

**OCT 09 P2600 MEETING
PP GUIDE
PROPOSED COMMENT RESOLUTIONS**

#	Section	Page	Line	Comment	Proposed Resolution
28	1.1	5	7	Should we add dates to the titles for 2600.2/3/4? (i.e. ""2600.2™-2010"")	Not sure what to do with this one: I agree with the commenter's suggested resolution – we should discuss this at the meeting.
26	1.1	5	7	The titles for 2600.2/3/4 changed (.1 is the same as always). Titles are now (example of 2600.2): ""IEEE Standard Protection Profile for Hardcopy Devices in IEEE Std. 2600-2008 Operational Environment B""	Accept: Will change the full titles for 2600.2/3/4 in the document to the correct new titles. See also Comment #42.
27	1.4	7	8	Missing ""TM"" on 2600.2/3/4	Accept: Will add the missing trademark symbol.
29	2.2	8	35	I don't think ""validated"" is the correct word. How something is validated is mandated by the CEM. I think you mean ""satisfied"" (as in: you satisfy a requirement).	Accept: Will change the indicated sentence as suggested by the commenter.
30	4.2.1.1	15	18	we do apply functional requirements under certain conditions (security functional requirements, at least) by way of the packages	Accept: Will change the indicated sentence as suggested by the commenter.
36	4.2.1.1	15	33	the common PP is not always combined with a package. env C and D have only one package (SMI) and it is not always required	Accept: Will change the indicated sentence as suggested by the commenter.
31	5.2	24	23	It seems like the heading for this section is a little strange. The section is about choosing which OpEnv to certify against for a given product and its intended usage.	Accept: Will change the title to the suggested text.
37	6.2	36	12	The SPD is not required for OpEnv D, because PP-D is a low assurance level PP. It can be included at the ST author's discretion.	Accept in Principle: Will add the suggested note after reviewing it with the commenter.
38	6.2	36	17	In OpEnv D, not all of the objectives are required and a rationale table is not required, because PP-D is a low assurance level PP. The ST author can include this information at his/her discretion. The rational table can be included only if the author has also included an SPD so that objectives map to something.	Accept in Principle: Will add the suggested note after reviewing it with the commenter.
39	6.2	36	33	security requirements rationale is not required in OpEnv D because PP-D is a LAL PP. It can be included at the ST author's discretion (if they have also included objectives)	Accept in Principle: Will add the suggested note after reviewing it with the commenter.
32	6.3.1.3	39	16	strange page break, also on 6.6.1 page 45 line 9	Accept: Will fix the page break in the indicated location.
33	6.6.2	50	40	Is the destination fax machine really trusted? Is it really similar to the printed document case? The receiving fax machine is outside of the TOE environment.	Not sure what to do with this one: Not sure I understand the comment or what to do about it. Let's discuss this at the meeting.
34	6.6.9	55	11	Shouldn't this advice be placed in the errata section where the problem is identified? It seems strange to put it here with a reference to errata and to have a pointer back here from the errata.	Not sure what to do with this one: Not sure the information in question should be moved to Clause 13. Let's discuss this at the meeting.

**OCT 09 P2600 MEETING
PP GUIDE
PROPOSED COMMENT RESOLUTIONS**

#	Section	Page	Line	Comment	Proposed Resolution
35	6.8.3	57	40	Packages can refer to SAR or SFR, so maybe it is better to head this as SAR Packages and not just Packages	Accept: Will change the indicated sentence as suggested by the commenter.
40	6.8.3	58	1	""Low assurance level"" isn't actually related to EALs, it is related to PP conformance.	Accept in Principle: Will make the suggested changes after reviewing the proposed note with the commenter.
25	TOC	3	11	For some reason, GUIDELINES is boldfaced in the TOC for clauses 6 and 7, maybe it got tagged boldface in the header but the boldface is invisible in the header because headers are already boldfaced (if that makes any sense at all...)	Accept: Will try to fix the problem if I can.
42	1.1	5	7	Since .2 .3 and .4 have completed Sponsor Ballot we may need to add 2009 to the date for the titles....they likely will be approved this year.	Accept: This comment is related to Comment #26. I'll update the titles to address both comments.
43	4.2.2.2	17	20	The sentence is confusing ...suggest	Accept in Principle: Will revise the sentence as suggested and review it with the Commenter.
44	6.9.4	75	30	The spacing of the text box to the line of text before it is messed up....possibly a Word'ism...may have to delete the lines before the box and retype to fix.	Accept: Will fix the text box spacing for the indicated line.
41	TOC	3	11	The word Guidelines is in bold for the heading in Clause 6	Accept: This is the same comment as Comment #25.
23	13	98	2	Both paragraph formats should be full justification, to be consistent.	Accept: Will fully justify the indicated paragraphs.
24	13	99	13	This paragraph seems to be in a smaller font. Was that intentional? [I understand that the source document uses a smaller font, but does that really matter?]	Accept: Will make the font size consistent with the rest of the document.
3	4.2.5.1	22	40	Change ""Items a and b) "" to ""Items a) and b) ""	Accept: Will make suggested change.
4	5.3	26	4	Change ""problem"" to ""problems""	Accept: Will make suggested change.
5	6.2	35	26	Lines 26-31: either use ""a)"" or ""a."" or even ""a)."" (least favorite) consistently throughout the document. (See pg. 36 lines 21-23, pg 39 lines 13-14 and much of Clause 6.9 [and elsewhere?])	Accept: Will make the indicated referencing consistent in the document.
6	6.3.1.2	38	23	Change ""probably because"" to ""e.g.,""	Accept: Will make suggested change.
7	6.3.1.3	39	16	Why is there a page break after line 16?	Accept: This is the same comment as Comment #32.
8	6.4	40	27	The footnote callout for ""TSF Data"" is wrong. Footnote 32 is called out on page 39 line 16. Should it be Footnote #33 instead?	Accept in Principle: Will make sure the correct footnote reference is used in the indicated line (not sure which one is correct at the moment).
9	6.5	42	5	Change ""reexamine at"" to ""reexamine"".	Accept: Will make suggested change.
10	6.5.1	43	8	Include the word ""Clause"" in the reference ""see 7 Item 5.a)"". [Previously agreed to use ""ClauseÆ"" when referencing 1st level paragraphs, but not insert ""Clause"" when referencing 2nd level paragraphs or higher.]	Accept: I caught this one also (see Comment #48). Will make the suggested change.

