

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **All P** SC **7.5.2** P L # **3**
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data

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

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 **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

Cl **P2600** SC **5.5** P L # **2**
 Chen, Nancy Oki Data

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

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 **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

Cl **PP-B** SC P L # **1**
 Carmen, Aubry OCE

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

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 2 certification.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

Cl **PP-B** SC **1.1** P **1** L **5** # **9**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

There is a grammatical error in the beginning of line 5 in PP-B - '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 **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **PP-B** SC 1.4.1 P 2 L 2 # 10
 Sukert, Alan Xerox
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 'wholy' is misspelled; it should be 'wholly'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Revise the indicated line to read "...in that row wholly or partially..."
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

Cl **PP-B** SC 1.4.1 P 2 L 7 # 11
 Sukert, Alan Xerox
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 'secodary' is misspelled; it should be 'secondary'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Revise the indicated line to read ""indicates that it performs a secondary fulfillment.""
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

Cl **PP-B** SC 10.2.2 P 79 L 7 # 6
 Sukert, Alan Xerox
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 In PP-B 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 subclause.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

Cl **PP-B** SC 11.1.1 P 97 L 17 # 18
 Sukert, Alan Xerox
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 The PP Application Note on this line has a grammatical error - says ""provided by that or those TOEs..."" and thus doesn't read correctly.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the lines indicated above to read ""...and will use the Channel(s) and interface(s) provided by those TOEs..."
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

Cl **PP-B** SC 12.5.5 P 128 L 32 # 19
 Sukert, Alan Xerox
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 The OBJECTIVE O.DOC.(+OTHERTOE)DELETED.NO_SAL is misspelled in PP-B, subclause 12.5.5, page 128, line 32.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Correct the spelling of OBJECTIVE O.DOC.(+OTHERTOE)DELETED.NO_SAL in the indicated line for PP-B.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

Cl **PP-B** SC 13.1.2 P 137 L 15 # 15
 Sukert, Alan Xerox
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 To be consistent with the rest of the document, the term 'Shared media interfaces' in lines 15 and 16 should be 'Shared-medium interfaces'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 'Shared media interfaces' in subclause 13.1.2, page 137, lines 15 and 16 to 'Shared-medium interfaces'
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **PP-B** SC **13.2.4** P **140** L **5** # **29**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

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 PPs and subclauses indicated above.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

Cl **PP-B** SC **13.3.4** P **142** L **4** # **17**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

In the header for Table 108 the objective O.CONF.(+OTHERTOE)TRANSIT.NO_ALT is misspelled (the ') is missing).

SuggestedRemedy

Correct the spelling of O.CONF.(+OTHERTOE)TRANSIT.NO_ALT in the header for Table 108.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

Cl **PP-B** SC **13.3.4** P **142** L **4** # **28**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

Neither assumption A.USER.TRAINING described in subclause 13.2.4, Table 104, page 140, line 5 nor the objective OE.USER.TRAINED in subclause 13.2.4, Table 107, page 142, line 1 are included in Table 108 - SMI objectives rationale.

SuggestedRemedy

Include assumption A.USER.TRAINING and objective OE.USER.TRAINED in Table 108.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **PP-B** SC **13.6** P **156** L **1** # **30**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The SFRs listed in Table 115 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 114. Table 115 indicates that only the SFRs FMT_MTD.1 and FMT_SMR.1 map to these objectives; Table 114 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 **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

Cl **PP-B** SC **13.6** P **156** L **1** # **22**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

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 **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **PP-B** SC 13.6 P 156 L 1 # 20
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

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 **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

Cl **PP-B** SC 13.6 P 157 L 1 # 21
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

In Table 115, 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 tables indicated above to read ""Authorization of Users to use the TOE"".

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

Cl **PP-B** SC 4 P 3 L 32 # 24
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

Comment Type **G** Comment Status **D**

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-B 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-B, page 3, lines 32 and 33. Make sure the same is done for all other acronyms in PP-B.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

Cl **PP-B** SC 4 P 3 L 46 # 12
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The sentence in line 46 is not grammatically correct.

