



Version: 2.6  
2025-01-31

**National Information Assurance Partnership**

## Revision History

---

Version	Date	Comment
2.6	2025-01-31	CC:2022 conversion, limitation of cryptographic algorithms to CNSA 1.0, incorporation of TDs
2.5	2024-06-24	Incorporation of TC feedback: Incorporation of TDs: 0662, 0672, 0690, 0697, 0711, 0725, 0753, 0788 Corrections to Base-PP references Definition of auditable events for Additional SFRs Explicit association of evaluation activities with components and elements
2.4	2022-03-31	Incorporation of TC feedback
2.3	2021-08-10	Support for MDF, Bluetooth updates
2.2	2021-01-05	Update release
2.1	2019-11-14	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
1.3.1	TOE Boundary
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
4.2	Security Objectives Rationale
5	Security Requirements
5.1	Protection Profile for Protection Profile for General Purpose Operating System Security Functional Requirements Direction
5.1.1	Modified SFRs
5.1.1.1	Cryptographic Key Generation
5.1.1.2	Cryptographic Key Establishment
5.1.2	Additional SFRs
5.1.2.1	Cryptographic Support (FCS)
5.1.2.1.1	Auditable Events for GPOS PP Additional SFRs
5.1.2.2	Identification and Authentication (FIA)
5.1.2.2.1	Auditable Events for GPOS PP Additional SFRs
5.1.2.3	Trusted Path/Channels (FTP)
5.1.2.3.1	Auditable Events for GPOS PP Additional SFRs
5.2	Protection Profile for Protection Profile for Mobile Device Fundamentals Security Functional Requirements Direction
5.2.1	Modified SFRs
5.2.1.1	Cryptographic Key Generation
5.2.1.2	Cryptographic Key Establishment (When Unlocked)
5.2.1.3	Subset Information Flow Control
5.2.1.4	Trusted Channel Communication
5.2.2	Additional SFRs
5.2.2.1	User Data Protection (FDP)
5.2.2.1.1	Auditable Events for MDF PP Additional SFRs
5.3	Protection Profile for Protection Profile for Application Software Security Functional Requirements Direction
5.3.1	Modified SFRs
5.3.1.1	Cryptographic Key Establishment
5.3.1.2	Cryptographic Key Generation Services
5.3.1.3	Cryptographic Operation - Encryption/Decryption
5.3.1.4	Protection of Data in Transit
5.3.2	Additional SFRs

5.3.2.1	Cryptographic Support (FCS)
5.3.2.1.1	Auditable Events for App PP Additional SFRs
5.4	Protection Profile for Protection Profile for Mobile Device Management Security Functional Requirements Direction
5.4.1	Modified SFRs
5.4.2	Additional SFRs
5.5	TOE Security Functional Requirements
5.6	TOE Security Functional Requirements Rationale
6	Consistency Rationale
6.1	Protection Profile for Protection Profile for General Purpose Operating System
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
6.2	Protection Profile for Protection Profile for Mobile Device Fundamentals
6.2.1	Consistency of TOE Type
6.2.2	Consistency of Security Problem Definition
6.2.3	Consistency of OE Objectives
6.2.4	Consistency of Requirements
6.3	Protection Profile for Protection Profile for Application Software
6.3.1	Consistency of TOE Type
6.3.2	Consistency of Security Problem Definition
6.3.3	Consistency of OE Objectives
6.3.4	Consistency of Requirements
6.4	Protection Profile for Protection Profile for Mobile Device Management
6.4.1	Consistency of TOE Type
6.4.2	Consistency of Security Problem Definition
6.4.3	Consistency of OE Objectives
6.4.4	Consistency of Requirements
Appendix A -	Optional SFRs
A.1	Strictly Optional Requirements
A.2	Objective Requirements
A.3	Implementation-dependent Requirements
Appendix B -	Selection-based Requirements
Appendix C -	Implicitly Satisfied Requirements
Appendix D -	Entropy Documentation and Assessment
Appendix E -	Acronyms
Appendix F -	Bibliography

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Overview

FIA\_X509\_EXT references to the Base-PPs are now removed and where appropriate the X.509 package is referenced instead. However, it's unclear whether there is still sufficient mechanism to actually 'force' the X.509 SFRs to be included. That is to say, there is nothing in here that says "because IPsec functionality is dependent on X.509 validation, and because the Base-PPs conform to the X.509 FP, the ST shall make the relevant X.509 FP claims." The scope of this Protection Profile Module (PP-Module) is to describe the security functionality of a virtual private network (VPN) client 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 General Purpose Operating Systems (GPOS PP), Version 4.3 Protection Profile for Mobile Device Fundamentals (MDF PP), Version 3.3 Protection Profile for Application Software (App PP), Version 2.0 Protection Profile for Mobile Device Management (MDM PP), Version 4.0 These Base-PPs are all valid because a VPN client may be a specific type of stand-alone software application or a built-in component of an operating system (OS), whether desktop or mobile. Regardless of which Base-PP is claimed, the VPN client functionality defined by this PP-Module will rely on the Base-PP. Sections 5.1 through 5.4 of this PP-Module describe the relevant functionality for each Base-PP, including specific selections and assignments, or inclusion of optional requirements that must be made as needed to support the VPN client functionality.

## 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.
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	An implementation-independent statement of security needs for a TOE type complementary

Profile Module (PP-Module)	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

Administrator	A user that has administrative privilege to configure the TOE in privileged mode.
Authorized	An entity granted access privileges to an object, system, or system entity.
Critical Security Parameter (CSP)	Security related information such as secret and private cryptographic keys, and authentication data such as passwords and PINs, whose disclosure or modification can compromise the security of a cryptographic module.
Entropy Source	This cryptographic function provides a seed for a random number generator by accumulating the outputs from one or more noise sources. The functionality includes a measure of the minimum work required to guess a given output and tests to ensure that the noise sources are operating properly.
IT Environment	Hardware and software that are outside the TOE boundary that support the TOE functionality and security policy.
Private Network	A network that is protected from access by unauthorized users or entities.
Privileged Mode	A TOE operational mode that allows a user to perform functions that require IT environment administrator privileges.
Public Network	A network that is visible to all users and entities and does not protect against unauthorized access (e.g. internet).
Threat Agent	An entity that tries to harm an information system through destruction, disclosure, modification of data, or denial of service.
Unauthorized User	An entity (device or user) that has not been authorized by an authorized administrator to access the TOE or private network.
Unprivileged Mode	A TOE operational mode that only provides VPN client functions for the VPN client user.
VPN Client	The TOE; allows remote users to use client computers to establish an encrypted IPsec tunnel across an unprotected public network to a private network.
VPN Client User	A user operating the TOE in unprivileged mode.
VPN Gateway	A component that performs encryption and decryption of IP packets as they cross the boundary between a private network and a public network.

