CKNs)
<a href="#">FPT_RPL.1</a>	Detected replay attempt	None

Table 2: Auditable Events

FAU\_GEN.1.2/MACSEC

- The TSF shall record within each audit record at least the following information:
- a. Date and time of the event, type of event, subject identity (if applicable), and the outcome (success or failure) of the event; and
  - b. For each audit event type, based on the auditable event definitions of the functional components included in the PP-**Module**/ST, [information specified in column three of the Auditable Events table (Table 2)].

### Evaluation Activities ▼

[FAU\\_GEN.1/MACSEC](#)

The evaluator shall complete the evaluation activity for FAU\_GEN.1 as described in the NDcPP for the auditable events defined in the PP-Module in addition to the applicable auditable events that are defined in the NDcPP. The evaluator shall also ensure that the administrative actions defined for this PP-Module are appropriately audited.

## 5.0.2 Cryptographic Support (FCS)

## FCS\_COP.1/CMAC Cryptographic Operation (AES-CMAC Keyed Hash Algorithm)

FCS\_COP.1.1/CMAC

The TSF shall perform [*keyed-hash message authentication*] in accordance with a specified cryptographic algorithm [AES-CMAC] and cryptographic key sizes **[selection: 128, 256 ] bits and message digest size of 128 bits** that meets the following: [NIST SP 800-38B].

**Application Note #1:** AES-CMAC is a keyed hash function that is used as part of the key derivation function (KDF) that is used for key generation.

### Evaluation Activities ▼

#### [FCS\\_COP.1/CMAC](#)

##### **TSS**

The evaluator shall examine the TSS to ensure that it specifies the following values used by the AES-CMAC function: key length, hash function used, block size, and output MAC length.

##### **Guidance**

There are no guidance evaluation activities (EAs) for this component.

##### **Tests**

The evaluator shall perform the following tests:

- **Test 1: CMAC Generation Test**

To test the generation capability of AES-CMAC, the evaluator shall provide to the TSF, for each key length-message length-CMAC length tuple (in bytes), a set of eight arbitrary key-plaintext tuples that will result in the generation of a known MAC value when encrypted. The evaluator shall then verify that the correct MAC was generated in each case.

- **Test 2: CMAC Verification Test**

To test the verification capability of AES-CMAC, the evaluator shall provide to the TSF, for each key length-message length-CMAC length tuple (in bytes), a set of 20 arbitrary key-MAC tuples that will result in the generation of known messages when verified. The evaluator shall then verify that the correct message was generated in each case.

The following information should be used by the evaluator to determine the key length-message length-CMAC length tuples that should be tested:

- Key length: Values will include the following:
  - 16
  - 32
- Message length: Values will include the following:
  - 0 (optional)
  - Largest value supported by the implementation (no greater than 65536)
  - Two values divisible by 16
  - Two values not divisible by 16
- CMAC length:
  - Smallest value supported by the implementation (no less than 1)
  - 16
  - Any supported CMAC length between the minimum and maximum values

## FCS\_COP.1/MACSEC Cryptographic Operation (MACsec AES Data Encryption and Decryption)

FCS\_COP.1.1/MACSEC

The TSF shall perform [*encryption and decryption*] in accordance with a specified cryptographic algorithm [AES used in AES Key Wrap, GCM] and cryptographic key sizes **[selection: 128, 256 ] bits** that meets the following: [AES as specified in ISO 18033-3, AES Key Wrap as specified in NIST SP 800-38F, GCM as specified in ISO 19772].

### Evaluation Activities ▼

#### [FCS\\_COP.1/MACSEC](#)

##### **TSS**

The evaluator shall verify that the TSS describes the supported AES modes that are required for this PP-Module in addition to the ones already required by the NDcPP in FCS\_COP.1/DataEncryption.

##### **Guidance**

There are no guidance EAs for this component.

### Tests

The evaluator shall perform testing for AES-GCM as required by the NDcPP in FCS\_COP.1/DataEncryption.

In addition to the tests specified in the NDcPP for other iterations of FCS\_COP.1, the evaluator shall perform the following tests:

- **Test 3: KW-AE Test:** To test the authenticated encryption capability of AES key wrap (KW), the evaluator shall provide five sets of 100 messages and keys to the TOE for each key length supported by the TSF. Each set of messages and keys shall correspond to one of five plaintext message lengths (detailed below). The evaluator shall have the TSF encrypt the messages with the associated key. The evaluator shall verify that the correct ciphertext was generated in each case.
- **Test 4: KW-AD Test:** To test the authenticated decryption capability of AES KW, the evaluator shall provide five sets of 100 messages and keys to the TOE for each key length supported by the TSF. Each set of ciphertexts and keys shall correspond to one of five plaintext message lengths (detailed below). For each set of 100 ciphertext values, 20 shall not be authentic (i.e., fail authentication). The evaluator shall have the TSF decrypt the ciphertext messages with the associated key. The evaluator shall then verify the correct plaintext was generated or the failure to authenticate was correctly detected.

The messages in each set for both tests shall be the following lengths:

- two that are non-zero multiples of 128 bits (two semiblock lengths)
- two that are odd multiples of the semiblock length (64 bits)
- the largest supported plaintext length less than or equal to 4096 bits

## FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.1 MACsec

### FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.1.1

The TSF shall implement MACsec in accordance with IEEE Standard 802.1AE-2018.

### FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.1.2

The TSF shall derive a Secure Channel Identifier (SCI) from a peer's MAC address and port to uniquely identify the originator of an MPDU.

### FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.1.3

The TSF shall reject any MPDUs during a given session that contain an SCI other than the one used to establish that session.

### FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.1.4

The TSF shall permit only EAPOL (Port Access Entity (PAE) EtherType 88-8E), MACsec frames (EtherType 88-E5), and MAC control frames (EtherType is 88-08) and shall discard others.

**Application Note #2:** Depending on the Carrier Ethernet service provider a TOE might need basic VLAN tag handling abilities such as a simple add or discard to be suitable for Use Case 2.

## Evaluation Activities ▼

### FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.1

#### TSS

The evaluator shall examine the TSS to verify that it describes the ability of the TSF to implement MACsec in accordance with IEEE 802.1AE-2018. The evaluator shall also determine that the TSS describes the ability of the TSF to derive SCI values from peer MAC address and port data and to reject traffic that does not have a valid SCI. Finally, the evaluator shall check the TSS for an assertion that only EAPOL, MACsec Ethernet frames, and MAC control frames are accepted by the MACsec interface.

#### Guidance

There are no guidance EAs for this component.

