

# PP-Module for Host Agent



Version: 2.0  
2026-01-13

**National Information Assurance Partnership**

## Revision History

---

| Version | Date       | Comment                |
|---------|------------|------------------------|
| 1.0     | 2020-10-23 | First version released |
| 2.0     | 2026-01-13 | CC:2022 Conversion     |

## 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  |
| 1.3.1        | TOE Boundary   |
| 1.3.2        | TOE Platform   |
| 1.4          | Use Cases  |
| 2            | Conformance Claims   |
| 3            | Security Problem Definition  |
| 3.1          | Threats  |
| 3.2          | Assumptions  |
| 3.3          | Organizational Security Policies   |
| 4            | Security Objectives  |
| 4.1          | Security Objectives for the Operational Environment                                    |
| 5            | Security Requirements  |
| 5.1          | Protection Profile for Application Software Security Functional Requirements Direction |
| 5.1.1        | Modified SFRs  |
| 5.2          | TOE Security Functional Requirements   |
| 5.2.1        | Auditable Events for Mandatory SFRs  |
| 5.2.2        | Security Audit (FAU)   |
| 5.2.3        | User Data Protection (FDP)   |
| 5.2.4        | Host Agent (FHA)   |
| 5.2.5        | Security Management (FMT)  |
| 5.3          | TOE Security Functional Requirements Rationale   |
| 6            | Consistency Rationale  |
| 6.1          | Protection Profile for Application Software  |
| 6.1.1        | Consistency of TOE Type  |
| 6.1.2        | Consistency of Security Problem Definition   |
| 6.1.3        | Consistency of OE Objectives   |
| 6.1.4        | Consistency of Requirements  |
| Appendix A - | Optional SFRs  |
| A.1          | Strictly Optional Requirements   |
| A.2          | Objective Requirements   |
| A.2.1        | Auditable Events for Objective SFRs  |
| A.2.2        | Security Management (FMT)  |
| A.3          | Implementation-dependent Requirements  |
| Appendix B - | Selection-based Requirements   |
| B.1          | Auditable Events for Selection-based SFRs  |
| B.2          | Host Agent (FHA)   |
| B.3          | Trusted Path/Channels (FTP)  |
| Appendix C - | Extended Component Definitions   |
| C.1          | Extended Components Table  |
| C.2          | Extended Component Definitions   |
| C.2.1        | Host Agent (FHA)   |
| C.2.1.1      | FHA_CHA_EXT Cache Host Agent Collected Data  |
| C.2.1.2      | FHA_COL_EXT Collected Audit  |
| C.2.2        | Security Audit (FAU)   |
| C.2.2.1      | FAU_STO_EXT Audit Data Storage   |
| C.2.3        | Security Management (FMT)  |
| C.2.3.1      | FMT_UNR_EXT User Unenrollment Prevention   |
| C.2.3.2      | FMT_POL_EXT Trusted Policy Update  |
| C.2.4        | Trusted Path/Channels (FTP)  |

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| C.2.4.1      | FTP_DIT_EXT Protection of Data in Transit |
| C.2.5        | User Data Protection (FDP)                |
| C.2.5.1      | FDP_NET_EXT Network Communications        |
| Appendix D - | Implicitly Satisfied Requirements         |
| Appendix E - | Acronyms                                  |
| Appendix F - | Bibliography                              |

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Overview

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

- Protection Profile for Application Software Version 2.0

This ~~Base-PP~~ is valid because a Host Agent is deployed as a software application on a general-purpose operating system.

## 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.   |
| Direct Rationale                                    | A type of Protection Profile, PP-Module, or Security Target in which the security problem definition (SPD) elements are mapped directly to the SFRs and possibly to the security objectives for the operational environment. There are no security objectives for the TOE.                  |
| 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 (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

|                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Endpoint                              | A computing device that runs a general purpose OS, mobile device OS, or network device OS. Endpoints can include desktops, servers, and mobile devices.  |
| Endpoint Detection and Response (EDR) | A system that analyzes collected EDR Host Agent data for detecting, investigating, and remediating unauthorized activities on endpoints.   |
| Enrolled State                        | The state in which an endpoint with a running Host Agent is managed by an ESM. Also, referred to as Onboarding.  |
| Enrollment                            | The process of transitioning an endpoint from an unenrolled to an enrolled state.  |
| Enterprise Security Management (ESM)  | A type of application hosted on a server or cloud service that provides support for security management, information flows, reporting, policy, and data analytics in complex enterprise environments.  |
| Host Agent                            | A logical piece of software that executes on endpoints to collect data about the endpoint and executes commands sent to the endpoint from an ESM server or service. An example command sent to an endpoint could be to enforce a policy from an ESM, to collect some files, or to run an OS command. |
| Operating System (OS)                 | Software that manages physical and logical resources and provides services for applications.   |
| Unenrolled State                      | The state in which an endpoint, with or without a Host Agent, is not managed by an ESM. Also, referred to as Offboarding.  |

## 1.3 Compliant Targets of Evaluation

The ~~PP-Module~~ for Host Agent covers the security functionality needed on the endpoint device (desktop, mobile device, etc.) for ~~ESM~~ software products in general. This version of the ~~PP-Module~~ is paired with the ~~PP-Module~~ for ~~EDR~~. Future versions of this ~~PP-Module~~ will include requirements for other classes of ~~ESM~~ software. It is expected that an ~~ESM~~ system will evaluate against a ~~PP-Configuration~~ that includes both the ~~PP-Module~~ for Host Agent and at least one other ~~ESM PP-Module~~; currently, this only includes the ~~PP-Module~~ for ~~EDR~~.

