

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl All P SC 1.4.1 P 2 L 9 # 1  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Use of the terms "primary" and "secondary" for SFRs is inconsistent with ISO/IEC TR-15446.

SuggestedRemedy

Change all appropriate occurrences of "primary" to "principal", and change "secondary" (and, mistakenly, "support") to "supporting". Comment reference is for P2600.1 first occurrence. Other occurrences in P2600.1 are 7.6 p32 l3-14 (note that line 14 should say "items provide supporting (s) fulfillment"), 8.6, 9.6, 10.6, 11.6, 12.6, and 13.6 (same note applies to all). Similar occurrences are in P2600.2, .3, and .4.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl All P SC 5.5.1 P 8 L 6 # 8  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh

Comment Type T Comment Status X

"Remote" should not be a type of user. It should be an attribute of User or its subclasses Originator, Delegate, and Administrator. It is also useful to have a superclass U.USER defined (as "any authorized User") that comprises Originator, Delegate, and Administrator.

SuggestedRemedy

In the entity definition for Users (5.5.1 page 8 line 6), remove Remote, add a superclass U.USER to Table 1 with the definition "Any authorized User", and add an app note that describes the existence of the Remote attribute (example app note is OTHERTOIE in P2600.1, page 12, line 8).

In the SMI TOE model, remove "Remote" subclass and add the attribute to "User" class.

In the SMI Access Control SFP (13.5.1.1 page 144 line 9 in P2600.1), change "U.REMOTE" to "U.USER(+REMOTE)" in both places.

In the SMI Information Flow Control SFP (13.5.1.2 page 144 line 11 in P2600.1), change "U.REMOTE" to "U.USER(+REMOTE)" in all places.

In all TOEs, search for and appropriately replace "any authorized User" with "U.USER" (primarily in the access control SFP tables).

Apply to all TOEs and all PPs.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl All P SC 7.5.2 P L # 13  
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Audit level of "none" with Additional information of "none" for a specified audit event in the Audit Data Requirements table and Audit Data Recommendations table could be very misleading. For example, does this mean that For this event, nothing should be audited. This applies to the same tables in all TOEs of all PPs.

SuggestedRemedy

According to PDTR\_15446 Audit level from "none" should be changed to "not specified" which means the audit level is not one of the levels (minimum, basic, or detailed) specified by Common Criteria.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl All P SC 7.5.2 P 22 L 14 # 2  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Missing open quote on table references

SuggestedRemedy

Insert open quote on the comment reference page/line (P2600.1), and also p 23 lines, 1, 12, and 14, and other TOEs in that PP, and also P2600.2 and .3.

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl All P SC 7.5.2 P 23 L 16 # 3  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Column headings for audit data requirements and recommendations tables are not well defined.

SuggestedRemedy

Re-order the columns as follows: Auditable event, Relevant SFR, Audit level, and Additional information.

Add a PP app note before the requirements table saying (for example) ""Table 15 lists the minimum set of auditable events that are required for inclusion in FAU\_GEN.1.1, the relevant SFR from which audit requirements are taken, the expected audit level at which information should be recorded in FAU\_GEN.1.2, and additional information that must be recorded in FAU\_GEN.1.2.""

Add a PP app note before the recommendations table saying (for example) ""Table 16 lists the minimum set of auditable events that are recommended for inclusion in FAU\_GEN.1.1, the relevant SFR from which audit requirements are taken, the recommended audit level at which information should be recorded in FAU\_GEN.1.2, and additional information that should be recorded in FAU\_GEN.1.2.""

In the Audit level column, where ""None"" appears, change to ""Not specified"".

In the Additional information column, where ""None"" appears, change to ""None required"" for requirements tables, or ""None recommended"" for recommendations tables.

Apply this change to all TOEs these tables occur in P2600.1, .2, and .3.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl All P SC 7.5.2 P 23 L 19 # 5  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Wording of PP app note indicating the reverse-dependency relationships is confusing with the standard SFR heading ""Dependencies""

SuggestedRemedy

In all SFRs with PP app note that says ""[sfr] is a dependency of [other sfr(s)]"", change to say ""[sfr] is one of the dependencies of [other sfr(s)]"". Apply to all TOEs, all PPs.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl All P SC 7.5.2 P 24 L 10 # 6  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh

Comment Type E Comment Status X

PP app note that describes the fulfillment of objectives is not specific about whether it is principal or supporting. Where these notes appear, they are all principal.