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 **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

Cl **PP-B** SC 5.2 P 6 L 42 # 13
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The reference to 'Clause 5' in PP-B, 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 **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

Cl **PP-B** SC **5.2** P **7** L **3** # **35**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

PP-B uses the term ""enterprise"" in the definition. I checked ""google"" and there are multiple definitions of the term ""enterprise"", none of which I believe define this term the way we are using it in PP-B.

For that reason we should add a definition of the term ""enterprise"" into PP-B Annex A.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following definition in PP-B Annex A --

Enterprise: A commercial context typically consisting of centrally-managed networks of IT products protected from direct Internet access by firewalls. Enterprise environments generally include medium to large businesses, certain governmental agencies, and organizations requiring managed telecommuting systems and remote offices.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Enterprise: An operational context typically consisting of centrally-managed networks of IT products protected from direct Internet access by firewalls. Enterprise environments generally include medium to large businesses, certain governmental agencies, and organizations requiring managed telecommuting systems and remote offices.

Cl **PP-B** SC **5.3** P **7** L **6** # **23**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

This line 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 lines to read ""In order to create a Common Criteria Protection Profile that can be used...""

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

Cl **PP-B** SC **7.3.4** P **20** L **6** # **25**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

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 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 8 and subclause 13.3.3.1, page 141, line 10.

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 **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

Cl **PP-B** SC **7.3.4** P **20** L **6** # **14**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

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 8 and subclause 13.3.3.1, page 141, line 10.

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 **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

CI **PP-B** SC **7.5.2** P **23** L **18** # **16**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

In PP-B 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 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 112, page 145, line 20.

SuggestedRemedy

The second auditable event in the tables listed above should read something like ""Attempts to reach authenticate failure limit"".

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

CI **PP-B** SC **7.5.6** P **28** L **1** # **26**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

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 followin.; 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 149, line 26.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct this application note to read ""FIA_UAU.1 is a dependency of FIA_AFL.1"" in the indicates subclauses.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

CI **PP-B** SC **7.5.6** P **28** L **16** # **27**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

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 followin: 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 150, line 14.

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 **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

CI **PP-B** SC **7.6** P **34** L **1** # **5**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

In PP-B 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.

PP-B --The same comment applies to the corresponding row in subclause 8.6, Table 35, page 54, line 1; subclause 9.6, Table 51, page 74, line 2; subclause 10.6, Table 67, page 95, line 1; subclause 11.6, Table 83; page 116, line 1 and subclause 12.6, Table 99, page 134, line 2.

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 **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

CI **PP-B** SC **9.5.2** P **65** L **17** # **7**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The PP Application Note on this line references FAU_STG.1; it should reference FAU_SAR.2 instead. This comment also applies to subclause 13.5.2, page 146, line 27

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 **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

CI **PP-B** SC **9.5.2** P **66** L **8** # **8**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

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 **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

CI **PP-B** SC **Annex A** P **159** L **23** # **33**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The definition for Compromise in Annex A 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 match the corresponding definition in P2600 standard, Rev D33a, subclause 2.2.16.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

CI **PP-B** SC **Annex A** P **159** L **32** # **31**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The definition for Hardcopy Device in Annex A 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 match the corresponding definition in P2600 standard, Rev D33a, subclause 2.1.1.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

CI **PP-B** SC **Annex A** P **160** L **26** # **32**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

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 match the corresponding definition in P2600 standard, Rev D33a, subclause 2.2.46.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

CI **PP-B** SC **Annex A** P **161** L **33** # **34**
 Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The definition for User Document Data in Annex A 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 match the corresponding definition in P2600 standard, Rev D33a, subclause 2.2.59.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments

IEEE P2600 Hardcopy Device and System Security comments

CI **PP-B** SC **Annex A** P **161** L **35** # **4**
Sukert, Alan Xerox

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

The definition for User Function Data in Annex A 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 match the corresponding definition in P2600 standard, Rev D33a, subclause 2.2.60.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Dealt with in Dot 1 Comments