#### Tests

The evaluator shall perform the following tests:

- **Test 5:** The evaluator shall successfully establish a MACsec channel between the TOE and a MACsec-capable peer in the operational environment and verify that the TSF logs the communications. The evaluator shall capture the traffic between the TOE and the operational environment to determine the SCI that the TOE uses to identify the peer. The evaluator shall then configure a test system to capture traffic between the peer and the TOE to modify the SCI that is used to identify the peer. The evaluator then verifies that the

- TOE does not reply to this traffic and logs that the traffic was discarded.*
- *Test 6: The evaluator shall send Ethernet traffic to the TOE's MAC address that iterates through the full range of supported EtherType values (refer to [List of Documented EtherTypes](#)) and observes that traffic for all EtherType values is discarded by the TOE except for the traffic which has an EtherType value of 88-8E, 88-E5, or 8808. Note that there are a large number of EtherType values so the evaluator is encouraged to execute a script that automatically iterates through each value.*

## **FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.2 MACsec Integrity and Confidentiality**

### **FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.2.1**

The TOE shall implement MACsec with support for integrity protection with a confidentiality offset of [**selection:** 0, 30, 50 ].

### **FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.2.2**

The TSF shall provide assurance of the integrity of protocol data units (MPDUs) using an Integrity Check Value (ICV) derived with the SAK.

**Application Note #3:** The length of the ICV is dependent on the ciphersuite used but will not be less than 8 octets or more than 16 octets at the end of the MPDU. The ICV protects the destination and source MAC address parameters, as well as all the fields of the MPDU.

### **FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.2.3**

The TSF shall provide the ability to derive an Integrity Check Value Key (ICK) from a Connectivity Association Key (CAK) using a KDF.

## **Evaluation Activities ▼**

### **[FCS\\_MACSEC\\_EXT.2](#)**

#### **TSS**

*The evaluator shall examine the TSS to verify that it describes the methods that the TOE implements to provide assurance of MACsec integrity. This should include any confidentiality offsets used, the use of an ICV (including the supported length), and ICV generation with the SAK, using the SCI as the most significant bits of the initialization vector (IV) and the 32 least significant bits of the PN as the IV.*

#### **Guidance**

*If any integrity verifications are configurable, such as any confidentiality offsets used or the mechanism used to derive an ICK, the evaluator shall verify that instructions for performing these functions are documented.*

#### **Tests**

*The evaluator shall perform the following tests:*

- *Test 7: The evaluator shall transmit MACsec traffic to the TOE from a MACsec-capable peer in the operational environment. The evaluator shall verify via packet captures, audit logs, or both that the frame bytes after the MACsec Tag values in the received traffic is not obviously predictable.*
- *Test 8: The evaluator shall transmit valid MACsec traffic to the TOE from a MACsec-capable peer in the operational environment that is routed through a test system set up as a man-in-the-middle. The evaluator shall use the test system to intercept this traffic to modify one bit in a packet payload before retransmitting to the TOE. The evaluator shall verify that the traffic is discarded due to an integrity failure.*

## **FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.3 MACsec Randomness**

### **FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.3.1**

The TSF shall generate unique Secure Association Keys (SAKs) using [**selection:** *key derivation from Connectivity Association Key (CAK) per section 9.8.1 of IEEE 802.1X-2010, the TOE's random bit generator as specified by [FCS\\_RBG\\_EXT.1](#) ] such that the likelihood of a repeating SAK is no less than 1 in 2 to the power of the size of the generated key.*

### **FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.3.2**

The TSF shall generate unique nonces for the derivation of SAKs using the TOE's random bit generator as specified by [FCS\\_RBG\\_EXT.1](#).

**Application Note #4:** [FCS\\_RBG\\_EXT.1](#) is defined in the Base-PP so a conformant MACsec TOE will include this dependency.



[FCS\\_MACSEC\\_EXT.3](#)**TSS**

*The evaluator shall examine the TSS to verify that it describes the method used to generate SAKs and nonces and that the strength of the CAK and the size of the CAK's key space are provided.*

**Guidance**

*There are no guidance EAs for this component.*

**Tests**

*Testing of the TOE's MACsec capabilities and verification of the deterministic random bit generator is sufficient to demonstrate that this SFR has been satisfied.*

**FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.4 MACsec Key Usage**

## FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.4.1

The TSF shall support peer authentication using pre-shared keys (PSKs) [**selection**: EAP-TLS with DevIDs, no other method ].

**Application Note #5:** The definition of the peer's CAK as defined by IEEE 802.1X-2010 is synonymous with the peer authentication performed here. If "EAP-TLS with DevIDs" is selected, the [FCS\\_DEVID\\_EXT.1](#) and [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1](#) SFRs must be claimed.

## FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.4.2

The TSF shall distribute SAKs between MACsec peers using AES key wrap as specified in FCS\_COP.1/MACSEC.

**Application Note #6:** This requirement applies to the SAKs that are generated by the TOE. They must be wrapped by the AES Key Wrap method specified in NIST SP 800-38F.

## FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.4.3

The TSF shall support specifying a lifetime for CAKs.

## FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.4.4

The TSF shall associate Connectivity Association Key Names (CKNs) with SAKs that are defined by the KDF using the CAK as input data (per IEEE 802.1X-2010, Section 9.8.1).

## FCS\_MACSEC\_EXT.4.5

The TSF shall associate CKNs with CAKs. The length of the CKN shall be an integer number of octets, between 1 and 32 (inclusive).

**Evaluation Activities** ▼[FCS\\_MACSEC\\_EXT.4](#)**TSS**

*The evaluator shall check the TSS to ensure that it describes how the SAK is wrapped prior to being distributed using the AES implementation specified in this PP-Module.*

**Guidance**

*If the method of peer authentication is configurable, the evaluator shall verify that the guidance provides instructions on how to configure this. The evaluator shall also verify that the method of specifying a lifetime for CAKs is described.*

**Tests**

*The evaluator shall perform the following tests:*

- *Test 9: For each supported method of peer authentication in [FCS\\_MACSEC\\_EXT.4.1](#), the evaluator shall follow the operational guidance to configure the supported method (if applicable). The evaluator shall set up a packet sniffer between the TOE and a MACsec-capable peer in the operational environment. The evaluator shall then initiate a connection between the TOE and the peer such that authentication occurs and a secure connection is established. The evaluator shall wait one minute and then disconnect the TOE from the peer and stop the sniffer. The evaluator shall use the packet captures to verify that the SC was established via the selected mechanism and that the non-VLAN EtherType of the first data frame sent between the TOE and the peer is 88-E5.*
- *Test 10: The evaluator shall capture traffic between the TOE and a MACsec-capable peer in the operational environment. The evaluator shall then cause the TOE to distribute a SAK to*

that peer, capture the MKPDUs from that operation, and verify the key is wrapped in the captured MKPDUs.

## FCS\_MKA\_EXT.1 MACsec Key Agreement

### FCS\_MKA\_EXT.1.1

The TSF shall implement Key Agreement Protocol (MKA) in accordance with IEEE 802.1X-2010 and 802.1Xbx-2014.

