

**SEP 09 P2600 MEETING  
PP GUIDE COMMENT RESOLUTIONS**

<b>#</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Line</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
1	1.2	5	37	Remove the word "four"	Sentence revised as suggested.
2	1.2	5	38	Remove "Footnote deleted"	Indicated footnote removed.
3	1.3	6	16	Change "covers" to "applies to"	Sentence revised as suggested.
88	13	98	3	Do we intend to complete this clause?	Clause 13 removed.
89	15	101	2	Do we intend to complete this clause? Items 5 and 7 are duplicates.	Superseded by resolution of Comment #88.
4	2.2	9	3	Add a period at end of sentence	Period added.
5	3.1	11	8	Last sentence in this paragraph is a bit long	Sentence was broken up and reworded.
6	3.3	13	43	Change "is" to "are"	Sentence revised as suggested.
7	4.2.2.1	17	10	"Operations" are not on the diagram as an "entity"	Text changed as per suggested resolution.
8	4.2.2.2	17	19	Change "TSFs" to "TSF"	Changed to read "... one or more TOE security functions".
9	4.2.2.2	18	1	Remove "for the IEEE Std 2600 Series of Protection Profiles"	Indicated text removed.
10	4.2.2.6	19	42	Remove "[11]"	Indicated text removed.
11	5.1	25	4	This introductory paragraph actually introduces Clauses 6 and 7, too.	Added specific introductions to Clauses 5, 6 & 7.
12	5.1	25	5	Remove ", which respectively address Operational Environments A, B, C and D,"	Indicated text removed.
13	5.1	25	20	Change footnote callouts "17" to "15"	Footnote callout changed as indicated.
14	5.2	25	29	Change "what" to "which"	Indicated text revised.
15	5.2	25	40	Where is footnote 16?	Footnote 16 now on page it's referenced.
16	5.2	27	7	This paragraph is confusing û and I don't understand its point.	Deleted indicated text – author couldn't figure out what it meant either.
17	5.3	27	13	Change " for the security problem in one of the four" to " for the security problems identified in the four"	Sentence revised as suggested.
18	5.3	27	14	Change colon to period.	Suggested change made.
19	5.3	28	10	I don't understand the use of the semicolon.	Made this line a complete sentence.
22	5.3	31	36	Remove "and point to".	Indicated text removed.
21	5.3	31	20	"Similarly, the types of HCDs that typically are used in this type of business." is not a sentence.	Indicated text deleted.
20	5.3	31	12	Paragraph formats should be full justification, to be consistent.	Fully justified indicated paragraphs.
23	5.3	33	6	Change "guidelines" to "guideline"	Suggested change made.

**SEP 09 P2600 MEETING  
PP GUIDE  
PROPOSED COMMENT RESOLUTIONS**

<b>#</b>	<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>	<b><u>Line</u></b>	<b><u>Comment</u></b>	<b><u>Resolution</u></b>
24	5.4.1	33	38	Use lower case “e” on “Environment”	Suggested change made.
25	5.4.2	35	1	Change “An additional topic” to “A topic”. (There is no preceding topic, is there?)	Changed to say “Another topic..”.
26	5.4.2	35	2	Change “whether” to “where”.	Suggested change made.
27	5.4.2	35	5	Change to “typically the default case”	Suggested change made.
28	5.4.2	35	7	Remove the period at the end of the bullet	Per IEEE Style Guide, made sure bullets had no “closing punctuation” except for complete sentences.4
29	5.4.2	35	25	Change “was” to “in”.	Suggested change made.
30	6	36	1	Remove “VENDOR USAGE GUIDELINES”	Indicated text removed.
31	6.2.1	37	40	Spell “conformance”	First paragraph in Clause 6.3.1 (was 6.2.1) was revised; revision addressed this comment also.
32	6.2.1	38	2	Remove “first of all”	Indicated text removed.
33	6.2.1.2	38	37	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”?	Changed “must” to “can” iin the indicated text.
34	6.2.1.2	38	47	Change “probably” to “e.g.”	Suggested change made.
35	6.2.1.2	39	10	Change “probably because” to “e.g.”	Suggested change made.
36	6.2.1.3	39	25	Change “it are” to “they are”	Suggested change made.
37	6.2.1.3	39	34	Move footnote callout to line 24 (earlier use of the term)	Footnote callout to suggested line (not 24 any more).
38	6.2.1.3	40	9	Change “Then if” to “If”	Suggested change made.
39	6.2.1.3	40	17	Change “what” to “how” and remove “for”	Suggested change made.
40	6.2.1.3	40	27	Spell “country”.	Corrected misspelling.
41	6.3	40	31	Where is footnote 38?	Changed footnote reference to ‘32’.
42	6.3	40	33	Remove second period.	Second period removed.
43	6.3	41	13	Remove the period.	Period removed.
44	6.3	41	25	Change to “give a potential attacker”	Suggested change made.
45	6.3	41	28	Remove “However”.	Indicated text removed.
46	6.3	42	5	Change “relook at” to “reexamine”.	Suggested change made.
47	6.4	43	1	Change to “summarize”.	Suggested change made.

