

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC P L # 515
 Wright, Don Lexmark
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 ""Not-to-Dos"" is strange and perhaps less than clear among non-native English speakers.
SuggestedRemedy
 Can we call them ""prohibitions"" instead
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 1.1 P 5 L 3 # 159
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Footnote 1 for "IEEE Std 2600"-2008" is confusing. In the note, it isn't clear whether "this standard" is referring to the Guide or the Profiles.
SuggestedRemedy
 Clarify
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC P L # 65
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 There are several places in the Guide use P2600.1-CPY, P2600.1-DSR, etc to describe a package requirement or some SFR requirement of a MFD in general not specific to environment A. Not all environments require all the SFR packages in P2600.1.
SuggestedRemedy
 If it's a common SFR requirement, please use P2600.x. Otherwise please make sure the description of the requirements is for the specific environment.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 1.1 P 5 L 5 # 160
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Footnote 2 seems to conflict with Footnote 1. Which is it, "IEEE 2600 series of standards" or "IEEE 2600 series of Protection Profiles"?
SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 1.1 P 5 L 3 # 158
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 "Guide for Development of Security Targets Conforming to IEEE Std 2600"-2008 Protection Profiles" is not the title of this document.
SuggestedRemedy
 Correct either the title or this reference.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 1.1 P 5 L 6 # 69
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 This guide is intended to be used after the completion of the profiles through the IEEE process, change from the (P and Draft) naming convention to the final version. (apply throughout)
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 1.1 P 5 L 6 # 161
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Should the word "Draft" or the letter "P" be used in IEEE P2600.1 Draft Standard for a Protection Profile in Operational Environment A"? Won't it be a Standard soon? Change to IEEE 2600.x Standard" throughout the document.
SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "IEEE 2600.x Standard" throughout the document.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 1.1 P 5 L 13 # 458
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 Strange wording: "It also explains how to use these four IEEE P2600 series of Protection Profiles as the building block to create a Common Criteria compliant Security Target (ST) against one of the IEEE P2600 series of Protection Profiles"
SuggestedRemedy
 Recommend: "It also explains how to create a Common Criteria Security Target (ST) that conforms to one of the IEEE P2600 series of Protection Profiles"
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 1.1 P 5 L 6 # 457
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 References to PPs should say "2600" not "P2600". Since this doc won't go through IEEE editing, we will need to make the change ourselves.
 Note also that there may be a title change to all four PPs...
SuggestedRemedy
 Carefully global search/replace P2600 with 2600
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 1.1 P 5 L 15 # 164
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 "ST developers" vs. "ST documents"
SuggestedRemedy
 Change "ST developers" to "ST documents"
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 1.1 P 5 L 10 # 162
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 There is only one series. Currently the series happens to contain four documents. Change "these four IEEE P2600 series of..." to "this series of four IEEE 2600..."
SuggestedRemedy
 Change "these four IEEE P2600 series of " to "this series of four IEEE 2600 "
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 1.1 P 5 L 15 # 163
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 "guide" vs. "Guide"
SuggestedRemedy
 Capitalize
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 1.1 P 5 L 16 # 165
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change from "one of the four IEEE P2600 series of Protection Profiles" to "one of the IEEE 2600 series of Protection Profiles" or ðone of the IEEE 2600 series of four Protection Profiles"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "one of the IEEE 2600 series of Protection Profiles." throughout the document.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 10 P 90 L 2 # 454
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "Twenty five" and spell out "Thirteen"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 1.1 P 5 L 18 # 459
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 I am not sure I understand this sentence, but I think it says that the Guide discusses scheme-specific issues. However, that subject is only briefly touched upon in the Guide (and there is a 'future considerations' reference to it).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the sentence?
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 10 P 90 L 4 # 455
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "countries"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 1.4 P 7 L 5 # 460
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [B12] is a duplicate of [B6]
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove [B12] (and change refs to [B12] to now refer to [B6])
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 10 P 90 L 16 # 456
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Spell out "Nineteen"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 10.1 P 22 L # 5
 Nevo, Ron Sharp

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Difference in contents of requirements between CC and [PP] in audit log:

""Which should be correct to handle that are not specified to audit in a [PP] out of all SFRs specified in the [PP]?

- it is not necessary to claim in ST since there is no description in the [PP].
- although there is no specification in the [PP], if the SFRs that are specified to be audited in CC part 2 will not be audited, the rationale for not auditing must be described in ST.

""

SuggestedRemedy

For The Guide:

""We request that it is not necessary to claim in ST since there is no description in the [PP].

For example, we would like to get agreement that the contents of requirements is to generate the log only for 5 items in Table 15 in the case we claim Minimum as audit level, not to generate the Minimum level of log that is described as audit for the other SFRs.

""

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 10.12 P 33 L # 6
 Nevo, Ron Sharp

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Sufficiency that some SFRs rationale meets the corresponding security objectives

CC require the ST author to describe the security requirements rationale that demonstrate the SFRs meet all security objectives for the TOE.(ASE_REQ.2.7C)

These rationale demonstrate correspondence between SFRs and all security objectives of [PP] in subclause 10.12 Table 20, page 34.

These rationale are written as high level statements (shown as bellow).

Is the same statement as [PP] enough because [PP] is validated?

Or is ST author required more detail statements how the refined SFRs meet to all security objectives for the TOE ?

In Table 20, ""Purpose"" state that how the SFRs meet to each security objectives.

1. FDP_ACC.1(a) Enforces protection by establishing an access control policy.
2. FDP_ACF.1(a) Su[PP]orts access control policy by providing access control function.
3. FIA_UID.1 Su[PP]orts access control and security roles by requiring user identification.

SuggestedRemedy

Same statement as [PP] is enough for ST because [PP] has already been approved.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 10.5 P 27 L # 2
 Nevo, Ron Sharp

Comment Type T Comment Status X

FIA_UID.1/FIA_UAU.1 is applicable in the case that TOE uses external user authentication server in the IT environment.

Referring the Meeting Minutes on the MEETING #42, the ATSEC recognized it.
<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/minutes/P2600-minutes-Mar2009.pdf>

Also the sample ST exists at
http://www.commoncriteriaportal.org/files/epfiles/st_vid10242-st.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

For the Guide:

FIA_UID.1/FIA_UAU.1 states ""require"" , but not ""provide"". Therefore FIA_UID.1/FIA_UAU.1 is applicable as the TOE SFR in the case that TOE uses external user authentication server in the IT environment.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 11 P 37 L # 4
 Nevo, Ron Sharp

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Question:

- 1.About ALC_FLR.2, let us clarify that this SAR focus on only TSF? In other word, could we recognize that non TSF software is out of scope of this SAR?
- 2.We would like to know how level of actual process is allowed as ALC_FLR.2. For example, ,about ""remediation procedures issued to TOE users"" , is it allowed that service engineer update FW by visiting users? And about ""flaw reporting"" is it allowed that service engineer notify this by email or displaying only on web site?

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 2.1 P 8 L 12 # 461
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 ""to a certain extent or assurance"" is a little vague
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to ""to a defined level of assurance""
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 2.1 P 8 L 28 # 70
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Problem with the sentence that ends on this line.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Reword to: security outside of these three categories.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 2.1 P 8 L 13 # 462
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 extraneous comma after ""Supporting documents""?
 SuggestedRemedy
 remove the errant comma, or change to ""Supporting documents, used within the Common
 Criteria certification process, define how the...""
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 2.1 P 8 L 37 # 528
 Wright, Don Lexmark
 Comment Type G Comment Status X
 No Annex A is found in this document
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change reference(s) to annex a to point to clause 7 (and/or clause 8)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 2.1 P 8 L 19 # 517
 Wright, Don Lexmark
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Referencing a document should include a name not just a reference number.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the sentence to read something like ""As indicated in Common Criteria Part 1 [B2]
 the ..."" This style should be used throughout the document.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 2.1 P 8 L 38 # 463
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 (actually, footnote #5)
 There are now twenty-six CCRA signatories. Pakistan joined as a consumer in November
 2008. Don't count the schemes in the list, because Australia and New Zealand operate one
 scheme but count as two signatories :-).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change ""twenty-five"" to ""twenty-six"".
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 2.1 P 8 L 378 # 166
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 According to the TOC, there is no "Annex A" in this Guide. In which document is the Annex A being referenced?
SuggestedRemedy
 Resolve to correct clause or clarify the document.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 2.2.1 P 9 L 28 # 56
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 The reference to PP content requirements in CEM document is not correct. Chapter 3 of CEMV3.1R2 is ""Normative References"".
SuggestedRemedy
 Change ""Chapter 3 of CEM"" to ""Chapter 9 of CEMV3.1R2"", and CC Part1 V3.1R1 Annex B.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 2.2 P 9 L 1 # 531
 Wright, Don Lexmark
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Missing information about not mandating a single solution.
SuggestedRemedy
 I think it would be useful for text to be added to this clause that reinforces the fact the PPs should be (and these PPs were) written in a way that they don't mandate a single solution to a problem. For example, in the case of PP-A, we don't mandate how a userid is validated. It was our intend that it could be done completely in the TOE or could be done by the TOE with the ""help"" of something like an LDAP server.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 2.2.1 P 10 L 15 # 464
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 table reference error?
SuggestedRemedy
 should say only ""table 1""
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 2.2 P 9 L 24 # 71
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 Change the ""in terms for the security"" to ""in terms of the security""
SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 2.2.1 P 10 L 15 # 167
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 "Table 5.a"?
SuggestedRemedy
 Delete
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 2.2.1 P 10 L 16 # 72
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Table 1 lower right cell: Assumptions sentence is mis-worded.
 SuggestedRemedy
 ... connectivity assumptions that are made about the operational environment..
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 2.3 P 11 L 11 # 74
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 in footnote 9, it's In this context, not in this content.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 2.2.1 P 11 L 1 # 168
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Insert a blank line after Table 1
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert a blank line after Table 1
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 2.3 P 11 L 910 # 169
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The phrase "... a specific type of IT..." seems odd. Do you mean "a specific type of IT equipment"? or IT product?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Reword?
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 2.3 P 11 L 5 # 73
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 change the word needs to requirements in two places in this sentence.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.1 P 13 L 7 # 75
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Reword the sentence to: The purpose of this standard is to guide manufacturers....
 (I don't think the purpose of the standard is to address a lack of standards)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 2.3 P 11 L 8 # 465
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 extraneous comma after ""consumers"" (and on linke 10 after ""entity""
 SuggestedRemedy
 remove errant commas
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 3.1 P 13 L 15 # 518
 Wright, Don Lexmark
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 ""necessitated"" is inaccurate
 SuggestedRemedy
 I suggest using ""motivated""
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 3.1 P 13 L 15 # 76
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 change the word necessitated to motivated.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 3.1 P 13 L 40 # 68
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 replace ""instructs"" with ""instruct""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 3.1.1 P 14 L 3 # 170
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 The end quote in the footnote #10 is backwards.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 3.1.1 P 14 L 13 # 466
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 funny formatting and extra quote:
 italic """" on line 13
 extraneous double quote on line 14
 missing indentation on lines 21 and 22? (line 20 ends with a colon)
 SuggestedRemedy
 fix
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 3.1.1 P 14 L 17 # 77
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 The unordered list is not consistent with what is stated (that provided the following:)The list is not a list of things provided.....
 SuggestedRemedy
 last two items in the list reworded.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 3.1.1 P 14 L 18 # 172
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 What does "This standard" refer to? The document alluded to in line 16? If so, then use the word "document." If the "standards" in line 17 is being referenced, then say "These standards..." If line 16 should use the word "Standard" (instead of document), then do that.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 3.1.1 P 14 L 20 # 173
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Should this paragraph be a bullet or a regular paragraph?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix if necessary
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.1.1 P 14 L 27 # 175
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove the word "do"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.1.1 P 14 L 24 # 174
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 What does "The Standard" refer to? The document alluded to in line 16? If so, then use the word "document." If the "standards" in line 17 is being referenced, then say "These standards..." If line 16 should use the word "Standard" (instead of document), then do that.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.1.1 P 14 L 28 # 176
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove the word "hold"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.1.1 P 14 L 26 # 78
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 This unordered list is not consistently worded.
 SuggestedRemedy
 reword the list items.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.1.1 P 14 L 40 # 79
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 change the last of the sentence to ""finalize their plans for an IEEE standards effort.""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 3.1.1 P 14 L1722 # 171
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The bullet items in lines 17-22 aren't indented properly. The text in the second bullet suggests that the third and fourth bullet should be subordinate to the second. And the text of the four bullets is not consistent with the into text in line 16.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.1.1 P 15 L512 # 177
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Indent the italicized paragraph.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.1.1 P 15 L 4 # 519
 Wright, Don Lexmark
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Formatting
 SuggestedRemedy
 I suggest adding a blank line after "...was."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.1.1. P 15 L1419 # 178
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Indent the italicized paragraph.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.1.1 P 15 L 21 # 467
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 By March 2008, we had 106 individuals from 387organizations.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Consider changing to ""more than 100 individuals from more than three dozen hardcopy device vendors and other organizations"" or something like that...
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.1.1. P 15 L2224 # 179
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 "Standard" vs. "standard"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Capitalize
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.1.3 P 16 L 2 # 180
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change the colon to a period.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 3.1.3.1 P 16 L 4 # 468
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 I don't think OpEnv A is ""high security"", because its security features are not so different from OpEnv B. I would call it ""high accountability"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change ""can be thought of as the 'high security' Operational Environment"" to ""is the 'high accountability' Operational Environment"".
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.1.3.4 P 16 L 34 # 470
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 ""euphemistically""!?
 SuggestedRemedy
 change ""can be euphemistically called"" to ""is""
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.1.3.1 P 16 L 4 # 80
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The beginning of the description sentences for the four environments should be made more consistent.
 SuggestedRemedy
 use: Operational Environment X can be considered.....
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.2 P 16 L 42 # 181
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 I don't think the bulleted list is actually "stated" in Clause 3.1.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "stated" to "described" ù or "explained"?
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.1.3.2 P 16 L 18 # 469
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 ""can be considered to be""? why not ""is""?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change ""can be considered to be"" to ""is""
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 3.2 P 17 L 8 # 471
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh

