

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 D  
 Remove the word ""four""  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 1.2 P 5 L 38 # 2  
 Farrell, Lee Canon  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Remove ""Footnote deleted""  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 1.3 P 6 L 16 # 3  
 Farrell, Lee Canon  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Change ""covers"" to ""applies to""  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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 W  
 Need to discuss what to do with this clause and Clause 15.

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

Will remove item 7; first part of comment will be addressed based on how we disposition Comment #88.  
 Cl 00 SC 2.2 P 9 L 3 # 4  
 Farrell, Lee Canon  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Add a period at end of sentence  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Will break up the sentence as suggested and let the commentor review the suggested change.

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl 00 SC 3.3 P 13 L 43 # 6  
 Farrell, Lee Canon  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Change "'is'" to "'are'"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Cl 00 SC 4.2.2.1 P 17 L 10 # 7  
 Farrell, Lee Canon  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 "'Operations'" are not on the diagram as an "'entity"'.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Fix text or diagram for consistency.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 "Operations" is shown between Subject and Asset.

Cl 00 SC 4.2.2.6 P 19 L 42 # 10  
 Farrell, Lee Canon  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Remove "'[11]"'  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 4.2.2.2 P 17 L 19 # 8  
 Farrell, Lee Canon  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Change "'TSFs'" to "'TSF'"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 There is definitely a grammatical error here. Propose it should read "one or more TOE security functions." to make sense.

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 W  
 Not sure how to address this comment. Need to discuss at the meeting.

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

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

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

Cl 00 SC 5.2 P 25 L 29 # 14  
 Farrell, Lee Canon  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Change ""what"" to ""which""  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 5.2 P 25 L 40 # 15  
 Farrell, Lee Canon  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Where is footnote 16?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 It is on page 26. Apparently MS Word put it on the next page.

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

Author will look at how I can revise this sentence to make it clearer.  
 Cl 00 SC 5.3 P 27 L 13 # 17  
 Farrell, Lee Canon  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Change "" for the security problem in one of the four"" to "" for the security problems identified in the four""  
 SuggestedRemedy

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

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl 00 SC 5.3 P 28 L 10 # 19  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D

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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Author will revise to make this line a complete sentence.

Cl 00 SC 5.3 P 31 L 20 # 22  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Remove "and point to".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 5.3 P 31 L 20 # 21  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"Similarly, the types of HCDs that typically are used in this type of business." is not a sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Author will either make this a complete sentence (if author can recall what was meant there) or just delete it.

Cl 00 SC 5.3 P 31 L 1236 # 20  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Paragraph formats should be full justification, to be consistent.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 5.3 P 33 L 6 # 23  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Change "guidelines" to "guideline"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 5.4.1 P 33 L 38 # 24  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Use lower case "e" on "Environment"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl 00 SC 5.4.2 P 35 L 1 # 25  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
Change ""An additional topic"" to ""A topic"". (There is no preceding topic, is there?)

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Prefer to say "Another topic..".

Cl 00 SC 5.4.2 P 35 L 2 # 26  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Change ""whether"" to ""where"".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 5.4.2 P 35 L 5 # 27  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Change to ""typically the default case""

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 5.4.2 P 35 L 7 # 28  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Remove the period at the end of the bullet

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Document is inconsistent in putting punctuation at end of bullets. Will follow what the IEEE convention is and make all the bullets consistent in terms of punctuation.

Cl 00 SC 5.4.2 P 35 L 25 # 29  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Change ""was"" to ""in"".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 6 P 36 L 1 # 30  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Remove ""VENDOR USAGE GUIDELINESö

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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 D  
 Spell "conformance"  
 SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The sentence starting in line 37 will be revised; that should address this comment also.

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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 6.2.1.2 P 38 L 37 # 33  
 Farrell, Lee Canon  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

---

Cl 00 SC 6.2.1.3 P 40 L 9 # 38  
Farrell, Lee Canon  
Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Change ""Then if"" to ""If""  
SuggestedRemedy  
Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

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

---

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

---

Cl 00 SC 6.3 P 40 L 31 # 41  
Farrell, Lee Canon  
Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Where is footnote 38?  
SuggestedRemedy  
Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

---

Footnote 38 should be Footnote 32  
Cl 00 SC 6.3 P 40 L 33 # 42  
Farrell, Lee Canon  
Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Remove second period.  
SuggestedRemedy  
Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

Cl 00 SC 6.3 P 41 L 13 # 43  
Farrell, Lee Canon  
Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Remove the period.  
SuggestedRemedy  
Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Will make change consistent with what is decided for Comment #28

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

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

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

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

Cl 00 SC 6.4 P 43 L 1 # 47  
 Farrell, Lee Canon  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Change to ""summarize"".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 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 W  
 Need to make a final decision on how to internally reference document clauses and author  
 will go back and make sure every internal paragraph reference follows that decision.

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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 6.4.1 P 44 L 4 # 50  
 Farrell, Lee Canon  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Spell ""Audit""  
 SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl 00 SC 6.4.1 P 44 L 10 # 51  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Change to ""job initiation events, and...""