### 1.3.1 TOE Boundary

The boundary for the Host Agent includes all processes, all modules, and libraries bundled with the Host Agent. The Host Agent can run as a daemon or service on the platform but is not required to. The Host Agent is not expected to have a local or remote Graphical User Interface (GUI) for administration but having such an interface is not precluded by this ~~PP-Module~~. It is expected that Host Agents will be managed by their associated ~~ESM~~ server or the underlying platform. The ~~TOE~~ boundary includes the communications channel with other Host Agents, an ~~ESM~~ server, or a cloud service. The platform operating system or execution environment upon which the Host Agent is executing is outside the scope of a Host Agent evaluation. The figures below show some sample Host Agents but are not inclusive of every possible Host Agent design.



Figure 1: Sample Host Agent TOE



Figure 2: Sample Host Agent TOE

### 1.3.2 TOE Platform

The TOE platform consists of a general purpose OS, a mobile device OS, a network device OS, or an Execution Environment on top of which the Host Agent software executes.

## 1.4 Use Cases

Requirements in this PP-Module are designed to address the security problem for the following use cases. These use cases are intentionally very broad, as many different types of ESM Host Agent products may exist. As this PP-Module is revised to allow for more specific types of ESM Host Agent products, additional use cases may be devised.

### [USE CASE 1] Communication

The Host Agent allows for communication interactively or non-interactively with other ESM software over a communications channel. Example communications include but are not limited to; receiving policy, sending data, and running tasks or commands.

## 2 Conformance Claims

### Conformance Statement

An **ST** must claim exact conformance to this **PP-Module**.

The evaluation methods used for evaluating the **TOE** are a combination of the workunits defined in [\[CEM\]](#) as well as the Evaluation Activities for ensuring that individual **SERs** and **SARs** have a sufficient level of supporting evidence in the Security Target and guidance documentation and have been sufficiently tested by the laboratory as part of completing ATE\_IND.1. Any functional packages this **PP** claims similarly contain their own Evaluation Activities that are used in this same manner.

### CC Conformance Claims

This **PP-Module** is conformant to Part 2 (extended) and Part 3 (extended) of Common Criteria **CC**:2022, Revision 1.

### PP Claim

This **PP-Module** does not claim conformance to any Protection Profile.

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

- Protection Profile for Application Software Version 2.0
- **PP-Module** for Endpoint Detection and Response (**EDR**), Version 2.0
- **PP-Module** for Enterprise-Management (**EM**), Version 2.0

### Package Claim

- This **PP-Module** is Functional Package for SSH, Version 2.0 conformant.
- This **PP-Module** is Functional Package for TLS, Version 2.1 conformant.
- This **PP-Module** is Functional Package for X.509, Version 1.0 conformant.
- This **PP-Module** does not conform to any assurance packages.

The functional packages to which the **PP** conforms may include **SERs** that are not mandatory to claim for the sake of conformance.

An **ST** that claims one or more of these functional packages may include any non-mandatory **SERs** that are appropriate to claim based on the capabilities of the **TSE** and on any triggers for their inclusion based inherently on the **SER** selections made.

## 3 Security Problem Definition

The security problem is described in terms of the threats that the Host Agent is expected to address, assumptions about the Operational Environment, and any organizational security policies that the Host Agent is expected to enforce. These extend any threats, assumptions, and organizational security policies defined by the ~~Base-PP~~.

### 3.1 Threats

---

Note that this ~~PP-Module~~ does not repeat the threats identified in the [\[AppPP\]](#), though they all apply given the conformance and hence dependence of this ~~PP-Module~~ on the [\[AppPP\]](#).

#### **T.DATA\_LOSS**

A Host Agent can be susceptible to data loss during periods when connectivity to the ~~ESM~~ system is not present.

#### **T.TAMPER**

A Host Agent can be susceptible to tampering by unprivileged users who may try to uninstall or disrupt the Host Agent's ability to function properly.

### 3.2 Assumptions

---

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 Operational Environment

---

This PP-Module does not define any objectives for the OE.

# 5 Security Requirements

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

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

## 5.1 Protection Profile for Application Software Security Functional Requirements Direction

In a PP::Configuration that includes App PP, the TOE is expected to rely on some of the security functions implemented by the application as a whole and evaluated against the Base-PP. The SFRs listed in this section are defined in the Base-PP and relevant to the secure operation of the Host Agent. This section describes any modifications that the ST author must make to the Base-PP SFRs to satisfy the required Host Agent functionality.

### 5.1.1 Modified SFRs

This PP::Module does not modify any SFRs defined by the App PP.

## 5.2 TOE Security Functional Requirements

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

### 5.2.1 Auditable Events for Mandatory SFRs

Table 1: Auditable Events for Mandatory Requirements

| Requirement   | Auditable Events    | Additional Audit Record Contents |
|---------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| FAU_GEN.1/HA  | No events specified | N/A                              |
| FAU_STO_EXT.1 | No events specified | N/A                              |
| FDP_NET_EXT.2 | No events specified | N/A                              |
| FHA_HAD_EXT.1 | No events specified | N/A                              |
| FMT_SMF.1/HA  | No events specified | N/A                              |
| FMT_UNR_EXT.1 | No events specified | N/A                              |

### 5.2.2 Security Audit (FAU)

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

FAU\_GEN.1.1/HA

The TSF shall be able to generate audit data of the following auditable events:

- ~~Start-up and shutdown of the audit functions;~~
- All auditable events for the [not specified] level of audit;

[

- Change in enrollment state with an ESM system,
- [selection: Receiving, Generating] periodic heartbeat events,
- [assignment: Other specifically defined auditable events]

].