## 1.3 Compliant Targets of Evaluation

---

The TOE defined by this PP-Module is the VPN client, a software application that runs on a physical or virtual host platform, used to establish a secure IPsec connection between that host platform and a remote system. The VPN client is intended to be located outside or inside of a private network, and establishes a secure tunnel to an IPsec peer. For the purposes of this PP-Module, IPsec peers are defined as: VPN gateways Other VPN clients An IPsec-capable network device (supporting IPsec for the purposes of management) The tunnel provides confidentiality, integrity, and data authentication for information that travels across a less trusted (sometimes public) network. All VPN clients that comply with this document will support IPsec. This PP-Module extends the GPOS PP when the VPN client is installed on an OS discussed in that PP (e.g., Windows, Mac OS, Linux). This PP-Module extends the MDF PP when the VPN client is installed on a self-contained mobile device that is bundled with an OS (e.g. Android, BlackBerry OS, iOS, Windows Mobile). This PP-Module extends the App PP when the VPN client is provided by a third party and is a standalone application that is not a bundled part of an OS or mobile device. This PP-Module extends the MDM PP when the VPN client is included with MDM server software that is used for centralized deployment and administration of enterprise mobile device policies. As a PP-Module of any of these PPs, it is expected that the content of this PP-Module and the chosen Base-PP be appropriately combined in the context of each product-specific ST. This PP-Module has been specifically defined such that there should be no difficulty or ambiguity in doing so. When this PP-Module is used, conformant TOEs are obligated to implement the functionality required in the claimed Base-PP with the additional functionality defined in this PP-Module in response to the threat environment discussed in this PP-Module.

### 1.3.1 TOE Boundary

The TOE defined by this PP-Module is purely a software solution executing on a platform (some sort of OS running on hardware). Depending on the Base-PP claimed as part of the TOE, the platform may also be part of the TOE or it may be an environmental component that the TOE vendor has no control over. Regardless of whether the platform itself is within the scope of the evaluation, the VPN client itself will rely on the platform for its execution domain and proper usage. The vendor is expected to provide sufficient installation and configuration instructions to identify an Operational Environment (OE) with the necessary features and to provide instructions for how to configure it correctly. The PP-Module contains requirements that must be met by the TOE. Depending on the Base-PP that is claimed, there may be some variation in the applicable requirements. This is because a given Base-PP may include one or more requirements that the VPN client can inherit but are not shared between each possible Base-PP. This is somewhat different than other PPs, but addresses most implementations of VPN clients where some part of the functionality of the IPsec tunnel is provided by the platform. In terms of the cryptographic primitives (random bit generation, encryption and decryption, key generation, etc.) it is actually desirable that a well-tested implementation in the platform is used rather than trying to implement these functions in each client. Requirements that can be satisfied by either the TOE or the platform are identified in Section 5 by text such as “The [selection: TSF, TOE platform] shall...” The ST author will make the appropriate selection based on where that element is implemented. It is allowable for some elements in a component to be implemented by the TOE, while other elements in that same component be implemented by the platform (requirements on the usage of X.509 certificates is an example of where this might be the case, where using the information contained in the certificates and the implementation of revocation checking may be done by the TOE, but storage and protection of the certificates may be done by the platform). Note that in the cases where this PP-Module is used to extend the GPOS PP or MDF PP, the TOE includes both the VPN client and the platform. In this case, it is appropriate to indicate that the TOE satisfies this requirement. However, the ST author should make it clear, for each of these components, which are implemented by the VPN client portion of the TOE versus the platform portion. A Supporting Document (SD) accompanies this PP-Module and contains guidance for how to evaluate the requirements defined by the PP-Module, expressed as Evaluation Activities (EAs). EAs will differ based on where the function that meets the requirement is implemented. In most cases, requirements implemented by the platform will require that the evaluator examine documents pertaining to the platform (generally the ST), while requirements implemented by the TOE may require examination of the TSS, examination of the Operational Guidance, or execution of evaluator testing. For requirements implemented by the platform, there may also be requirements where the evaluator must examine the interfaces used by the TOE to access these functions on the platform. This ensures that the functionality being invoked to satisfy the requirements of this PP-Module is the same functionality that was evaluated. Given the degree of coupling between a VPN client and its underlying platform, it is expected that the client will be tested on each platform claimed in the ST. In cases where the platforms are simply different versions of the same OS (provided by the same platform vendor), an equivalency argument may be made in lieu of testing on each version. The argument would have to demonstrate that the client interacts in exactly the same way with the versions of the OS (i.e., the same APIs are used with the same parameters, the network stack is modified with exactly the same kernel modules). The evaluator shall use the operational guidance to configure the TOE and underlying platform. A TOE that conforms to this PP-Module will implement the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) IPsec Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol, RFC 4301, as well as the IPsec Encapsulating Security Payload (ESP) protocol. IPsec ESP is specified in RFC 2406 and RFC 4303. The IPsec VPN client will support ESP in either tunnel mode, transport mode, or both. The IPsec VPN client will use the Internet Key Exchange (IKE)v1 protocol, IKEv2, or both. IKEv1 is implemented as defined in RFCs 2407, 2408, 2409, and 4109, and IKEv2 is implemented as specified in RFC 7296 and 4307 to authenticate and establish session keys with the VPN entities. The IKEv2 implementation also requires mandatory support for network address translation (NAT) traversal as specified in section 2.23 of RFC 7296. To show that the TSF implements the RFCs correctly, the evaluator shall perform the EAs documented in the SD that accompanies this PP-Module. In future versions of this PP-Module, EAs may be modified or new ones may be introduced that cover more aspects of RFC compliance than what is currently described in this publication. The IPsec VPN client enables encryption of all information that flows between itself and its IPsec peer. The VPN client serves as an

endpoint for an IPsec VPN connection and performs a number of cryptographic functions related to establishing and maintaining that connection. If the cryptography used to perform endpoint authentication, generate keys, and encrypt information is sufficiently robust and the implementation has no critical design mistakes, an adversary will be unable to exhaust the encryption key space to obtain the data. Compliance with IPsec standards, use of a properly seeded Random Bit Generator (RBG), and secure authentication factors will ensure that access to the transmitted information cannot be obtained with less work than a full exhaust of the key space. Any plaintext secret and private keys or other cryptographic security parameters will be zeroized when no longer in use to prevent disclosure of security critical data.