### FCS\_MKA\_EXT.1.2

The TSF shall provide assurance of the integrity of MKA protocol data units (MKPDUs) using an Integrity Check Value (ICV) derived from an Integrity Check Value Key (ICK).

**Application Note #7:** The ICV has length 128 bits and is computed according to Section 9.4.1 of IEEE 802.1X-2010. The ICV protects the destination and source MAC address parameters, as well as all the fields of the MAC Service Data Unit of the MKPDU including the allocated EtherType, and up to but not including, the generated ICV.

### FCS\_MKA\_EXT.1.3

The TSF shall provide the ability to derive an Integrity Check Value Key (ICK) from a CAK using a KDF.

### FCS\_MKA\_EXT.1.4

The TSF shall enforce an MKA Lifetime Timeout limit of 6.0 seconds and MKA Bounded Hello Timeout limit of 0.5 seconds.

**Application Note #8:** The key server may also distribute a group CAK established by pairwise CAKs.

### FCS\_MKA\_EXT.1.5

The key server shall refresh a SAK when it expires. The key server shall distribute a SAK by **[selection:**

- *a group CAK, distributed by a group CAK*
- *a group CAK, distributed by pairwise CAKs derived from MKA*
- *a group CAK, distributed by pre-shared key (PSK)*
- *pairwise CAKs, derived from MKA*
- *pairwise CAKs that are PSKs*

].

### FCS\_MKA\_EXT.1.6

The key server shall distribute a fresh SAK whenever a member is added to or removed from the live membership of the CA.

### FCS\_MKA\_EXT.1.7

The TSF shall validate MKPDUs according to IEEE 802.1X-2010 Section 11.11.2. In particular, the TSF shall discard without further processing any MKPDUs to which any of the following conditions apply:

- a. The destination address of the MKPDU was an individual address
- b. The MKPDU is less than 32 octets long
- c. The MKPDU comprises fewer octets than indicated by the Basic Parameter Set body length, as encoded in bits 4 through 1 of octet 3 and bits 8 through 1 of octet 4, plus 16 octets of ICV
- d. The CAK Name is not recognized

If an MKPDU passes these tests, then the TSF will begin processing it as follows:

- a. If the Algorithm Agility parameter identifies an algorithm that has been implemented by the receiver, the ICV shall be verified as specified in IEEE 802.1X-2010 Section 9.4.1.
- b. If the Algorithm Agility parameter is unrecognized or not implemented by the receiver, its value can be recorded for diagnosis but the received MKPDU shall be discarded without further processing.

Each received MKPDU that is validated as specified in this clause and verified as specified in IEEE 802.1X-2010 Section 9.4.1 shall be decoded as specified in IEEE 802.1X-2010 Section 11.11.4.

## Evaluation Activities ▼

[FCS\\_MKA\\_EXT.1.1](#)



**TSS**

The evaluator shall examine the TSS to verify that it describes the methods that the TOE implements to provide assurance of MKA integrity, including the use of an ICV and the ability to use a KDF to derive an ICK.

**Guidance**

There are no guidance EAs for this element.

**Tests**

The evaluator shall perform the following tests:

- Test 11: The evaluator shall transmit MKA traffic (MKPDUs) to the TOE from an MKA-capable peer in the operational environment. The evaluator shall verify via packet captures, audit logs, or both that the last 16 octets of the MKPDUs in the received traffic do not appear to be predictable.
- Test 12: The evaluator shall transmit valid MKA traffic to the TOE from an MKA-capable peer in the operational environment that is routed through a test system set up as a man-in-the-middle. The evaluator shall use the test system to intercept this traffic to modify one bit in a packet payload before retransmitting to the TOE. The evaluator shall verify that the traffic is discarded due to an integrity failure.

**TSS**

There are no TSS EAs for this element.

**Guidance**

There are no guidance EAs for this element.

**Tests**

The tests below require the TOE to be deployed in an environment with two MACsec-capable peers, identified as devices B and C, that the TOE can communicate with. Prior to performing these tests, the evaluator shall follow the steps in the guidance documentation to configure the TOE as the key server and principal actor (peer). The evaluator shall then perform the following tests:

- Test 13: The evaluator shall send a fresh SAK that includes both peers as active participants. The evaluator shall start an MKA session between the TOE and the two active participant peers and send MKPDUs. The evaluator shall verify from packet captures that MKPDUs are sent at least once every half-second.
- Test 14: Disconnect one of the peers. Using a man-in-the-middle device, arbitrarily introduce an artificial delay in sending a fresh SAK following the change in the Live Peer List. Repeat Test 1 delaying a fresh SAK for MKA Lifetime traffic and observe that the timeout of 6.0 seconds is enforced by the TSF.

**TSS**

The evaluator shall verify that the TSS describes the TOE's compliance with IEEE 802.1X-2010 and 802.1Xbx-2014 for MKA, including the values for MKA and Hello timeout limits and support for data delay protection. The evaluator shall also verify that the TSS describes the ability of the PAE of the TOE to establish unique CAs with individual peers and group CAs using a group CAK such that a new group SAK is distributed every time the group's membership changes. The evaluator shall also verify that the TSS describes the invalid MKPDUs that are discarded automatically by the TSF in a manner that is consistent with the SFR, and that valid MKPDUs are decoded in a manner consistent with IEEE 802.1X-2010 section 11.11.4.

**Guidance**

The evaluator shall verify that the guidance documentation provides instructions on how to configure the TOE to act as the key server in an environment with multiple MACsec-capable devices.

**Tests**

The tests below require the TOE to be deployed in an environment with two MACsec-capable peers, identified as devices B and C, that the TOE can communicate with. Prior to performing these tests, the evaluator shall follow the steps in the guidance documentation to configure the TOE as the key server and principal actor (peer). The evaluator shall then perform the following tests:

- Test 15: The evaluator shall perform the following steps:
  1. Load one PSK onto the TOE and device B and a second PSK onto the TOE and device C. This defines two pairwise CAs.

2. Generate a group CAK for the group of three devices using `ieee8021XKayCreateNewGroup`.
3. Observe via packet capture that the TOE distributes the group CAK to the two peers, protected by AES key wrap using their respective PSKs.
4. Verify that B can form an SA with C and connect securely.
5. Disable the KaY functionality of device C using `ieee8021XPaePortKayMkaEnable`.
6. Generate a group CAK for the TOE and B using `ieee8021XKayCreateNewGroup` and observe they can connect.
7. The evaluator shall have B attempt to connect to C and observe this fails.
8. Re-enable the KaY functionality of device C.
9. Invoke `ieee8021XKayCreateNewGroup` again.
10. Verify that both the TOE can connect to C and that B can connect to C.
- Test 16: The evaluator shall start an MKA session between the TOE and the two environmental MACsec peers and then perform the following steps:
  1. Send an MKPDU to the TOE's individual MAC address from a peer. Verify the frame is dropped and logged.
  2. Send an MKPDU to the TOE that is less than 32 octets long. Verify the frame is dropped and logged.
  3. Send an MKPDU to the TOE whose length in octets is not a multiple of four. Verify the frame is dropped and logged.
  4. Send an MKPDU to the TOE that is one byte short. Verify the frame is dropped and logged.
  5. Send an MKPDU to the TOE with unknown Agility Parameter. Verify the frame is dropped and logged.