**Application Note:** The required audit events must be generated by the Host Agent, but can leverage ~~API~~'s available from the platform if needed to generate the audit events. For the selection one or both options may be selected. The assignment may be empty, a single item, or multiple items. Changes in enrollment include new enrollment and unenrollment.

FAU\_GEN.1.2/HA

The [selection: ~~TSE~~, ~~TOE Platform~~] shall record within the audit data 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;
- b. For each audit type, based on the auditable event definitions of the functional components included in the ~~PP~~, ~~PP-Module~~, functional package, or ~~ST~~, [assignment: other audit relevant information].

**Application Note:** All audits must contain at least the information mentioned in [FAU\\_GEN.1.2/HA](#), but may contain more information. The term *subject* here is understood to be the user that the process is acting on behalf of or for network communication related events the server name/address. The subject identity can be blank if not applicable for a given process. The assignment may be empty, a single item, or multiple items.

## Evaluation Activities ▼

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

**TSS**

*The evaluator shall verify the TSS lists all record types that are recorded.*

*The evaluator shall verify that the TSS lists all the auditable event types and all audit information that the TOE records.*

### **Guidance**

*The evaluator shall check the administrative guide and ensure that it lists all of the auditable events. The evaluator shall check to make sure that every audit event type selected in the ST is included.*

*The evaluator shall check the administrative guide and ensure that it provides a format for audit records. Each audit record format type must be covered, along with a brief description of each field. The evaluator shall ensure that the fields contain the information required.*

### **Tests**

- Test FAU\_GEN.1/HA:1: The evaluator shall test the Host Agent's ability to correctly generate audit records by having the Host Agent generate audit records for each type of event listed in the ST.
- Test FAU\_GEN.1/HA:2: The evaluator shall ensure the audit records generated during testing match the format specified in the administrative guide, and that the fields in each audit record provide the required information.

## FAU\_STO\_EXT.1 Audit Data Storage

FAU\_STO\_EXT.1.1

The [selection: ~~TSE~~, ~~TOE Platform~~] shall store audit events in the platform-provided logging mechanism.

**Application Note:** The term *audit events* here is understood to be only the set of events defined in [FAU\\_GEN.1/HA](#). If the job of this Host Agent is to generate or collect events for an ~~ESM~~ server it is not expected that those events will be stored in the platform-provided logging mechanism.

## Evaluation Activities ▼

[FAU\\_STO\\_EXT.1](#)

**TSS**

*The evaluator shall verify the TSS contains details of where all audit data is stored.*

### **Guidance**

The evaluator shall check the administrative guide and ensure that the list of auditable events are stored in the platform-provided logging mechanism.

#### Tests

The evaluator shall test the Host Agent's ability to correctly generate audit records by having the TSE generate audit records for the events listed in the ST. This should include all instance types of an event specified. When verifying the test results, the evaluator shall ensure the audit records generated during testing are stored in the platform-provided logging mechanism.

On Linux based platforms this would be in var/logs. On Windows based platforms this would be the Windows Event Log.

No specific locations are defined for other platforms.

## 5.2.3 User Data Protection (FDP)

### FDP\_NET\_EXT.2 Network Communications

#### FDP\_NET\_EXT.2.1

The TSE shall restrict network communications to: [selection:

- An ESM server
- Another Host Agent

]

**Application Note:** By selecting another Host Agent the additional FDP\_DIT\_EXT.2 requirements must be included in the ST for peer-to-peer communication.

This restricts the selections in the Base-PP to a specific list of communications that may be user or application initiated.

#### Evaluation Activities

#### FDP\_NET\_EXT.2

##### TSS

The evaluator shall confirm the TSS lists network communication destinations and that it matches the selections made in the SER.

##### Guidance

The evaluator shall confirm that guidance is provided for any configuration needed to limit network communications.

##### Tests

The evaluator shall run the application. While the application is running, the evaluator shall sniff network traffic ignoring all non-application associated traffic and verify that any network communications witnessed are limited to the selection made in the SER.

## 5.2.4 Host Agent (FHA)

### FHA\_HAD\_EXT.1 Host Agent Declaration

#### FHA\_HAD\_EXT.1.1

The TSE shall operate with the following ESM software: [selection:

- Endpoint Detection and Response (EDR)
- [assignment: Other NIAP-approved ESM servers]

].

**Application Note:** Currently, the only NIAP-approved ESM server is EDR; PP-Modules for other ESM servers (Systems Management and Audit Server) will be added in the future. By including EDR, the additional FHA\_CHA\_EXT.1 and FHA\_COL\_EXT.1 requirements must be included in the ST.

#### Evaluation Activities

#### FHA\_HAD\_EXT.1

##### TSS

The evaluator shall verify the TSS lists all classes of products the Host Agent is designed to function with.

**Guidance**

The evaluator shall check the administrative guide and ensure that guidance exists for enrollment with all compatible ESM products identified in the ST.

**Tests**

Conditional: If "EDR" is selected, the evaluator shall install the Host Agent and enroll it with the EDR management system. The evaluator shall verify that enrollment was successful and that the Host Agent is communicating with the EDR.