## 1.4 Use Cases

---

A VPN client allows users on the TOE platform to establish secure IPsec communications, providing confidentiality, integrity, and protection of data, across a less trusted network to secure data in transit. This PP-Module defines three use cases for VPN clients. A conformant TOE will implement one or more of the use cases specified below.

### **[USE CASE 1] TOE to VPN Gateway**

A VPN client allows users on the TOE platform to establish an encrypted IPsec tunnel across a less trusted, often unprotected, public network to a private network (see ). In this case, the TOE provides encryption and decryption of network packets as they leave and arrive on the VPN client's underlying platform. IP packets crossing from the private network to the public network will be encrypted if their destination is a remote access VPN client supporting the same VPN policy as the source network. The TOE is responsible for encrypting the packets that are intended to be received by the target on the private network and then encapsulating these packets in a way that allows the VPN gateway to securely receive them and forward them to their final destination.

### **[USE CASE 2] TOE to VPN Client**

A VPN client may additionally or alternatively allow a client computer to connect directly to another computer running a VPN client (see ). In this case, the functionality of the VPN client is to connect directly to another endpoint system to facilitate point-to-point communications with that system. IPsec transport mode is used for end-to-end communications. In this use case, the content of the packet data (payload) is encrypted but the original IP header is preserved. Inherent to this use case, when two peers are communicating directly, is the disclosure of the source and destination of the packets. Users should take into consideration any security risks associated with this disclosure when architecting their networks in line with this use case.

### **[USE CASE 3] TOE to IPsec-Capable Network Device**

Similar to Use Case 2 above, a VPN client TOE can also be used to establish a secure connection to an IPsec-capable network device using IPsec, similar to how an SSH connection might be used. In this case, where a network device is being managed remotely over an IPsec connection, the network device itself must contain IPsec functionality to act as the peer for the connection (see ). While this will behave functionally the same way as the scenario described by Use Case 2, the user of the TOE in Use Case 3 is a network administrator who is assumed to have administrative access to the network device they are connecting to.

# 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 SFRs 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 General Purpose Operating Systems, Version 4.3
- Protection Profile for Mobile Device Fundamentals, Version 3.3
- Protection Profile for Mobile Device Management, Version 4.0
- Protection Profile for Application Software, Version 2.0
- cPP-Module for Wireless LAN Clients, version 1.1
- PP-Module for Bluetooth, version 1.1
- PP-Module for Mobile Device Management Agent, version 1.2
- cPP-Module for Biometric Enrolment and Verification, version 1.1

## Package Claim

- This PP-Module is Functional Package for Transport Layer Security Version 2.1 conformant.
- This PP-Module is Functional Package for X.509 Version 1.0 conformant.
- This PP-Module is Assurance Package for Flaw Remediation Version 1.0 conformant.

The functional packages to which the PP conforms may include SFRs 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 SFRs that are appropriate to claim based on the capabilities of the TSF and on any triggers for their inclusion based inherently on the SFR selections made.



# 3 Security Problem Definition

The security problem is described in terms of the threats that the TOE is expected to address, assumptions about its OE, and any organizational security policies that the TOE is expected to enforce. This PP-Module is written to address the situation in which a user accesses a private network (e.g. the user's office network) or terminal endpoint (e.g. a network device) using a less trusted network (such as a public Wi-Fi network or local area network). Protection of network packets is desired as they traverse a public network. To protect the data in transit from disclosure and modification, a VPN is created to establish secure communications. The VPN client provides one end of the secure VPN tunnel and performs encryption and decryption of network packets in accordance with a VPN security policy negotiated between the VPN client (TOE) and its IPsec peer. The proper installation and configuration of the VPN client is critical to its correct operation such that proper handling of the TOE by an administrator is also addressed. Note that as a PP-Module, all threats, assumptions, and organizational security policies (OSPs) defined in the Base-PP will also apply to a TOE unless otherwise specified, depending on which of the Base-PPs it extends. The SFRs defined in this PP-Module will mitigate the threats that are defined in the PP-Module but may also mitigate some threats defined in the Base-PPs in more comprehensive detail due to the specific capabilities provided by a VPN client.

## 3.1 Threats

---

### T.TSF\_CONFIGURATION

Configuring VPN tunnels is a complex and time-consuming process, and prone to errors if the interface for doing so is not well-specified or well-behaved. The inability or failure of an ignorant or careless administrator to configure certain aspects of the interface may also lead to the incorrect specification of the desired communications policy or use of cryptography that may be desired or required for a particular site. This may result in unintended weak or plaintext communications while the user thinks that their data are being protected. Other aspects of configuring the TOE or using its security mechanisms (for example, the update process) may also result in a reduction in the trustworthiness of the VPN client.

### T.TSF\_FAILURE

Security mechanisms of the TOE generally build up from a primitive set of mechanisms (e.g., memory management, privileged modes of process execution) to more complex sets of mechanisms. Failure of the primitive mechanisms could lead to a compromise in more complex mechanisms, resulting in a compromise of the TSF.