### 5.0.3 Identification and Authentication (FIA)

#### FIA\_PSK\_EXT.1 Pre-Shared Key Composition

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

The TSF shall use PSKs for MKA as defined by IEEE 802.1X-2010, [**selection:** *no other protocols*, [**assignment:** *other protocols that use PSKs*] ].

**Application Note #9:** If other protocols can use PSKs, they should be listed in the assignment as well; otherwise “no other protocols” should be chosen.

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

The TSF shall be able to [**selection:** *accept, generate using the random bit generator specified in FCS\_RBG\_EXT.1* ] bit-based PSKs.

**Application Note #10:** The ST author specifies whether the TSF merely accepts bit-based PSKs or if it is also capable of generating them. If it generates them, the requirement specifies that they must be generated using the RBG provided by the TOE.

### Evaluation Activities ▼

#### [FIA\\_PSK\\_EXT.1](#)

##### **TSS**

The evaluator shall examine the TSS to ensure it describes the process by which the bit-based PSKs are generated (if the TOE supports this functionality), and confirm that this process uses the RBG specified in `FCS_RBG_EXT.1`.

##### **Guidance**

The evaluator shall examine the operational guidance to determine that it provides guidance to administrators on the composition of strong PSKs, and (if the selection indicates keys of various lengths can be entered) that it provides information on the range of lengths supported.

The evaluator shall confirm the operational guidance contains instructions for either entering bit-based PSKs for each protocol identified in the requirement, generating a bit-based PSK, or both.

##### **Tests**

The evaluator shall also perform the following tests for each protocol (or instantiation of a protocol, if performed by a different implementation on the TOE). Note that one or more of these tests can be performed with a single test case.

- Test 17: (conditional, the TOE supports PSKs of multiple lengths) The evaluator shall use the minimum length, the maximum length, a length inside the allowable range, and invalid lengths beyond the supported range (both higher and lower). The minimum, maximum, and included length tests should be successful, and the invalid lengths must be rejected by the TOE.

- *Test 18: (conditional, the TOE does not generate bit-based PSKs) The evaluator shall obtain a bit-based PSK of the appropriate length and enter it according to the instructions in the operational guidance. The evaluator shall then demonstrate that a successful protocol negotiation can be performed with the key.*
- *Test 19: (conditional, the TOE can generate bit-based PSKs) The evaluator shall generate a bit-based PSK of the appropriate length and use it according to the instructions in the operational guidance. The evaluator shall then demonstrate that a successful protocol negotiation can be performed with the key.*

## 5.0.4 Security Management (FMT)

### FMT\_SMF.1/MACSEC Specification of Management Functions (MACsec)

#### FMT\_SMF.1.1/MACSEC

The TSF shall be capable of performing the following management functions **related to MACsec functionality**: [Ability of a Security Administrator to:

- Manage a PSK-based CAK and install it in the device
- Manage the key server to create, delete, and activate MKA participants [**selection**: as specified in IEEE 802.1X-2020, Sections 9.13 and 9.16 (cf. MIB object `ieee8021XKayMkaParticipant` Entry) and section 12.2 (cf. function `createMKA()`, [**assignment**: other management function] ]
- Specify the lifetime of a CAK
- Enable, disable, or delete a PSK-based CAK using [**selection**: the MIB object `ieee8021XKayMkaPartActivateControl`, [**assignment**: other management function] ]

[**selection**:

- Cause key server to generate a new group CAK (i.e., rekey the CA) using [**selection**: MIB object `ieee8021XKayCreateNewGroup`, [**assignment**: other management function] ]
- Manage generation of a PSK-based CAK
- No other MACsec management functions

]].

**Application Note #11:** IEEE 802.1X-2010 specifies Management Information Base (MIB) objects for management functionality but configuration of management functions via other approved methods is acceptable. The ST author should select either the MIB object or provide the function used to achieve this management functionality.

If a selection containing “group CAK” is chosen in [FCS\\_MKA\\_EXT.1.5](#), then “Cause key server to generate a new group CAK...” must be selected.

## Evaluation Activities ▼

### [FMT\\_SMF.1/MACSEC](#)

#### TSS

The evaluator shall verify that the TSS describes the ability of the TOE to provide the management functions defined in this SFR.

#### Guidance

The evaluator shall examine the operational guidance to determine that it provides instructions on how to perform each of the management functions defined in this SFR.

#### Tests

The evaluator shall set up an environment where the TOE can connect to two other MACsec devices, identified as devices B and C, with the ability of PSKs to be distributed between them. The evaluator shall configure the devices so that the TOE will be elected key server and principal actor, i.e., has highest key server priority.

The evaluator shall follow the relevant operational guidance to perform the tests listed below. Note that if the TOE claims multiple management interfaces, the tests should be performed for each interface that supports the functions.

- **Test 20:** The evaluator shall connect to the PAE of the TOE and install a PSK. The evaluator shall then specify a CKN and that the PSK is to be used as a CAK.
  - Repeat this test for both 128-bit and 256-bit key sizes.
  - Repeat this test for a CKN of valid length (1-32 octets), and observe success.
  - Repeat this test again for CKN of invalid lengths zero and 33, and observe failure.
- **Test 21:** The evaluator shall test the ability of the TOE to enable and disable MKA participants using the management function specified in the ST. The evaluator shall install PSKs in devices B and C, and take any necessary additional steps to create corresponding

MKA participants. The evaluator shall disable the MKA participant on device C, then observe that the TOE can communicate with B but neither the TOE nor B can communicate with device C. The evaluator shall re-enable the MKA participant of device B and observe that the TOE is now able to communicate with devices B and C.

- Test 22: For TOEs using only PSKs, the TOE should be the key server in both tests and only one peer (B) needs to be tested. The tests are:
  - Test 22.1: Switch to unexpired CKN: TOE and Peer B have CKN1(10 minutes) and CKN2. CKN2 can either be configured with a longer overlapping lifetime (20 minutes) or be configured with a lifetime starting period of more than 10 minutes after the CKN1 start. The TOE and Peer B start using CKN1 and after 10 minutes, verify that the TOE expires SAK1. This can be verified by either 1) seeing the TOE immediately distribute a new SAK to the peer if the lifetime of CKN2 overlaps CKN1, or 2) by terminating the connection with CKN1 and distributing a new SAK once the lifetime period of CKN2 begins.
  - Test 22.2: Reject CA with expired CKN: TOE has CKN1 (10 minutes). Peer B has CKN1 (20 minutes). TOE and Peer B start using CKN1 and after 10 minutes, verify that the TOE rejects (or ignores) peer's request to use (or distribute) a SAK using CKN1.
- Test 23: (conditional, "Cause key server to generate a new group CAK..." is selected) The evaluator shall connect to the PAE of the TOE, set the management function specified in the ST (e.g., set `ieee8021XKeyCreateNewGroup` to true), and observe that the TOE distributes a new group CAK.