SuggestedRemedy

In all SFRs with PP app note that says ""[sfr] is a requirement which fulfills [objective(s)]"", change to say ""[sfr] is a principal SFR that directly fulfills [objective(s)]"". Apply to all TOEs in all PPs.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl All P SC 7.5.6 P 27 L 20 # 4  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh

Comment Type E Comment Status X

""Suggested"" is inconsistent with other PP app note recommendations.

SuggestedRemedy

Change ""suggested"" to ""recommended"".

Apply to all occurrences of FIA\_SOS.1 in TOEs of all PPs.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl All P SC 7.5.7 P 29 L 6 # 7  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh

Comment Type E Comment Status X

PP app notes that indicate an SFR performs management functions could be worded more clearly.

SuggestedRemedy

In all SFRs with PP app note that says ""[sfr] performs management recommendations of [other sfrs]"", change to say ""[sfr] performs management functions that are recommended by [other sfrs]""

Proposed Response Response Status O

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **P2600** SC **5.5** P L # **12**  
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**  
 Definitions of new terms such as security attribute name and nomenclature in Access Control table and Information Flow Control table should be added in Entity Definitions.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add these new terminologies into Section 5.5 Entity Definitions.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP An** SC **7.5.2** P **22** L **14** # **9**  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**  
 Open square bracket appears in wrong place.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Move the open square bracket to after the ""," and before "assignment".  
 Same change in FAU\_GEN.1.2, other TOEs, and in P2600.1, .2, and .3.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC P L # **11**  
 Carmen, Aubry OCE  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**  
 Please define the scope for O.DOC.DELETED.NO\_SAL as required by AI 448.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 As decided during the previous meeting, we should limit the scope to spool (format: PDL: this is the minimum and we have already agreed on it) and bitmap images (format: raw/proprietary: we have not discussed about this case, I don't know what the group thinks about it).  
 All other data are protected by encryption (FCS\_COP.1) and are more difficult to retrieve due do their temporary storage. This protection is probably enough for an EAL 3 certification.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **1.1** P **1** L **5** # **19**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**  
 There is a grammatical error in the beginning of line 5 in PP-A - 'standard' should be plural to agree with the corresponding verb 'are' on line 7.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Revise the first sentence in clause 1.1 to read ""Standards for a Protection Profile for Hardcopy Devices...are required."" or ""A standard for a Protection Profile for Hardcopy Devices...is required.""  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **1.2** P **1** L **13** # **81**  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**  
 Reference to IEEE Std. 2600 needs fixing.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **1.4.1** P **2** L **2** # **20**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**  
 'wholy' is misspelled; it should be 'wholly'.  
 This comment applies to the following:  
 PP-A -- Subclause 1.4.1, page 2, line 2  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Revise the indicated line to read "...in that row wholly or partially..."  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **PP-A** SC 1.4.1 P 2 L 7 # 21  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**  
 'secodary' is misspelled; it should be 'secondary'.

This comment applies to the following:  
 PP-A -- Subclause 1.4.1, page 2, line 7

*SuggestedRemedy*

Revise the indicated line to read ""indicates that it performs a secondary fulfillment.""

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC 10.1.1 P 76 L 13 # 89  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

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

No need for the parenthesis to separate the text. Commas will do.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC 10.2.1 P 79 L 4 # 49  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

In Table 54 the rational that D.DOC.RETRIEVE does not apply to the FAX TOE states that User Document Data is not retained for the FAX TOE after job completion. In actuality that may not always be true - in some designs User Document Data from a FAX receive or send job may be stored in volatile memory after completion of the job and thus could potentially be accessible by an attacker; that's why some products offer an overwrite capability for the Fax memory. The statement in Table 54 is really an assumption that the potential threat here at EAL3 does not warrant inclusion in the PP.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Provide a better rationale for not including D.DOC.RETRIEVE in the FAX TOE (I'll try to have something for the meeting).

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC 10.2.2 P 79 L 7 # 16  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

In PP-A Table 55, the description for T.FUNC.REST.ALT has a grammatical error - should say ""User Function Data in the TOE may be altered by unauthorized persons"".

