

Certification Report

BSI-DSZ-CC-0829-V2-2015

for

**Infineon smart card IC (Security Controller) M7820
A11 with optional RSA2048/4096 v1.02.013, EC
v1.02.013, SHA-2 v1.01 and Toolbox v1.02.013
libraries and with specific IC dedicated software**

from

Infineon Technologies AG

BSI - Bundesamt für Sicherheit in der Informationstechnik, Postfach 20 03 63, D-53133 Bonn
Phone +49 (0)228 99 9582-0, Fax +49 (0)228 9582-5477, Infoline +49 (0)228 99 9582-111



Bundesamt
für Sicherheit in der
Informationstechnik

Deutsches IT-Sicherheitszertifikat

erteilt vom Bundesamt für Sicherheit in der Informationstechnik

BSI-DSZ-CC-0829-V2-2015(*)

Infineon smart card IC (Security Controller) M7820 A11 with optional RSA2048/4096 v1.02.013, EC v1.02.013, SHA-2 v1.01 and Toolbox v1.02.013 libraries and with specific IC dedicated software

from Infineon Technologies AG
PP Conformance: Security IC Platform Protection Profile, Version 1.0, 15 June 2007, BSI-CC-PP-0035-2007
Functionality: PP conformant plus product specific extensions
Common Criteria Part 2 extended
Assurance: Common Criteria Part 3 conformant
EAL 5 augmented by ALC_DVS.2 and AVA_VAN.5



SOGIS
Recognition Agreement



The IT Product identified in this certificate has been evaluated at an approved evaluation facility using the Common Methodology for IT Security Evaluation (CEM), Version 3.1 extended by advice of the Certification Body for components beyond EAL 5 and CC Supporting Documents as listed in the Certification Report for conformance to the Common Criteria for IT Security Evaluation (CC), Version 3.1. CC and CEM are also published as ISO/IEC 15408 and ISO/IEC 18045.

(*) This certificate applies only to the specific version and release of the product in its evaluated configuration and in conjunction with the complete Certification Report and Notification. For details on the validity see Certification Report part A chapter 4.

The evaluation has been conducted in accordance with the provisions of the certification scheme of the German Federal Office for Information Security (BSI) and the conclusions of the evaluation facility in the evaluation technical report are consistent with the evidence adduced.

This certificate is not an endorsement of the IT Product by the Federal Office for Information Security or any other organisation that recognises or gives effect to this certificate, and no warranty of the IT Product by the Federal Office for Information Security or any other organisation that recognises or gives effect to this certificate, is either expressed or implied.

Bonn, 3 August 2015
For the Federal Office for Information Security

Bernd Kowalski
Head of Department

L.S.



Bundesamt für Sicherheit in der Informationstechnik

Godesberger Allee 185-189 - D-53175 Bonn - Postfach 20 03 63 - D-53133 Bonn
Phone +49 (0)228 99 9582-0 - Fax +49 (0)228 9582-5477 - Infoline +49 (0)228 99 9582-111

This page is intentionally left blank.

Preliminary Remarks

Under the BSIG¹ Act, the Federal Office for Information Security (BSI) has the task of issuing certificates for information technology products.

Certification of a product is carried out on the instigation of the vendor or a distributor, hereinafter called the sponsor.

A part of the procedure is the technical examination (evaluation) of the product according to the security criteria published by the BSI or generally recognised security criteria.

The evaluation is normally carried out by an evaluation facility recognised by the BSI or by BSI itself.

The result of the certification procedure is the present Certification Report. This report contains among others the certificate (summarised assessment) and the detailed Certification Results.

The Certification Results contain the technical description of the security functionality of the certified product, the details of the evaluation (strength and weaknesses) and instructions for the user.