## 5.2.5 Security Management (FMT)

### FMT\_SMF.1/HA Specification of Management Functions (Configuration of Host Agent)

#### FMT\_SMF.1.1/HA

The TSE shall be capable of performing the following management functions: [**assignment:** list of management functions to be provided by the TSE].

**Application Note:** This requirement captures all the configuration functionality the TSE provides the administrator to configure the Host Agent. The configuration of these management functions can be achieved by either local configuration of the Host Agent or by remote configuration using the ESM server. The frequency for sending data to an ESM can be specified as a time value, but does not have to be. A value like Aggressive, Normal, Low Bandwidth is a measure of control of frequency and meets the requirement. Host Agent data refers to the data collected in the requirements in this PP-Module, such as [FHA\\_COL\\_EXT.1.1](#).

#### Evaluation Activities ▼

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

###### TSS

The evaluator shall verify the TSS contains all frequencies for sending Host Agent data to an ESM and all labels that are permitted.

###### **Guidance**

The evaluator shall verify that every management function mandated by the PP-Module is described in the operational guidance and that the description contains the information required to perform the management duties associated with the management function.

###### **Tests**

The evaluator shall test the ability to configure the Host Agent and test each function listed in the SER. The evaluator is expected to test these functions in all the ways in which the ST and guidance documentation state the configuration can be managed.

### FMT\_UNR\_EXT.1 User Unenrollment Prevention

#### FMT\_UNR\_EXT.1.1

The [**selection:** TSE, TOE Platform] shall enforce a mechanism to prevent unprivileged users of the platform from unenrolling the Host Agent with the ESM system.

**Application Note:** Unenrolling is the action of transitioning from the enrolled state to the unenrolled state. Preventing unprivileged users from unenrolling the Host Agent provides assurance that the enterprise can manage connected endpoints.

#### Evaluation Activities ▼

##### [FMT\\_UNR\\_EXT.1](#)

###### TSS

The evaluator shall ensure that the TSS describes the mechanism used to prevent users from unenrolling the Host Agent.

**Guidance**

There are no guidance EAs for this component.

**Tests**

The evaluator shall attempt to unenroll the Host Agent from the *ESM* system as an unprivileged user and verify that the attempt fails.

### 5.3 TOE Security Functional Requirements Rationale

The following rationale provides justification for each *SER* for the *TOE*, showing that the *SERs* are suitable to address the specified threats:

**Table 2: *SER* Rationale**

| Threat      | Addressed by                    | Rationale  |
|-------------|---------------------------------|--|
| T.DATA_LOSS | FDP_NET_EXT.2                   | The <i>PP-Module</i> includes FDP_NET_EXT.2 to define the trust network connection to another host.  |
|             | FHA_CHA_EXT.1 (selection-based) | The <i>PP-Module</i> includes FHA_HAD_EXT.1 to define the interface between the Host Agent and the intended destination for the data it transmits.   |
|             | FHA_COL_EXT.1 (selection-based) | The <i>PP-Module</i> includes FHA_COL_EXT.1 to define the data that the Host Agent can collect from its Operational Environment.   |
|             | FHA_HAD_EXT.1                   | The <i>PP-Module</i> includes FHA_HAD_EXT.1 to define the interface between the Host Agent and the intended destination for the data it transmits  |
|             | FMT_SMF.1/HA                    | The <i>PP-Module</i> includes FMT_SMF.1/HA to define the management functions that are configurable on the Host Agent.   |
|             | FTP_DIT_EXT.2 (selection-based) | The <i>PP-Module</i> includes FTP_DIT_EXT.2 to optionally define the trusted communications channel between multiple Host Agents.  |
| T.TAMPER    | FAU_GEN.1/HA                    | The <i>PP-Module</i> includes FAU_GEN.1/HA to ensure that the <i>TOE</i> provides accountability through the generation of audit records for security-relevant events.   |
|             | FAU_STO_EXT.1                   | The <i>PP-Module</i> includes FAU_STO_EXT.1 to ensure that the <i>TOE</i> provides accountability by ensuring that audit records are stored using an appropriate mechanism.                                    |
|             | FMT_POL_EXT.1 (objective)       | The <i>PP-Module</i> includes FMT_UNR_EXT.1 to ensure that the Host Agent is protected from unenrollment actions that would result in it being unable to receive or enforce policy and/or commands sent to it. |
|             | FMT_UNR_EXT.1                   | The <i>PP-Module</i> includes FMT_UNR_EXT.1 to ensure that the Host Agent is protected from unenrollment actions that would result in it being unable to receive or enforce policy and/or commands sent to it. |

# 6 Consistency Rationale

## 6.1 Protection Profile for Application Software

### 6.1.1 Consistency of TOE Type

If this PP-Module is used to extend the Application Software PP, the TOE type for the overall TOE is still a software-based application. The TOE boundary is simply extended to include the Host Agent functionality that is built into the application so that additional security functionality is claimed within the scope of the TOE.

### 6.1.2 Consistency of Security Problem Definition

Table 3: Consistency of Security Problem Definition (App PP base)

| PP-Module Threat, Assumption, OSP | Consistency Rationale  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| T.DATA_LOSS                       | This threat relates to the loss of data that is collected by the ESM Host Agent. This relates to functionality defined by the PP-Module and does not interfere with the functionality described by the Base-PP.                            |
| T.TAMPER                          | This threat is an extension of the T.LOCAL_ATTACK threat defined by the Base-PP. The threat of tampering as applied to the PP-Module exists in addition to the local attacks that are possible on the capabilities defined by the Base-PP. |

### 6.1.3 Consistency of OE Objectives

This PP-Module does not define any objectives for the TOE's Operational Environment.