**SEP 09 P2600 MEETING  
PP GUIDE  
PROPOSED COMMENT RESOLUTIONS**

<b>#</b>	<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>	<b><u>Line</u></b>	<b><u>Comment</u></b>	<b><u>Resolution</u></b>
48	6.4.1	43	15	Include the word "Clause" in the reference.	Document revised to insert 'Clause' when referencing 1 <sup>st</sup> level paragraphs, but not insert clause when referencing 2 <sup>nd</sup> level paragraphs or higher.
49	6.4.1	43	24	Remove "clear". (If it was clear, why would we need to explain it?)	Indicated text removed.
50	6.4.1	44	4	Spell "Audit"	Corrected misspelling.
51	6.4.1	44	10	Change to "job initiation events, and..."	Made change as suggested by the commenter.
52	6.5.1	45	6	Change initial "T" to same font size.	Made everything proper font size.
53	6.5.1	45	17	Change "isn't" to "aren't".	Suggested change made.
54	6.5.1	46	15	Change "... then the 'S All requests..." to "then 'All requests"	Suggested change made.
55	6.5.1	46	24	Change to "recommended".	Suggested change made.
56	6.5.1	46	30	Spell "level".	Corrected misspelling.
57	6.5.1	46	31	Should we identify which statement is "applicable"?	Added the applicable statement number.
58	6.5.1.1	46	34	Remove "is".	Indicated text removed.
59	6.5.1.1	48	3	Change "less" to "fewer".	Suggested change made.
60	6.5.1.1	48	4	Remove "have been".	Suggested change made.
61	6.5.3	51	11	Spell "authorize" and snub the British!	Comment rejected – no change necessary.
62	6.5.3.1	51	23	Remove "clear". (If it was clear, why would we need to explain it?)	Indicated text removed.
63	6.5.6	52	37	Remove "Still".	Indicated text removed.
64	6.5.6	52	41	Spell "fulfills".	Corrected misspelling.
65	6.5.6	52	43	Remove "recommended".	Indicated text removed.
66	6.5.6	52	43	Change the hyphen to a period and start a second sentence with "See".	Suggested changes made.
67	6.5.8	54	14	Change to "(which could...)".	Suggested change made.
68	6.5.8	54	15	Spell "secretly".	Corrected misspelling.
70	6.5.8	54	18	Remove closing quotes.	Indicated closing quotes removed.
69	6.5.8	54	18	Change to "if a trusted channel".	Suggested change made.
71	6.7	56	17	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.	Placed the indicated text in a new Clause 6.8.1, General ST Content.