¹ Act on the Federal Office for Information Security (BSI-Gesetz - BSIG) of 14 August 2009, Bundesgesetzblatt I p. 2821

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| A. Certification..... | 7 |
| 1. Specifications of the Certification Procedure..... | 7 |
| 2. Recognition Agreements..... | 7 |
| 3. Performance of Evaluation and Certification..... | 9 |
| 4. Validity of the Certification Result..... | 9 |
| 5. Publication..... | 10 |
| B. Certification Results..... | 11 |
| 1. Executive Summary..... | 12 |
| 2. Identification of the TOE..... | 14 |
| 3. Security Policy..... | 18 |
| 4. Assumptions and Clarification of Scope..... | 18 |
| 5. Architectural Information..... | 18 |
| 6. Documentation..... | 19 |
| 7. IT Product Testing..... | 19 |
| 8. Evaluated Configuration..... | 20 |
| 9. Results of the Evaluation..... | 21 |
| 10. Obligations and Notes for the Usage of the TOE..... | 24 |
| 11. Security Target..... | 25 |
| 12. Definitions..... | 25 |
| 13. Bibliography..... | 29 |
| C. Excerpts from the Criteria..... | 31 |
| CC Part 1:..... | 31 |
| CC Part 3:..... | 32 |
| D. Annexes..... | 39 |

A. Certification

1. Specifications of the Certification Procedure

The certification body conducts the procedure according to the criteria laid down in the following:

- Act on the Federal Office for Information Security²
- BSI Certification and Approval Ordinance³
- BSI Schedule of Costs⁴
- Special decrees issued by the Bundesministerium des Innern (Federal Ministry of the Interior)
- DIN EN ISO/IEC 17065 standard
- BSI certification: Technical information on the IT security certification, Procedural Description (BSI 7138) [3]
- BSI certification: Requirements regarding the Evaluation Facility (BSI 7125) [3]
- Common Criteria for IT Security Evaluation (CC), Version 3.1⁵ [1] also published as ISO/IEC 15408.
- Common Methodology for IT Security Evaluation (CEM), Version 3.1 [2] also published as ISO/IEC 18045.
- BSI certification: Application Notes and Interpretation of the Scheme (AIS) [4]

2. Recognition Agreements

In order to avoid multiple certification of the same product in different countries a mutual recognition of IT security certificates - as far as such certificates are based on ITSEC or CC - under certain conditions was agreed.

2.1. European Recognition of ITSEC/CC – Certificates (SOGIS-MRA)

The SOGIS-Mutual Recognition Agreement (SOGIS-MRA) Version 3 became effective in April 2010. It defines the recognition of certificates for IT-Products at a basic recognition level and, in addition, at higher recognition levels for IT-Products related to certain SOGIS Technical Domains only.

The basic recognition level includes Common Criteria (CC) Evaluation Assurance Levels EAL 1 to EAL 4 and ITSEC Evaluation Assurance Levels E1 to E3 (basic). For

² Act on the Federal Office for Information Security (BSI-Gesetz - BSIG) of 14 August 2009, Bundesgesetzblatt I p. 2821

³ Ordinance on the Procedure for Issuance of Security Certificates and approval by the Federal Office for Information Security (BSI-Zertifizierungs- und -Anerkennungsverordnung - BSIZertV) of 17 December 2014, Bundesgesetzblatt 2014, part I, no. 61, p. 2231

⁴ Schedule of Cost for Official Procedures of the Bundesamt für Sicherheit in der Informationstechnik (BSI-Kostenverordnung, BSI-KostV) of 03 March 2005, Bundesgesetzblatt I p. 519

⁵ Proclamation of the Bundesministerium des Innern of 12 February 2007 in the Bundesanzeiger dated 23 February 2007, p. 3730

"Smartcards and similar devices" a SOGIS Technical Domain is in place. For "HW Devices with Security Boxes" a SOGIS Technical Domains is in place, too. This Domain is linked to a conformance claim to one of the related SOGIS Recommended Protection Profiles. In addition, certificates issued for Protection Profiles based on Common Criteria are part of the recognition agreement.

As of September 2011 the new agreement has been signed by the national bodies of Austria, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, The Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom. Details on recognition and the history of the agreement can be found at <https://www.bsi.bund.de/zertifizierung>.

The SOGIS-MRA logo printed on the certificate indicates that it is recognised under the terms of this agreement by the nations listed above.

This certificate is recognized under SOGIS-MRA for all assurance components selected.

2.2. International Recognition of CC – Certificates (CCRA)

The international arrangement on the mutual recognition of certificates based on the CC (Common Criteria Recognition Arrangement, CCRA-2014) has been ratified on 08 September 2014. It covers CC certificates based on collaborative Protection Profiles (cPP) (exact use), certificates based on assurance components up to and including EAL 2 or the assurance family Flaw Remediation (ALC_FLR) and certificates for Protection Profiles and for collaborative Protection Profiles (cPP).