## 5.0.5 Protection of the TSF (FPT)

### FPT\_CAK\_EXT.1 Protection of CAK Data

FPT\_CAK\_EXT.1.1

The TSF shall prevent reading of CAK values by administrators.

**Application Note #12:** The intent is for the TOE to protect CAK data from unauthorized disclosure. This data should only be accessed for the purposes of its assigned security functionality and there is no need for it to be displayed or accessed at any other time. This requirement does not prevent the device from providing indication that these exist, are in use, or are still valid. It does, however, restrict the reading of the values outright.

### Evaluation Activities ▼

#### [FPT\\_CAK\\_EXT.1](#)

##### **TSS**

The evaluator shall examine the TSS to determine that it details how CAKs are stored and that they are unable to be viewed through an interface designed specifically for that purpose. If these values are not stored in plaintext, the TSS shall describe how they are protected or obscured.

##### **Guidance**

There are no guidance EAs for this component.

##### **Tests**

There are no test EAs for this component.

### FPT\_FLS.1 Failure with Preservation of Secure State

FPT\_FLS.1.1

The TSF shall **fail-secure** when **any of** the following types of failures occur: [failure of the power-on self-tests, failure of integrity check of the TSF executable image, failure of noise source health tests].

**Application Note #13:** The intent of this requirement is to express the fail secure capabilities that the TOE possesses. This means that the TOE must be able to attain a secure/safe state (shutdown) when any of the identified failures occur. For a TOE with redundant failover capability (that continues to operate if power-on self-test (POST) passes on the redundant component), in the event of a POST failure on a redundant component, the specific component that received the POST failure will be shut down. For conformance with other PP-Modules it might be a requirement for the fail-secure state to be "shut down."

### Evaluation Activities ▼

## [FPT\\_FLS.1](#)

### **TSS**

*The evaluator shall examine the TSS to determine that it indicates that the TSF will shut down if a self-test failure is detected. For TOEs with redundant failover capability, the evaluator shall examine the TSS to determine that it indicates that the failed components will shut down if a self-test failure is detected.*

### **Guidance**

*The evaluator shall examine the operational guidance to verify that it describes the behavior of the TOE following a self-test failure and actions that an administrator should take if it occurs.*

### **Tests**

*The following test may require the vendor to provide access to a test platform that provides the evaluator with the ability to modify the TOE internals in a manner that is not provided to end customers:*

- *Test 24: The evaluator shall modify the TSF in a way that will cause a self-test failure to occur. The evaluator shall determine that the TSF shuts down and that the behavior of the TOE is consistent with the operational guidance. The evaluator shall repeat this test for each type of self-test that can be deliberately induced to fail. For TOEs with redundant failover capability, the evaluator shall determine that the failed components shut down and the behavior of the TOE is consistent with the operational guidance. For each component, the evaluator shall repeat each type of self-test that can be deliberately induced to fail.*

## **FPT\_RPL.1 Replay Detection**

### **FPT\_RPL.1.1**

The TSF shall detect replay for the following entities: [MPDUs, MKA frames].

### **FPT\_RPL.1.2**

The TSF shall perform [discarding of the replayed data, logging of the detected replay attempt] when replay is detected.

**Application Note #14:** As per IEEE 802.1AE-2018, replay is detected by examining the PN value that is embedded in the SecTag that is at the header of the MPDU. The PN is encoded in octets 5 through 8 of the SecTag to support replay protection.

## **Evaluation Activities ▼**

## [FPT\\_RPL.1](#)

### **TSS**

*The evaluator shall examine the TSS to determine that it describes how replay is detected for MPDUs and how replayed MPDUs are handled by the TSF.*

### **Guidance**

*There are no guidance EAs for this component.*

### **Tests**

*The evaluator shall perform the following tests:*

*Before performing each test, the evaluator shall successfully establish a MACsec channel between the TOE and a MACsec-capable peer in the operational environment sending enough traffic to see it working and verify the PN values increase for each direction.*

- *Test 25: The evaluator shall set up a MACsec connection with an entity in the operational environment. The evaluator shall then capture traffic sent from this remote entity to the TOE. The evaluator shall retransmit copies of this traffic to the TOE in order to impersonate the remote entity where the PN values in the SecTag of these packets are less than the lowest acceptable PN for the SA. The evaluator shall observe that the TSF does not take action in response to receiving these packets and that the audit log indicates that the replayed traffic was discarded.*  
*The evaluator shall establish a MACsec connection between the TOE and a test system. The evaluator shall then capture traffic sent from the test system to the TOE. The evaluator shall retransmit copies of this traffic to the TOE in order to impersonate the remote entity where the PN values in the SecTag of these packets are less than the lowest acceptable PN for the SA. The evaluator shall observe that the TSF does not take action in response to receiving these packets and that the audit log indicates that the replayed traffic was discarded.*
- *Test 26: The evaluator shall capture frames during an MKA session and record the lowest*



*PN observed in a particular time range. The evaluator shall then send a frame with a lower PN, and then verify that this frame is dropped. The evaluator shall verify that the device logged this event.*

## 5.0.6 Trusted Path/Channels (FTP)

### FTP\_ITC.1/MACSEC Inter-TSF Trusted Channel (MACsec Communications)

#### FTP\_ITC.1.1/MACSEC

The TSF shall provide a communication channel between itself and a **MACsec peer** 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.

#### FTP\_ITC.1.2/MACSEC

The TSF shall permit [**selection:** *the TSF, another trusted IT product* ] to initiate communication via the trusted channel.

#### FTP\_ITC.1.3/MACSEC

The TSF shall initiate communication via the trusted channel for [*communications with MACsec peers that require the use of MACsec*].

### Evaluation Activities ▼

#### [FTP\\_ITC.1/MACSEC](#)

*This SFR is addressed through evaluation of [FCS\\_MACSEC\\_EXT.1](#) through [FCS\\_MACSEC\\_EXT.4](#).*

## 5.0.7 Identification and Authentication (FIA)

### FIA\_AFL\_EXT.1 Authentication Attempt Limiting

#### FIA\_AFL\_EXT.1.1

When three unsuccessful authentication attempts have been made to the local console, the TSF shall limit the rate of login attempts to one per minute.

**Application Note #15:** This requirement applies to an administrator at a local console. This anti-hammering requirement is to slow down brute force password guessing.

