

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl 00 SC 1.2 P 5 L 37 # 1
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove the word ""four""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 15 P 101 L 2 # 89
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Do we intend to complete this clause? Items 5 and 7 are duplicates.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 1.2 P 5 L 38 # 2
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove ""Footnote deleted""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 2.2 P 9 L 3 # 4
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Add a period at end of sentence
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 1.3 P 6 L 16 # 3
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change ""covers"" to ""applies to""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 3.1 P 11 L 8 # 5
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Last sentence in this paragraph is a bit long
 SuggestedRemedy
 Break it up.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 13 P 98 L 3 # 88
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Do we intend to complete this clause?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 3.3 P 13 L 43 # 6
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change ""is"" to ""are""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl 00 SC 4.2.2.1 P 17 L 10 # 7
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 ""Operations"" are not on the diagram as an ""entity"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix text or diagram for consistency.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 5.1 P 25 L 4 # 11
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 This introductory paragraph actually introduces Clauses 6 and 7, too.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either the Clause hierarchy should change, or the stuff about Clauses 6 and 7 should be moved.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 4.2.2.2 P 17 L 19 # 8
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change ""TSFs"" to ""TSF""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 5.1 P 25 L 5 # 12
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove "", which respectively address Operational Environments A, B, C and D,""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 4.2.2.2 P 18 L 1 # 9
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove ""for the IEEE Std 2600 Series of Protection Profiles""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 5.1 P 25 L 2028 # 13
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change footnote callouts ""17"" to ""15""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 4.2.2.6 P 19 L 42 # 10
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove ""[11]""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 5.2 P 25 L 29 # 14
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change ""what"" to ""which""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl 00 SC 5.2 P 25 L 40 # 15
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Where is footnote 16?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 5.3 P 28 L 10 # 19
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 I don't understand the use of the semicolon.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either make the opening phrase a complete sentence, or change to a comma.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 5.2 P 27 L 7 # 16
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 This paragraph is confusing û and I don't understand its point.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 5.3 P 31 L 20 # 22
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove ""and point to"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 5.3 P 27 L 13 # 17
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change "" for the security problem in one of the four"" to "" for the security problems identified in the four""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 5.3 P 31 L 20 # 21
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 ""Similarly, the types of HCDs that typically are used in this type of business."" is not a sentence.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 5.3 P 27 L 14 # 18
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change colon to period.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 5.3 P 31 L 1236 # 20
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Paragraph formats should be full justification, to be consistent.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl 00 SC 5.3 P 33 L 6 # 23
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change ""guidelines"" to ""guideline""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 5.4.2 P 35 L 5 # 27
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change to ""typically the default case""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 5.4.1 P 33 L 38 # 24
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Use lower case ""e"" on ""Environment""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 5.4.2 P 35 L 7 # 28
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove the period at the end of the bullet
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 5.4.2 P 35 L 1 # 25
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Change ""An additional topic"" to ""A topic"". (There is no preceding topic, is there?)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 5.4.2 P 35 L 25 # 29
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change ""was"" to ""in"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 5.4.2 P 35 L 2 # 26
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change ""whether"" to ""where"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6 P 36 L 1 # 30
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove ""VENDOR USAGE GUIDELINESö
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl 00 SC 6.2.1 P 37 L 40 # 31
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Spell "conformance"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.2.1.2 P 39 L 10 # 35
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change "probably because" to "e.g.,"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.2.1 P 38 L 2 # 32
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove "first of all"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.2.1.3 P 39 L 25 # 36
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change "it are" to "they are"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.2.1.2 P 38 L 37 # 33
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 I'm confused at how the following text helps determine whether or not the ST *must* claim conformance. Is "can" a better word than "must"?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.2.1.3 P 39 L 34 # 37
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Move footnote callout to line 24 (earlier use of the term)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.2.1.2 P 38 L 47 # 34
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change "probably" to "e.g.,"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.2.1.3 P 40 L 9 # 38
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change "Then if" to "If"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl 00 SC 6.2.1.3 P 40 L 17 # 39
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change ""what"" to ""how"" and remove ""for""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.3 P 41 L 13 # 43
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove the period.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.2.1.3 P 40 L 27 # 40
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Spell ""country"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.3 P 41 L 25 # 44
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change to ""give a potential attacker""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.3 P 40 L 31 # 41
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Where is footnote 38?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.3 P 41 L 28 # 45
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove ""However"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.3 P 40 L 33 # 42
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove second period.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.3 P 42 L 5 # 46
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change ""relook at"" to ""reexamine"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