**SEP 09 P2600 MEETING  
PP GUIDE  
PROPOSED COMMENT RESOLUTIONS**

<u>#</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Resolution</u>
72	6.7.3	59	21	Use either "restrictive" or "restricted" consistently. Also in line 28.	Used "restrictive" in the indicated lines.
73	6.7.4	59	34	Change "is:" to "given below."	Suggested change made.
74	6.7.4	59	45	Change "trace" to "map" (for consistency with later usage on page 60, lines 5 and 18.)	Suggested change made.
75	6.8	61	42	Capitalize "Guide".	Suggested capitalization made.
76	6.8	62	7	I don't understand the use of "7 - 6.8.10". Also in lines 15, 18, 27, 31	See resolution of Comment #48.
83	6.8.10	82	3	Should "PP APPLICATION NOTE 114" and "PP APPLICATION NOTE 115 and 116" be in bold?	Implemented agreed resolution – all caps but not bolded – in Clause 6.9 (was Clause 6.8)
77	6.8.2	66	24	Remove "The ST Author should keep this in mind when creating the ST."	Indicated text removed.
78	6.8.2	69	21	Change "principal" to "principle". (Multiple occurrences on page 70 and elsewhere in document.)	Comment rejected – no change necessary.
79	6.8.2	70	36	Remove "here".	Indicated text removed.
80	6.8.6	77	39	Make font size consistent.	Made font size consistent for indicated text.
81	6.8.7	78	3	Which "three" Application Notes above? I see six. Also line 7.	Changed indicated lines to read "PP APPLICATION NOTES 93-96 above...".
82	6.8.8	79	14	Remove "\".	Indicated text removed.
84	6.9	83	1	Is the phrase "is Part 3 extended" meaningful, or just bad grammar?	Proposed change made.
85	6.9	83	8	Remove "only".	Changed indicated sentence to read "...this SAR requires that a procedure...".
86	7	84	1	Remove "VENDOR USAGE GUIDELINES"	Indicated text removed.
87	8.1	88	7	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.)	Removed all the question numbers.
113	---	3	11	The title of Clause 6 is confusing. (is it a Vendor Usage Guideline or an Author Usage Guideline)	Indicated text removed.
114	---	4	11	Title of Clause 7 needs to be changed (should be Customer Usage Guidelines)	Clause 7 title changed as suggested.
115	1.1	5	19	Last part of the sentence should be reworded.	Changed this sentence as suggested by the commenter.

**SEP 09 P2600 MEETING  
PP GUIDE  
PROPOSED COMMENT RESOLUTIONS**

<b>#</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Line</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
117	1.4	7	5	I believe that 2600.2, .3, and .4 will also be trademarked by the IEEE...	Added trademark symbols for 2600.2, 2600.3 & 2600.4.
118	3.1	11	8	The sentence starting at line 8 and ending at line 13 needs rewording and splitting into at least two sentences	See resolution of Comment #5.
119	3.2.1	12	19	remove the S in mitigations....	Indicated text removed.
120	3.2.1.1	12	25	There are three choices in this paragraph.....the work either doesn't work..	Indicated text was removed.
121	4.2.2.6	19	22	I don't believe the bracketed [11] is necessary....the footnote 11 will do..	Same as Comment #10.
122	4.2.3.2	20	15	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....	Sentence revised to use the "reserved" words instead of the "descriptive" words.
123	4.2.5.1	22	21	the (see 9) should be (see Clause 9)	See resolution of Comment #48.
124	5.1	25	20	the footnote indicators in line 20,21,22,24,26, and 28 should be 15 not 17.	Same as Comment #13
125	5.3	33	6	remove the S from "guidelines"	Same as Comment #23
126	5.4.2	35	27	should be "an ST" not "a ST"	Suggested change made.
127	6.2.1	38	12	remove the word "with"	After reviewing the indicated sentence, realized the 'with' actually was needed and couldn't be deleted. To avoid confusion, revised this sentence to read "...combining within a single clause the common SFRs with all of the SFRs in the SFR Packages the TOE must conform to ...".
128	6.3	41	24	reword the sentence at the end of the line...	The sentence in question was reworded into two sentences. See also Comment #44.
129	6.4.1	44	20	remove the word "in" from the sentence	Indicated text removed.
130	6.5.1.1	47	37	This sentence needs work....	Revised the indicated paragraph and added an accompanying footnote.
131	7.2	85	24	the phrase "Effect on Security Requirements" is not aligned with the text in the table.	Alignment fixed.
132	8.1	88	39	Std is on bold in two places.....it shouldn't be	'Std' unbolded in the indicated instances.
133	8.1	89	5	the words "Protection Profiles" should be in bold to match the rest of the question text.	"Protection Profiles" bolded in indicated question.
99	12	97	12	NIAP is doing away with the CIMs	Removed the sentences on page 97, lines 11-15.