The CCRA-2014 replaces the old CCRA signed in May 2000 (CCRA-2000). Certificates based on CCRA-2000, issued before 08 September 2014 are still under recognition according to the rules of CCRA-2000. For on 08 September 2014 ongoing certification procedures and for Assurance Continuity (maintenance and re-certification) of old certificates a transition period on the recognition of certificates according to the rules of CCRA-2000 (i.e. assurance components up to and including EAL 4 or the assurance family Flaw Remediation (ALC_FLR)) is defined until 08 September 2017.

As of September 2014 the signatories of the new CCRA are government representatives from the following nations: Australia, Austria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, and the United States.

The current list of signatory nations and approved certification schemes can be seen on the website: <http://www.commoncriteriaportal.org>.

The Common Criteria Recognition Arrangement logo printed on the certificate indicates that this certification is recognised under the terms of this agreement by the nations listed above.

As this certificate is a re-certification of a certificate issued according to CCRA-2000 this certificate is recognized according to the rules of CCRA-2000, i.e. up to and including CC part 3 EAL 4 components. The evaluation contained the components ALC_DVS.2, AVA_VAN.5, ADV_FSP.5, ADV_INT.2, ADV_TDS.4, ALC_CMS.5, ALC_TAT.2 and ATE_DPT.3 that are not mutually recognised in accordance with the provisions of the CCRA-2000, for mutual recognition the EAL 4 components of these assurance families are relevant.

3. Performance of Evaluation and Certification

The certification body monitors each individual evaluation to ensure a uniform procedure, a uniform interpretation of the criteria and uniform ratings.

The product Infineon smart card IC (Security Controller) M7820 A11 with optional RSA2048/4096 v1.02.013, EC v1.02.013, SHA-2 v1.01 and Toolbox v1.02.013 libraries and with specific IC dedicated software has undergone the certification procedure at BSI. This is a re-certification based on BSI-DSZ-CC-0829-2012. Specific results from the evaluation process BSI-DSZ-CC-0829-2012 were re-used.

The evaluation of the product Infineon smart card IC (Security Controller) M7820 A11 with optional RSA2048/4096 v1.02.013, EC v1.02.013, SHA-2 v1.01 and Toolbox v1.02.013 libraries and with specific IC dedicated software was conducted by TÜV Informationstechnik GmbH. The evaluation was completed on 23 July 2015. TÜV Informationstechnik GmbH is an evaluation facility (ITSEF)⁶ recognised by the certification body of BSI.

For this certification procedure the sponsor and applicant is: Infineon Technologies AG.

The product was developed by: Infineon Technologies AG.

The certification is concluded with the comparability check and the production of this Certification Report. This work was completed by the BSI.

4. Validity of the Certification Result

This Certification Report only applies to the version of the product as indicated. The confirmed assurance package is only valid on the condition that

- all stipulations regarding generation, configuration and operation, as given in the following report, are observed,
- the product is operated in the environment described, as specified in the following report and in the Security Target.

For the meaning of the assurance levels please refer to the excerpts from the criteria at the end of the Certification Report.

The Certificate issued confirms the assurance of the product claimed in the Security Target at the date of certification. As attack methods evolve over time, the resistance of the certified version of the product against new attack methods needs to be re-assessed. Therefore, the sponsor should apply for the certified product being monitored within the assurance continuity program of the BSI Certification Scheme (e.g. by a re-certification). Specifically, if results of the certification are used in subsequent evaluation and certification procedures, in a system integration process or if a user's risk management needs regularly updated results, it is recommended to perform a re-assessment on a regular e.g. annual basis.

In order to avoid an indefinite usage of the certificate when evolved attack methods require a re-assessment of the products resistance to state of the art attack methods, the maximum validity of the certificate has been limited. The certificate issued on 3 August 2015 is valid until 2 August 2020. The validity date can be extended by re-certification.