CI 00 SC 6.4 P 43 L 1 # 47
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change to ""summarize"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 00 SC 6.4.1 P 44 L 4 # 50
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Spell ""Audit""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 00 SC 6.4.1 P 43 L 15 # 48
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Include the word ""Clause"" in the reference.
 Also in the following (page#, line#):
 (46,31), (50,35), (50,38), (54,6), (54,27), (58,11-15), (62,20), (62,22), (63,9), (63,18),
 (63,45), (65,8), (66,29), (68,2), (68,26), (72,4), (72,15), (72,29-30), (75,32), (76,19), (77,10),
 (77,29), (81,28), (84,41), (87,10), (97,28)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 00 SC 6.4.1 P 44 L 10 # 51
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change to ""job initiation events, and...""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 00 SC 6.4.1 P 43 L 24 # 49
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove ""clear"". (If it was clear, why would we need to explain it?)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 00 SC 6.5.1 P 45 L 6 # 52
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change initial ""T"" to same font size.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 00 SC 6.5.1 P 45 L 17 # 53
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change ""isn't"" to ""aren't"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl 00 SC 6.5.1 P 46 L 15 # 54
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change "... then the 'S All requests..." to "...then 'All requestsà"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.5.1.1 P 46 L 34 # 58
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove "'is"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.5.1 P 46 L 24 # 55
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change to "'recommended"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.5.1.1 P 48 L 3 # 59
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change "'less"' to "'fewer"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.5.1 P 46 L 30 # 56
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Spell "'level"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.5.1.1 P 48 L 4 # 60
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove "'have been"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.5.1 P 46 L 31 # 57
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Should we identify which statement is "'applicable"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.5.3 P 51 L 11 # 61
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Spell "'authorize"' û and snub the British!
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl 00 SC 6.5.3.1 P 51 L 23 # 62
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove ""clear"". (If it was clear, why would we need to explain it?)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.5.6 P 52 L 43 # 66
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change the hyphen to a period and start a second sentence with ""See"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.5.6 P 52 L 37 # 63
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove ""Still"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.5.8 P 54 L 14 # 67
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change to ""(which could...)"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.5.6 P 52 L 41 # 64
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Spell ""fulfills"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.5.8 P 54 L 15 # 68
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Spell ""secretly"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.5.6 P 52 L 43 # 65
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove ""recommended"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.5.8 P 54 L 18 # 70
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove closing quotes.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl 00 SC 6.5.8 P 54 L 18 # 69
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change to ""if a trusted channel"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.7.4 P 59 L 45 # 74
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change ""trace"" to ""map"" (for consistency with later usage on page 60, lines 5 and 18.)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.7 P 56 L 1724 # 71
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Is this opening paragraph in the wrong place? It seems like the one on line 25 should be the into paragraph - and this seems out of sequence.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.8 P 61 L 42 # 75
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Capitalize ""Guide"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.7.3 P 59 L 2122 # 72
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Use either ""restrictive"" or ""restricted"" consistently. Also in line 28.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.8 P 62 L 7 # 76
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 I don't understand the use of ""7 - 6.8.10"". Also in lines 15, 18, 27, 31
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.7.4 P 59 L 35 # 73
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change ""is:"" to ""given below.""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.8.10 P 82 L 3 # 83
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Should ""PP APPLICATION NOTE 114"" and ""PP APPLICATION NOTE 115 and 116"" be in bold?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl 00 SC 6.8.2 P 66 L 24 # 77
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Remove ""The ST Author should keep this in mind when creating the ST.""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.8.7 P 78 L 3 # 81
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Which ""three"" Application Notes above? I see six. Also line 7.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.8.2 P 69 L 21 # 78
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Change ""principal"" to ""principle"". (Multiple occurrences on page 70 and elsewhere in document.)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.8.8 P 79 L 14 # 82
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove ""\".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.8.2 P 70 L 36 # 79
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove ""here"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.9 P 83 L 1 # 84
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Is the phrase ""is Part 3 extended"" meaningful, or just bad grammar?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.8.6 P 77 L 39 # 80
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Make font size consistent.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 6.9 P 83 L 8 # 85
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove ""only"".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl 00 SC 7 P 84 L 1 # 86
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Remove ""VENDOR USAGE GUIDELINESö
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Globa SC P 4 L 11 # 114
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Title of Clause 7 needs to be changed (should be Customer Usage Guidelines)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove ""Vendor Usage Guidelines""
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 8.1 P 88 L 7 # 87
 Farrell, Lee Canon
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 The ""double numbering"" of the Questions (""1. Question 1"" is weird. Why do this? A number got dropped on Question 4 (page 89, line 1). And then the double numbering got dropped on Questions 12 and 13 (page 91, line 6 and 11.)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Globa SC 1.1 P 5 L 19 # 115
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Last part of the sentence should be reworded.
 SuggestedRemedy
were Common Criteria certified.....notare Common Criteria Certified.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Globa SC P 3 L 11 # 113
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 The title of Clause 6 in confusing. (is it a Vendor Usage Guideline or an Author Usage Guideline)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the Vendor Usage Guideline (that's clause 5)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Globa SC 1.4 P 7 L 5 # 117
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 I believe that 2600.2, .3, and .4 will also be trademarked by the IEEE...
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Globa** SC 3.1 P 11 L 8 # 118
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