### Evaluation Activities ▼

#### [FIA\\_AFL\\_EXT.1](#)

##### **TSS**

*The evaluator shall examine the TSS to determine that it describes the ability of the TSF to limit the rate at which authentication attempts can be made at the local console following three successive failed attempts.*

##### **Guidance**

*If the TOE requires configuration to be put into a state where authentication attempt limiting is enforced, the evaluator shall review the operational guidance to verify that it describes the procedures to configure the TOE into this state.*

##### **Tests**

- *Test 27: The evaluator shall follow the operational guidance to configure the TOE into a state that enforces authentication attempt limiting (if applicable). The evaluator shall successfully log in to the TOE at a local console, log back out, and immediately log back in in order to demonstrate that successive authentication attempts can be made in under a minute. The evaluator shall then enter an incorrect password three consecutive times for the same account to trigger authentication attempt limiting. Once the TOE is in this state, the evaluator shall attempt to log in to the TOE periodically over several attempts of varying time intervals and observe that authentication attempts cannot be made any more frequently than once per minute.*

## 5.0.8 Protection of the TSF (FPT)

### FPT\_DDP\_EXT.1 Data Delay Protection

The TSF shall enable data delay protection for MKA that ensures data frames protected by MACsec are not delayed by more than two seconds.

## Evaluation Activities ▼

### [FPT\\_DDP\\_EXT.1](#)

#### **TSS**

*There are no TSS EAs for this component.*

#### **Guidance**

*There are no guidance EAs for this component.*

#### **Tests**

*The test below requires the TOE to be deployed in an environment with two MACsec-capable peers, identified as devices B and C, that the TOE can communicate with. Prior to performing this test, the evaluator shall follow the steps in the guidance documentation to configure the TOE as the key server and principal actor. The evaluator shall then perform the following test:*

- *Test 28: The evaluator shall use a peer device to send traffic to the TOE, arbitrarily inducing artificial delays in their transmission using a man-in-the-middle setup. The evaluator shall observe that traffic delayed longer than 2.0 seconds is rejected.*

## **FPT\_RPL\_EXT.1 Replay Protection for XPN**

### FPT\_RPL\_EXT.1.1

The TSF shall support extended packet numbering (XPN) as per IEEE 802.1AE-2018.

### FPT\_RPL\_EXT.1.2

The TSF shall support [**selection:** GCM-AES-XPN-128, GCM-AES-XPN-256 ] as per IEEE 802.1AE-2018.

**Application Note #16:** XPN support is expected for devices that are capable of 40Gbps or higher throughput. This SFR is optional because not all conformant TOEs are expected to provide this level of bandwidth. For XPN the full 64-bit PN is recovered using the 32 least significant bits conveyed in the SecTag and the 32 most significant bits are recovered on receipt of a frame.

## Evaluation Activities ▼

### [FPT\\_RPL\\_EXT.1](#)

#### **TSS**

*The evaluator shall examine the TSS to determine that it includes XPN in the description of how replay is detected for MPDUs and how replayed MPDUs are handled by the TSF.*

#### **Guidance**

*If the use of XPN or the XPN ciphersuites used by the TOE are configurable, the evaluator shall examine the guidance documentation to determine that it describes how this is configured.*

#### **Tests**

*The evaluator shall perform the following tests:*

- *Test 29: The evaluator shall establish a MACsec connection between the TOE and a test system using the GCM-AES-XPN-128 ciphersuite if selected, otherwise use GCM-AES-XPN-256. The evaluator shall write or obtain a script to send a small frame with a known payload (such as five bytes of all zeroes) to the TOE. The evaluator shall activate a packet capture tool on the connection between the TOE and the test system and then use the test system to send this frame to the TOE 4,294,967,267 ( $2^{32} + 1$ ) times. The evaluator shall use the packet capture tool to verify that for the first and last frames sent, the least significant 32 bits are the same. This means the most significant bits should have been incremented during this test. Since the IV is different the two encrypted frames should be different. Note that if traffic is sent to the TOE at a rate of 10 GB/s, this will take approximately five minutes as per IEEE 802.1AE-2018.*
- *Test 30: If both ciphersuites were selected, then the evaluator shall reconfigure the TOE using the second ciphersuite and rerun Test 1 to demonstrate support for both ciphersuites.*

## FTP\_TRP.1/MACSEC Trusted Path (MACsec Administration)

### FTP\_TRP.1.1/MACSEC

The TSF shall provide a communication path between itself and [remote] users **using [selection: MACsec, SNMPv3 ]** that is logically distinct from other communication paths and provides assured identification of its end points and protection of the communicated data from [modification, disclosure].

### FTP\_TRP.1.2/MACSEC

The TSF shall permit [remote users] to initiate communication via the trusted path.

### FTP\_TRP.1.3/MACSEC

The TSF shall require the use of the trusted path for [remote administration of MACsec management functions as defined in [FMT\\_SMF.1/MACSEC](#)].

**Application Note #17:** This SFR is optional because it is permissible for the management functions defined in this PP-Module to be implemented solely through the trusted path defined in FTP\_TRP.1/Admin in the Base-PP. If SNMP is selected, the [FCS\\_SNMP\\_EXT.1](#) and [FMT\\_SNMP\\_EXT.1](#) SFRs must be claimed.

## Evaluation Activities ▼

### [FTP\\_TRP.1/MACSEC](#)

If “MACsec” is selected in [FTP\\_TRP.1.1/MACSEC](#), this SFR is addressed through evaluation of [FCS\\_MACSEC\\_EXT.1](#) through [FCS\\_MACSEC\\_EXT.4](#).

If “SNMPv3” is selected in [FTP\\_TRP.1.1/MACSEC](#), this SFR is addressed through evaluation of [FCS\\_SNMP\\_EXT.1](#) and [FMT\\_SNMP\\_EXT.1](#).

For these EAs, the evaluator shall ensure that the testing is performed on the management interface (e.g., if “MACsec” is selected in [FTP\\_TRP.1.1/MACSEC](#), the evaluator shall repeat the testing as needed for the management interface and not rely on the testing of an outbound connection to an arbitrary MACsec peer).

## 5.0.10 Cryptographic Support (FCS)

### FCS\_DEVID\_EXT.1 Secure Device Identifiers

***The inclusion of this selection-based component depends upon selection in [FCS\\_MACSEC\\_EXT.4.1](#).***

#### FCS\_DEVID\_EXT.1.1

The TSF shall implement Secure Device Identifiers (DevIDs) following IEEE Standard 802.1AR-2018.

#### FCS\_DEVID\_EXT.1.2

The TSF shall contain an Initial DevID (IDevID) as specified in Section 6 of IEEE 802.1AR-2018.

#### FCS\_DEVID\_EXT.1.3

The TSF shall contain the credential chain as specified in Section 6.3 of IEEE 802.1AR-2018.