Comment Type E Comment Status X

There might be a better way to state this relationship... and there are some minor errors and strange things in the existing text.

SuggestedRemedy

Change lines 8-15 to:

""The IEEE 2600 series of Protection Profiles are closely related to IEEE Std. 2600-2008. IEEE Std. 2600-2008 is a general standard for hardcopy device security containing a large amount of content that is beyond the scope of or otherwise inappropriate for a Common Criteria Protection Profile, but the major security objectives of IEEE Std. 2600-2008 are codified as Common Criteria Protection Profiles in [B8]-[B11] so that hardcopy device vendors can develop conforming products and have them Common Criteria certified as such.

""In particular, the mandatory[footnote] security objectives for hardcopy device manufacturers contained in the Compliance clause (clause 8) of IEEE Std. 2600-2008 are represented in the Security Objectives clause (APE_OBJ) of the IEEE 2600-series Protection Profiles.

""For example, the mandatory objectives in Clause 8.1.1 of IEEE Std. 2600-2008 [B1] are represented in the Security Objectives clause APE_OBJ of IEEE Std. 2600.1-2009 [B8]. Similarly, objectives in Clause 8.1.2 of [B1] are represented in APE_OBJ of [B9], Clause 8.1.3 of [B1] in APE_OBJ of [B10], and Clause 8.1.4 of [B1] in APE_OBJ of [B11].

""[footnote] Mandatory security objectives in IEEE Std. 2600-2008 are distinguished by use of the word ""shall"". Non-mandatory objectives use the word ""should"".

Or something like that :-)

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.2 P 17 L 16 # 81
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The sentence refers to the single IEEE 2600-2008 as a series of standards when describing how the series of profiles relates to it. Same reference is also in the following sentence and in the sentence on line 21.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword the sentences

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.2 P 17 L 16 # 182
 Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The second sentence of this paragraph is confusing. What is its point?

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify, re-word, or delete.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.2 P 17 L 21 # 183
 Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

What is meant by "The two standards"? Which two? And should "standards" in this case be capitalized?

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 3.2 P 17 L 24 # 532
 Wright, Don Lexmark