### T.UNAUTHORIZED\_ACCESS

This PP-Module does not include requirements that can protect against an insider threat. Authorized users are not considered hostile or malicious and are trusted to follow appropriate guidance. Only authorized personnel should have access to the system or device that contains the IPsec VPN client. Therefore, the primary threat agents are the unauthorized entities that try to gain access to the protected network (in cases where tunnel mode is used) or to plaintext data that traverses the public network (regardless of whether transport mode or tunnel mode is used). The endpoint of the network communication can be both geographically and logically distant from the TOE and can pass through a variety of other systems. These intermediate systems may be under the control of the adversary, and offer an opportunity for communications over the network to be compromised. Plaintext communication over the network may allow critical data (such as passwords, configuration settings, and user data) to be read or manipulated directly by a malicious user or process on intermediate systems, leading to a compromise of the TOE or to the secured environmental systems that the TOE is being used to facilitate communications with. IPsec can be used to provide protection for this communication; however, there are numerous options that can be implemented for the protocol to be compliant to the protocol specification listed in the RFC. Some of these options can have negative impacts on the security of the connection. For instance, using a weak encryption algorithm (even one that is allowed by the RFC, such as DES) can allow an adversary to read and even manipulate the data on the encrypted channel, thus circumventing countermeasures in place to prevent such attacks. Further, if the protocol is implemented with little-used or non-standard options, it may be compliant with the protocol specification, but will not be able to interact with other diverse equipment that is typically found in large enterprises. Even though the communication path is protected, there is a possibility that the IPsec peer could be tricked into thinking that a malicious third-party user or system is the TOE. For instance, a middleman could intercept a connection request to the TOE and respond to the request as if it were the TOE. In a similar manner, the TOE could also be tricked into thinking that it is establishing communications with a legitimate IPsec peer when in fact it is not. An attacker could also mount a malicious man-in-the-middle-type of attack, in which an intermediate system is compromised, and the traffic is proxied, examined, and modified by this system. This attack can even be mounted via encrypted communication channels if appropriate countermeasures are not applied. These attacks are, in part, enabled by a malicious attacker capturing network traffic (for instance, an authentication session) and "playing back" that traffic in order to fool an endpoint into thinking it was communicating with a legitimate remote entity.

### T.USER\_DATA\_REUSE

Data traversing the TOE could inadvertently be sent to a different user as a consequence of a poorly-designed TOE; since these data may be sensitive, this may cause a compromise that is unacceptable. The specific threat that must be addressed concerns user data that is retained by the TOE in the course of processing network traffic that could be inadvertently reused in sending network traffic to a user other than that intended by the sender of the original network traffic.

## 3.2 Assumptions

---

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

### **A.NO\_TOE\_BYPASS**

Information cannot flow onto the network to which the VPN client's host is connected without passing through the TOE.

### **A.PHYSICAL**

Physical security, commensurate with the value of the TOE and the data it contains, is assumed to be provided by the environment.

### **A.TRUSTED\_CONFIG**

Personnel configuring the TOE and its OE will follow the applicable security configuration guidance.

## 3.3 Organizational Security Policies

---

# 4 Security Objectives

## 4.1 Security Objectives for the Operational Environment

**OE.NO\_TOE\_BYPASS**

Information cannot flow onto the network to which the VPN client’s host is connected without passing through the TOE.

**OE.PHYSICAL**

Physical security, commensurate with the value of the TOE and the data it contains, is assumed to be provided by the environment.

**OE.TRUSTED\_CONFIG**

Personnel configuring the TOE and its OE will follow the applicable security configuration guidance.

## 4.2 Security Objectives Rationale

This section describes how the assumptions and organizational security policies map to operational environment security objectives.

Table 1: Security Objectives Rationale		
Assumption or OSP	Security Objectives	Rationale
A.NO_TOE_BYPASS	OE.NO_TOE_BYPASS	This assumption is satisfied by the environmental objective that ensures network routes do not exist that allow traffic to be transmitted from the TOE system to its intended destination without going through the TOE’s IPsec tunnel.
A.PHYSICAL	OE.PHYSICAL	This assumption is satisfied by the environmental objective that ensures the TOE is not deployed on a system that is vulnerable to loss of physical custody.
A.TRUSTED_CONFIG	OE.TRUSTED_CONFIG	This assumption is satisfied by the environmental objective that ensures that anyone responsible for administering the TOE can be trusted not to misconfigure it, whether intentionally or not.

# 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 Protection Profile for General Purpose Operating System Security Functional Requirements Direction

In a PP-Configuration that includes the GPOS PP, the VPN client is expected to rely on some of the security functions implemented by the OS as a whole and evaluated against the Base-PP. In this case, the following sections describe any modifications that the ST author must make to the SFRs defined in the Base-PP in addition to what is mandated by section 5.5.

### 5.1.1 Modified SFRs

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

#### 5.1.1.1 Cryptographic Key Generation

FCS\_CKM.1:

#### 5.1.1.2 Cryptographic Key Establishment

FCS\_CKM.2:

### 5.1.2 Additional SFRs

This section defines additional SFRs that must be added to the TOE boundary in order to implement the functionality in any PP-Configuration where the GPOS PP is claimed as the Base-PP.

#### 5.1.2.1 Cryptographic Support (FCS)

##### 5.1.2.1.1 Auditable Events for GPOS PP Additional SFRs

Table 2: Auditable Events for GPOS PP Additional SFRs

Requirement	Auditable Events	Additional Audit Record Contents
-------------	------------------	----------------------------------

#### FCS\_CKM\_EXT.2 Cryptographic Key Storage

FCS\_CKM\_EXT.2.1

The [**selection:** *VPN client, OS*] shall store persistent secrets and private keys when not in use in OS-provided key storage.

**Application Note:** This requirement ensures that persistent secrets (credentials, secret keys) and private keys are stored securely when not in use. If some secrets or keys are manipulated by the VPN client and others are manipulated by the OS, then both of the selections can be specified by the ST author.

#### 5.1.2.2 Identification and Authentication (FIA)

##### 5.1.2.2.1 Auditable Events for GPOS PP Additional SFRs

Table 3: Auditable Events for GPOS PP Additional SFRs

Requirement	Auditable Events	Additional Audit Record Contents
-------------	------------------	----------------------------------

#### FIA\_X509\_EXT.4 X.509 Certificate Use and Management

FIA\_X509\_EXT.4.1

The TSF shall use X.509v3 certificates as defined by RFC 5280 to support

authentication for IPsec exchanges, and [selection: *digital signatures for FPT\_TUD\_EXT.1, integrity checks for FPT\_TST\_EXT.1, no additional uses*] .

FIA\_X509\_EXT.4.2

When a connection to determine the validity of a certificate cannot be established, the [selection, choose one of: *VPN client, OS*] shall [selection, choose one of: *allow the administrator to choose whether to accept the certificate in these cases, accept the certificate, not accept the certificate*] .