**SEP 09 P2600 MEETING  
PP GUIDE  
PROPOSED COMMENT RESOLUTIONS**

<b>#</b>	<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>	<b><u>Line</u></b>	<b><u>Comment</u></b>	<b><u>Resolution</u></b>
102	6.4.1	43	39	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.	Deleted the indicated lines as suggested by the commenter in the suggested resolution.
90	6.4.1	44	4	Typo: "Audi"	Same as Comment #50.
103	6.4.1	44	19	2600.4 does *not* include audit logging requirements.	Deleted the indicated lines (doesn't negate resolution to Comment #3 from the Jul 09 meeting).
91	6.5.1	46	15	Typo: "S All requests"...	Same as Comment #54.
92	6.5.6	53	17	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.	Changed indicated sentence to the suggested rewording.
104	6.5.8	54	1	Doesn't this also apply to 2600.1?	Added IEEE Std 2600.1 to the discussion in Clause 6.6.8 (was 6.5.8) as suggested by the commenter.
93	6.6	55	24	I think the para starting on line 24 is a remnant that was replaced by the para starting on line 28.	Removed indicated lines.
105	6.6	55	33	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.	Commenter still needs to discuss this comment with atsec before it can get resolved.
94	6.8.1	63	6	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.	Add the suggested guidance to PP App Notes 2 & 6. Note that I also fixed an obvious typo in both PP App Notes – was referencing IEEE STD 2600.2 when it should be referencing IEEE Std 2600.4 in both cases.
100	6.8.10	80	42	App note 114 contains a mistake.	Referenced the Errata clause and also added the brief summary of the correct App Note 114 agreed on for Comment #137.
101	6.8.10	82	3	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.	Indicated paragraph has been updated per the commentor's suggested resolution.
112	6.8.10	82	3	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.	See resolution to Comment #101.

**SEP 09 P2600 MEETING  
PP GUIDE  
PROPOSED COMMENT RESOLUTIONS**

<b>#</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Line</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
95	6.8.2	54	32	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?	Comment withdrawn.
106	6.8.2	64	39	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).	Deleted the recommended paragraph.
107	6.8.2	65	17	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).	Replaced existing example with example suggested by the commenter.
96	6.8.2	66	10	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.	Suggested change made.
97	6.8.2	73	35	"central time server" might be confused with Central time (versus Eastern, Mountain, Pacific,...)	Suggested change made.
109	6.8.2	75	32	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,	The references to 6.8.2 Item 2a were removed in all the places identified in the comment. Since the comment didn't indicate the examples were incorrect they were kept in all these instances.
108	6.8.4	75	23	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.	Deleted the recommended lines and the associated example.
98	6.8.7	77	39	Unintended typeface change in the first few words about app note 96	Made sure proper typeface used in indicated text.
110	6.8.7	78	3	"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.	The suggested table rows with the Allowed rules were removed.
111	6.8.8	79	11	The existing rule for D.DOC +DSR Read/Modify U.NORMAL is not correct in this example.	The rule was revised as suggested.
116	1.3	6	3	reword sentence....	Sentence reworded as suggested.
138	1.3	6	15	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.	Added suggested text in Clause 1.3 for Clauses 14 and 15 (now Clauses 13 and 14).

**SEP 09 P2600 MEETING  
PP GUIDE  
PROPOSED COMMENT RESOLUTIONS**

<b>#</b>	<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>	<b><u>Line</u></b>	<b><u>Comment</u></b>	<b><u>Resolution</u></b>
136	1.4	6	25	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.	Comment rejected; no change necessary.
139	14.1	99	12	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.	Suggested changes to 14.1, Item #1 made.
140	15	101	3	There is a missing space between '2600' and 'Series' on this line.	Added missing space in indicated sentence.
134	6.4.1	44	19	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 ôTOE useö and not for either accounting purposes or for monitoring security concerns."	See resolution to Comment #103.
135	6.5.8	54	3	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."	Deleted ""User Data and" from the indicated sentence.
137	6.8.10	81	42	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.	Made the recommended change to the discussion on PP APP Note 114. See also Comment #100.