*SuggestedRemedy*

See suggested remedy above for the indicated subclauses.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC 11.1.1 P 97 L 17 # 27  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The PP Application Note on this line in PP-A has a grammatical error - says ""provided by that or those TOEs..."" and thus doesn't read correctly.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the line indicated above to read ""...and will use the Channel(s) and interface(s) provided by those TOEs..."

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC 12.1.2 P 119 L 10 # 50  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

There seems to be an inconsistency between subclauses 12.1.1 and 12.1.2. Subclause 12.1.2 refers to both an authorized Administrator and an originating User but the NVS TOE Model in 12.1.1 only discusses an administrator. If the originating User in 12.1.2 is supposed to be the 'NVS Subject' discussed in 12.1.1 then it should say that.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Resolve the inconsistency between subclauses 12.1.1 and 12.1.2 as to what Users apply to the NVS TOE.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **PP-A** SC **12.2.1** P **120** L **4** # **41**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

PP-A, Table 86 indicates that D.DOC(+OTHERTOE).REST is not applicable to the NVS TOE. However, Table 84 lists D.DOC(+OTHERTOE).REST as a User Data Asset of the NVS TOE that is addressed by threat T.DOC(+OTHERTOE).REST.SAL.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Resolve the inconsistency between the indicated tables above (I suspect the row needs to be removed from the second table).

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **12.5.4.2** P **127** L **23** # **91**  
 Shigeru, Ueda Canon

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

I guess that existence of FCS\_CKM.1 and FCS\_CKM.4 are because of the dependency from FCS\_COP.1 which protects NVS data by the cryptographic operation to oppose to T.DOC.REST.SAL. I believe that the original reason that FCS\_CKM.1 and FCS\_CKM.4 depends on FCS\_COP.1 is the needs of data encryption as the measure to the threat ""tapping to data communication in the network"". In the case of network,encrypted network data becomes unnecessary if it is received and decrypted for further operation, so FCS\_CKM.4 make sense to lower the risk to be stolen from attacker.

However, encryption keys in the NVS will not be destructed because data in the NVS is mainly not a temporary data so it is required to be kept read in the normal environment. It will not be able to be read if it is destructd. Another problem is that it depends on implementation.

In some implementation, encryption keys are stored in the RAM area, so it is automatically disappear when it is powered off. It will be generated again after power-on from original resource.

This way looks achieving FCS\_CKM.4, but I think it is not achieving FCS\_CKM.4 because it is not an active method.

*SuggestedRemedy*

It is too much to require FCS\_CKM.4 for NVS, so should be deleted.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **12.5.5** P **128** L **32** # **28**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The OBJECTIVE O.DOC.(+OTHERTOE)DELETED.NO\_SAL is misspelled in PP-A, subclause 12.5.5, page 128, line 32.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Correct the spelling of OBJECTIVE O.DOC.(+OTHERTOE)DELETED.NO\_SAL in the indicated lines for PP-A.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **13.1.2** P **137** L **6** # **42**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

I believe security function (b) for the SMI TOE is incorrectly stated. It should read ""The SMI TOE can protect the User Data and TSF Data of the Subject of another TOE from unauthorized disclosure or alteration..."".

*SuggestedRemedy*

Correct this SMI TOE security function as indicated above.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **13.2.4** P **140** L **6** # **43**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

Because the SMI TOE, as indicated in subclause 13.1.1, deals with the essential processing elements required to control access to and communications over shared communications media it is not clear why the A.LOCATION.SECURITY assumption and associated objective OE.LOCATION.SECURED are needed for this TOE or even make sense for this TOE. Since we are dealing with a communication media what location of the TOE needs to be secured or monitored. This assumption/objective pair can be eliminated for this TOE without sacrificing any security of the SMI TOE.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove A.LOCATION.SECURITY and OE.LOCATION.SECURED from the applicable tables in the subclauses indicated above.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