### 6.1.4 Consistency of Requirements

This PP-Module identifies several SERs from the App PP that are needed to support Host Agent functionality. This is considered to be consistent because the functionality provided by the App PP is being used for its intended purpose. The rationale for why this does not conflict with the claims defined by the App PP are as follows:

Table 4: Consistency of Requirements (App PP base)

| PP-Module Requirement  | Consistency Rationale   |
|--|---|
| Modified SERs  |   |
| This PP-Module does not modify any requirements when the App PP is the base. |   |
| Additional SERs  |   |
| This PP-Module does not add any requirements when the App PP is the base.    |   |
| Mandatory SERs   |   |
| FAU_GEN.1/HA   | The Base-PP does not define an audit mechanism for its own functionality. This function does not interfere with the Base-PP.  |
| FAU_STO_EXT.1  | The Base-PP does not define an audit mechanism for its own functionality. This function does not interfere with the Base-PP.  |
| FDP_NET_EXT.2  | The Base-PP does not define specific network communications for EDR - HA communications. This function does not interfere with the Base-PP.   |
| FHA_HAD_EXT.1  | This SER defines the type of software the Host Agent is intended to operate and communicate with. This relates to functionality not present in the Base-PP and does not affect the TOE's ability to satisfy the Base-PP's SERs. |
| FMT_SMF.1/HA   | This SER defines management functions for the SERs defined in this PP-Module. It does not affect the management functions defined in the Base-PP.   |
| FMT_UNR_EXT.1  | This SER defines protections to prevent users from tampering with the Host Agent. This relates to functionality not present in the Base-PP and does not affect the TOE's ability to satisfy the Base-PP's SERs.                 |

### Optional ~~SERs~~

This ~~PP-Module~~ does not define any Optional requirements.

### Objective ~~SERs~~

[FMT\\_POL\\_EXT.1](#) This ~~SER~~ defines protections for the integrity of commands sent to the Host Agent. This relates to functionality not present in the ~~Base-PP~~ and does not affect the ~~TOE~~'s ability to satisfy the ~~Base-PP~~'s ~~SERs~~.

### Implementation-dependent ~~SERs~~

This ~~PP-Module~~ does not define any Implementation-dependent requirements.

### Selection-based ~~SERs~~

[FHA\\_CHA\\_EXT.1](#) This ~~SER~~ defines how the Host Agent shall cache data locally. This relates to functionality not present in the ~~Base-PP~~ and does not affect the ~~TOE~~'s ability to satisfy the ~~Base-PP~~'s ~~SERs~~.

[FHA\\_COL\\_EXT.1](#) This ~~SER~~ defines the type of software the Host Agent is intended to operate with. This relates to functionality not present in the ~~Base-PP~~ and does not affect the ~~TOE~~'s ability to satisfy the ~~Base-PP~~'s ~~SERs~~.

[FTP\\_DIT\\_EXT.2](#) This ~~SER~~ defines the communication channel for Host Agents communicating with other Host Agents. This relates to functionality not present in the ~~Base-PP~~ and does not affect the ~~TOE~~'s ability to satisfy the ~~Base-PP~~'s ~~SERs~~.



# Appendix A - Optional SFRs

## A.1 Strictly Optional Requirements

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

## A.2 Objective Requirements

### A.2.1 Auditable Events for Objective SFRs

Table 5: Auditable Events for Objective Requirements

| Requirement   | Auditable Events    | Additional Audit Record Contents |
|---------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| FMT_POL_EXT.1 | No events specified | N/A                              |

### A.2.2 Security Management (FMT)

#### FMT\_POL\_EXT.1 Trusted Policy Update

FMT\_POL\_EXT.1.1

The [selection: *TSE*, *TOE Platform*] shall only accept policies or commands that are digitally signed using [selection: *RSA*, *ECDSA*] signatures that meet FIPS PUB 186-5.

**Application Note:** The intent of this requirement is to cryptographically tie any policy updates or commands sent to the Host Agent as being from the *ESM* server. This is not to protect the policies in transit as they are already protected by FTP\_ITC.1 in the PP-Module for EDR, *FTP\_DIT\_EXT.2.1*, or both. If the *TSE* implements this function, any signature algorithms used should be consistent with any selections made in FCS\_COP.1/SigGen and FCS\_COP.1/SigVer in the Protection Profile for Application Software, Version 2.0.

### Evaluation Activities

#### FMT\_POL\_EXT.1

##### TSS

The evaluator shall ensure that the *TSS* describes how the candidate policies or commands are sent to the Host Agent; the processing associated with verifying the digital signature of the policies or commands; and the actions that take place for successful (signature was verified) and unsuccessful (signature could not be verified) cases. The software components that are performing the processing must also be identified in the *TSS* and verified by the evaluators (this could be the Host Agent or the underlying platform).

##### Guidance

There are no guidance EAs for this component.

##### Tests

- Test FMT\_POL\_EXT.1:1:  
The evaluator shall perform or wait for a policy update or commands from an *ESM* server to be sent to a Host Agent. The evaluator shall verify the policy or command is signed and is provided to the Host Agent. The evaluator shall verify the Host Agent accepts the digitally signed policy.  
  
The execution of this test may require some configuration or a test version of either the Host Agent or the *ESM* system in order to view the incoming policy or command and verify that the content is digitally signed.
- Test FMT\_POL\_EXT.1:2: The evaluator shall alter a policy update or command and verify the Host Agent rejects the altered policy.