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Hard to follow exceptions

SuggestedRemedy

I think the difference between P2600 and the PPs should be more explicitly identified.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 4.1 P 18 L 5 # 184
 Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Change to "is a discussion" or "are discussions"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 4.1 P 18 L 7 # 185
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Need a period at the end of the sentence.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 4.2 P 18 L 10 # 533
 Wright, Don Lexmark
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Clause 3.1.1 describes the creation of IEEE Std. 2600 not a 2600 series of standards.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Changes ""series of standards"" to ""standard""
 Same change in line 39, 40 and 48.
 It should be removed anywhere the text is simply talking about IEEE 2600.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 4.2 P 18 L 14 # 186
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Why "a single Protection Profile"? We made four of them. Do you mean the initial PP?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "the PPs"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 4.2 P 18 L 17 # 472
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 ""National Security""? We disclaim providing support for life-critical or national security applications.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change ""US Government customers for agencies involving National Security"" to ""some US Government agencies""
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 4.2 P 18 L 20 # 473
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Not just ""selected hardcopy devices"", but (more to the point) ""selected security requirements"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change line 20 sentence to ""Responding to this new requirement, manufacturers started obtaining Common Criteria certifications of selected hardcopy devices (typically, Multifunction Devices) for selected security functions (typically, only those that specific customers required).""
 Change line 25 sentence to ""The lack of a Protection Profile for hardcopy devices resulted in manufacturers certifying different sets of security functions and often expressing those functions using different sets of SFRs.""
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 4.2 P 18 L 37 # 189
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Why "... the two sets"? Which two? Isn't there either one or four sets?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 4.2 P 18 L 46 # 190
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Why "... the single PP"? Do you mean the initial PP? The use of the word "comprise" doesn't make sense [to me] when referring to a single thing comprising a series of things.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 4.2 P 19 L 1 # 474
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 slight improvement in wording...
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change line 1 sentence to "...the decision was made to create four Protection Profile standards -- one for each Operational Environment -- and for those four standards to be part of the IEEE 2600 series of standards."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 4.2 P 18 L 2832 # 187
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 This first sentence is excessive. Needs cleaning up and breaking up. (What's it trying to say?)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.1.1 P 19 L 2629 # 191
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Long sentence. Break into two.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change " HCD configuration, and the SFR " to " HCD configuration. The SFR "
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 4.2 P 18 L 3233 # 188
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove one of the two "each" in this sentence.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.1.2 P 19 L 33 # 192
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Invert sentence so it's clearer that the bullets pertain to the "necessary elements".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "The common PP applies to any supported HCD configuration and contains all of the necessary elements of a PP:"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 4.3.1.2 P 19 L 34 # 82
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 The sentence before the list doesn't indicate a list is to follow.
SuggestedRemedy
 add: ""These elements are:""
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.1 P 20 L 39 # 84
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 ""the IEEE P2600 series standards of Protection Profiles""
SuggestedRemedy
 reword and shorten.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.1.2 P 19 L 45 # 83
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 Same lack of list indicator as in 4.3.1.2.
SuggestedRemedy
 Add: ""These packages are:""
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.1 P 21 L 1 # 504
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Graphic needs to be updated to show ""Functions"" as a third category of asset.
SuggestedRemedy
 (draw a new diagram or ask Brian for one)
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.1.3 P 19 L 43 # 193
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 This first sentence seems circular.
SuggestedRemedy
 How about "SFR packages contain only those SFRs that apply to specific HCD functions."?
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.1 P 21 L 1 # 85
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 The figure needs a figure ID and caption.
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.1 P 20 L 39 # 194
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Remove the word "standards"
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.1 P 21 L 2 # 195
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 The diagram doesn't seem to jive with this sentence. I see six entities (boxes) in the diagram -- and not one of them is labeled "Operations"
SuggestedRemedy
 Make consistent.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.1 P 21 L 5 # 86
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 Refer to the figure by its figure number. (after adding it of course)
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.2 P 21 L 20 # 88
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 ...for these four IEEE P2600 series of PPs
SuggestedRemedy
 reword
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.2 P 21 L 14 # 196
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change to "which can then act on" or "which then acts on"
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.2 P 21 L 21 # 89
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 Remove the parenthetical (which are what these four PPs cover)...it should be obvious to the reader by the time they get to this part..
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.2 P 21 L 18 # 520
 Wright, Don Lexmark
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 Is is the ""IEEE P2600 series of PPs"" or the ""IEEE P2600 series of Protection Profiles.""
SuggestedRemedy
 Please be consistent.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.2 P 21 L 26 # 90
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 remove the ""is"" from the sentence.
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.2 P 21 L 18 # 87
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 The four PPs in the IEEE P2600 series of PPs.....
SuggestedRemedy
 reword
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.2 P 21 L 26 # 198
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change to "...performs the operation can be..."
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.2 P 21 L 2526 # 197
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Should the word "subject" be capitalized? It is elsewhere in this paragraph.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make consistent.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.4 P 22 L 39 # 200
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Where the phrase "categorized somewhat differently" is used, it isn't clear about how the assets categorization is "different." Different to what?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Clarify
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.2 P 22 L 4 # 146
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The application note is for an ST not a PP.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.4.3 P 23 L 12 # 91
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Not really sure what the first sentence means....Why in the context of assets? What do assets have to do with the rest of this paragraph.
 SuggestedRemedy
 reword
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.4 P 22 L 30 # 199
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change wording: "... typically valued in terms of might can be..." Maybe change "might" to "what"?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.6 P 23 L 21 # 201
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "PP" to "IEEE PPs"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.6 P 23 L 33 # 92
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 IrDA is a registered trademark is owned by the Infrared Data Association.
SuggestedRemedy
 add the (R) and the footnote, also suggest rewording the trademark footnotes to "" The XXX trademark is owned by XXXowner.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.3.2 P 24 L 3 # 93
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 TSF Confidential Data and TSF Protected Data are ""reserved words"" and probably should be capitalized...
SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.6 P 23 L 2931 # 202
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 It's not clear what the point of the second sentence in this paragraph is. What does "sniffing" have to do with giving examples of shared-medium interfaces? To be consistent with the definition provided, I think the only point should be that multiple users can access it simultaneously -- regardless of whether it be for sniffing or other reasons. If we want to make a point about how "simultaneous access" can lead to "sniffing", then we should say that.
SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.3.2 P 24 L 6 # 204
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Remove the period in "IEEE. 2600 series"
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.2.6 P 23 L 3435 # 203
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 It's not clear what the point of the second sentence in this paragraph is. What does "intercepted surreptitiously" have to do with giving examples of private-medium interfaces? To be consistent with the definition provided, I think the only point should be that multiple users can't access it simultaneously -- regardless of whether it be for interception or other reasons. If we want to make a point about how "simultaneous access" can lead to "surreptitious interception", then we should say that.
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.3.2 P 24 L 6 # 94
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 Odd references (as a series) to IEEE 2600-2008 in two places.
SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.3.2 P 24 L 67 # 205
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 If [B1] is the [single] document reference, why is it referred to as the "series of standards"?
SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 4.3.5.1 P 26 L 5 # 95
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 etc. needs a comma (etc.,)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 4.3.5.1 P 26 L 30 # 207
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 If "Restricted forwarding of data to external interfaces" is the title of FPT_FDI_EXP.1, then the sentence would be easier to read if the title were in quotes.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 4.3.5.1 P 26 L 8 # 96
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Clause is incorrectly spelled (Claus)...also the reference to the ""four Protection Profiles"" is inconsistent with other references in the guide.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 4.3.5.1 P 26 L 3233 # 208
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 This paragraph should not be indented as part of item b).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Exdent
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 4.3.5.1 P 26 L 8 # 206
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 "Claus" is misspelled. Other uses of "clause" in the document are not capitalized. Or just eliminate the phrase "this Claus is describing"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 4.3.5.2 P 26 L 49 # 534
 Wright, Don Lexmark
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 Sentence is too limiting
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to read:
 ""Two examples of where this situation occurs in the PPs are:""
 This will provide sufficient ""cover"" if there is another place where the objective is satisfied externally.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 4.3.7 P 27 L 39 # 535
 Wright, Don Lexmark
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 How do we know if important issues not addressed by the PPs will arise?
SuggestedRemedy
 Change sentence to read something like:
 ""Should important issues be identified that are not currently addressed by the PPs, that information will be provided in this clause.""
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.7 P 27 L 39 # 97
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 Is referring to the profiles as a group by ""the four IEEE P2600 series of Protection Profiles"" really the best way....what if we add a fifth later. Comment applies to all references to the general group of profiles
SuggestedRemedy
 suggest referring to them as:""the IEEE 2600 profiles""....
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.3.7 P 27 L 3840 # 209
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Is this clause really necessary as a placeholder? If it's just a note to the editor, then put in a different font or color or highlight.
SuggestedRemedy
 delete
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.4 P 27 L 42 # 475
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 really?
SuggestedRemedy
 why not put it in this version? or remove this clause...
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.4 P 27 L 44 # 147
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 The paragraph refers to something being added.....
SuggestedRemedy
 need to add or remove the paragraph
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 4.4 P 27 L 4144 # 210
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 If this clause is just a note to the editor, then put in a different font or color or highlight.
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5 P L # 529
 Wright, Don Lexmark
Comment Type G **Comment Status** X
 I think this section is too large with too many levels of headings (6)
SuggestedRemedy
 Break this into multiple clauses to make reading easier for example:
 5 - General Usage Guidelines
 6 - Vendor Usage Guideline
 7 - Customer Usage Guidelines
 8 - Usage Exmples
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5, 12.3, P6,39 L # 1
 Nevo, Ron Sharp
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Specification of TOE boundary
 Physical and logical boundary of TOE and its method of specification.
 From Table 22 of Section 5, physical object is seen as physical boundary and logical boundary is seen as aspect of functional specification of physical object.
SuggestedRemedy
 For the Guide:
 We would like to get agreement that each vendor can specify its own TOE boundary. For example:
 - we would like to be granted that each vendor specifies firmware version that is necessary
 - in the case hardware (for example IC chip) will be included in addition to firmware, we would like to be granted that hardware boundary is specified in terms of IC chip, not the whole hardware.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.1 P 28 L 5 # 476
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 minor consistency issue
SuggestedRemedy
 Change first bullet to ""A vendor who...""
 Change second bullet to ""An Author ...""
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.1 P 28 L 13 # 98
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 The guide is intended for use AFTER the completion of the profiles. Shouldn't refer to the ""draft""
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.1 P 28 L 16 # 477
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 just a suggestion about how to refer to the PP series
SuggestedRemedy
 I usually use ""2600.n"" (with ""n"" in italics)
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.1 P 28 L 17 # 99
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 Is footnote marker 10 correct here, and the other 5 place it's used in this list. Footnote 10 text didn't seem to match.
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.1 P 28 L 29 # 488
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 5.2.1.1 is a very long section (6 pages) under a single heading, easy to lose context
SuggestedRemedy
 I hate to see 5 heading levels, but consider breaking 5.2.1.1 into 5th-level subheadings
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.1 P 28 L 1725 # 211
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Footnote 10 is not on this page -- and [apparently] doesn't apply.
SuggestedRemedy
 Change footnote number
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.1 P 28 L 30 # 53
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 This section states that there are two key criteria (which are numbered a) & b)) to consider in order to determine which operational environment a product belongs. Criteria c) - g) are detailed security criteria for b).
SuggestedRemedy
 Please properly number the criteria to reflect the correct structure of the section.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.1 P 29 L 13 # 521
 Wright, Don Lexmark
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 ""draft"" and ""P2600"" is redundant
SuggestedRemedy
 Strike ""draft"" here and anywhere else this occurs.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.1 P 29 L 10 # 212
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Remove "not connected"
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1 P 30 L 3 # 101
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 Inconsistent reference to the 2600 Profiles here (2600 PP standard)
SuggestedRemedy
 fix
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 29 L 16 # 57
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data

Comment Type T Comment Status X

MFP here is defined as the acronym for Multifunctional Product. However in many industry reports, MFP is the acronym for Multifunctional Printer. MFD is more consistently used for Multifunctional Device (either printer-based or copier based). MFD is used in PWG standards.

SuggestedRemedy

Please discuss which is better to be used in the Guide. Prefer to change MFP to MFD as Multifunctional Device to be consistent with PWG. Need to make global change if we decide to make the change.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 29 L 16 # 478
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh

Comment Type E Comment Status X

elsewhere we use ""multifunction device"" and ""MFD"" but here we use ""multifunction product"" and ""MFP""

SuggestedRemedy

make consistent (2600-2008 uses MFD)

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 29 L 33 # 214
 Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Change "This type of criteria" to "Functional criteria"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 29 L 35 # 215
 Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

I don't understand the point of the second sentence nor how it relates to the first sentence in this paragraph.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 29 L 41 # 100
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The HCD ""provides"" security features, not performs

SuggestedRemedy

replace ""performs"" with ""provides""

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 29 L 2531 # 213
 Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The last sentence in this paragraph is awfully long. Can it be broken up to make reading easier?