#### FCS\_DEVID\_EXT.1.4

The TSF shall verify that both the Supplicant and Authenticator DevIDs presented for EAP-TLS have credentials that chain to one of the specified Certificate Authorities.

#### FCS\_DEVID\_EXT.1.5

The TSF shall not establish a trusted channel if the Supplicant DevID is invalid.

#### FCS\_DEVID\_EXT.1.6

The TSF shall support mutual authentication using DevIDs.

#### FCS\_DEVID\_EXT.1.7

The TSF shall support the following operations as specified in Section 7.2 of IEEE 802.1AR-2018:

1. Enable or disable DevID credential
2. Enable or disable DevID key

## Evaluation Activities ▼



[FCS\\_DEVID\\_EXT.1.1](#)

[FCS\\_DEVID\\_EXT.1.2](#)

[FCS\\_DEVID\\_EXT.1.3](#)

[FCS\\_DEVID\\_EXT.1.4](#)

[FCS\\_DEVID\\_EXT.1.5](#)

### **TSS**

*The evaluator shall check the TSS to verify that it describes how the TSF implements and validates DevIDs.*

### **Guidance**

*There are no guidance EAs for this element.*

### **Tests**

*The evaluator shall perform the following tests:*

- Test 31:
  1. *The evaluator shall install a DevID in the Supplicant that has one octet changed to invalidate the signature.*
  2. *The evaluator shall cause the Supplicant to initiate an EAP-TLS session with the Authenticator.*
  3. *The evaluator shall verify that the connection fails.*
- Test 32:
  1. *The evaluator shall install a DevID in the Supplicant with a valid signature but from an issuer not recognized by the Authenticator.*
  2. *The evaluator shall cause the Supplicant to initiate an EAP-TLS session with the Authenticator.*
  3. *The evaluator shall verify that the connection fails.*
- Test 33:
  1. *The evaluator shall cause the Supplicant to initiate an EAP-TLS session with the Authenticator.*
  2. *The evaluator shall intercept, manipulate, and retransmit the packets sent by the Supplicant so that the presented name differs from the name in the DevID.*
  3. *The evaluator shall verify that the connection fails.*

[FCS\\_DEVID\\_EXT.1.6](#)

### **TSS**

*The evaluator shall check the TSS to verify that it describes the ability of the TSF to support mutual authentication using DevIDs.*

### **Guidance**

*There are no guidance EAs for this element.*

### **Tests**

*The evaluator shall perform the following test:*

- Test 34:
  - *Step 1: The evaluator shall cause the Supplicant to initiate an EAP-TLS session with the Authenticator in which mutual authentication is requested.*
  - *Step 2: The evaluator shall verify that the EAP-TLS packet with a Client Certificate Request message is sent and that the Supplicant responds with its DevID.*

[FCS\\_DEVID\\_EXT.1.7](#)

### **TSS**

*The evaluator shall check the TSS to verify that it describes the ability of the TSF to support the signing, enable and disable DevID credential, and enable and disable DevID key operations.*

### **Guidance**

*There are no guidance EAs for this element.*

### **Tests**

*The evaluator shall perform the following tests:*

- Test 35:
  1. *The evaluator shall disable the Supplicant public key by setting MIB object devIDPublicKeyEnabled to false.*
  2. *The evaluator shall cause Supplicant to initiate an EAP-TLS session with the Authenticator.*
  3. *The evaluator shall verify that the Supplicant is unable to authenticate.*
  4. *The evaluator shall re-enable the public key, then verify the Supplicant can authenticate.*
- Test 36:
  1. *The evaluator shall disable the Supplicant DevID by setting MIB object devIDCredentialEnabled to false.*

2. The evaluator shall cause Supplicant to initiate an EAP-TLS session with the Authenticator.
3. The evaluator shall verify that the Supplicant is unable to authenticate.
4. The evaluator shall re-enable the DevID, then verify the Supplicant can authenticate.

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

**The inclusion of this selection-based component depends upon selection in [FCS\\_MACSEC\\_EXT.4.1](#).**

### FCS\_EAPTLS\_EXT.1.1

The TSF shall implement the Extensible Authentication Protocol (EAP) as specified in RFC 3748 and EAP-Transport Layer Security (EAP-TLS) as specified in RFC 5216 as updated by RFC 8996 with TLS implemented using mutual authentication in accordance with **[selection:**

- *FCS\_DTLSC\_EXT.1 and FCS\_DTLSC\_EXT.2*
- *FCS\_DTLSS\_EXT.1 and FCS\_DTLSS\_EXT.2*
- *FCS\_TLSC\_EXT.1 and FCS\_TLSC\_EXT.2*
- *FCS\_TLSS\_EXT.1 and FCS\_TLSS\_EXT.2*

**] from the Base-PP.**

**Application Note #18:** If this SFR is selected, the FCS\_(D)TLSC\_EXT or FCS\_(D)TLSS\_EXT SFRs from the Base-PP must be included.

RFC 8996 deprecates TLS 1.1.

## Evaluation Activities ▼

### [FCS\\_EAPTLS\\_EXT.1](#)

#### **TSS**

The evaluator shall check the TSS to verify that it describes the ability of the TSF to support EAP-TLS.

#### **Guidance**

There are no guidance EAs for this component.

#### **Tests**

The evaluator shall set up an environment where the TOE can connect to a second MACsec device, identified as device B. The evaluator shall configure the devices to use EAP-TLS as the authentication method. The evaluator shall set up an authentication server, which may run on the TOE or be a separate device that connects to the test environment.

The evaluator shall then perform the following modifications to Request EAP packets from device B to the TOE:

1. The evaluator shall increment the length field of a Request EAP packet and verify that the TOE does not respond (i.e., silently discards the packet).
2. The evaluator shall append at least one octet to the end of a Request EAP packet and verify that the TOE responds as if there was no change (i.e., ignores the additional octets).
3. The evaluator shall modify the code field of a Request EAP packet to 5 and verify that the TOE does not respond (i.e., silently discards the packet).

Testing of the security of the (D)TLS protocol is performed as part of FCS\_(D)TLSS\_EXT.1 and .2 or FCS\_(D)TLSC\_EXT.1 and .2 in the Base-PP.

## FCS\_SNMP\_EXT.1 SNMP Protocol

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

### FCS\_SNMP\_EXT.1.1

The TSF shall support SNMP using TLS as specified in RFC 6353 as updated by RFC 8996 with TLS implemented using mutual authentication in accordance with **[selection:**

- *FCS\_DTLSC\_EXT.1 and FCS\_DTLSC\_EXT.2*
- *FCS\_DTLSS\_EXT.1 and FCS\_DTLSS\_EXT.2*
- *FCS\_TLSC\_EXT.1 and FCS\_TLSC\_EXT.2*

- *FCS\_TLSS\_EXT.1 and FCS\_TLSS\_EXT.2*

] from the Base-PP.