The owner of the certificate is obliged:

⁶ Information Technology Security Evaluation Facility

1. when advertising the certificate or the fact of the product's certification, to refer to the Certification Report as well as to provide the Certification Report and the Security Target and user guidance documentation mentioned herein to any applicant of the product for the application and usage of the certified product,
2. to inform the Certification Body at BSI immediately about vulnerabilities of the product that have been identified by the developer or any third party after issuance of the certificate,
3. to inform the Certification Body at BSI immediately in the case that security relevant changes in the product's evaluated life cycle, e.g. related to development and production sites or processes, occur or the confidentiality of documentation and information related to the Target of Evaluation (TOE) or resulting from the evaluation and certification procedure is not given any longer. In particular, prior to the dissemination of confidential documentation and information related to the TOE or resulting from the evaluation and certification procedure that do not belong to the product deliverables according to the Certification Report part B chapter 2 to third parties, permission of the Certification Body at BSI has to be obtained.

In case of changes to the certified version of the product, the validity can be extended to the new versions and releases, provided the sponsor applies for assurance continuity (i.e. re-certification or maintenance) of the modified product, in accordance with the procedural requirements, and the evaluation does not reveal any security deficiencies.

5. Publication

The product Infineon smart card IC (Security Controller) M7820 A11 with optional RSA2048/4096 v1.02.013, EC v1.02.013, SHA-2 v1.01 and Toolbox v1.02.013 libraries and with specific IC dedicated software has been included in the BSI list of certified products, which is published regularly (see also Internet: <https://www.bsi.bund.de> and [5]). Further information can be obtained from BSI-Infoline +49 228 9582-111.

Further copies of this Certification Report can be requested from the developer⁷ of the product. The Certification Report may also be obtained in electronic form at the internet address stated above.

⁷ Infineon Technologies AG
Am Campeon 1-12
85579 Neubiberg

B. Certification Results

The following results represent a summary of

- the Security Target of the sponsor for the Target of Evaluation,
- the relevant evaluation results from the evaluation facility, and
- complementary notes and stipulations of the certification body.

1. Executive Summary

The Target of Evaluation (TOE) is **Infineon smart card IC (Security Controller) M7820 A11 with optional RSA2048/4096 v1.02.013, EC v1.02.013, SHA-2 v1.01 and Toolbox v1.02.013 libraries and with specific IC dedicated software.**

The TOE provides a real 16-bit CPU-architecture. The major components of the core system are the two CPUs (Central Processing Units), the MMU (Memory Management Unit) and MED (Memory Encryption/Decryption Unit). The two CPUs control each other in order to detect faults and serve by this for data integrity. The TOE implements a full 16 MByte linear addressable memory space for each privilege level, a simple scalable Memory Management concept and a scalable stack size. The flexible memory concept consists of ROM- and Flash-memory as part of the non volatile memory (NVM), respectively Infineon® SOLID FLASH⁸.

The co-processor block contains the processors for RSA/EC and DES/AES processing, while the peripheral block contains the random number generation and the external interfaces service. The peripheral block contains also the timers and a watchdog. All data of the memory block is encrypted and all memory types are equipped with an error detection code (EDC), the Infineon® SOLID FLASH™ in addition with an error correction code (ECC). The security modules serve for operation within the specified range and manage the alarms.

The RMS library providing some functionality via an API to the Smartcard Embedded Software contains for example Infineon® SOLID FLASH™ service routines. The Service Algorithm provides functionality for the tearing save write into the Infineon® SOLID FLASH™. The STS firmware is used for test purposes during start-up and the Flash Loader allows downloading user software to the NVM during the manufacturing process. The STS is implemented in a separated Test-ROM being part of the TOE.

This dual interface controller is able to communicate using either the contact based or the contactless interface. The implemented dual interface provides a maximum flexibility in using following communication protocols respectively methods:

This dual interface controller is able to communicate using either the contact based or the contactless interface. The implemented dual interface provides a maximum flexibility in using following communication protocols respectively methods:

- ISO 7816,
- ISO 14443 Type A,
- ISO14443 Type B,
- ISO/IEC 18092 passive mode,
- Mifare compatible Interface or,
- The digital Contactless Bridge mode (DCLB),
- Advance Communication Mode (ACM).