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Agree that a change is needed here but author is not sure the suggested change is the best way to change this sentence. Author will come up with a suggested rewording and get the commenter's acceptance.

Cl 00 SC 6.5.1 P 45 L 6 # 52  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Change initial ""T"" to same font size.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 6.5.1 P 45 L 17 # 53  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Change ""isn't"" to ""aren't"".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 6.5.1 P 46 L 15 # 54  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Change ""... then the 'S All requests..."" to ""then 'All requestsà""

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 6.5.1 P 46 L 24 # 55  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Change to ""recommended"".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 6.5.1 P 46 L 30 # 56  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Spell ""level"".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl 00 SC 6.5.1 P 46 L 31 # 57  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
Should we identify which statement is ""applicable""?

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Author will add the applicable statement number here.

Cl 00 SC 6.5.1.1 P 46 L 34 # 58  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Remove ""is"".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 6.5.1.1 P 48 L 3 # 59  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Change ""less"" to ""fewer"".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 6.5.1.1 P 48 L 4 # 60  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Remove ""have been"".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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 W  
The wording comes directly from CC Part 2; don't think we can change the spelling if that is what is in the CC. Can we change the spelling from the British to the American spelling of words extracted directly from an SFR definition in CC Part 2?

Cl 00 SC 6.5.3.1 P 51 L 23 # 62  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Remove ""clear"". (If it was clear, why would we need to explain it?)

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl 00 SC 6.7 P 56 L1724 # 71  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Author agrees the indicated wording is out of place in Clause 6.7. Author will figure out the best place in Clause 6.7 to put it.

Cl 00 SC 6.7.3 P 59 L2122 # 72  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Use either "restrictive" or "restricted" consistently. Also in line 28.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Author agrees we should be consistent, but is not sure which of the two is more appropriate - "restrictive" or "restricted".

Cl 00 SC 6.7.4 P 59 L 35 # 73  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Change "is:" to "given below."

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 6.7.4 P 59 L 45 # 74  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Change "trace" to "map" (for consistency with later usage on page 60, lines 5 and 18.)

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 6.8 P 61 L 42 # 75  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Capitalize "Guide".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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 W

This is the same issue as noted in Comment #48. Author will resolve this one the same way we resolve Comment #48.

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

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 W  
Author will go with the consensus on this one and make sure whatever is decided is applied consistently in Clause 6.8.

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 W  
Author feels leaving this sentence as is emphasizes the point made above this line. Will go with what the group thinks

Cl 00 SC 6.8.2 P 69 L 21 # 78  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Change "principal" to "principle". (Multiple occurrences on page 70 and elsewhere in document.)

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED REJECT.  
  
The wording comes straight from IEEE Std 2600.1 and I also think "principal" is the correct term here (context of being the "main" SFR for fulfilling what is stated).

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 W  
There is no line 36 on page 70. The commenter should please recheck and indicate which line is actually meant here.

Cl 00 SC 6.8.6 P 77 L 39 # 80  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
Make font size consistent.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 6.8.7 P 78 L 3 # 81  
Farrell, Lee Canon

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
Which "three" Application Notes above? I see six. Also line 7.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
  
Author thinks it should read on both lines 3 and 7 "...into account PP Application Notes 93-96 above..." but will double-check.

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

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

Cl 00 SC 7 P 84 L 1 # 86  
 Farrell, Lee Canon  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Remove ""VENDOR USAGE GUIDELINESö  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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 W  
 Author believes this is the correct terminology per the CC. If it isn't group should determine what should be used here.  
 By the way, should 'extended' be capitalized here?

Cl 00 SC 8.1 P 88 L 7 # 87  
 Farrell, Lee Canon  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 The question numbering became messed up for some reason. Author's proposal is to remove all the question numbers since each question/answer pair is numbered.

Cl 00 SC 6.9 P 83 L 8 # 85  
 Farrell, Lee Canon  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Remove ""only"".   
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Author believes the correct wording should be "...this SAR only requires that a procedure..." but will double-check.

Cl Globa SC P 3 L 11 # 113  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

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

Cl **Globa** SC 1.1 P 5 L 19 # 115  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**  
 Last part of the sentence should be reworded.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 .....were Common Criteria certified.....not .....are Common Criteria Certified.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Author agrees that the last part of the indicated sentence should be rewritten. Author will make a proposed change and have the commenter review it.

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

Cl **Globa** SC 3.1 P 11 L 8 # 118  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**  
 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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Same as Comment #5. Author suggests using the suggested rewording from this comment to resolve both Comment #5 and this comment.

Cl **Globa** SC 3.2.1 P 12 L 19 # 119  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**  
 remove the S in mitigations....  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **Globa** SC 3.2.1.1 P 12 L 25 # 120  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**  
 There are three choices in this paragraph.....the work either doesn't work..  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 reword  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Author thinks the comment is saying that the word "either" should be removed. If that's the comment it will be removed; otherwise author is not sure what the commenter was suggesting be done here.

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

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

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**

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

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Note: Same as Comment #10

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

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**

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 **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

If the author understands the comment correctly the sentence will be revised to use the "reserved" words instead of the "descriptive" ones.