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

The sentence starting at line 8 and ending at line 13 needs rewording and splitting into at least two sentences

SuggestedRemedy

This reflects the increased awareness by industry and government agencies that networked printers and other hardcopy peripherals (such as copiers and multifunctions devices) contain many of the same communications, processing, and storage components as network connected workstations, servers, and PCs. These networked HCDs are subject to many of the same security problems, threats, and vulnerabilities as these other networked nodes.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Globa** SC 3.2.1 P 12 L 19 # 119
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

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

remove the S in mitigations....

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Globa** SC 3.2.1.1 P 12 L 25 # 120
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

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

There are three choices in this paragraph....the work either doesn't work..

SuggestedRemedy

reword

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Globa** SC 4.2.2.6 P 19 L 42 # 121
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

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

I don't believe the bracketed [11] is necessary....the footnote 11 will do..

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Globa** SC 4.2.3.2 P 20 L 15 # 122
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

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

The paragraph refers to two ""reserved"" words (TSF Confidential Data and TSF Protected Data) but then uses two ""descriptive"" words for User Data and User Function Data....

SuggestedRemedy

use the reserved words for all four types of data assets.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Globa** SC 4.2.5.1 P 22 L 21 # 123
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

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

the (see 9) should be (see Clause 9)

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Globa** SC 5.1 P 25 L 20 # 124
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