The DCLB mode is provided by the specific TOE derivatives as listed in Table 4 and enables the use of an external analogue interface or near field communication (NFC) modem via the ISO-pads. Those external analogue modems are typically deemed for

⁸ SOLID FLASH™ is an Infineon Trade Mark and stands for Flash EEPROM technology.

applications running in mobile devices and are not part of this TOE. In case of the available DCLB mode, the part of the contactless interface using the external antenna is out of operation. Whether the DCLB option is available or not is a configuration applied in TOE production which can not be changed afterwards.

The availability of the DCLB mode is configured during TOE production and depends on the customer order. Regarding the DCLB enabled derivatives it depends on the operating system of how the pads are used. The block diagram of the TOE is shown in [6], Figure 1. For more details please refer to [6, chapter 2.1).

This TOE is intended to be used in smart cards or any other form factor for particularly security relevant applications and for its previous use as developing platform for smart card operating systems or similar according to the life cycle model from [7]. The term Smartcard Embedded Software is used in the following for all operating systems and applications stored and executed on the TOE. The TOE is the platform for the Smartcard Embedded Software. The Smartcard Embedded Software itself is not part of the TOE.

All products based on the M7820 representing this TOE are identically from hardware perspective and produced with the same masks. The first metal mask (called M1 mask) contains the derivative specific information (e.g. development code, first digit of the design step and i.e. ROM mask data). Depending on the blocking configuration an M7820 product can have different user available memory sizes and can come with or without individual accessible cryptographic co-processors. For example a product with the M-number M7820 in the field can come in one project with the fully available Infineon® SOLID FLASH™ or in another project with equal or any other Infineon® SOLID FLASH™-size below the physical implementation size, depending on the user requirements. And more, the user is free to choose prior to production, whether he needs the symmetric co-processor SCP, or the asymmetric co-processor Crypto2304T, or both, or none of them. In addition, the user is also free to choose whether the TOE comes with a free combination of delivered cryptographic libraries or without any.

The entire configuration is done during the manufacturing process of the TOE according to the choice of the user. All differences between the products of this TOE are realized by means of blocking without changing the hardware. Therefore, all products of this TOE are equal from hardware perspective.

The blocking of the Infineon® SOLID FLASH™ is done by setting the according value in the chip configuration page, which is not available to the user. The same means of blocking are also used for switching on and off the accessibility of the cryptographic co-processors SCP and/or Crypto2304T and also for the configuration of the XRAM- and ROM-sizes.

The memory settings are done during the production process by programming the physical start and end-address of the user available memory areas. The entire configuration page including also the other blocking information can not be changed by the user afterwards and is protected against manipulation. For more details please refer to the Security Target [6], chapter 1.

This TOE is equipped with Flash Loader Software (FL) to allow the download of user software, i.e. the operating system and applications. Various options can be chosen by the user to implement his software during production. For more details please refer to the Security Target [6], chapter 1.

The Security Target [6] is the basis for this certification. It is based on the certified Protection Profile Security IC Platform Protection Profile, Version 1.0, 15 June 2007, BSI-CC-PP-0035-2007 [7].

The TOE Security Assurance Requirements (SAR) are based entirely on the assurance components defined in Part 3 of the Common Criteria (see part C or [1], Part 3 for details). The TOE meets the assurance requirements of the Evaluation Assurance Level EAL 5 augmented by ALC_DVS.2 and AVA_VAN.5.

The TOE Security Functional Requirements (SFR) relevant for the TOE are outlined in the Security Target [6], chapter 7. They are selected from Common Criteria Part 2 and some of them are newly defined. Thus the TOE is CC Part 2 extended.

The TOE Security Functional Requirements are implemented by the following TOE Security Functionality:

| TOE Security Features | Addressed issue |
|-----------------------|---|
| SF_DPM | Device Phase Management |
| SF_PS | Protection against Snooping |
| SF_PMA | Protection against Modification Attacks |
| SF_PLA | Protection against Logical Attacks |
| SF_CS | Cryptographic Support |

Table 1: TOE Security Functionalities

For more details please refer to the Security Target [6], chapter 8.

The assets to be protected by the TOE are defined in the Security Target [6], chapter 4.1.2. Based on these assets the TOE Security Environment is defined in terms of Assumptions, Threats and Organisational Security Policies. This is outlined in the Security Target [6], chapter 4.2.

This certification covers the configurations of the TOE as outlined in chapter 8.