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 30 L 7 # 522
 Wright, Don Lexmark
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Where is ""here""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Point to something specific.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 30 L 12 # 218
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Should the title of this table have a footnote, similar to Tables 3-6?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 30 L 12 # 219
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 There is no footnote #14. It skips from 13 to 15.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 30 L 12 # 58
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 In Table 2, User Document Data as a whole are still listed as required for protection from unauthorized disclosure or alteration in environment B. A recent correction in PP-B changed the requirement to only User Document Data AT REST are protected from disclosure or alteration. Similar change applies to User Function Data for environment B.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please correct the table according to the recent changes in PP-B.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 30 L 12 # 102
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Suggest centering the tables. Left justified breaks the flow if the very long ordered list.
 SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 30 L 79 # 216
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 I think this paragraph should not be indented as part of b). It seems to introduce the next several bulleted items c) through g) -- which should be renumbered to a) through e). Better yet, this paragraph could be given a new clause number and title, with each of a) through e) being subordinate numbered clauses. Change from "Here are guidelines..." to "The following clauses provide guidelines..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 30 L 79 # 217
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 I don't think "the product" can consider anything. Should it be the "product vendor" or the
 ôST Author" -- or someone else?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 31 L 7 # 223
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change the semicolon to a period and make two sentences.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 31 L 1 # 220
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove "(pick any company... employees);"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 31 L 11 # 224
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "an Operation Environment A" to "Operational Environment A"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 31 L 3 # 221
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "that type of" to "such an"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 31 L 12 # 225
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Put a period after "purposes". If the parenthetical phrase is really necessary, make it a
 whole sentence and re-word it to "Determining which one of the environments would
 depend on..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 31 L 5 # 222
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Delete "In that type of environment", and capitalize "Senior".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 31 L 15 # 505
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 I don't really agree this example. I don't think an accounting office should use the C environment, and I also am not sure that ""constant turnover"" is a good reason to go with the D environment. Without the ""constant turnover"" then it might be a good candidate for D.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the example for D. Find a better example for C (hotel business center?)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 31 L 21 # 226
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Who is "the vendor"? The HCD vendor -- or the accounting firm owner?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 31 L 22 # 481
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 the ""company"" is not always a particular environment, so this statement might be a little misleading
 SuggestedRemedy
 change ""an Operational Environment C or D company"" to ""Operational Environment C or D""
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 31 L 26 # 59
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 In Table 4, the Objectives for protecting User Document Data and User Function Data in environment B need to be corrected to apply to that data AT REST only. See recent corrections in PP-B.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please correct the table according to the recent changes in PP-B.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 31 L 26 # 482
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 it may not be clear that admins are authorized in PP-A and PP-B
 SuggestedRemedy
 add a footnote mark to O.ADMIN.AUTHORIZED for PP-A and PP-B and in the footnote indicate that administrators are authorized as part of O.USER.AUTHORIZED
 similarly, add footnote for OE.ADMIN.AUTHORIZED...
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 31 L 26 # 506
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 we changed PP-B, so it now has ""O.DOC_REST.NO_DIS"" instead of ""O.DOC.NO_DIS""; similarly O.DOC_REST.NO_ALT and O.FUNC_REST.NO_ALT
 SuggestedRemedy
 add new rows to the table and change the entries for O.DOC and O.FUNC
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.1 P 32 L 1 # 227
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 This sentence should include the phrase "for the product's intended Operational Environment"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.1 P 32 L 6 # 507
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 I think that additional objectives can be added that violate assumptions; the point is that the ST can be more restrictive (fewer/reduced assumptions or more/enhanced objectives). For example, if you do not assume that users are trained, then the TOE would need to have functions which enforce the policies/procedures of the organization. (this is actually described on page 30 line 27)
 SuggestedRemedy
 correct this statement
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.1 P 32 L 2 # 103
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Refer to the table by its table number, not its position.
 SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.1 P 32 L 9 # 229
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "... that were applicable to Table 3 also apply..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.1 P 32 L 4 # 228
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "... covering security objectives other than those listed in..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.1 P 32 L 9 # 508
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 this paragraph and the next one do not really distinguish A and B very well; the point of A and B is that users are identified and authenticated and cannot access either's documents; the distinguishing feature of A (versus B) is that all operations are logged for auditing purposes, not just exceptions/violations
 SuggestedRemedy
 re-work the exmaples of A and B
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 32 L 11 # 230
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "... both internal and external threats to access..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 32 L 36 # 232
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "... HIPAA do not apply".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 32 L 13 # 231
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Footnote 18 should refer to clause 5.2.2.4, not 5.2.2.3.1
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 32 L 40 # 483
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 it may not be clear that there is an OSP for admin authorization in A and B
 SuggestedRemedy
 add a footnote mark to P.ADMIN.AUTHORIZATION for PP-A and PP-B and in the footnote indicate that administrators are authorized as part of P.USER.AUTHORIZATION
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 32 L 27 # 509
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 this example has a few errors:
 (1) tax return information would not be protected or confidential data, it would be document data, which is NOT protected in env C or D (except after job completion, in C)
 (2) ""no outside person could walk in and take a disk"" -- there is no NVS package in either C or D
 SuggestedRemedy
 re-work the example, probably making one example for C and another for D
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 32 L 4243 # 233
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 What is this sentence trying to say? Why would this document dictate what an organization must do with regard to its security policies? And which "assumptions" are being referenced here that must be removed?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Clarify or delete.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 33 L 1 # 234
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "key differences between Operational Environment OSP requirements are..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 33 L 10 # 104
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 the word ""user"" should be either users or ""a user""
 SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 33 L 3 # 484
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Again, I think that an accounting firm may be a poor example for environment D.
 Accounting and auditing often go together! Although it may be true that there is no need for auditing in, say, a small business bookkeeping operation, I think that it may be misleading to use accounting as an example of OpEnv D.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Maybe use a different example firm, like a small retail shop?
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 33 L 10 # 236
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "user" to "use"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 33 L 9 # 235
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "they" to "the"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 33 L 15 # 485
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 College campus MFDs might actually be a good example for environment C! Environment C doesn't preclude authorization, it just doesn't prescribe it. Older campus facilities used coin-op copiers (now they are more likely to use campus cards). Some printers might be available for use simply by virtue of the student having access to a particular lab which has a printer. But strong admin control is still required, and it is present in OpEnv C. And I don't think there is any assumption about document privacy on college campus MFPs/printers, so C would be acceptable. But some campuses may be more sophisticated and would use OpEnv B.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Switch this example to C, or choose a different example for B.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 33 L 15 # 237
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "take" to "consider"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 34 L 7 # 239
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "principal driver" to "principle security guideline"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 33 L 32 # 486
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 it might be useful to clarify the meaning of (a) and (b) in the SFR table, either in the table or in a footnote
 SuggestedRemedy
 (a) is for data access control, (b) is for function access control
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 34 L 17 # 240
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove the redundant "also" from this sentence.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 34 L 2 # 105
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 First sentence is mis-worded.
 SuggestedRemedy
 ...difficult to show how particular SFRs apply to a particular ...
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 34 L 19 # 487
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 inconsistency in examples: ""accounting firm"" on page 34 needs user I&A, but previous example using accounting firm suggested OpEnv C or D (no user I&A)
 SuggestedRemedy
 make consistent
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.1.1 P 34 L 2 # 238
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "... to show how the applicable SFRs indicate a particular...
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.2 P 35 L 4 # 494
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 compliant versus conformant: we have been using ""compliant"" for 2600-2008 and other things like HIPAA, but use ""conformant"" for an ST's relationship to one of the PPs
SuggestedRemedy
 change ""compliant"" to ""conformant""
 see also 5.2.2.1 page 36 line 25
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.2 P 35 L 4 # 241
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 This clause could benefit from an introduction, describing the purpose of the following sub-clauses, and why they are relevant to this title.
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.2 P 35 L 4 # 511
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 This clause contains some, but not all issues of how the PP is not implementation-specific. Either we should include more issues, or change the heading to something about how the PP allows some objectives to be fulfilled inside or outside of the TOE
SuggestedRemedy
 I suggest that we change the heading to ""How the PPs allow some objectives to be fulfilled inside the TOE or outside the TOE"", and then remove the clauses about NVS and SMI (merge any unique/useful info from those clauses into 5.2.2.2.3 and 5.2.2.2.2 respectively)
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.2 P 35 L 7 # 106
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 sentence needs rewording.
SuggestedRemedy
 If the product provides an internal capability to store and provide access to audit records, this capability must be implemented in such a way as to meet or exceed the following objectives:
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.2.1 P 35 L 7 # 242
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 And what about if the product *doesn't* provide an internal capability? Is that relevant? Given the title of 5.2.1.2, I would expect so.
SuggestedRemedy
 Address this situation.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.2.1 P 35 L 7 # 510
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Three cases should be covered in this section: outside storage (PP default), inside storage, and both
SuggestedRemedy
 Insert paragraph describing the overall objectives, then cover how they are fulfilled in each of the three cases (OEs for default, replace OEs with SFRs for inside, and add SFRs to OEs for both -- but evaluate as separate modes of operation)
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.2.1 P 35 L 11 # 107
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 modifications doesn't need the ""s"" and the (e.g., needs a comma)
SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.2.2 P 35 L 18 # 489
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 ""described below"" where!?
SuggestedRemedy
 replace with ""described in clause 5.2.2.2.3""
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.2.2 P 35 L 17 # 108
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 Replace ""to get hold of"" with aquire.....
SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.2.3 P 35 L 21 # 490
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 should also mention that conformance to this package is further described in 5.2.2.2.2
SuggestedRemedy
 add a note about that at the end of this clause
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.2.2 P 35 L 18 # 243
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Instead of "described below", could a specific reference be provided? I don't think it's obvious where to look. Perhaps this clause should be moved closer to "below"? Or vice-versa? Otherwise, it's not very clear that it actually relates to 5.2.1.2
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.2.3 P 35 L 21 # 109
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 First sentence in this paragraph need rewording...
SuggestedRemedy
 ...cover the threat of an attacker accessing or modifying sensitive information as it are being transmitted over shared-medium interfaces by capturing the data as it are in transit.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.2.3 P 35 L 28 # 110
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 (for instance, use TLS or IPSec) should be (for instance, the use of TLS or IPSec)
SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.2.4 P 35 L 40 # 244
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change to "each of the print servers"
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2 P 36 L 17 # 245
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change "subsections" to "subclauses" (assuming that is the convention we're trying to follow.)
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.2.4 P 36 L 6 # 491
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 should mention that external authentication is the default, and perhaps list external as the first item in the list on line 8
SuggestedRemedy
 mention that external is the default and list it first
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.1 P 36 L 21 # 493
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 not a ""class of types""
SuggestedRemedy
 replace ""for a class of TOE types"" with ""for a class of TOEs""
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.1.2.4 P 36 L 9 # 492
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 ""Active Directory"" is vendor-specific
SuggestedRemedy
 why not use LDAP instead?
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.1 P 37 L 1 # 111
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 This text should be indented (possibly a note.) as it's part of a list. Also, it's (an ST) not (a ST)
SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.1 P 37 L 8 # 246
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 Is this bullet item out of place? Or maybe the paragraph above it?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix if appropriate
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.1 P 38 L 7 # 113
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 change the word ""claim"" to ""claimed""
 SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.1 P 37 L 14 # 247
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 Remove the space before the colon.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.10 P 76 L 31 # 411
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 This sentence is incomplete. It will show examples of how the SFRs do what? How they meet the requirements? How they will be added in this section?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Clarify
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.1 P 37 L 17 # 248
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 Remove the space before the colon.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.2 P 37 L 34 # 496
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 minor nit: ""conformance with""
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to ""conformance to""
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.1 P 37 L 18 # 112
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 The word ""tracing"" should be ""Mapping"" in list items 1 and 2.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2 P 37 L 34 # 60
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Would like the titles of subsections showing examples of conformance properly named as 'Examples'.
SuggestedRemedy
 Please rename the subsection as Example Conformance to .
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.1 P 38 L 7 # 250
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change to "what is claimed"
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.1 P 37 L 35 # 61
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 The guidances provided for PP SFR conformance in this section violates the Demonstrable Conformance rules specified in CC. Consequently it conflicts with the guidances provided in sections 5.2.2.6.3, 5.2.2.6.4, and 5.2.2.6.5.
SuggestedRemedy
 Please provide guidances that are consistent with the Demonstrable Conformance rules in CC.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.1 P 38 L 11 # 251
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Delete "in" and change "is" to ôare": ôExamples to help understand this concept are provided in the following clauses."
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.1 P 37 L 36 # 249
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 This is one long sentence that is difficult to parse. Can it be broken up somehow? Or structured as a list?
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.2 P 38 L 12 # 497
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 there is only one entry under this clause
SuggestedRemedy
 change heading to ""Source of reliable time stamps"", remove bullet item (a), make the rest of the clause a regular paragraph
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.2 P 38 L 16 # 495
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 TBD, what is it supposed to point to? an app note in the PP? which PP?
 SuggestedRemedy
 remember to fix it, or remove it
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.2 P 38 L 19 # 115
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 should be ""In the first case"" not ""If the first case""
 SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.2 P 38 L 16 # 114
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 fix the (TBD)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.2 P 38 L 20 # 62
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The PP App. Note for Reliable Time Stamp SFR already explained that SFR can be claimed in two ways: 1) using an internal time clock or 2) an external time server clock, except that if external time source is used, additional SFRs must be implemented to ensure secure authentication of the time source and protection of the obtained time from alteration.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the statement that says: In the second case the ST author can't claim the FPT_STM.1 SFR .
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.2 P 38 L 16 # 252
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove or resolve the "(see TBD)".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.2 P 38 L 21 # 254
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove "in the case of (2)". There is no "case of (2)" referenced in this paragraph. Also, this sentence is too long. Break it up.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.2 P 38 L 19 # 253
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "If" to "In".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.3 P 38 L 28 # 498
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh

Comment Type E Comment Status X

this clause deals with both whether AND HOW to conform to the NVS package (and there is a grammatical error)

SuggestedRemedy

change to ""The first step is to determine if an ST can claim conformance to the NVS package:""

follow with bullet items a and b

then ""The next step is to determine how conformance can be claimed:""

follow with bullet items d, then c

add an additional bullet item ""if the product offers this feature and the integrity and confidentiality protection is supplied by a third party product that has itself already been CC certified, then this package may be claimed by a TOE composed of the vendor's HCD and the certified third party product. It is beyond the scope of this document to describe the requirements and process for TOE composition."" (maybe make this text consistent with similar text for SMI on page 39 line 15)

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.3 P 38 L 29 # 116
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

Comment Type E Comment Status X

The sentence refers to a list of more than one general issue. The initial word in each list should be capitalized.