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

the footnote indicators in line 20,21,22,24,26, and 28 should be 15 not 17.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Globa** SC 5.3 P 33 L 6 # 125
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 remove the S from ""guidelines""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Globa** SC 6.4.1 P 44 L 20 # 129
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 remove the word ""in"" from the sentence
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Globa** SC 5.4.2 P 35 L 27 # 126
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 should be ""an ST"" not ""a ST""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Globa** SC 6.5.1.1 P 47 L 37 # 130
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 This sentence needs work....
 SuggestedRemedy
 ...events mandated by the audit level choses, the ST author should.....
 (maybe..)
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Globa** SC 6.2.1 P 38 L 12 # 127
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 remove the word ""with""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Globa** SC 7.2 P 85 L 24 # 131
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 the phrase ""Effect on Security Requirements"" is not aligned with the text in the table.
 SuggestedRemedy
 restructure table ..
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Globa** SC 6.3 P 41 L 24 # 128
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 reword the sentence at the end of the line...
 SuggestedRemedy
 Clearly a user would prefer that nobody else knows his username.....
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Globa** SC 8.1 P 88 L 39 # 132
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Std is on bold in two places.....it shouldn't be
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Globa** SC **8.1** P **89** L **5** # **133**
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 the words ""Protection Profiles"" should be in bold to match the rest of the question text.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC **6.4.1** P **44** L **4** # **90**
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Typo: ""Audi""
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to ""Audit""
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC **12** P **97** L **12** # **99**
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 NIAP is doing away with the CIMs
 SuggestedRemedy
 Maybe just say that NIAP has a unique set of policies toward PPs and STs :-)
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC **6.4.1** P **44** L **19** # **103**
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 2600.4 does *not* include audit logging requirements.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove lines 19-22.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC **6.4.1** P **43** L **39** # **102**
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 The suggested modification of O.AUDIT.LOGGED is not correct for this case (and would probably violate demonstrable conformance anyway). If the TOE maintains and protects audit data, then the original objective is correct.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove lines 39-41.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC **6.5.1** P **46** L **15** # **91**
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 Typo: ""S All requests""...
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to ""All requests""...
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 6.5.6 P 53 L 17 # 92
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

Comment Type E **Comment Status** X

In addition to that the NVS device ""can no longer be protected by the TOE itself"", the NVS device is outside of the physical area in which the assumptions can be upheld.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change sentence (staring on line 15) to ""(2) when that removable nonvolatile storage is actually outside the physical TOE so that it can no longer be protected by the TOE itself and by the assumptions that must be upheld for the PP.""

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 6.5.8 P 54 L 1 # 104
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

Comment Type T **Comment Status** X

Doesn't this also apply to 2600.1?

SuggestedRemedy
 Change section heading and text on line 3 to ""2600.1 and 2600.2"".

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 6.6 P 55 L 24 # 93
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

Comment Type E **Comment Status** X

I think the para starting on line 24 is a remnant that was replaced by the para staring on line 28.

SuggestedRemedy
 Remove lines 24-26

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 6.6 P 55 L 33 # 105
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

Comment Type T **Comment Status** X

I don't think that the AC SFP can be modified like this without violating demonstrable conformance. Remember, a vendor can provide the ability to let admins or users grant extended permissions to other users, admins can change the default permissions, and admins can even disable security entirely, but the product (as certified) must still be capable of being locked down as specified in the PP.

SuggestedRemedy
 Remove lines 33-36 (including table 7) and also lines 1-15 on page 56.

It is OK to mention that vendors can provide features that relax the permissions, but the product must be certified in a configuration where the AC SFPs are strictly enforced.

It is also good to mention that if a product lets Administrators view/delete/whatever any document they want, then those rules can be added to the SFP. This would not violate conformance because the standard SFP rules apply only to Normal Users; Administrators are not specified one way or the other.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 6.8.1 P 63 L 6 # 94
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

Comment Type E **Comment Status** X

I think it's worth saying that if someone is conforming to 2600.4 at EAL1, they do not need to include the security problem definition in their ST.

SuggestedRemedy
 see comment... maybe also applies to app note 6 (page 63, line 22)

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl Guide SC 6.8.10 P 80 L 42 # 100
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

Comment Type T **Comment Status** X

App note 114 contains a mistake.