**Application Note:** Oftentimes a connection must be established to perform a verification of the revocation status of a certificate - either to download a certificate revocation list (CRL) or to use the online certificate status protocol (OCSP) to check revocation status. The selection is used to describe the behavior in the event that such a connection cannot be established (for example, due to a network error). The behavior of the TOE in these cases is described by the second selection. If the TOE has determined the certificate is valid according to all other rules in FIA\_X509\_EXT.1 in [Functional Package for X.509, version 1.0](#) , the behavior indicated in the second selection will determine the validity. The TOE must not accept the certificate if it fails any of the other validation rules in FIA\_X509\_EXT.1 in [Functional Package for X.509, version 1.0](#) . If the administrator-configured option is selected by the ST Author, the ST author must also make the appropriate selection in FMT\_SMF.1/VPN.

FIA\_X509\_EXT.4.3

The [selection, choose one of: *VPN client, OS*] shall not establish an SA if a certificate or certificate path is deemed invalid.

### 5.1.2.3 Trusted Path/Channels (FTP)

#### 5.1.2.3.1 Auditable Events for GPOS PP Additional SFRs

**Table 4: Auditable Events for GPOS PP Additional SFRs**

Requirement	Auditable Events	Additional Audit Record Contents
-------------	------------------	----------------------------------

#### FTP\_ITC.1 Inter-TSF Trusted Channel

FTP\_ITC.1.1

The [selection, choose one of: *VPN client, OS*] shall use IPsec to provide a trusted communication channel between itself and [selection:

- *a remote VPN gateway*
- *a remote VPN client*
- *a remote IPsec-capable network device*

] that is logically distinct from other communication channels and provides assured identification of its end points and protection of the channel data from disclosure and detection of modification of the channel data .

FTP\_ITC.1.2

The [selection, choose one of: *VPN client, OS*] shall permit [ the TSF ] to initiate communication via the trusted channel.

FTP\_ITC.1.3

The [selection, choose one of: *VPN client, OS*] shall initiate communication via the trusted channel for [ all traffic traversing that connection ].

**Application Note:** The intent of the above requirement is to demonstrate that IPsec can be used to establish remote communications in transport mode, tunnel mode, or both. The requirement implies that not only are communications protected when they are initially established, but also on resumption after an outage. It may be the case that some part of the TOE setup involves manually setting up tunnels to protect other communication, and if after an outage the TOE attempts to reestablish the communication automatically with (the necessary) manual intervention, there may be a window created where an attacker might be able to gain critical information or compromise a connection.

## 5.2 Protection Profile for Protection Profile for Mobile Device Fundamentals Security Functional Requirements Direction

In a PP-Configuration that includes the MDF PP, the VPN client is expected to rely on some of the security functions implemented by the OS as a whole and evaluated against the Base-PP. In this case, the following sections describe any modifications that the ST author must make to the SFRs defined in the Base-PP in addition to what is mandated by section 5.5.

5.2.1 Modified SFRs

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

5.2.1.1 Cryptographic Key Generation

FCS\_CKM.1:

5.2.1.2 Cryptographic Key Establishment (When Unlocked)

FCS\_CKM.2/UNLOCKED:

5.2.1.3 Subset Information Flow Control

FDP\_IFC\_EXT.1:

5.2.1.4 Trusted Channel Communication

FTP\_ITC\_EXT.1:

5.2.2 Additional SFRs

This section defines additional SFRs that must be added to the TOE boundary in order to implement the functionality in any PP-Configuration where the MDF PP is claimed as the Base-PP.

5.2.2.1 User Data Protection (FDP)

5.2.2.1.1 Auditable Events for MDF PP Additional SFRs

Table 5: Auditable Events for MDF PP Additional SFRs

Requirement	Auditable Events	Additional Audit Record Contents
-------------	------------------	----------------------------------

FDP\_VPN\_EXT.1 Split Tunnel Prevention

FDP\_VPN\_EXT.1.1

The TSF shall ensure that all IP traffic (other than IP traffic required to establish the VPN connection) flow through the IPsec VPN client.

**Application Note:** This requirement is implementation-dependent on the MDF PP being the Base-PP claimed by the TOE. In this case, this requirement must be claimed. For all other Base-PPs, this requirement is strictly optional. This requirement is used when the VPN client is able to enforce the requirement through its own components. This generally will have to be done through using hooks provided by the platform such that the TOE is able to ensure that no IP traffic can flow through other network interfaces.

5.3 Protection Profile for Protection Profile for Application Software Security Functional Requirements Direction

In a PP-Configuration that includes the App PP, the VPN client is expected to rely on some of the security functions implemented by the OS as a whole and evaluated against the Base-PP. In this case, the following sections describe any modifications that the ST author must make to the SFRs defined in the Base-PP in addition to what is mandated by section 5.5.

5.3.1 Modified SFRs

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

5.3.1.1 Cryptographic Key Establishment

FCS\_CKM.2:

5.3.1.2 Cryptographic Key Generation Services

FCS\_CKM\_EXT.1:

5.3.1.3 Cryptographic Operation - Encryption/Decryption

FCS\_COP.1/SKC:

5.3.1.4 Protection of Data in Transit

### 5.3.2 Additional SFRs

This section defines additional SFRs that must be added to the TOE boundary in order to implement the functionality in any PP-Configuration where the App PP is claimed as the Base-PP.

#### 5.3.2.1 Cryptographic Support (FCS)

##### 5.3.2.1.1 Auditable Events for App PP Additional SFRs

**Table 6: Auditable Events for App PP Additional SFRs**

Requirement	Auditable Events	Additional Audit Record Contents
-------------	------------------	----------------------------------

#### FCS\_CKM.6 Cryptographic Key Destruction

FCS\_CKM.6.1

The [**selection:** *TOE, TOE platform*] shall destroy [**assignment:** *list of cryptographic keys (including keying material)*] when [**selection:** *no longer needed, [assignment: other circumstances for key or keying material destruction]* ] .

FCS\_CKM.6.2

The TSF shall destroy cryptographic keys and keying material specified by [FCS\\_CKM.6.1](#) in accordance with a specified cryptographic key destruction method [**assignment:** *cryptographic key destruction method*] that meets the following: [**assignment:** *list of standards*] .