SuggestedRemedy

....should be claimed in an ST are:

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.3 P 38 L 29 # 255
 Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Change from "Some general issues an ST Author should be aware of in determining whether conformance with the NVS SFR package should be claimed in an ST is:" to "Some general guidelines that an ST Author should consider in claiming conformance with the NVS SFR package include the following:"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.3 P 38 L 31 # 256
 Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

This line says, "... if demonstrating compliance..." -- but it doesn't [seem to] suggest what to do if *not* demonstrating compliance. Do we need this phrase?

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.3 P 38 L 37 # 257
 Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Change "I" to "conformance to the".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.2.3 P 38 L 37 # 501
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 typo ""then I NVS""
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to ""then the NVS""
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.2.3 P 38 L 41 # 500
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 is it ""artifacts required in order [to] demonstrate conformance..."" or is it really more like
 ""evidence required for Common Criteria certification""?
 SuggestedRemedy
 consider rewriting, or at least include the missing ""to"" in the sentence
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.2.3 P 38 L 42 # 258
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "this package" to "conformance to this package"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.2.3 P 38 L 44 # 259
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "this package can claimed; the vendor" to "conformance to this package can be
 claimed. The vendor"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.2.3 P 38 L 44 # 499
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 I am not sure that there is much value in describing three ways plus ""other solutions"", and
 anyhow, aren't two of those ways the same thing? (1 and 3)
 SuggestedRemedy
 remove the last part of the sentence and the numbered list that follows
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.2.3 P 38 L 45 # 117
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 In list item D the wording is wrong in a couple of ways.
 SuggestedRemedy
 "".....then this package can be claimed; the vendormandated by this package
 including:""
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.2.3 P 38 L 46 # 118
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 all items in this list should be passive voice.
 SuggestedRemedy
 1) use of an encrypted....
 2) use of hardware solutions
 3) use of nonvolatile
 leave out the other.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.2.4 P 39 L 30 # 54
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 On the statement: ""Clearly if the TOE doesn't provide any type of trusted path then the FPT_FDI_EXP extended SFR component can not be claimedà""
 This statement does not make sense.
 SuggestedRemedy
 This is probably an editorial mistake. Please clarify.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.2.4 P 39 L 5 # 502
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 where to start? all four paragraphs are difficult!
 SuggestedRemedy
 rewrite. what we're trying to say is that:
 (1) if you have a shared-medium interface, then conformance to the SMI package must be claimed
 (2) if the trusted path and data forwarding restrictions are implemented by the TSF, then it is no problem to make the claim
 (3) if the trusted path is performed by a third party device (e.g. network interface card that internally implements IPsec), then there are two ways to claim conformance: (a) include the third party device and its assurance evidence in the TOE evaluation, or (b) use a third party device that itself has been Common Criteria certified and then compose the TOE
 I wouldn't bother to mention ""adding FPT_FDP_EXP or something similar"", it just confuses the issue and you won't get certified if you can't satisfy FTP_TRP
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.2.4 P 39 L 31 # 261
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 Change "extended SFR component can't be claimed" to "extended SFR component should not be included in <something?>]" or δconformance to the extended SFR component can't be claimed"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.2.4 P 39 L 33 # 262
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 Change "This means TOE" to "This means the TOE"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.2.4 P 39 L 6 # 119
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Replace ""What happens though,"" with ""However,""
 SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.4 P 39 L 33 # 120
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 should be ""This means the TOE has..." instead of ""This means TOE""
SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.3 P 39 L 40 # 264
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change "allow owner's" to "allow the owner's"
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.2.4 P 39 L 610 # 260
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Is this [very long] second sentence a question? If so it needs a question mark. And breaking up. If not, then I don't understand it.
SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.3 P 39 L 40 # 121
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 missing words (the) and (to) instead of (of)
SuggestedRemedy
 allow the owner's assets to be processed in.....and hence the threats to the TOE....
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.3 P 39 L 35 # 263
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 The title of this clause gives me the impression that it will discuss the "SFRs/threats/objectives applicable to each environment" -- however, there is only one subclause: O.AUDIT.LOGGING Security Objective. Should there be more content? Or a change to the title?
SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

CI **Guide** SC **5.2.2.3** P **40** L **1** # **503**
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh

Comment Type **G** Comment Status **X**

I gave up making comments after page 39. I think there is a lot of work to do and I am out of time for detailed review...

SuggestedRemedy

Some general restructuring ideas:

1. Promote ""vendor usage guidelines"", ""ST author usage guidelines"", and ""customer usage guidelines"", and ""claiming product compliance"" to major clauses 5, 6, 7, and 8. This will make the clause depth manageable (I saw some seventh-level headings!).
2. Try to order the ST Author guidelines in the same order as items are found in the PP (and would be written in an ST)
3. Look for headings that have only one sub-item (e.g. 5.2.2.3) and fix them
4. Look for items that have no content other than to say that we'll do something in a future version, and remove those items (e.g. 5.2.2.10)

Some general formatting/presentation ideas:

1. Avoid including raw content from the PPs, but instead instruct the reader to be looking at the PP alongside the PP Guide
2. When giving examples of how to complete assignments/selections in SFRs, indent them or otherwise make them stand out in the text. Otherwise, it is mind-numbing to try to figure out what are the examples and what are the notes about the examples.
3. Some of the text starts to read like a standard. For example, 5.2.2.5.2 page 54 line 18 ""The ST SHALL state that it is..."". We shouldn't be putting text like that in an informative guide.
4. In 5.2.2.7, do we plan to remove app notes for which we offer no additional guidance? I hope so.

Some technical ideas:

1. Be very careful about instructing ST authors to redefine SFRs or ECDs. For example, the suggestion in 5.2.5.7.4.2 (!) page 49 line 23 is wrong, you can't rewrite the ECD that way.
2. Be careful about giving advice about how a particular approach will be evaluated. For example, the advice in 5.2.5.7.4.2 page 50 line 19 suggests that encrypting disks prevents alteration of data and that there is no need to detect. But it depends on the surrounding implementation. If an encrypted disk is degaussed, an implementation may ""detect"" that condition as indicating a fresh new MFP and then assign default admin passwords!
3. Be careful not to suggest the addition of unnecessary stuff, for example in 5.2.2.7.1 page 61 line 42 it is suggested to add ""D.DOC / Delete / U.ADMINISTRATOR / Authorized"" but this is not necessary because it was not Denied in the first place. Administrators can read, modify, or delete anyone's D.DOC. You can only add items that further restrict access, otherwise you are violating the SFP. So an example in this case would be where you want to prevent the administrator from reading or modifying D.DOC, you could add an entry ""D.DOC / Read; Modify / U.AMINISTRATOR / Denied except for his/her own documents"".

Some miscellaneous notes:

1. 5.2.2.7 says that PP-B/C/D have subsets of the app notes of PP-A. This is not strictly true, there are a few (just a few) unique app notes in PP-B and C and maybe D.

2. Is there a way we can make the Guide about 1/2 of its current length (or is that girth?)
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **Guide** SC **5.2.2.3** P **40** L **3** # **122**
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**

it's (of) the TOE instead of (to)

SuggestedRemedy

see comment

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **Guide** SC **5.2.2.3** P **40** L **3** # **265**
 Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**

Change "to the TOE" to "of the TOE"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **Guide** SC **5.2.2.3** P **40** L **6** # **123**
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**

it's (an ST) not (a ST), also the last half of the sentence needs rewording.