### A.3 Implementation-dependent Requirements

---

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

# Appendix B - Selection-based Requirements

## B.1 Auditable Events for Selection-based SFRs

Table 6: Auditable Events for Selection-based Requirements

| Requirement                   | Auditable Events    | Additional Audit Record Contents |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| <a href="#">FHA_CHA_EXT.1</a> | No events specified | N/A                              |
| <a href="#">FHA_COL_EXT.1</a> | No events specified | N/A                              |
| <a href="#">FTP_DIT_EXT.2</a> | No events specified | N/A                              |

## B.2 Host Agent (FHA)

### FHA\_CHA\_EXT.1 Cache Host Agent Collected Data

- FHA\_CHA\_EXT.1.1

The TSSF shall cache collected data up to [assignment: size of cache storage capacity] on [selection: persistent storage, non-persistent storage] if the trusted channel is not available.

**Application Note:** The term collected data here is understood to be any type of collected endpoint data by the Host Agent destined for an ESM server. The ST author specifies the size of the cache storage and whether it is implemented in persistent or non-persistent storage.
- FHA\_CHA\_EXT.1.2

The TSSF shall [selection: overwrite previous data according to the following rule: [assignment: rule for overwriting previously cached data], [assignment: other actions]] when the local cache is full.

**Application Note:** This requirement addresses how the Host Agent handles collected data while the trusted path is not available and the local cache is full.

### Evaluation Activities

[FHA\\_CHA\\_EXT.1](#)

**TSS**  
The evaluator shall verify the TSS details how data is cached, any rules that would affect data caching, and how cached data will be affected if storage limits are reached.

**Guidance**

The evaluator shall verify that any configuration options related to data caching are listed in the guidance.

**Tests**

The evaluator shall test the Host Agent's ability to cache data by disconnecting the endpoint from the network to simulate a network connectivity failure, these should be actual hours not via changing system time. The evaluator shall exercise behaviors on the endpoint during the outage to generate Host Agent data. Example behaviors could be running programs, performing some authentications, installing/uninstalling software, or sample test cases provided by the vendor to generate Host Agent data. The evaluator will then reconnect the endpoint to the network and verify on the ESM system that the missing data from the outage is available on the ESM management portal.

### FHA\_COL\_EXT.1 Collected Audit

The TSE shall collect the following minimum set of endpoint event data:

- a. Operating System (OS) version, architecture, and IP Address,
- b. Privileged and unprivileged endpoint account login activity,
- c. Process creation,
- d. Libraries and modules loaded by processes,
- e. Network connection activity, including destination IP,
- f. Files created on persistent storage,
- g. [assignment: other host data].

**Application Note:** The intent of this requirement is to specify the minimum set of endpoint data that the Host Agent for an ESM EDR system must be capable of collecting. This requirement only applies to Host Agents used with the [EDR] PP-Module per the selection from [FHA\\_HAD\\_EXT.1](#). The assignment may be empty, a single item, or multiple items.

#### Evaluation Activities ▼

##### [FHA\\_COL\\_EXT.1](#)

##### TSS

The evaluator shall verify the TSS contains a full list of endpoint data that can be collected.

##### **Guidance**

The evaluator shall check the administrative guide and ensure that it lists all of the collectable types of endpoint event data. The evaluator shall check to make sure that every endpoint event type listed in the ST is included in the administrative guidance.

##### **Tests**

The evaluator shall run the systems causing multiple events to occur and then review the items collected by the Host Agent to verify that all items in the minimum set are included.

## B.3 Trusted Path/Channels (FTP)

### FTP\_DIT\_EXT.2 Protection of Data in Transit for Peer-to-Peer Host Agents

#### FTP\_DIT\_EXT.2.1

The TSE shall [selection: encrypt, invoke platform-provided functionality to encrypt] all transmitted data according to FTP\_DIT\_EXT.1 between itself and another Host Agent.

**Application Note:** This requirement is designed to protect the communications with other Host Agents in a peer-to-peer scenario where Host Agents are sending and receiving data from each other. The selection of whether the TSE of the TOE platform encrypts these communications should be consistent with any selections made in FTP\_DIT\_EXT.1

#### Evaluation Activities ▼

##### [FTP\\_DIT\\_EXT.2](#)

##### TSS

The evaluator shall verify that the TSS contains a description of all data transmitted to other Host Agents and that all such data is protected according to FPT\_DIT\_EXT.1.

##### **Guidance**

The evaluator shall ensure the guidance contains any configuration details required for ensuring data transmitted to other Host Agents is protected according to FPT\_DIT\_EXT.1.

##### **Tests**

The tests in FTP\_DIT\_EXT.1.1 shall be repeated for data transmitted between two Host Agents.

# Appendix C - Extended Component Definitions

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

## C.1 Extended Components Table

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

**Table 7: Extended Component Definitions**

| Functional Class            | Functional Components   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Host Agent (FHA)            | FHA_CHA_EXT Cache Host Agent Collected Data<br>FHA_COL_EXT Collected Audit    |
| Security Audit (FAU)        | FAU_STO_EXT Audit Data Storage  |
| Security Management (FMT)   | FMT_POL_EXT Trusted Policy Update<br>FMT_UNR_EXT User Unenrollment Prevention |
| Trusted Path/Channels (FTP) | FTP_DIT_EXT Protection of Data in Transit                                     |
| User Data Protection (FDP)  | FDP_NET_EXT Network Communications  |

## C.2 Extended Component Definitions

### C.2.1 Host Agent (FHA)


This `PP::Module` defines the following extended components as part of the FHA class originally defined by `CC`, Part 2:

#### C.2.1.1 FHA\_CHA\_EXT Cache Host Agent Collected Data

##### Family Behavior

Components in this family define requirements for the location and duration of storage for its collected data.