**Application Note:** Any security related information (such as keys, authentication data, and passwords) must be zeroized when no longer in use to prevent the disclosure or modification of security critical data. The zeroization indicated above applies to each intermediate storage area for plaintext key or CSP data (i.e., any storage, such as memory buffers, that is included in the path of such data) upon the transfer of the key or CSP to another location. In practice, the TOE will not implement all of the functionality associated with the requirement, since if it performs zeroization at all it will be by invoking platform interfaces to perform the storage location clear or overwrite function. The ST author should select "TOE" when, for at least one of the keys needed to meet the requirements of this PP-Module, the TOE manipulates (reads, writes) the data identified in the requirement and thus needs to ensure that those data are cleared. In these cases, it is sufficient for the TOE to invoke the correct underlying functions of the host to perform the zeroization—it does not imply that the TOE has to include a kernel-mode memory driver to ensure the data are zeroized. The ST author should select "TOE platform" when native OS functionality is used to perform the key destruction. In the likely event that some of the data are manipulated by the TOE and other data are manipulated entirely by the platform, the ST author must select both options.

#### FCS\_CKM\_EXT.2 Cryptographic Key Storage

FCS\_CKM\_EXT.2.1

The [**selection:** *VPN client, OS*] shall store persistent secrets and private keys when not in use in platform-provided key storage.

**Application Note:** This requirement ensures that persistent secrets and private keys are stored securely when not in use. This differs from FCS\_STO\_EXT.1 in the Base-PP, which only applies to secure storage of administrative credentials. If some secrets or keys are manipulated by the TOE and others are manipulated by the platform, then both of the selections can be specified by the ST author.

## 5.4 Protection Profile for Protection Profile for Mobile Device Management Security Functional Requirements Direction

In a PP-Configuration that includes the MDM PP, the VPN client is expected to rely on some of the security functions implemented by the OS as a whole and evaluated against the Base-PP. In this case, the following sections describe any modifications that the ST author must make to the SFRs defined in the Base-PP in addition to what is mandated by section 5.5.

### 5.4.1 Modified SFRs

This PP-Module does not modify any SFRs defined by the MDM PP.

### 5.4.2 Additional SFRs

This PP-Module does not define any additional SFRs for any PP-Configuration where the MDM PP is claimed

as the Base-PP.

## 5.5 TOE Security Functional Requirements

This PP-Module does not define any mandatory SFRs.

## 5.6 TOE Security Functional Requirements Rationale

The following rationale provides justification for each SFR for the TOE, showing that the SFRs are suitable to address the specified threats:

**Table 7: SFR Rationale**

Threat	Addressed by	Rationale
T.TSF_CONFIGURATION	FAU_GEN.1/VPN	This SFR mitigates the threat by optionally requiring the TOE to generate audit data for its behavior.
	FAU_SEL.1/VPN	This SFR mitigates the threat by optionally requiring the TOE to allow for the configuration of what behavior is audited.
	FIA_X509_EXT.4	This SFR mitigates the threat by providing the ability to verify the integrity of the TSF using X.509 certificates.
	FMT_SMF.1/VPN	This SFR mitigates the threat by requiring the TOE to implement certain administratively-configurable functions.
	FPT_TST_EXT.1/VPN	This SFR mitigates the threat by requiring the TOE to execute self-tests that demonstrate that its integrity is maintained.
T.TSF_FAILURE	FAU_GEN.1/VPN	This SFR mitigates the threat by optionally requiring the TOE to generate audit data for its behavior.
	FAU_SEL.1/VPN	This SFR mitigates the threat by optionally requiring the TOE to allow for the configuration of what behavior is audited.
	FPT_TST_EXT.1/VPN	This SFR mitigates the threat by requiring the TOE to execute self-tests that demonstrate that its integrity is maintained.
T.UNAUTHORIZED_ACCESS	FCS_EAP_EXT.1	This SFR mitigates the threat by optionally implementing EAP-TLS or EAP-TTLS as a mechanism for authentication.
	FCS_IPSEC_EXT.1	This SFR mitigates the threat by requiring the TOE's implementation of IPsec to include requirements for how the remote VPN gateway or peer is authenticated.
	FIA_BMA_EXT.1	This SFR mitigates the threat by optionally defining the TOE's support for a platform-based biometric mechanism to use as an authentication mechanism.
	FIA_PSK_EXT.1	This SFR mitigates the threat by optionally requiring support for pre-shared keys as an alternate authentication method for IPsec.
	FIA_PSK_EXT.2	This SFR mitigates the threat by optionally specifying whether the TOE generates its own pre-shared keys used for authentication or accept them from an external source.
	FIA_PSK_EXT.3	This SFR mitigates the threat by optionally defining the composition and use of password-based pre-shared keys used for authentication.
	FIA_PSK_EXT.4	This SFR mitigates the threat by optionally defining HOTP as an authentication mechanism.
	FIA_PSK_EXT.5	This SFR mitigates the threat by optionally defining TOTP as an authentication mechanism.
	FPF_MFA_EXT.1	This SFR mitigates the threat by optionally enforcing a multifactor authentication requirement on an IPsec connection.
	FTP_ITC.1	This SFR mitigates the threat by defining the use of IPsec for protecting data in transit.



FCS_CKM_EXT.2	This SFR mitigates the threat by requiring the TOE to store sensitive data in the OS' key storage.
FCS_CKM_EXT.2	This SFR mitigates the threat by requiring the TOE or its platform to store sensitive data in the OS' key storage.
FCS_CKM.6	This SFR mitigates the threat by requiring the TOE or its platform to zeroize key data when no longer needed.
FDP_RIP.2	This SFR mitigates the threat by requiring the TOE or its platform to ensure that residual data is purged from the system.
FDP_VPN_EXT.1	This SFR mitigates the threat by optionally requiring the TOE to prohibit split-tunneling so that network traffic cannot be transmitted outside of an established IPsec tunnel.
FPF_MFA_EXT.1	This SFR mitigates the threat by optionally requiring the TOE to prohibit transmission of packet data aside from those packets needed to perform multifactor authentication.