SuggestedRemedy

not sure what the sentence is trying to convey.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.3 P 40 L 8 # 266
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change "being configured" to "is configured"
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.3.1 P 40 L 39 # 268
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 This paragraph references PP Clause 8.4, but doesn't seem to give a specific document reference. Is Clause 8.4 the same in all PPs?
SuggestedRemedy
 Qualify reference.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.3 P 40 L 10 # 55
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 This four-line sentence seems to be the combination of two sentences with a missing period.
SuggestedRemedy
 Please break this sentence into two sentences.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.3.1 P 40 L 1719 # 267
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 This paragraph references Clause 7 and Application Note 5, but doesn't seem to give a specific document reference. Are Clause 7 and Application Note 5 the same in all PPs?
SuggestedRemedy
 Qualify reference.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.3 P 40 L 38 # 63
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 This paragraph is suitable for ST claiming conformance to PP-A or B only, but not for C or D. There is no O.USER.AUTHORIZED in PP-C or D.
SuggestedRemedy
 Please include O.ADMINISTOR.AUTHORIZED for ST conforming to PP-C and D.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.4 P 41 L 4 # 270
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 The footnote should include a space before the clause number.
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.4 P 41 L 4 # 269
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Delete the dash at the end of the title.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.4 P 41 L 42 # 272
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "that the TOE is to operate it" to "in which the TOE is to operate"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.4 P 41 L 5 # 124
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 TSF Confidential Data and TSF Protected Data are reserved words...should be caps..
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.4 P 41 L 46 # 273
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The entire phrase, "(which often is easy to guess because many companies have a standard format for usernames)" seems to have no relevance to the point of the paragraph and just makes it unnecessarily long.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete it
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.4 P 41 L 16 # 271
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "hard-and-fast" to "definitive".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.4 P 42 L 4 # 126
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 should be disclosed...is missing a NOT
 SuggestedRemedy
 should not be disclosed...
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.4 P 41 L 41 # 125
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Data is plural and the last half of the sentence needs rewording
 SuggestedRemedy
 The data that have to beTOE, as well as the TOE's environment.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.4 P 42 L 21 # 274
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "aif the TOE is designated for a hospital, the types of data mentioned above become applicable;"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.4 P 42 L 46 # 278
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Not sure what the last sentence in this paragraph is trying to say. I can't parse which <something> is being "based on" <something else>. (Base what on what?)
 SuggestedRemedy
 clarify
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.4 P 42 L 37 # 276
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change the semicolon to a question mark: "àmade the newspaper would that be treated as bad news? If the answer is yesà"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.4 P 42 L 3133 # 275
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The paragraph after item 2) seems inadequate. Isn't the case of having the answer to 1) being yes considered sufficient reason to qualify the data as confidential -- regardless of the answer to 2)?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.4 P 42 L 39 # 277
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The item "1)" in this line should probably be left as a "3)" ù because the sentence above it refers to it as a ôthird question". It follows the two questions listed in b).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.4 P 43 L 1 # 279
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove the word "Finally". OR, if this is a final step to the process a), b), c) -- then keep the word, but make this paragraph d).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.4 P 43 L 4 # 280
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Clause 7 of which document? Not the Guide.
 SuggestedRemedy
 reference document
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5 P 43 L 21 # 284
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The footnote indicator at the end of the sentence is either misplaced or should be deleted.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.4 P 43 L 79 # 281
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 This should be a statement, not a question. Change to "Otherwise, a service technician or software developer who is authorized to change the TOE software to fix software problems found in the field would not be able to do so."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5 P 43 L 22 # 148
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Should be referring to internal JTC1/SC27 documents?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5 P 43 L 15 # 282
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "common SFRs for which all HCDs..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5 P 43 L 25 # 285
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Delete "one of".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5 P 43 L 2021 # 283
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The references to "aP2600.x-PRT, P2600.x-SCN, P2600.x-CPY, P2600.x-FAX, P2600.x-DSR, P2600.x-NVS, P2600.x-SMI" could be misleading. There are no such documents.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.1 P 43 L 27 # 286
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Delete the question mark.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.2 P 43 L 43 # 536
 Wright, Don Lexmark
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Reword sentence to make clear it is the intent of the PP authors.
 SuggestedRemedy
 ""It was the clear intent of the PP authors to allow both internal and external authentication.""
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.2 P 43 L 35 # 287
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Please clarify which credentials are being referred to in "If the validity of the credentials is verified directly by the HCDà" [The credentials of what?]
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.2 P 43 L 47 # 289
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Is "Description" capitalized for a reason?
 SuggestedRemedy
 lower case
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.2 P 43 L 36 # 288
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "within the TOE" to "within the TOE description"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.3 P 44 L 5 # 149
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 ""both PPs mention"" which ones???
 SuggestedRemedy
 fix
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.3 P 44 L 5 # 290
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Which "both PPs"? We have four in the series.
 SuggestedRemedy
 clarify
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.3 P 44 L 10 # 291
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "if a vendor builds"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.4 P 44 L 17 # 293
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "using the Operator Panel when"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.3 P 44 L 10 # 512
 Wright, Don Lexmark
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 ""build"" should be ""builds""
 SuggestedRemedy
 ""If a vendor builds a product...""
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.5 P 44 L 20 # 128
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 it's (an SMI) not (a SMI) in the heading.
 SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.3 P 44 L 10 # 127
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Reword the sentence....
 SuggestedRemedy
 If a vendor builds a product for which it is desired that special users (for instance Administrators) be able tostated in the ST and is acceptable.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.5 P 44 L 24 # 294
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Capitalize "Medium" in "Shared medium Interface".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.4 P 44 L 14 # 292
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "using the Operator Panel in"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.6 P 44 L 27 # 295
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "provide required" to "require"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.6 P 44 L 27 # 129
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 reword to ""require that an HCD provide""
SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.1 P 45 L 2 # 297
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Remove the colon at the end of the title
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.6 P 44 L 30 # 523
 Wright, Don Lexmark
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 Is ""d)"" correct here... I don't think so.
SuggestedRemedy
 Fix bullet numbering.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.1 P 45 L 13 # 150
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 The ST defines one of the four possible levels of detail...not all four.
SuggestedRemedy
 fix the sentence
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.6 P 44 L 2829 # 296
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 The last sentence in this paragraph and the bulleted item(s) underneath need work. The words "types" and "is" don't agree. And the bulleted item starts with d) instead of a). And why is there only one bulleted item?
SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.1 P 46 L 11 # 298
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 The footnote reference number is out of sequence? And no footnote at the bottom of the page.
SuggestedRemedy
 Delete or fix.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.1 P 46 L 13 # 299
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Which "(2)" is being referenced here? It's not obvious.
SuggestedRemedy
 Clarify
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.7.2 P 46 L 26 # 307
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove the colon at the end of the title
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.7.2 P 46 L 28 # 300
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "requires" to "require"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.7.2 P 46 L 47 # 302
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change the last [long] sentence on this page into an introductory phrase and a numbered list. ("... control of SFP would consist of:" -- followed by the bulleted items.)
 SuggestedRemedy
 restructure for readability
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.7.2 P 46 L 47 # 130
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 the ""that"" should be a ""the""...for the case of. Also in line 48 there's another inconsistent reference to the profiles.
 SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.7.2 P 46 L 47 # 64
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The given guidance for User Data Protection for a MFD that copies, prints, has NVS that is not removable, does not have fax will require 4 sets of access control SFRs that include those from the P2600.x-DSR package. However, P2600.x-DSR package is required only when the MFD allows storing of User Data by one job and retrieve the same data by another job request. The requiriements are not consistent with the description of MFD functions.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please remove DSR package requirement, or add DSR function to the description of the MFD.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.7.2 P 46 L 47 # 301
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "However, for the case of an ST that is being written"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.2 P 46 L 48 # 513
 Wright, Don Lexmark
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 What are 2600.x PPs?
SuggestedRemedy
 Use P2600 series of protection profiles
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.2 P 47 L 6 # 131
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 reword the sentence (more user role's access????)
SuggestedRemedy
 ???
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.2 P 47 L 10 # 66
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 This paragraph describes all listed SFR packages PRT, SCN, CPY, DSR, FAX are common requirements for MFDs as long as the MFD has the functions. However, this is only true for environment A and B, not environment C and D. Please see Table 6 on page 34.
SuggestedRemedy
 Please be consistent with Table 6, correctly state which package is required for which environments, or refer to Table 6 for SFR package requirement of each environment, and make a general statement that not all packages are required by every environment.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.2 P 47 L 21 # 514
 Wright, Don Lexmark
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 ""document"" is ambiguous
SuggestedRemedy
 Change to ""physical document"" or ""paper document""
 Also line 27 and page 48, line 2.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.2 P 47 L 22 # 132
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 reword
SuggestedRemedy
 Requires that only a Normal User....
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.2 P 47 L 28 # 303
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change to "This SFR package specifies any minimumà"
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.2 P 47 L 44 # 304
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 ("send)" needs a closing quote.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.3 P 48 L 18 # 308
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove the colon at the end of the title
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.2 P 48 L 9 # 305
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "can be processed"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.3 P 48 L 35 # 67
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 O.USER.AUTHORIZED is an objective only applicable to environment A & B.
 SuggestedRemedy
 (1) Please add the environment specificity here.
 (2) Search globally to make sure O.USER.AUTHORIZED is only applicable for environment A & B.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.2 P 48 L 1517 # 306
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 I think this paragraph should not be indented. It appears not to be exclusively related to item e).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Exdent
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4 P 48 L 43 # 310
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove the colon at the end of the title
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.3 P 48 L 18 # 309
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove the colon at the end of the title
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.1 P 48 L 44 # 311
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove the colon at the end of the title
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.1 P 49 L 1 # 312
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The TSF should be indented. Why is it in bold text?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.1 P 49 L 7 # 313
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The TSF should be indented. Why is it in bold text?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.1 P 49 L 11 # 314
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The TSF should be indented -- but is this paragraph supposed to be here? The number doesn't agree with the previous sentence reference, and there is no colon at the end of the previous sentence.
 SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.1 P 50 L 26 # 524
 Wright, Don Lexmark
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 <lf> has been inserted after ""functionality""
 SuggestedRemedy
 remove them
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.1 P 51 L 14 # 133
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Who is the OUR in this sentence?
 SuggestedRemedy
 reword...
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 49 L 1 # 327
Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
The TSF should be indented. Why is it in bold text?
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 49 L 15 # 317
Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
Why is this paragraph a bullet item?
SuggestedRemedy
Make it a normal paragraph
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 49 L 4 # 329
Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
The TSF should be indented. Why is it in bold text?
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 49 L 23 # 318
Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
Why is this paragraph indented?
SuggestedRemedy
Make it a normal paragraph
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 49 L 14 # 315
Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
Remove the colon at the end of the title
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 49 L 26 # 319
Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
The TSF should be indented. Why is it in bold text?
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 49 L 14 # 316
Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
This entire clause is structured oddly. I don't understand the indents, the bold texts, and the bulleting logic used. Very confusing about what relates to what.
SuggestedRemedy
Fix
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 49 L 29 # 320
Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
The TSF should be indented. Why is it in bold text?
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 49 L 32 # 321
Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
Why is this paragraph indented? Why is it in bold text?
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 49 L 39 # 325
Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
The TSF should be indented. Why the bold text?
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 49 L 34 # 322
Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
The TSF should be indented. Why the bold text?
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 49 L 40 # 326
Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
Why is this paragraph indented? Why the bold text?
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 49 L 36 # 323
Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
Why the bold text?
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 50 L 2 # 328
Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
Why the bold text?
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 49 L 37 # 324
Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
The TSF should be indented. Why is it in bold text?
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 50 L 6 # 330
Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
Why the bold text?
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 50 L 7 # 331
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Why is this paragraph indented?
SuggestedRemedy
 Make a normal paragraph
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 50 L 23 # 333
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Why is this paragraph a bullet item?
SuggestedRemedy
 Make a normal paragraph
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 50 L 11 # 332
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Why is this paragraph a bullet item?
SuggestedRemedy
 Make a normal paragraph
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 50 L 3335 # 334
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 I don't understand the formatting, bolding and indenting of these lines (or most of this section)
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 50 L 19 # 7
 AUBRY, Carmen oce
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 This comment concerns PP Guideline 43a:
 "In this case the ST Author should be able to argue that such fully encrypted disks do meet the requirements of FPT_CIP_EXP.1.2 because they do detect gross modification such as degaussing of the disk and, more importantly, they exceed the "detection" requirement by preventing modification."
SuggestedRemedy
 Please check with Helmut Kurth or someone else from ATSEC in order to double check this statement.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.4.2 P 51 L 1 # 335
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Why smaller text size? Different indent level?
SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.5.7.5 P 52 L 13 # 336
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Remove the colon at the end of the title
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.7.5 P 52 L 14 # 337
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Which PP? We have four of them.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Clarify