CI **PP-A** SC 13.3.4 P 143 L 1 # 29  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**  
 In the header for Table 110 the objective O.CONF.(+OTHERTOE)TRANSIT.NO\_ALT is misspelled (the 'e') is missing).  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Correct the spelling of the objective O.CONF.(+OTHERTOE)TRANSIT.NO\_ALT in the header for Table 110.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **PP-A** SC 13.6 P 156 L 1 # 34  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**  
 The description for O.SMI.MEDIATED in Table 115 has a misspelling - 'communication s medium interfaces' should be 'communications medium interfaces'.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Correct the description for O.SMI.MEDIATED as indicated above.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **PP-A** SC 13.5.11 P 155 L 3 # 30  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**  
 There is a double set of periods after the sentence on this line.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove one of the periods after the sentence on Line 3.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **PP-A** SC 13.6 P 157 L 1 # 32  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**  
 In PP-A Table 117 for the O.SMI.MEDIATED objective, in the purpose of FDP\_IFC.1 'shared media interface' should be 'shared-medium interface' to be consistent with the rest of the document.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change 'shared media interface' to 'shared-medium interface' in the Table indicated above.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **PP-A** SC 13.5.11 P 155 L 9 # 31  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**  
 The objective O.FUNCT.(+OTHERTOE)TRANSIT.NO\_ALT is misspelled in the PP Application Note.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Correct the spelling of the objective O.FUNCT.(+OTHERTOE)TRANSIT.NO\_ALT in the PP Application Note on Line 9.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **PP-A** SC 13.6 P 157 L 1 # 33  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**  
 In Table 117, to be consistent with document conventions in the row for O.USER.AUTHORIZED 'users' should be capitalized because it is referring to the User asset..  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Revise the description for O.USER.AUTHORIZED in the table indicated above to read ""Authorization of Users to use the TOE"".  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **PP-A** SC **13.6** P **157** L **1** # **44**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

In PP-A, the SFRs listed in Table 117 that are mapped to the O.CONF.REST\_NO\_DIS, O.PROT.REST\_NO\_ALT and O.CONF.REST\_NO\_ALT objectives does not agree with the SFRs that are mapped to these objectives in Table 116. Table 117 indicates that only the SFRs FMT\_MTD.1 and FMT\_SMR.1 map to these objectives; Table 116 also includes SFRs FIA\_UID.1 and FMT\_SMF.1.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Resolve the inconsistency between the tables indicated above as to what SFRs map to the O.CONF.REST\_NO\_DIS, O.PROT.REST\_NO\_ALT and O.CONF.REST\_NO\_ALT objectives.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **4** P **3** L **10** # **82**  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

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

Do we want to keep using the tag P2600.1 is as the an indicator?  
 The P is the indicator for the project which will no longer exist after the completion of the project.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **4** P **3** L **32** # **36**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

In general acronyms, even if they are included in the acronyms list, should be defined the first time they are used within the document. In PP-A on page 3, line 32 the acronym 'HCD' and on line 33 the acronym 'MFP' are used but not defined.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Include the definition of the acronyms HCD and MFP in PP-A, page 3, lines 32 and 33.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **4** P **3** L **46** # **22**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The sentence in line 47 is not grammatically correct.

This comment applies to the following:  
 PP-A -- Subclause 4, page 3, line 46

*SuggestedRemedy*

Revise the indicated line to read "...that perform a scanning function in which physical document input is converted to electronic document output."

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **5.2** P **6** L **42** # **23**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The reference to 'Clause 5' in PP-A, page 6, line 42 should be to 'Clause 4'.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Revise the indicated line to read "A complete description of those environments can be found in IEEE Std. P2600, Clause 4."

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **5.3** P **7** L **6** # **35**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

This line in PP-A states "In order to create a Common Criteria profile that can be used...". Technically what is being created is a Common Criteria Protection Profile.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Revise the indicated line to read "In order to create a Common Criteria Protection Profile that can be used..."

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **PP-A** SC **6.4** P **14** L **12** # **83**  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **X**  
 Do we really want to allow somebody to create additional profiles of these protection profiles instead of just Security Targets?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove ""and Protection Profiles"" from this line as well as line 14.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **7.22** P **18** L **5** # **85**  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**  
 For some reason, Table 8 has no borders.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **6.4** P **14** L **14** # **84**  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**  
 The word target needs to be Target  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **7.3.4** P **20** L **8** # **25**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**  
 PP-A -- In the first row of Table 12, the definition of OE.LOCATION.SECURED has a grammatical error. The same comment applies to subclause 8.3.4, page 41, line 6; subclause 9.3.4, page 61, line 6; subclause 10.3.4, page 81, line 8; subclause 11.3.4, page 102, line 8; subclause 12.3.3.1, page 122, line 9 and subclause 13.3.3.1, page 142, line 4.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change the definition of OE.LOCATION.SECURED to read ""The TOE shall be placed in a secure or monitored area which limits the opportunity for unauthorized physical access to the TOE."" in the subclauses listed above.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **7.2.2** P **18** L **5** # **10**  
 Smithson, Brian Ricoh  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**  
 Table does not have borders.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Put borders on the table. Also check other tables, all PPs, for consistent style.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **7.2.2** P **18** L **5** # **24**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **X**  
 For some reason the boundaries for Table 8 have been removed.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Fix the boundaries in Table 8.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