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 **W**

This is the same issue as noted in Comments #48 and #76. Author will resolve this comment the same way these other two comments are resolved.

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

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**

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

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Note: Same as Comment #13

Cl **Globa** SC 5.3 P 33 L 6 # 125  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**

remove the S from ""guidelines""

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Note: Same as Comment #23

Cl **Globa** SC 5.4.2 P 35 L 27 # 126  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**

should be ""an ST"" not ""a ST""

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

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

Cl **Globa** SC **6.3** P **41** L **24** # **128**  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**  
 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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Author thinks the whole long sentence here needs to be reworded. Author will make a proposed change and have the commenter review it. This change should also encompass the change for Comment #44.

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

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

Author will make a proposed revised sentence and have the commenter review it.  
 Cl **Globa** SC **7.2** P **85** L **24** # **131**  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**  
 the phrase ""Effect on Security Requirements"" is not aligned with the text in the table.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 restructure table ..  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

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 **W**

Author is not sure what the commenter intended to fix here because the author doesn't see an issue with page 89, line 5. Was another line on that page meant in this case?

By the way, the author suggests that he should fix the capitalization on page 89, lines 3 and 6 while he's there.

Cl **Guide** SC **12** P **97** L **12** # **99**  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**  
 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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Need to remove the sentences on page 97, lines 11-15.

Cl **Guide** SC **6.4.1** P **43** L **39** # **102**  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**  
 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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Need the commenters help to determine how to address this comment.

Cl **Guide** SC **6.4.1** P **44** L **4** # **90**  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**  
 Typo: ""Audi""

SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to ""Audit""

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Note: Same as Comment #50.

Cl **Guide** SC **6.4.1** P **44** L **19** # **103**  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**  
 2600.4 does \*not\* include audit logging requirements.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove lines 19-22.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Before deleting lines 19-22 as suggested the author wants to make sure that doesn't negate resolution to a comment from the Jul 09 meeting that necessitated this change in the first place.

Cl **Guide** SC **6.5.1** P **46** L **15** # **91**  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**  
 Typo: ""S All requests""...

SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to ""All requests""...

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Note: Same as Comment #54.

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** D

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 (starting 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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

**Comment Type** T **Comment Status** D

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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The commenter is likely correct but the author will double-check. If the commenter is correct the author make the suggested title change, revise the wording accordingly and then have the commented review it.

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

**Comment Type** E **Comment Status** D

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

**SuggestedRemedy**

Remove lines 24-26

**Proposed Response** Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

**Comment Type** T **Comment Status** D

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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Author will work with the commenter to address this comment. Author will likely delete the recommended lines and replace them with the note in the suggested remedy.

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

**Comment Type** E **Comment Status** D

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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

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

**Comment Type** T **Comment Status** D  
 App note 114 contains a mistake.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Refer the reader to the Errata section.

**Proposed Response** **Response Status** W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

**Comment Type** T **Comment Status** D  
 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** W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Author will work with the commenter to address this comment.

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

**Comment Type** T **Comment Status** D  
 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** W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Author will work with the commenter to address this comment together with Comment #101.

**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** W

Author has been back and forth on this one trying to address the conflicting comments on what PP App Notes to comment on in the PP Guide. Group should make a final decision on this issue and then the author will implement what is decided.

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

**Comment Type** T **Comment Status** D  
 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** W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Author will work with the commenter to address this comment.

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

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

**Comment Type** T **Comment Status** D

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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Author will replace what is there now with the suggested example and review it with the commenter.

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

**Comment Type** E **Comment Status** D

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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl Guide** SC 6.8.2 P 73 L 35 # 97  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

**Comment Type** E **Comment Status** D

""central time server"" might be confused with Central time (versus Eastern, Mountain, Pacific,...)

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change to ""centralized time server""

**Proposed Response** Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**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 W

Author agrees with the commenter her but is not sure how to resolve the issue. Should discuss this at the meeting.

**Cl Guide** SC 6.8.4 P 75 L 23 # 108  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

**Comment Type** T **Comment Status** D

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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl Guide** SC 6.8.7 P 77 L 39 # 98  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

**Comment Type** E **Comment Status** D

Unintended typeface change in the first few words about app note 96

**SuggestedRemedy**

fix

**Proposed Response** Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **Guide** SC **6.8.7** P **78** L **3** # **110**  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**  
 ""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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Author will remove the suggested lines and review resulting text with the commenter.

Cl **Guide** SC **6.8.8** P **79** L **11** # **111**  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh Americas Corpo

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**  
 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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **Main** SC **1.3** P **6** L **3** # **116**  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**  
 reword sentence....

SuggestedRemedy  
 ...overview of the Common Criteria and Protection Profiles.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **PP Gu** SC **1.3** P **6** L **15** # **138**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**  
 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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **PP Gu** SC **1.4** P **6** L **25** # **136**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**  
 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 **W**  
 Author is asking for direction on what CC 3.1 revision to reference.

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **PP Gu** SC **14.1** P **99** L **12** # **139**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**

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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **PP Gu** SC **15** P **101** L **3** # **140**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**

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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**

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 δTOE useö 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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Same as Comment #103.

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

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**

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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

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

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**

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 **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.