##### Component Leveling



[FHA\\_CHA\\_EXT.1](#), Cache Host Agent Collected Data, requires either the `TOE` or its platform to store audit data using the platform's logging mechanism.

##### Management: FHA\_CHA\_EXT.1

No specific management functions are identified.

##### Audit: FHA\_CHA\_EXT.1

There are no auditable events foreseen.

##### FHA\_CHA\_EXT.1 Cache Host Agent Collected Data

Hierarchical to: No other components.

Dependencies to: [FHA\\_COL\\_EXT.1](#) Collected Audit  
[FHA\\_HAD\\_EXT.1](#) Host Agent Declaration

##### FHA\_CHA\_EXT.1.1

The `TSE` shall cache collected data up to [assignment: size of cache storage capacity] on [selection: persistent storage, non-persistent storage] if the trusted channel is not available.

## FHA\_CHA\_EXT.1.2

The TSF shall [selection: *overwrite previous data according to the following rule: [assignment: rule for overwriting previously cached data], [assignment: other actions]*] when the local cache is full.

### C.2.1.2 FHA\_COL\_EXT Collected Audit

#### Family Behavior

Components in this family define requirements for the collection of data the TOE collects from its Operational Environment as audit data.

#### Component Leveling



FHA\_COL\_EXT.1, Collected Audit, requires the TOE to collect a specified set of data from its Operational Environment.

#### Management: FHA\_COL\_EXT.1

No specific management functions are identified.

#### Audit: FHA\_COL\_EXT.1

There are no auditable events foreseen.

#### FHA\_COL\_EXT.1 Collected Audit

Hierarchical to: No other components.

Dependencies to: FHA\_HAD\_EXT.1 Host Agent Declaration

#### FHA\_COL\_EXT.1.1

The TSF shall collect the following minimum set of endpoint event data:

- a. Operating System (OS) version, architecture, and IP Address,
- b. Privileged and unprivileged endpoint account login activity,
- c. Process creation,
- d. Libraries and modules loaded by processes,
- e. Network connection activity, including destination IP,
- f. Files created on persistent storage,
- g. [assignment: *other host data*].

### C.2.2 Security Audit (FAU)

This PP-Module defines the following extended components as part of the FAU class originally defined by CC, Part 2:

#### C.2.2.1 FAU\_STO\_EXT Audit Data Storage

#### Family Behavior

Components in this family define requirements for the location and method of audit storage.

#### Component Leveling



FAU\_STO\_EXT.1, Audit Data Storage, requires either the TOE or its platform to store audit data using the platform's audit mechanism.

#### Management: FAU\_STO\_EXT.1

No specific management functions are identified.

#### Audit: FAU\_STO\_EXT.1

There are no auditable events foreseen.

#### FAU\_STO\_EXT.1 Audit Data Storage

Hierarchical to: No other components.

Dependencies to: No dependencies.

### FAU\_STO\_EXT.1.1

The [selection: ~~TSE~~, ~~TOE Platform~~] shall store audit events in the platform-provided logging mechanism.

## C.2.3 Security Management (FMT)


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

### C.2.3.1 FMT\_UNR\_EXT User Unenrollment Prevention

#### Family Behavior

Components in this family define requirements for ensuring that an unprivileged user cannot remove the ~~TOE~~ from management by another ~~ESM~~ component.

#### Component Leveling



[FMT\\_UNR\\_EXT.1](#), User Unenrollment Prevention, requires the ~~TSE~~ to prevent its unenrollment by an unauthorized user.

#### Management: FMT\_UNR\_EXT.1

No specific management functions are identified.

#### Audit: FMT\_UNR\_EXT.1

There are no auditable events foreseen.

#### FMT\_UNR\_EXT.1 User Unenrollment Prevention

Hierarchical to: No other components.

Dependencies to: No dependencies.

### FMT\_UNR\_EXT.1.1

The [selection: ~~TSE~~, ~~TOE Platform~~] shall enforce a mechanism to prevent unprivileged users of the platform from unenrolling the Host Agent with the ~~ESM~~ system.

### C.2.3.2 FMT\_POL\_EXT Trusted Policy Update

#### Family Behavior

Components in this family define requirements for the ~~TOE~~'s verification of policies or commands transmitted to it.

#### Component Leveling



[FMT\\_POL\\_EXT.1](#), Trusted Policy Update, requires the ~~TSE~~ to reject any unsigned management policies or commands sent to it.

#### Management: FMT\_POL\_EXT.1

No specific management functions are identified.

#### Audit: FMT\_POL\_EXT.1

There are no auditable events foreseen.

#### FMT\_POL\_EXT.1 Trusted Policy Update

Hierarchical to: No other components.

Dependencies to: FCS\_COP.1 Cryptographic Operation

### FMT\_POL\_EXT.1.1

The [selection: *TSE, TOE Platform*] shall only accept policies or commands that are digitally signed using [selection: *RSA, ECDSA*] signatures that meet ~~FIPS~~ PUB 186-5.