CI **PP-A** SC **7.3.4** P **20** L **8** # **37**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The definitions for OE.USER.AUTHORIZED and OE.ADMIN.AUTHORIZED are awkward and do not read correctly. You don't want the TOE owner to grant permission for the user (or admin) to be authorized to use (or manage) the HCD; I think you want the TOE owner to authorize the user (or admin) to use (or manage) the HCD.

The same comment applies to clause 8.3.4, page 41, line 6; subclause 9.3.4, page 61, line 6; subclause 10.3.4, page 81, line 8; subclause 11.3.4, page 102, line 8; subclause 12.3.3.1, page 122, line 9 and subclause 13.3.3.1, page 142, line 4.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Consider changing the definitions for OE.USER.AUTHORIZED and OE.ADMIN.AUTHORIZED to read something like ""The TOE Owner shall authorize Users to use the TOE..."" and ""The TOE Owner shall authorize Administrators to manage the TOE..."", respectively in all the subclauses cited above.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **PP-A** SC **7.5.2** P **22** L **14** # **86**  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

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

Throughout the document, the Table references are inconsistently called out, sometimes it's just the table number (Table x, P38 L26), sometimes it's the table number and the table title that's sometimes bold or not. There also appears to be a hanging quotation mark after the table title.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Make consistent.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **PP-A** SC **7.5.2** P **23** L **18** # **26**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

In PP-A Table 16, I believe the auditable event for FIA\_AFL1 is incorrectly defined. You want to track when the limit is reached here, not something else.

This same comment applies to the following:  
 PP-A: subclause 8.5.2, Table 32, page 44, line 8; subclause 9.5.2, Table 48, page 64, line 8; subclause 10.5.2, Table 64, page 84, line 23; subclause 11.5.2, Table 80, page 105, line 22; subclause 12.5.2, Table 96, page 125, line 10 and subclause 13.5.2, Table 114, page 146, line 3.

*SuggestedRemedy*

The auditable event for FIA\_AFL.1 in the tables listed above should read something like ""Attempts to reach authenticate failure limit"".

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

CI **PP-A** SC **7.5.6** P **28** L **1** # **38**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The application note says that FIA\_UAU.1 is a dependency of both FIA\_AFL.1 and FIA\_UAU.7; it is not a dependency of FIA\_UAU.7.

The same comment applies to the following:  
 PP-A: subclause 8.5.6, page 48, line 16; subclause 9.5.6, page 68, line 16; subclause 10.5.6, page 89, line 8; subclause 11.5.6, page 110, line 8; subclause 12.5.6, page 129, line 26 and subclause 13.5.6, page 150, line 18.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Correct this application note to read ""FIA\_UAU.1 is a dependency of FIA\_AFL.1"" in the indicated subclauses.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **PP-A** SC **7.5.6** P **28** L **16** # **39**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The PP Application Note on this line lists FIA\_UAU.1, FAU\_GEN.2 and FMT\_SMR.1 as being dependent on FIA\_UID.1. Note that FAU\_UID.1 is also a dependency of FIA\_UAU.7.

The same comment applies to the following:  
 PP-A: subclause 8.5.6, page 49, line 8; subclause 9.5.6, page 69, line 8; subclause 10.5.6, page 89, line 23; subclause 11.5.6, page 110, line 23; subclause 12.5.6, page 130, line 14 and subclause 13.5.6, page 151, line 8.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Update the Application Note in the subclauses indicated above to read ""FIA\_UID.1 is a dependency of FIA\_UAU.1, FIA\_UAU.7, FAU\_GEN.2 and FMT\_SMR.1.""