# 6 Consistency Rationale

## 6.1 Protection Profile for Protection Profile for General Purpose Operating System

### 6.1.1 Consistency of TOE Type

### 6.1.2 Consistency of Security Problem Definition

Table 8: Consistency of Security Problem Definition (GPOS PP base)

PP-Module Threat, Assumption, OSP	Consistency Rationale
T.TSF_CONFIGURATION	
T.TSF_FAILURE	
T.UNAUTHORIZED_ACCESS	
T.USER_DATA_REUSE	
A.NO_TOE_BYPASS	
A.PHYSICAL	
A.TRUSTED_CONFIG	

### 6.1.3 Consistency of OE Objectives

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

Table 9: Consistency of OE Objectives (GPOS PP base)

PP-Module OE Objective	Consistency Rationale
OE.NO_TOE_BYPASS	
OE.PHYSICAL	
OE.TRUSTED_CONFIG	

### 6.1.4 Consistency of Requirements

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

Table 10: Consistency of Requirements (GPOS PP base)

PP-Module Requirement	Consistency Rationale
Modified SFRs	
FCS_CKM.1	
FCS_CKM.2	
Additional SFRs	
FCS_CKM_EXT.2	
FIA_X509_EXT.4	
FTP_ITC.1	
Mandatory SFRs	
This PP-Module does not define any Mandatory requirements.	
Optional SFRs	
This PP-Module does not define any Optional requirements.	
Obiective SFRs	

This PP-Module does not define any Objective requirements.

#### Implementation-dependent SFRs

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

#### Selection-based SFRs

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

## 6.2 Protection Profile for Protection Profile for Mobile Device Fundamentals

### 6.2.1 Consistency of TOE Type

### 6.2.2 Consistency of Security Problem Definition

**Table 11: Consistency of Security Problem Definition (MDF PP base)**

**PP-Module Threat, Assumption, OSP    Consistency Rationale**

[T.TSF\\_CONFIGURATION](#)

[T.TSF\\_FAILURE](#)

[T.UNAUTHORIZED\\_ACCESS](#)

[T.USER\\_DATA\\_REUSE](#)

[A.NO\\_TOE\\_BYPASS](#)

[A.PHYSICAL](#)

[A.TRUSTED\\_CONFIG](#)

### 6.2.3 Consistency of OE Objectives

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

**Table 12: Consistency of OE Objectives (MDF PP base)**

**PP-Module OE Objective    Consistency Rationale**

[OE.NO\\_TOE\\_BYPASS](#)

[OE.PHYSICAL](#)

[OE.TRUSTED\\_CONFIG](#)

### 6.2.4 Consistency of Requirements

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

**Table 13: Consistency of Requirements (MDF PP base)**

**PP-Module Requirement    Consistency Rationale**

#### Modified SFRs

[FCS\\_CKM.1](#)

[FCS\\_CKM.2/UNLOCKED](#)

[FDP\\_IFC\\_EXT.1](#)

[FTP\\_ITC\\_EXT.1](#)

#### Additional SFRs

[FDP\\_VPN\\_EXT.1](#)

#### Mandatory SFRs

This PP-Module does not define any Mandatory requirements.

#### Optional SFRs

This PP-Module does not define any Optional requirements.

#### Objective SFRs

This PP-Module does not define any Objective requirements.

#### Implementation-dependent SFRs

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

#### Selection-based SFRs

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

## 6.3 Protection Profile for Protection Profile for Application Software

### 6.3.1 Consistency of TOE Type

### 6.3.2 Consistency of Security Problem Definition

**Table 14: Consistency of Security Problem Definition (App PP base)**

**PP-Module Threat, Assumption, OSP Consistency Rationale**

T.TSF\_CONFIGURATION

T.TSF\_FAILURE

T.UNAUTHORIZED\_ACCESS

T.USER\_DATA\_REUSE

A.NO\_TOE\_BYPASS

A.PHYSICAL

A.TRUSTED\_CONFIG

### 6.3.3 Consistency of OE Objectives

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

**Table 15: Consistency of OE Objectives (App PP base)**

**PP-Module OE Objective Consistency Rationale**

OE.NO\_TOE\_BYPASS

OE.PHYSICAL

OE.TRUSTED\_CONFIG

### 6.3.4 Consistency of Requirements

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

**Table 16: Consistency of Requirements (App PP base)**

**PP-Module Requirement Consistency Rationale**

#### Modified SFRs

FCS\_CKM.2

FCS\_CKM\_EXT.1

FCS\_COP.1/SKC

FTP\_DIT\_EXT.1

#### Additional SFRs

FCS\_CKM.6

FCS\_CKM\_EXT.2

#### Mandatory SFRs

This PP-Module does not define any Mandatory requirements.

#### Optional SFRs

This PP-Module does not define any Optional requirements.

#### Objective SFRs

This PP-Module does not define any Objective requirements.

#### Implementation-dependent SFRs

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

#### Selection-based SFRs

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

## 6.4 Protection Profile for Protection Profile for Mobile Device Management

### 6.4.1 Consistency of TOE Type

### 6.4.2 Consistency of Security Problem Definition

**Table 17: Consistency of Security Problem Definition (MDM PP base)**

PP-Module	Threat, Assumption, OSP	Consistency Rationale
-----------	-------------------------	-----------------------

T.TSF_CONFIGURATION		
---------------------	--	--

T.TSF_FAILURE		
---------------	--	--

T.UNAUTHORIZED_ACCESS		
-----------------------	--	--

T.USER_DATA_REUSE		
-------------------	--	--

A.NO_TOE_BYPASS		
-----------------	--	--

A.PHYSICAL		
------------	--	--

A.TRUSTED_CONFIG		
------------------	--	--

### 6.4.3 Consistency of OE Objectives

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

**Table 18: Consistency of OE Objectives (MDM PP base)**

PP-Module	OE Objective	Consistency Rationale
-----------	--------------	-----------------------

OE.NO_TOE_BYPASS		
------------------	--	--

OE.PHYSICAL		
-------------	--	--

OE.TRUSTED_CONFIG		
-------------------	--	--

### 6.4.4 Consistency of Requirements

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

**Table 19: Consistency of Requirements (MDM PP base)**

PP-Module Requirement
-----------------------

Consistency Rationale
-----------------------

#### **Modified SFRs**

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

#### **Additional SFRs**

This PP-Module does not add any requirements when the MDM PP is the base.

#### **Mandatory SFRs**

This PP-Module does not define any Mandatory requirements.

#### **Optional SFRs**

This PP-Module does not define any Optional requirements.

#### **Objective SFRs**

This PP-Module does not define any Objective requirements.

#### **Implementation-dependent SFRs**

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

#### **Selection-based SFRs**

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

# 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

---

This PP-Module does not define any Objective SFRs.

## A.3 Implementation-dependent Requirements

---

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

# Appendix B - Selection-based Requirements

This PP-Module does not define any Selection-based SFRs.



# Appendix C - 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, 8.3 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.