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.7.6 P 52 L 32 # 341
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Which PP is referenced by "in PP Clause 10.4"?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Clarify
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.7.5 P 52 L 16 # 338
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The TSF should be indented. Why is it in bold text?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.7.6 P 52 L 35 # 342
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The TSF should be indented. Why is it in bold text?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.7.5 P 52 L 29 # 339
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "later" to "latter"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.7.6 P 52 L 39 # 343
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The TSF should be indented. Why is it in bold text?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.7.6 P 52 L 31 # 340
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove the colon at the end of the title
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.7.6 P 53 L 7 # 344
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Why is the TSF in bold here? It isn't in line 1 (and other places).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Unbold
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.7.6 P 53 L 12 # 345
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove the second [redundant] "only" in this sentence
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.6 P 53 L 23 # 347
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove initial double quote and the single quotes in "To dos" and "Not to dos". [Or move them to ôdo/Æs" û if that was intended.]
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.7.6 P 53 L 18 # 346
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Why is the TSF in bold here? It isn't in line 1 (and other places).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Unbold
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.6 P 53 L 33 # 349
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove the single quotes in "To dos" and "Not to dos". [Or move them to ôdo/Æs" û if that was intended.]
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.5.7.6 P 53 L 19 # 134
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 User Document and User Function Data are reserved terms. you can't use them in possessive terms.
 SuggestedRemedy
 another user's User Document or modify or delete another user's User Function Data....
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.6 P 53 L 34 # 348
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "Most importantly, the special attentions they must pay to the sections"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6 P 53 L 37 # 135
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 it's (an ST) not (a ST)
SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.2 P 54 L 21 # 137
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 where's the footnote for the superscript (13)
SuggestedRemedy
 fix
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.1 P 54 L 10 # 350
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Why is this text indented and bulleted?
SuggestedRemedy
 Exdent, remove bullets
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.2 P 54 L 21 # 353
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Remove footnote reference at end of paragraph, or add actual footnote.
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.1 P 54 L 15 # 136
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 separate the slash-connected words to either a list or a comma delimited (and/or) list.
SuggestedRemedy
 hardware, software, and firmware required.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.2 P 54 L 28 # 138
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 it's i.e., (missing comma)
SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.2 P 54 L 17 # 351
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Why is this text indented and bulleted? Instead of bullets, use subclause numbers û or add some text that introduces the list of bullets somehow.
SuggestedRemedy
 Exdent, remove bullets
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.2 P 54 L 31 # 354
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change "tables" to "tables:"
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.2 P 54 L 32 # 355
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Although grammatically incorrect, the headers in tables i) thru iv) should be changed to "SFR Package to Conform to". [Or is "Conform with" better?] [Or maybe just δSFR Conformance Package" would be best?]
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.2 P 54 L 1920 # 352
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Why is "conformant" and "extended" in bold? They aren't elsewhere.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Unbold
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.2 P 55 L 6 # 356
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 This paragraph should not be indented to the level of table iv). It seems to apply to both iii) and iv).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Exdent
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.2 P 56 L 1 # 357
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 I don't think this paragraph should be indented.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Exdent
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.2 P 56 L 2 # 358
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "This can be explained" to "This is explained"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.2 P 56 L 9 # 359
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove the single quote in "Not to dos". [Or move it to "do's" û if that was intended.]
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.2 P 56 L 10 # 360
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "for a function not implementedà"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.3 P 56 L 14 # 361
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Why is this text indented and bulleted? Instead of bullets a)-d), use subclause numbers û or add some text that introduces the list of bullets somehow. Also why all the bold text in this clause (lines 14-36) but not elsewhere
SuggestedRemedy
 Exdent, remove bullets, and unbold.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.3 P 56 L 30 # 525
 Wright, Don Lexmark
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 This text is unclear largely due to the embedded 1) and 2) and having two SHALLs in the same paragraph.
SuggestedRemedy
 Rewrite.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.4 P 56 L 38 # 362
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Why is this text indented and bulleted? Instead of bullets a)-d), use subclause numbers û or add some text that introduces the list of bullets somehow. Also why all the bold text in this clause (lines 14-36) but not elsewhere?
SuggestedRemedy
 Exdent, remove bullets, and unbold.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.4 P 57 L 5 # 363
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change "traces" to "trace"
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.4 P 57 L 6 # 364
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Remove the single quote in "Not to dos". [Or move it to "do's" û if that was intended.]
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.4 P 57 L 7 # 365
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 "The security objectives for the TOE SHALL never have less..." Have less what?
SuggestedRemedy
 Clarify
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.4 P 57 L 14 # 366
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change "traces" to "trace"
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.4 P 57 L 16 # 367
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Remove the single quote in "Not to dos". [Or move it to "do's" û if that was intended.]
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.5 P 58 L 19 # 369
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Remove the single quote in "Not to dos". [Or move it to "do's" û if that was intended.]
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.4 P 58 L 11 # 151
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 The paragraph around this line conflicts with the previous paragraph. it seems to imply that the TOE CANNOT process data that comes in one interface before exporting it out another interface...which is opposite what it's supposed to be.
SuggestedRemedy
 fix the text
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.6 P 58 L 24 # 370
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change the format of this paragraph to fully justified (to be consistent)
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.5 P 58 L 1 # 368
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Should these two paragraphs be indented? Do they only apply to item b)?
SuggestedRemedy
 Exdent
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.6 P 58 L 29 # 371
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Remove the single quote in "To dos". [Or move it to "do's" û if that was intended.]
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.6.6 P 58 L 46 # 372
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Remove the single quote in "Not to dos". [Or move it to "do's" û if that was intended.]
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7 P 58 L 46 # 373
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change to "Each of the four Protection Profiles that this guide covers contains a set..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 59 L 15 # 537
 Wright, Don Lexmark
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Where is PP APPLICATION NOTE 1?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either add it or explain why it is missing.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.1 P L # 516
 Wright, Don Lexmark
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Missing APPLICATION NOTES throughout this and other clauses.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either add them or explain their absence
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 59 L 42 # 375
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "provides" to "provide"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 59 L 14 # 374
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Why is this text indented and bulleted? Instead of bullets a)-d), use subclause numbers ũ or add some text that introduces the list of bullets somehow. Also why all the bold text in this clause (lines 14-36) but not elsewhere?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Exdent, remove bullets, and unbold.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 60 L 29 # 376
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 FAU_SAR.2.1 should all be in bold. The ".1" is not.
 SuggestedRemedy
 bold all
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 60 L 40 # 377
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 "Prevention of data loss" needs to be indented consistently
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 60 L 40 # 526
 Wright, Don Lexmark
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Formatting error
 SuggestedRemedy
 Center ""Prevention of audit data loss"" over the text below it.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 63 L 1114 # 378
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 What is the purpose of the use of bold font in the descriptive text here? (And elsewhere on this page.)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 61 L 35 # 538
 Wright, Don Lexmark
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Where are APPLICATION NOTES 13 & 14
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add them or explain their absence.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 63 L 2833 # 379
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 What is the purpose of the use of bold and italic font in the descriptive text here? (And elsewhere on this page.) It seems inconsistent with the [normal font] text in lines 40-46.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 62 L 27 # 539
 Wright, Don Lexmark
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Where is APPLICATION NOTE 21?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either add it or explain its absence.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 64 L 37 # 541
 Wright, Don Lexmark
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Where are APPLICATION NOTES 31, 32, & 33?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either add them or explain their absence.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 63 L 24 # 540
 Wright, Don Lexmark
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Where are APPLICATION NOTES 25, 26, & 27?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either add them or explain their absence.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 65 L 19 # 380
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Is there some special significance to the word "met" here? Why the underscore and italics?
 SuggestedRemedy
 make normal
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 67 L 5 # 383
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Is "s)" intended here, or a typo?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 65 L 34 # 381
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The phrase "this data would be documented in 5.3.2.2" is a bit confusing to me. If "5.3.2.2" is referencing a clause in [8], then why say "would be documented"? Wouldn't "is documented" more appropriate? I am also confused by the phrase "in the equivalent of Table 4". What does this mean? An equivalent table in a theoretical document? Which document?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Clarify.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 67 L 18 # 384
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Is "u)" intended here, or a typo?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 66 L 40 # 382
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "any body" to "anyone"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 67 L 20 # 139
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Provides is spelled wrong.
 SuggestedRemedy
 fix
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.1 P 68 L 3 # 385
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "PPs interpret" to "PP interprets". [We're only referencing the contents of PP-A in this clause, right?]
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.2 P 69 L 2 # 387
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "extent" to "extend"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.3 P 69 L 38 # 390
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "refers" to "refers to".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.2 P 69 L 5 # 388
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "could be interpreted, for example," to "should not be interpreted". [We don't want to encourage the interpretation described, do we?]
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.3 P 70 L 5 # 391
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The reference to "d.2.i above" is fairly awkward for the reader to resolve, because it's in a different clause. At least change to "clause 5.2.2.7.1, paragraph d) 2) i)" -- or something similar. Maybe the example given for Application Notes 15-17"? [I assume that's the one intended?]
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.2 P 69 L 24 # 389
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The reference to "d.2.i above" is fairly awkward for the reader to resolve, because it's in a different clause. At least change to "clause 5.2.2.7.1, paragraph d) 2) i)" -- or something similar. Maybe the example given for Application Notes 15-17"? [I assume that's the one intended?]
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 5.2.2.7.4 P 70 L 34 # 392
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The reference to "d.2.i above" is fairly awkward for the reader to resolve, because it's in a different clause. At least change to "clause 5.2.2.7.1, paragraph d) 2) i)" -- or something similar. Maybe the example given for Application Notes 15-17"? [I assume that's the one intended?]
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.5 P 71 L 30 # 393
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change "a owner" to "the owner" or "an owner".
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.7 P 74 L 1 # 396
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change "this case" to "the case".
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.5 P 72 L 1 # 394
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 In footnote 33, change "Would have to" to "The ST Author would have to".
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.7 P 74 L 15 # 397
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change "[None]" to "[none]" (or at least be consistent with lines 22 and 24.)
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.7 P 73 L 35 # 395
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 The following sentence seems incomplete: "If encryption is to be used the ST Author should make sure that the proper SFRs from the FCS Class (Cryptography) as also mentioned in PP APPLICATION NOTE 107." What is it exactly that the ST Author should "make sure" of?
SuggestedRemedy
 Perhaps change to: "If encryption is to be used the ST Author should make sure that the proper SFRs from the FCS Class (Cryptography) as also mentioned in PP APPLICATION NOTE 107 are included." (?)
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.7 P 74 L 24 # 398
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change "[None]" to "[none]" (or at least be consistent with lines 22 and 24.)
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.7 P 74 L 28 # 400
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change "What the scheme the TOE is to be certified" to "In some cases, the choice of country scheme in which the TOE is certified".
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.7 P 74 L 30 # 401
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change "be used" to "that is used"
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.8 P 74 L 48 # 403
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change "SFRS" to SFRs".
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.7 P 74 L 36 # 402
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 I'm not sure what the point of this paragraph is supposed to be. In line 39, it's not clear what "this" is referencing. But more importantly, I don't know what action this paragraph is recommending for the ST Author. After reading it, I'm wondering "... and therefore what?"
SuggestedRemedy
 Clarify point intended.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.8 P 75 L 2 # 404
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Need to resolve "See TBD".
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.7.7 P 74 L 2427 # 399
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 This paragraph is hard to read. How about, "Note that [none] is used as the selection in both FCS_CKM.4.1 and FCS_COP.1.1 to indicate that no standards for cryptographic key destruction are deemed applicable to cryptographic key destruction and cryptographic operation."
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.8 P 75 L 28 # 405
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 "EAL" or "EAL level"? Usage in lines 28, 29, and 32 and elsewhere should be consistent.
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.8 P 75 L 29 # 141
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 dangling participle....(between the A and the T)
SuggestedRemedy
 reword the sentence
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.8 P 76 L 1 # 406
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change "There is also the question of" to "Another consideration for the ST Author is to determine"
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.9 P 76 L 21 # 409
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change "the such access" to "such access".
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.9 P 76 L 11 # 407
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 This paragraph should not be bullet numbered. If anything, make it a subclause number with a descriptive title of the Guidance topic. Future "Miscellaneous" Guidance items can be added in other subclauses later.
SuggestedRemedy
 Remove bullet number, give it a subclause number and title.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.9 P 76 L 27 # 410
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Delete "allowable in".
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.2.9 P 76 L 20 # 408
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 The last sentence of this paragraph is a bit too long. The part after the dash doesn't seem to belong in the same sentence.
SuggestedRemedy
 Re-write and/or break into two sentences
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.3.1 P 76 L 34 # 142
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 The heading title doesn't really match the contents of the section...either that or the content is missing. consider a more descriptive heading title.
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.3.1.1 P 77 L 14 # 412
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The sentence is somewhat circular. Change to "One of the purposes of Protection Profiles is to specify a common set of security features that must be Common Criteria certified in order to claim a defined level of security conformance."