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **7.6** P **34** L **1** # **15**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

In PP-A Table 19 for the O.USER.AUTHORIZED & O.ADMIN.AUTHORIZED row, in keeping with the conventions used in this document users should be capitalized in the 'Description' column because it refers to a type of entity.  
 The same comment applies to the corresponding row in subclause 8.6, Table 35, page 54, line 1; subclause 9.6, page 74, line 2; subclause 10.6, page 95, line 1; subclause 11.6, page 116, line 1 and subclause 12.6, page 135, line 1.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the 'Description' for the O.USER.AUTHORIZED & O.ADMIN.AUTHORIZED row read ""Authorization of Users and Administrators to use the TOE"" in all the subclauses indicated above.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **8.6** P **53** L **6** # **90**  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

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

There's a space missing between Table 34 and ""and""

*SuggestedRemedy*

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **8.6** P **53** L **9** # **87**  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

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

For some reason, the first column header for all of the SFR tables seems to overwrite the second line of the table. While probably just a Word to PDF transformation problem, it still needs to be fixed.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Don't merge the cells in the first two rows of the first column

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **9.1.1** P **56** L **8** # **88**  
 Thrasher, Jerry Lexmark International I

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

There are numerous instances of the use of e.g. without the period. (five on this page alone)

*SuggestedRemedy*

fix throughout

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **9.5.2** P **65** L **17** # **17**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The PP Application Note on this line in PP-A references FAU\_STG.1; it should reference FAU\_SAR.2 instead. This comment also applies to PP-A, subclause 13.5.2, page 147, line 14

*SuggestedRemedy*

Revise this PP Application Note to read ""FAU\_SAR.2 is a requirement which fulfills O.AUDIT.LOGGED"" in the subclauses listed above.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **PP-A** SC **9.5.2** P **66** L **8** # **18**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The PP Application Note on this line references FAU\_STG.1; it should reference FAU\_STG.4 instead. Also the security objective listed in this note is misspelled.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Revise this PP Application Note to read ""FAU\_STG.4 is a requirement which fulfills O.AUDIT.LOGGED"" in the subclause noted above.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **9.5.7** P **71** L **12** # **40**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

FIA\_UID.1 is listed in Table 49 as one of the SFRs for which FMT\_SMF.1 provides management recommendations. However, FIA\_UID.1 is not included in the associated PP Application Note on line 12.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the PP Application Note to read ""FMT\_SMF.1 may perform management recommendations of FAU\_SAR.1, FIA\_UAU.1, FIA\_UID.1, and FPT\_STM.1.""

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **Annex A** P **160** L **23** # **47**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The definition for Compromise in Annex A of each PP does not match the corresponding definition of Compromise in P2600 standard, Rev D33a, subclause 2.2.16.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Make the definition of Compromise in Annex A for all PPs match the corresponding definition in P2600 standard, Rev D33a, subclause 2.2.16.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **Annex A** P **160** L **32** # **45**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The definition for Hardcopy Device in Annex A of each PP does not match the corresponding definition of Hardcopy Device in P2600 standard, Rev D33a, subclause 2.1.1.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Make the definition of Hardcopy Device in Annex A for all PPs match the corresponding definition in P2600 standard, Rev D33a, subclause 2.1.1.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **Annex A** P **161** L **26** # **46**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The definition for Operational Environment in Annex A of each PP does not match the corresponding definition of Operational Environment in P2600 standard, Rev D33a, subclause 2.2.46.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Make the definition of Operational Environment in Annex A for all PPs match the corresponding definition in P2600 standard, Rev D33a, subclause 2.2.46.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

Cl **PP-A** SC **Annex A** P **162** L **33** # **48**  
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The definition for User Document Data in Annex A of each PP does not match the corresponding definition of User Document Data in P2600 standard, Rev D33a, subclause 2.2.59.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Make the definition of User Document Data in Annex A for all PPs match the corresponding definition in P2600 standard, Rev D33a, subclause 2.2.59.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

CI **PP-A** SC **Annex A** P **162** L **35** #

Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The definition for User Function Data in Annex A of each PP does not match the corresponding definition of User Function Data in P2600 standard, Rev D33a, subclause 2.2.60.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Make the definition of User Function Data in Annex A for all PPs match the corresponding definition in P2600 standard, Rev D33a, subclause 2.2.60.

Proposed Response Response Status **O**