

19 Apr. 2004

Yusuke OHTA, Ricoh Co., Ltd.

Ricoh's challenge to the CC

Ricoh has three products certified based on ISO/IEC 15408 (identical to the CC Ver.2.1) so far:

- **TrustyCabinet UX V1:**
document management system that can ensure the integrity of documents with digital signature technology, EAL3, in 2001.
- **imagio Neo 350/450 series:**
multi-functional printer (known as Aficio 1035/1045 in USA) that can store users' documents in the HDD and protect them, EAL3, in 2002.
- **DataOverwriteSecurity Unit Type A/B:**
optional kit of the MFP to protect the residual data in the HDD, EAL3, in 2004.

All the products were evaluated and certified in German scheme, i.e. you can see the information of those certifications in the web site of the evaluation/certification body called "TUViT". And "The Common Criteria Project" web site provided the certified product list including Ricoh's certifications, but the site is now under reconstruction.

List in TUViT: <http://www.tuvit.de/XS/ASP/content.020112&zerttyp=1/sprache.EN/SX/>

The CC Project: <http://www.thecommoncriteria.org/>

About the "Secure MFP Protection Profile – Lite"

The "Secure MFP Protection Profile – Lite" describes the one example of the security specification that should be implemented in a near-future MFP. But the almost features might be only my hope. :-)

This PP was written in principle according to the structure defined in the CC. However, because it was not prepared for official PP evaluation but for discussion about MFP security, there are some differences from the CC requirements for a PP. Concretely, this PP dose not include the following aspects that are required in the official evaluation but are considered as unimportant for general discussion:

- justifications that should be described in section 6.1 and 6.2, which demonstrate the consistency among "TOE security environment", "Security objectives" and "IT security requirements",
- rationale for some claims, e.g. minimum strength of function,
- etc.

Please note that this PP is just one example of a MFP and its environment. It might be necessary that some PPs are developed based on several assumed environments, kinds of attackers, and types of assets to be protected. Please note also that the security consideration might be a little old-fashioned as this PP was written in 2002.

For your information, there is a very useful guidance to produce PP and ST, which is draft version of ISO/IEC 15446 "Guide on the production of protection profiles and security targets"

See http://www.ipa.go.jp/security/ccj/documents/27n3374ppstguide_v093.pdf