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.3.1.2 P 77 L 20 # 413
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

This paragraph seems out of place somehow. Is it better off being in clause 5.2.3.2? By itself, it doesn't seem to be related to any "Customer Usage Guidance".

SuggestedRemedy

Expand, move, or delete.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.3.1.2 P 77 L 27 # 414
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

I don't see the relevance of this paragraph to providing "Customer Usage Guidance". What point is being made that a customer can use?

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify, move, or delete

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.3.2 P 77 L 36 # 415
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Change "are defined" to "are defined in [xxx]". [The sentences starting on line 39 seem to do this well enough. Perhaps they can be combined better?]

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.3.2 P 78 L 13 # 416
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Change "exist" to "can exist" or "might exist".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.3.2 P 78 L 36 # 417
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The last two sentences of this paragraph introduce exceptions to the previous precautions appropriate to Operation A. ("However, there are many other functions...") What guidance is being given the customer regarding these "other functions"? If none, why are they being raised?

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify or delete.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.3.2 P 79 L 6 # 418
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Add a period to the end of the sentence.
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.4 P 79 L 25 # 143
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 Inconsistent reference to the PPs (different from the other inconsistent references)
SuggestedRemedy
 fix
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.4 P 79 L # 542
 Wright, Don Lexmark
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Should this section mention ""out of box"" configuration?
SuggestedRemedy
 Add text explaining that a certified product meetings the requirements based on its out of box configuration. Changing that configuration may affect the products security functionality.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.4 P 79 L 31 # 152
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 So what's the specific language for vendors and consumers???
SuggestedRemedy
 delete the sentence
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.4 P 79 L 12 # 419
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Why is "Claiming Product Compliance" in the section on "Usage Guidelines"? If this section is meant for Customer Usage guidance, the title should probably be changed (customers don't claim product conformance) and numbered as a subclause of 5.2.3. If not for the Customer, then for whom? Maybe the Vendor (5.2.1)?
SuggestedRemedy
 Move or delete.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.4.1 P 79 L 34 # 420
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 I'm not sure why a clause about specifying RFP content is a subclause of "Claiming Product Compliance". Isn't this more related to Customer Usage Guidance (5.2.3)?
SuggestedRemedy
 Move or delete.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.4.1 P 79 L 36 # 153
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Missing text here.....
SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the sentence
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 5.2.4.2 P 79 L 37 # 421
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 This clause seems redundant (although more informative) to 5.2.3.3. and should be moved under Customer Usage Guidance (5.2.3)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move or delete
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 6.1 P 81 L 7 # 423
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Instead of each question being a bullet list item [a), b), c) ...] could they each be given a subclause title? That way, they would show in the TOC for easier discovery. [Or is this overkill?]
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.2.7.7 P 74 L 28 # 140
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Reword the first of the sentence.
 SuggestedRemedy
 The scheme used to certify the TOE can be a factor....
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 6.1 P 81 L 7 # 424
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "for the HCD" to "used in the IEEE HCD Protection Profiles".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 5.3 P 80 L 2 # 422
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The format of these two paragraphs should be "full justification" -- for consistency.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 6.1 P 81 L 25 # 425
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Delete the word "Moreover" and move this last sentence to the beginning of the paragraph: "There are various ways in which the functions corresponding with the SFR packages may interact to perform the tasks that an HCD is designed for. For example, when a user faxes a document, the operation typically involves a collaborative effort between the SCN and FAX functions."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 6.1 P 81 L 31 # 426
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 It seems like the phrase "series of standards" is used to reference just the main specification [B1], not the entire set of specifications. As in lines 37 and 42, it is being discussed as something *separate* from the PPs.
SuggestedRemedy
 Modify.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 6.1 P 82 L 1 # 144
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 Is the link provided going to be a permanent link? Would reference to the ISO Guide ISO 17799 (though it has to be purchased) be a sufficient replacement.
SuggestedRemedy
 fix
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 6.1 P 81 L 44 # 427
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 "WD" is not in the acronym list.
SuggestedRemedy
 Spell out, or add to acronyms.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 6.1 P 82 L 4 # 530
 Wright, Don Lexmark
Comment Type G **Comment Status** X
 We have distribution lists now.
 This should also be the recommended action for question f).
SuggestedRemedy
 Put the actual distribution lists of each of the PPs in the Guide
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 6.1 P 81 L 44 # 527
 Wright, Don Lexmark
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 What is TR 14446?
SuggestedRemedy
 Add a reference. What is the URL that follows this?
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 6.1 P 82 L 4 # 154
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Do we have the final answer to the question here...???
SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 6.1 P 82 L 18 # 428
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "is" to "if".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 6.1 P 82 L 22 # 430
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Delete "if there is a way to contact someone".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 6.1 P 82 L 19 # 429
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "regarding" to "regards".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 6.1 P 82 L 23 # 155
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The P2600 group will cease before this question will ever be asked...
 The working group (and Footnote 39) reference should be removed.
 SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 6.1 P 82 L 22 # 431
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 I think the phrase "There is also a body of information at the P2600 website" is too vague to be helpful (i.e., why are you telling me this?) Also, the phrase "that isn't available in most cases of PP development" is irrelevant -- and should be deleted.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 6.1 P 82 L 25 # 432
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change "you" to "ST Authors".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 6.1 P 82 L 28 # 433
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T *Comment Status* X
 The "full set of PPs" likely won't be certified. We should mention that they are available from the IEEE.
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response *Response Status* O

Cl Guide SC 6.1 P 82 L 32 # 145
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
Comment Type E *Comment Status* X
 The PP's will be approved by the standards board well before the guide. Remove the (Once these PPs are approved) language
SuggestedRemedy
 see comment
Proposed Response *Response Status* O

Cl Guide SC 6.1 P 82 L 31 # 434
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T *Comment Status* X
 This question and the one in line 35 are not preceded with a "Q:".
SuggestedRemedy
 Make consistent.
Proposed Response *Response Status* O

Cl Guide SC 6.1 P 83 L 1 # 436
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T *Comment Status* X
 Why the use of bold text in footnotes 40-42?
SuggestedRemedy
 Unbold
Proposed Response *Response Status* O

Cl Guide SC 6.1 P 82 L 31 # 435
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T *Comment Status* X
 Delete "(e.g., applicable URL pointers)". If important to do so, mention in the Answer that there are no "applicable URL pointers".
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response *Response Status* O

Cl Guide SC 6.1 P 83 L 7 # 437
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T *Comment Status* X
 Probably better to unjustify this paragraph format.
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response *Response Status* O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 6.2 P 83 L # 439
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

This answer is worded as if the FAQ is published outside the Guide document. Is that intended? [The answer in clause 6.3 is inconsistent with this perspective.] Also, "Guide Security Targets Conforming to the IEEE P2600 series of Protection Profiles" is not the title of the Guide.

SuggestedRemedy
Fix.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 6.2 P 83 L 13 # 438
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Change "will be included in" to "are included in". [Yes, I know they're not there yet, but that fact is explained in 5.3.]

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 6.2 P 83 L 15 # 440
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

This question is not preceded with a "Q:".

SuggestedRemedy
Make consistent.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 6.2 P 83 L 15 # 441
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Change to "... which SFR packages should I include in the ST?"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 6.2 P 83 L 16 # 442
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

This answer seems to be full of words that aren't very clear how they're relevant to the question. The real answer *seems* to be "The Security Target for an HCD that provides PIN Printing for any of these three functions must include the corresponding SFR package(s)." All the rest appears to be unfocused, if not irrelevant.

SuggestedRemedy
Make answer more concise.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 6.2 P 83 L 17 # 443
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Change from "implement" to "implements"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 6.2 P 83 L 39 # 444
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 This sentence is unclear. What is the "that" that is "how conformance would be demonstrated"? Is the intent here to say that getting your ST certified via the CC process is the way to demonstrate conformance? [That's probably not a very helpful explanation.]
SuggestedRemedy
 Clarify or delete.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 6.4 P 84 L 7 # 447
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Does this question, as stated, really reflect the intended issue? The answer seems to assume more than was given in the question. As worded, I'm not sure I actually understand the intent of the question. I would think that the actual answer is simply "No". Isn't it entirely up to the vendor/ST Author to declare whatever they are claiming conformance to?
SuggestedRemedy
 Elaborate on the question.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 6.3 P 84 L 2 # 445
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Contrary to the title of 6.3, this question does not seem relevant to Consumers. Perhaps 6.3 should be broken into two clauses -- one for Vendors and one for Consumers.
SuggestedRemedy
 Fix.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 6.4 P 84 L 16 # 448
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Should "scheme" be capitalized in "US Scheme" and "German Scheme"? [The capitalization for this word seems inconsistent in the document.]
SuggestedRemedy
 Make consistent.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 6.3 P 84 L 5 # 446
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change "what" to "which".
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 6.4 P 84 L 16 # 449
 Farrell, Lee Canon
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 Change "the other three Protection Profiles" to "B[9]". We're not paying BSI to certify PP-C or PP-D.
SuggestedRemedy
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC 6.4 P 84 L 16 # 156
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

Comment Type T Comment Status X

The language here implies that there are THREE profiles being certified by the German scheme.....there's actually only ONE. This needs to be made clear very early in the guide that while IEEE 2600.3-2009 and IEEE 2600.4-2009 are approved IEEE standards, they are NOT certified protection profiles.

SuggestedRemedy
 see comment.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 6.4 P 84 L 19 # 450
 Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Change "with scheme" to "with the scheme".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 6.4 P 84 L 19 # 451
 Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Change "it's" to "its".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 7 P 85 L 2 # 452
 Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status X

This document is not a standard -- draft or otherwise.

SuggestedRemedy
 Fix

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 7 P 85 L 15 # 479
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh

Comment Type E Comment Status X

looks like an automatic spell-correction error: "...Maps (multifunction peripherals)..." and also, is it usually "multifunction product"?

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "Maps" to "MFPs"

Consider changing "multifunction peripherals" to "multifunction products" (although this definition was taken from 2600-2008 so maybe it's OK to leave as is)

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl **Guide** SC 7 P 85 L 20 # 480
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh

Comment Type E Comment Status X

minor error "MFDS"

SuggestedRemedy
 change to "MFD"

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC **7** P **85** L **33** # **453**
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 Add a period to the end of the sentence.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC **TOC** P **3** L **50** # **157**
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 Why aren't clauses 5.2.2.7.2 thru 5.2.2.7.6 included in the TOC?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC **8.1** P **14** L # **3**
 Nevo, Ron Sharp
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 Consistency between O.AUDIT.LOGGED and corresponding SFRs.
 The O.AUDIT.LOGGED security objective states that "The TOE shall create and maintain a log of TOE use and security-relevant events, and prevent its unauthorized disclosure or alteration", while the corresponding SFRs are FAU_GEN.1 and FAU_GEN.2 . It seems to be inconsistent.
 SuggestedRemedy
 For the Guide:
 The ST that claims SFRs and rationale corresponding to O.AUDIT.LOGGED as it is in [PP] should be permissible to fulfill the security objective.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC **TOC** P **3** L **50** # **386**
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 Why aren't clauses 5.2.2.7.2 thru 5.2.2.7.6 included in the TOC?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**