**OCT 09 P2600 MEETING
PP GUIDE
PROPOSED COMMENT RESOLUTIONS**

#	Section	Page	Line	Comment	Proposed Resolution
11	6.6.1	45	9	Why is there a page break after line 9?	Accept: Will make suggested change.
12	6.6.1.1	48	28	I think the footnote callout number is incorrect.	Accept in Principle: Will make sure the correct footnote reference is used in the indicated line (not sure which one is correct at the moment).
13	6.9	62	42	I think the range ""7 - 6.9.10"" is incorrect. Maybe ""6.1 - 6.9.10?	Accept: MS Word strikes again – it is supposed to be 6.1 – 6.9.10 as you stated. Will fix it hopefully for good this time.
14	6.9.2	70	12	[See text in footnote #50] Remove ""here"".	Accept: Will make suggested change.
15	6.9.7	77	33	Paragraph format should be full justification, to be consistent.	Accept: Will fully justify the indicated paragraph.
16	7.6	87	13	Paragraph format should be full justification, to be consistent.	Accept: Will fully justify the indicated paragraph.
17	8.1	88	31	Both paragraph formats should be full justification, to be consistent.	Accept: Will fully justify the indicated paragraphs.
18	8.1	89	2	Paragraph format should be full justification, to be consistent.	Accept: Will fully justify the indicated paragraph.
19	8.1	89	35	Paragraph format should be full justification, to be consistent.	Accept: Will fully justify the indicated paragraph.
20	8.1	90	3	Paragraph format should be full justification, to be consistent.	Accept: Will fully justify the indicated paragraph.
21	8.3	91	6	Lines 6-9 and 11-28 are missing Question numbers and paragraph indentation, as in Clauses 8.1 and 8.2.	Accept in Principle: Actually the problem is that the question numbers in Clauses 8.1 and 8.2 should have been removed. Will remove all question numbers in Clause 8 and fix the paragraph indentation in Clause 8 to be consistent.
22	9	92	2	All paragraph formats in this Clause should be full justification, to be consistent.	Accept: Will fully justify the indicated paragraphs.
1	TOC	3	11	Why is ""GUIDELINES"" in bold font?	Accept: This is the same comment as Comments #25 and #41.
2	TOC	4	13	Why is ""GUIDELINES"" in bold font?	Accept: I believe this is the same comment as in Comment #25.
49	6.6.1.1	47	27	The sentence starting on line 27 is not correct as stated - what it should say is that if fewer audit events than those specified in the applicable Audit Data Requirement table are specified in the ST, the ST can't claim conformance to the applicable PP.	Accept in Principle: It's my comment. I'd like to know if the group agrees with the suggested rewording.
46	6.6.1.2	47	32	The text ""for a Basic level of audit detail,"" is bolded and shouldn't be. Note there is also an extraneous quotation mark after functionality on this line that should be removed.	Accept: It's my comment, so all I can do is recommend the group accept my suggested changes to this subclause.

**OCT 09 P2600 MEETING
PP GUIDE
PROPOSED COMMENT RESOLUTIONS**

#	<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Proposed Resolution</u>
45	6.7	55	14	This is a restatement of Comment #105 from the Sep 09 Meeting: I don't think that the AC SFP can be modified like this without violating demonstrable conformance. Remember, a vendor can provide the ability to let admins or users grant extended permissions to other users, admins can change the default permissions, and admins can even disable security entirely, but the product (as certified) must still be capable of being locked down as specified in the PP.	Not sure what to do with this one: Need results of discussion between original commenter and atsec to determine how to resolve this comment.
48	6.9	62	6	The references to '7 on both line 6 and line 10 on page 62 should be to ""Clause 7'.	Accept: The is the same comment as Comments #10 & #13.
50	6.9.10	81	3	In updating the indicated text to address Comment #101 from the Sep meeting, the author feels that appropriate examples of how flow control SFRs can be used when forwarding of unmediated transmission is never allowed or is allowed would be appropriate here.	Accept in Principle: Would like to work with the original commenter of Comment #101 to come up with a valid example based on how Xerox actually used flow control in a similar case.
47	6.9.2	64	36	In updating the additional guidance for PP Application Note 10 to resolve previous comments, I noticed that the PP Application Note as stated in IEEE Std 2600.1, Clause 10.1, page 19 may not agree with the direction in CC Part 2, Appendix C.3, page 185. CC Part 2, Appendix C.3 indicates that auditable events are hierarchical, meaning for example that if the Basic audit level is chosen all auditable events for both the Basic and Minimal levels must be collected. PP Application Note 10 states that in the event of a conflict between the CC IEEE Std 2600.1 Table 15, the ""greater of those requirements"" must be specified in the ST. Unless the ""greater of those requirements"" includes the lower audit level requirement the requirements of CC Part 2 Appendix C.3 would not be met.	Not sure what to do with this one: Let's discuss this comment at the meeting.