## C.2.4 Trusted Path/Channels (FTP)


This ~~PP-Module~~ defines the following extended components as part of the FTP class originally defined by ~~CC~~ Part 2:

### C.2.4.1 FTP\_DIT\_EXT Protection of Data in Transit

#### Family Behavior

This family is defined in the. This ~~PP-Module~~ adds a component to the existing family definition.

#### Component Leveling



[FTP\\_DIT\\_EXT.2](#), Protection of Data in Transit for Peer-to-Peer Host Agents, requires the ~~TSE~~ to secure data in transit between itself and another ~~ESM~~ Host Agent using a ~~TSE~~-provided or platform-provided trusted channel.

#### Management: FTP\_DIT\_EXT.2

No specific management functions are identified.

#### Audit: FTP\_DIT\_EXT.2

There are no auditable events foreseen.

#### FTP\_DIT\_EXT.2 Protection of Data in Transit for Peer-to-Peer Host Agents

Hierarchical to: No other components.

Dependencies to: FDN\_NET\_EXT.2 Network Communications

FTP\_DIT\_EXT.1 Protection of Data in Transit

#### FTP\_DIT\_EXT.2.1

The ~~TSE~~ shall [selection: *encrypt, invoke platform-provided functionality to encrypt*] all transmitted data according to FTP\_DIT\_EXT.1 between itself and another Host Agent.

## C.2.5 User Data Protection (FDP)

This ~~PP-Module~~ defines the following extended components as part of the FDP class originally defined by ~~CC~~ Part 2:

### C.2.5.1 FDP\_NET\_EXT Network Communications

#### Family Behavior

Components in this family define requirements for recording the occurrence of security relevant events.

#### Component Leveling



[FDP\\_NET\\_EXT.2](#), Network Communications, requires either the ~~TSE~~ restrict network communications.

#### Management: FDP\_NET\_EXT.2

There are no management functions foreseen.

#### Audit: FDP\_NET\_EXT.2

There are no audit events foreseen.

#### FDP\_NET\_EXT.2 Network Communications

Hierarchical to: No other components.

Dependencies to: No dependencies.



## FDP\_NET\_EXT.2.1

The TSE shall restrict network communications to: **[selection:**

- *An ESM server*
- *Another Host Agent*

**]**

# Appendix D - 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 SERs and should not be included in the ST. They are not included as standalone SERs because it would increase the time, cost, and complexity of evaluation. This approach is permitted by [CC] Part 1, 8.3 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.

| Requirement                      | Rationale for Satisfaction   |
|----------------------------------|--|
| FPT_STM.1 - Reliable Time Stamps | CC Part 2 specifies FPT_STM.1 as a dependency of FAU_GEN.1 because the audit records require a reliable timestamp to satisfy FAU_GEN.1.2. This dependency is implicitly addressed through the A.PLATFORM assumption of the Base-PP because a "trustworthy computing platform" is assumed to include a reliable system clock. |

# Appendix E - Acronyms

**Table 8: Acronyms**

| Acronym          | Meaning   |
|------------------|---|
| API              | Application Programming Interface                     |
| Base-PP          | Base Protection Profile                               |
| CC               | Common Criteria                                       |
| CEM              | Common Evaluation Methodology                         |
| cPP              | Collaborative Protection Profile                      |
| EA               | Evaluation Activity                                   |
| ECDSA            | Elliptic Curve Digital Signature Algorithm            |
| EDR              | Endpoint Detection and Response                       |
| EP               | Extended Package                                      |
| ESM              | Enterprise Security Management                        |
| FIPS             | Federal Information Processing Standards              |
| FP               | Functional Package                                    |
| IP               | Internet Protocol                                     |
| ISO              | International Organization for Standardization        |
| IT               | Information Technology                                |
| NIAP             | National Information Assurance Partnership            |
| NIST             | National Institute of Standards and Technology        |
| OE               | Operational Environment                               |
| OS               | Operating System                                      |
| PP               | Protection Profile                                    |
| PP-Configuration | Protection Profile Configuration                      |
| PP-Module        | Protection Profile Module                             |
| RSA              | Rivest, Shamir, Adleman (digital signature algorithm) |
| SAR              | Security Assurance Requirement                        |
| SFR              | Security Functional Requirement                       |
| ST               | Security Target                                       |
| TOE              | Target of Evaluation                                  |
| TSE              | TOE Security Functionality                            |
| TSEI             | TOE Interface   |
| TSS              | TOE Summary Specification                             |

# Appendix F - Bibliography

Table 9: Bibliography

| Identifier | Title  |
|------------|--|
| [CC]       | Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation - <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Part 1: Introduction and general model, CCMB-2022-11-001, CC:2022, Revision 1, November 2022.</li><li>Part 2: Security functional requirements, CCMB-2022-11-002, CC:2022, Revision 1, November 2022.</li><li>Part 3: Security assurance requirements, CCMB-2022-11-003, CC:2022, Revision 1, November 2022.</li><li>Part 4: Framework for the specification of evaluation methods and activities, CCMB-2022-11-004, CC:2022, Revision 1, November 2022.</li><li>Part 5: Pre-defined packages of security requirements, CCMB-2022-11-005, CC:2022, Revision 1, November 2022.</li></ul> |
| [CEM]      | Common Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation - <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Evaluation methodology, CCMB-2022-11-006, CC:2022, Revision 1, November 2022.</li></ul>  |
| [AppPP]    | Protection Profile for Application Software, Version 2.0, June 16, 2025  |
| [EDR]      | PP-Module for Endpoint Detection and Response, Version 2.0, January 13, 2026   |