**Application Note #19:** If this SFR is selected, the appropriate FCS\_(D)TLSC\_EXT and FCS\_(D)TLSS\_EXT SFRs from the Base-PP must be included.

## Evaluation Activities ▼

### *FCS\_SNMP\_EXT.1*

#### **TSS**

*The evaluator shall check the TSS to verify that it describes the ability of the TSF to support SNMP-TLS.*

#### **Guidance**

*There are no guidance EAs for this component.*

#### **Tests**

*The evaluator shall perform the following tests:*

- *Test 37: The evaluator shall attempt to connect to the TOE using one of the SNMP-TLS ciphersuites supported by the TOE. The evaluator shall confirm that the connection is successful.*
- *Test 38: The evaluator shall attempt to connect to the TOE using an SNMP-TLS ciphersuite not supported by the TOE. The evaluator shall confirm that the connection is not successful.*

*Testing of the security of the (D)TLS protocol is performed as part of testing FCS\_(D)TLSS\_EXT.1 and .2, or FCS\_(D)TLSC\_EXT.1 and .2 from the Base-PP.*

## 5.0.11 Security Management (FMT)

### **FMT\_SNMP\_EXT.1 SNMP Management**

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

#### FMT\_SNMP\_EXT.1.1

The TSF shall implement Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) with TLS security in conformance with RFC 6353 "Transport Layer Security (TLS) Transport Model for the Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP)."

#### FMT\_SNMP\_EXT.1.2

The TSF shall permit access to TSF management functions using only SNMP version 3.

#### FMT\_SNMP\_EXT.1.3

The TSF shall support the following password quality metrics for SNMPv3 passwords: [*character selections and minimum length defined in FIA\_PMG\_EXT.1*].

**Application Note #20:** FIA\_PMG\_EXT.1 is defined in the Base-PP so a conformant MACsec TOE will include this dependency.

## Evaluation Activities ▼

### *FMT\_SNMP\_EXT.1*

#### **TSS**

*The evaluator shall examine the TSS to determine that it describes the ability of the TSF to support SNMPv3 for remote management for connections to authorized IT entities (per [FTP\\_TRP.1/MACSEC](#)), and that it can apply appropriate password restrictions to this interface.*

#### **Guidance**

*If the TOE requires configuration to be put into a state where SNMPv3 is the only version of SNMP that is accepted, the evaluator shall verify that the operational guidance provides instructions on how to disable unsupported versions of SNMP.*

#### **Tests**

*The evaluator shall configure the TOE in accordance with its operational guidance to accept no versions of SNMP other than SNMPv3 (if applicable). The evaluator shall then perform the*

*following tests:*

- *Test 39: The evaluator shall attempt to connect to the TOE using SNMPv2 and observe that the connection is not successful.*
- *Test 40: The evaluator shall attempt to connect to the TOE using SNMPv1 and observe that the connection is not successful.*

*Testing of the security of the SNMPv3 trusted path is done as part of [FCS\\_SNMP\\_EXT.1](#). Testing of the password complexity policy is performed as part of [FIA\\_PMG\\_EXT.1](#) in the Base-PP. Testing of the ability to manage the TSF using SNMPv3 is carried out as part of [FMT\\_SMF.1/MACSEC](#).*

# Appendix A - Implicitly Satisfied Requirements

This appendix lists requirements that should be considered satisfied by products successfully evaluated against this PP-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-Module provides evidence that these controls are present and have been evaluated.

**Table 3: Implicitly Satisfied Requirements**

Requirement	Rationale for Satisfaction
<b>FIA_UAU.1 - Timing of Authentication</b>	<a href="#">FIA_AFL_EXT.1</a> has a dependency on FIA_UAU.1 because the notion of authentication failure handling implies the existence of an authentication mechanism. This dependency is addressed by a conformant TOE through the Base-PP requirement FIA_UAU_EXT.2, which defines authentication mechanisms specific to network devices.

# Appendix B - Allocation of Requirements in Distributed TOEs

For a distributed TOE, the SFRs 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
FAU_GEN.1/MACSEC	Audit Data Generation (MACsec)	All
FCS_COP.1/CMAC	Cryptographic Operation (AES-CMAC Keyed Hash Algorithm)	Feature Dependent
FCS_COP.1/MACSEC	Cryptographic Operation (MACsec AES Data Encryption and Decryption)	Feature Dependent
FCS_MACSEC_EXT.1	MACsec	Feature Dependent
FCS_MACSEC_EXT.2	MACsec Integrity and Confidentiality	Feature Dependent
FCS_MACSEC_EXT.3	MACsec Randomness	Feature Dependent
FCS_MACSEC_EXT.4	MACsec Key Usage	Feature Dependent
FCS_MKA_EXT.1	MACsec Key Agreement	Feature Dependent
FIA_PSK_EXT.1	Pre-Shared Key Composition	Feature Dependent
FMT_SMF.1/MACSEC	Specification of Management Functions (MACsec)	One
FPT_CAK_EXT.1	Protection of CAK Data	Feature Dependent
FPT_FLS.1	Failure with Preservation of Secure State	All
FPT_RPL.1	Replay Detection	Feature Dependent
FPT_ITC.1/MACSEC	Inter-TSF Trusted Channel (MACsec Communications)	Feature Dependent
FIA_AFL_EXT.1	Authentication Attempt Limiting	One
FPT_DDP_EXT.1	Data Delay Protection	Feature Dependent
FPT_RPL_EXT.1	Replay Detection for XPN	Feature Dependent
FTP_TRP.1/MACSEC	Trusted Path (MACsec Administration)	One
FCS_DEVID_EXT.1	Secure Device Identifiers	Feature Dependent
FCS_EAPTLS_EXT.1	EAP-TLS Protocol	Feature Dependent
FCS_SNMP_EXT.1	SNMP Protocol	Feature Dependent
FMT_SNMP_EXT.1	SNMP Management	Feature Dependent

# Appendix C - Entropy Documentation and Assessment

The TOE does not require any additional supplementary information to describe its entropy source beyond the requirements outlined in the Base-PP. As with other Base-PP requirements, the only additional requirement is that the entropy documentation also applies to the specific MACsec Ethernet encryption capabilities of the TOE that require random data, in addition to any functionality required by the Base-PP. [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.

[NDcPP] [collaborative Protection Profile for Network Devices](#), Version 2.2e, March 23, 2020 [NDcPP SD]  
[Supporting Document - Evaluation Activities for Network Device cPP](#), Version 2.2, December 2019 [MOD\_FW]  
[PP-Module for Stateful Traffic Filter Firewalls](#), Version 1.4 + Errata 20200625, June 25, 2020 [MOD\_VPNGW]  
[PP-Module for VPN Gateways](#), Version 1.2, March 31, 2022