**Table 20: Implicitly Satisfied Requirements**

Requirement	Rationale for Satisfaction
<b>FCS_CKM.2 - Cryptographic Key Distribution, or FCS_COP.1 - Cryptographic Operation</b>	FCS_CKM.1 (which is defined in this PP-Module as FCS_CKM.1/VPN) requires one of FCS_CKM.2 or FCS_COP.1 to be claimed so that the generated keys can serve some security-relevant purpose. Each of the Base-PPs for this PP-Module define an iteration of FCS_COP.1 for symmetric cryptography that is expected to use the IKE keys generated by FCS_CKM.1/VPN. Therefore, this dependency is satisfied through requirements defined in the Base-PPs.
<b>FCS_COP.1 - Cryptographic Operation</b>	FCS_IPSEC_EXT.1 has a dependency on FCS_COP.1 because of the cryptographic operations that are needed in support of implementing the IPsec protocol. FCS_COP.1 is not defined in this PP-Module because each of the supported Base-PPs define iterations of FCS_COP.1 that support the functions that are relevant to IPsec.
<b>FMT_MTD.1 - Management of TSF Data</b>	<p>FAU_SEL.1/VPN has a dependency on FMT_MTD.1 to enforce appropriate access controls on the audit configuration, as this is TSF data. This SFR is not explicitly defined in any of the supported Base-PPs but the dependency is implicitly addressed by each Base-PP in the following manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• GPOS PP: The GPOS PP implicitly defines the existence of ‘user’ and ‘administrator’ roles in the extended SFRs FMT_MOF_EXT.1 and FMT_SMF_EXT.1. A TOE that conforms to this Base-PP can associate the ability to perform the functionality defined by FAU_SEL.1/VPN to one or both of these roles.</li><li>• MDF PP: The MDF PP implicitly defines the existence of ‘user,’ ‘administrator,’ and ‘MDM’ roles in the SFRs FMT_MOF_EXT.1 and FMT_SMF.1. A TOE that conforms to this Base-PP can associate the ability to perform the functionality defined by FAU_SEL.1/VPN to one or more of these roles.</li><li>• App PP: The App PP does not define the existence of a separately authenticated management interface; instead, the App PP assumes that authentication to the underlying OS platform is sufficient authorization to access the application’s management functionality.</li><li>• MDM PP: The MDM PP defines the existence of management roles in FMT_SMR.1/SECMAN_ROLES. A TOE that conforms to this Base-PP can associate the ability to perform the functionality defined by FAU_SEL.1/VPN to one or more of the roles defined here.</li></ul>
<b>FPT_STM.1 - Reliable Time Stamps</b>	<p>FAU_GEN.1/VPN has a dependency on FPT_STM.1 because audit data is required to have timestamps that are based on reliable clock data. All of the supported Base-PPs either define this requirement explicitly or provide rationale for why the reader should expect that a reliable clock service should be present. Depending on the claimed Base-PP, the dependency is satisfied in the following manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• GPOS PP: The GPOS PP states that FPT_STM.1 is implicitly satisfied by the requirements of FAU_GEN.1 since that requirement could not be satisfied if no clock service was present. Additionally, a clock service is reasonably assumed to be provided by a general-purpose OS.</li><li>• MDF PP: The MDF PP explicitly defines FPT_STM.1.</li><li>• App PP: The App PP assumption A.PLATFORM assumes that the general-purpose computing platform on which the TOE is installed is ‘a trustworthy computing platform.’ System time data is not explicitly mentioned but a clock service is reasonably assumed to be provided by a general-purpose computer.</li><li>• MDM PP: The MDM PP assumption A.MDM_SERVER_PLATFORM assumes that the platform on which the TOE is installed will provide reliable time services.</li></ul>
<b>FPT_STM.1 - Reliable Time Stamps</b>	FAU_GEN.1 has a dependency on FPT_STM.1. While not explicitly stated in the PP, it is assumed that this will be provided by the underlying hardware platform on which the TOE is installed. This is because the TOE is installed as a software or firmware product that runs on general-purpose computing hardware so a hardware clock is assumed to be available.

# Appendix D - Entropy Documentation and Assessment

The TOE does not require any additional supplementary information to describe its entropy sources beyond the requirements outlined in the Base-PPs. As with other Base-PP requirements, the only additional requirement is that the entropy documentation also applies to the specific VPN client capabilities of the TOE in addition to the functionality required by the claimed Base-PP.

# Appendix E - Acronyms

Table 21: Acronyms	
Acronym	Meaning
AES	Advanced Encryption Standard
Base-PP	Base Protection Profile
CC	Common Criteria
CEM	Common Evaluation Methodology
cPP	Collaborative Protection Profile
CRL	Certificate Revocation List
CSP	Critical Security Parameter
DH	Diffie-Hellman
DN	Distinguished Name
DSS	Digital Signature Standard
ECC	Elliptic Curve Cryptography
EP	Extended Package
ESP	Encapsulating Security Protocol
EUD	End-User Device
FFC	Finite Field Cryptography
FIPS	Federal Information Processing Standards
FP	Functional Package
FQDN	Fully Qualified Domain Name
IKE	Internet Key Exchange
IP	Internet Protocol
IT	Information Technology
MD	Mobile Device (MD)
NAT	Network Address Translation
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
OCSP	Online Certificate Status Protocol
OE	Operational Environment
OS	Operating System (OS)
OSP	Organizational Security Policy
PP	Protection Profile
PP-Configuration	Protection Profile Configuration
PP-Module	Protection Profile Module
PUB	Publication
RBG	Random Bit Generation
RFC	Request For Comment
SA	Security Association
SAR	Security Assurance Requirement
SD	Supporting Document

SFR	Security Functional Requirement
SHA	Secure Hash Algorithm
SPD	Security Policy Database
ST	Security Target
TOE	Target of Evaluation
TSF	TOE Security Functionality
TSFI	TSF Interface
TSS	TOE Summary Specification
VPN	Virtual Private Network

# Appendix F - Bibliography

Table 22: 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>
[App PP]	Protection Profile for Application Software, Version 2.0, June 16, 2025
[GPOS PP]	Protection Profile for General Purpose Operating Systems, Version 4.3, September 27, 2022
[MDF PP]	Protection Profile for Mobile Device Fundamentals, Version 3.3, Version 3.3, September 12, 2022
[MDM PP]	Protection Profile for Mobile Device Management, Version 4.0, April 25, 2019