SuggestedRemedy
 Refer the reader to the Errata section.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC **6.8.10** P **81** L **3** # **101**
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

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

Additional guidance is not correct. First, there is no need to specify an administrative role if unmediated forwarding is never allowed. Second, the way to specify rules for forward should be a flow control policy, not an access control policy.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove lines 3-12. Consider adding text that clarifies that in cases where unmediated forwarding is never allowed, an administrative roll and function are not required, and an SFP is not appropriate (it might imply that there is an active technical mechanism, versus an architectural limitation, that prohibits unmediated transmission). Also consider adding text to indicate that in cases where unmediated forwarding is allowed under administrative control, then the ST author should support that control with a flow control policy.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC **6.8.10** P **82** L **3** # **112**
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

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

If unmediated forwarding is never allowed, either by some active technical mechanism or by architecture, I don't think that the ST author needs to do anything. But if something is needed, then I think it's a flow control SFP and not an access control SFP.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete lines 3-12?

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC **6.8.2** P **54** L **32** # **95**
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

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

This is a general comment about the PP app note section. Do we really need to include all of the app notes that say only ""this SFR fulfills some objective"" or ""performs an audit function"" etc.? Is there ever any additional guidance for these app notes?

SuggestedRemedy

If not, consider removing them. Save a tree :-).

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC **6.8.2** P **64** L **39** # **106**
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

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

I do not understand this paragraph and the example objectives. First, it says (on line 39) ""two assumptions"", but they are really objectives. Second, is it suggesting that additional objectives are needed? The examples on page 65 are already in the PP, but with different names (O.AUDIT.LOGGED and OE.AUDIT_REVIEWED).

SuggestedRemedy

Delete?

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC **6.8.2** P **65** L **17** # **107**
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

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

This is an unfortunate example, because it is actually a mistake in the PP (which is already in the Errata section 14.1 item #1).

SuggestedRemedy

A better example might be FIA_UAU.1 where the PP requires a Basic level for auditability. If the ST specifies ""Minimum"" level overall, the ST author will still need to use Basic level for this SFR.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **Guide** SC **6.8.2** P **66** L **10** # **96**
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

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

Is it worth noting that the example still lets an administrator delete others' documents? I think so, because it illustrates that unspecified conditions are implicitly allowed.

SuggestedRemedy

Change sentence to say ""...preventing an authorized System Administrator from reading or modifying anyone else's documents, while still permitting the Administrator to delete others' documents.""

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl Guide SC 6.8.2 P 73 L 35 # 97
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 ""central time server"" might be confused with Central time (versus Eastern, Mountain, Pacific,...)
SuggestedRemedy
 Change to ""centralized time server""
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 6.8.7 P 77 L 39 # 98
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo
Comment Type E **Comment Status** X
 Unintended typeface change in the first few words about app note 96
SuggestedRemedy
 fix
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 6.8.2 P 75 L 32 # 109
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 I am confused about this one. What does the example in 6.8.2 item 2a have to do with this? Same applies to 6.8.5 page 76 line 19, 6.8.6 page 77 line 10, 6.8.7 page 78 line 17, 6.8.8 page 79 line 28,
SuggestedRemedy
 Discuss...
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 6.8.7 P 78 L 3 # 110
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 ""Allowed"" rules are not necessary; also applies to line 7, and page 9 line 20. I think that giving examples with Allowed rules may confuse ST authors so that they think that anything to be allowed must be specified.
SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the ""allowed"" line from the SFP example(s).
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 6.8.4 P 75 L 23 # 108
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 The ST author cannot add a rule that allows another U.NORMAL to read a print document, because would be less restrictive and therefore nonconformant. However, the example given (of letting an Administrator read a print document) is OK because Administrator rules are not specified. But the example is not very useful because the Allowed rule is unnecessary.
SuggestedRemedy
 Delete lines 21-25.
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

Cl Guide SC 6.8.8 P 79 L 11 # 111
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo
Comment Type T **Comment Status** X
 The existing rule for D.DOC +DSR Read/Modify U.NORMAL is not correct in this example.
SuggestedRemedy
 Change the rule to ""Denied, except (1) for his/her own documents or (2) if authorized by another role or mechanism if such functions are provided by a conforming TOE""
Proposed Response **Response Status** O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Main** SC 1.3 P 6 L 3 # 116
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 reword sentence....
 SuggestedRemedy
 ...overview of the Common Criteria and Protection Profiles.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP Gu** SC 1.3 P 6 L 15 # 138
 Sukert, Alan Xerox
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 Clause 1.3 that discusses the organization of the PP Guide does not include Clause 14, which provides critical 2600.x Protection Profile Errata information and Clause 15 which indicates content that may appear in future updates to the PP Guide.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the following sentences after Line 15:
 Clause 14 provides a list of errors and corrected text in any of the four PPs that comprise the IEEE Std 2600 Series of Protection Profiles
 Clause 15 lists issues that may be included in future updates of this PP Guide.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP Gu** SC 1.4 P 6 L 25 # 136
 Sukert, Alan Xerox
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**
 The PP Guide currently references in Clause 1.4 the Version 3.1, Release 2 versions of Common Criteria Parts 1, 2 & 3 as well as the CEM. However, recently Version 3.1, Release 3 of these documents was issued. Should Clause 1.4 reference the Version 3.1 Release 2 versions of these documents that the PPs and the PP Guide were created under, or should Clause 1.4 reference the Version 3.1 Release 3 versions of these documents that users of this PP Guide will be working under in most cases.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Resolve which Version 3.1 release of Common Criteria Parts 1-3 and the CEM the PP Guide should reference in Clause 1.4.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP Gu** SC 14.1 P 99 L 12 # 139
 Sukert, Alan Xerox
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 The sentence states that '..."Locking of an interactive session by the session locking mechanism"' is actually the auditable event for the FTA_SSL.3 SFR.' The SFR that should have been referenced in this sentence is FTA_SSL.2. There is also a grammatical error in the sentence because the reference to Table 15 was accidentally left out of this sentence.
 SuggestedRemedy

Revise the sentence in Clause 14.1, page 99 starting in line 12 to read as follows:
 Discussion: The auditable event listing for the FTA_SSL.3 SFR in Page 19, Table 15 - "..."Locking of an interactive session by the session locking mechanism"' - is actually the auditable event for the FTA_SSL.2 SFR.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP Gu** SC 15 P 101 L 3 # 140
 Sukert, Alan Xerox
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**
 There is a missing space between '2600' and 'Series' on this line.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Revise Clause 15, page 101, line 3 to read:
 1. Guidance on how to evaluate a TOE based on one of the IEEE Std 2600 Series of Protection Profiles.
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **PP Gu** SC **6.4.1** P **44** L **19** # **134**
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data

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

P2600.4 does not have any audit log requirement. Though some customers may desire to track ""TOE use"". Therefore, It's wrong to state that ""IEEE Std 2600.4 [B11] does include audit logging requirements, but the audit logging in for IEEE Std 2600.4 is only for purposes of tracking δ TOE use and not for either accounting purposes or for monitoring security concerns.""

SuggestedRemedy

Please delete the audit log requirement statement.

Below is the propose to change for the paragraph:

""P2600.4 does not have any audit log requirement. Though some customers may desire to track ""TOE use"". It is for that reason that the O.AUDIT.LOGGED security objective is not included in IEEE Std 2600.4.""

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP Gu** SC **6.8.10** P **81** L **42** # **137**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

As indicated in Clause 14.1, Item #4, the text of PP Application Note 114 in IEEE Std 2600.1 has changed to no longer discuss the FPT_FDI_EXP.1 SFR. As a result, the summary of PP Application Note in Clause 6.8.10, Item #2a needs to be changed to reflect the new text of PP Application Note 114.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Clause 6.8.10, Item #2a to read:

PP APPLICATION NOTE 114 (FPT_FDI_EXP.1) - Provides guidance on when the FMT_SMF.1 and FMT_SMR.1 SFRs need to be employed in support of the FPT_FDI_EXP.1 SFR.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP Gu** SC **6.5.8** P **54** L **3** # **135**
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data

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

This proposed solution from the last meeting is missed in this version.

Here is the comment from the last review:

""P2600.2 for environment B only requires that TSF data be protected for confidentiality and integrity when the data is transmitted over a SMI.""

SuggestedRemedy

Delete ""User Data"" from the sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**