The vulnerability assessment results as stated within this certificate do not include a rating for those cryptographic algorithms and their implementation suitable for encryption and decryption (see BSIG Section 9, Para. 4, Clause 2).

The certification results only apply to the version of the product indicated in the certificate and on the condition that all the stipulations are kept as detailed in this Certification Report. This certificate is not an endorsement of the IT product by the Federal Office for Information Security (BSI) or any other organisation that recognises or gives effect to this certificate, and no warranty of the IT product by BSI or any other organisation that recognises or gives effect to this certificate, is either expressed or implied.

2. Identification of the TOE

The Target of Evaluation (TOE) is called:

Infineon smart card IC (Security Controller) M7820 A11 with optional RSA2048/4096 v1.02.013, EC v1.02.013, SHA-2 v1.01 and Toolbox v1.02.013 libraries and with specific IC dedicated software

The following table outlines the TOE deliverables:

| No | Type | Identifier | Release | Form of delivery |
|----|------------------|---|--|---|
| 1 | HW | M7820 Smart Card IC | A11 (produced in Dresden) | Complete module, package, with or without inlay antenna mounting, in form of plain wafers, in an IC case or in bare dies. |
| 2 | FW | Flash Loader | V3.60.009 and FL patch version V3.61.006 | Stored in reserved area of User ROM on the IC (patch in NVM) |
| 3 | FW | STS Self Test Software (the IC Dedicated Test Software) | V78.01.09.09 and STS patch version V800B | Stored in Test ROM on the IC (patch in NVM) |
| 4 | FW | RMS Resource Management System (the IC Dedicated Support Software) | V8000B001B and overall patch 80 47 | Stored in reserved area of User ROM on the IC (patch in NVM) |
| 5 | FW | SAM library | V20.22 and overall patch 80 47 | Stored in reserved area of User ROM on the IC (patch in NVM) |
| 6 | SW ⁹ | ROM code (including Embedded Software and crypto libraries) | – | Stored in User ROM on the IC |
| 7 | SW ¹⁰ | NVM image (including Embedded Software and crypto libraries) | – | Stored in Flash memory on the IC |
| 8 | SW | RSA library (optional) | RSA2048 v1.02.013 RSA4096 v1.02.013 | Object code in electronic form |
| 9 | SW | EC library (optional) | EC v1.02.013 | Object code in electronic form |
| 10 | SW | SHA-2 library (optional) | SHA-2v1.01 | Object code in electronic form |
| 11 | SW | Toolbox (optional) | Toolbox v1.02.013 | Object code in electronic form |
| 12 | DOC | SLx 70 Family Hardware Reference Manual | 2010-11-18 | Hardcopy or pdf-file |
| 13 | DOC | M7801 / M7820 Controller Family for Security Applications Errata Sheet | 2013-04-17 | Hardcopy or pdf-file |
| 14 | DOC | M7820 Controller Family for Security Application Security Guidelines | 2015-06-19 | Hardcopy or pdf-file |
| 15 | DOC | SLE 70 Family Programmer's Reference User's Manual | 2012-03-19 | Hardcopy and pdf-file |
| 16 | DOC | SLE70 Asymmetric Crypto Library for Crypto@2304T RSA / ECC / Toolbox (1.02.013) | 2011-06-07 | Hardcopy and pdf-file |
| 17 | DOC | Crypto@2304T User Manual | 2010-03-23 | Hardcopy and pdf-file |

⁹ Only in case the IC Embedded Software Developer provides Infineon with code for ROM.

¹⁰ Only in case the IC Embedded Software Developer provides Infineon with code for Flash memory.

| No | Type | Identifier | Release | Form of delivery |
|----|------|---|------------|-----------------------|
| 18 | DOC | SLx70 Family Secure Hash Algorithm SHA-2 (SHA 256/224, SHA 512/384) Library Version V1.01 | 2009-11 | Hardcopy and pdf-file |
| 19 | DOC | SLx 70 Family Production and Personalization User's Manual | 2012-06-27 | Hardcopy and pdf-file |

Table 2: Deliverables of the TOE

A processing step during production testing incorporates the chip-individual features into the hardware of the TOE. The hardware part of the TOE is identified by M7820 A11 (design step A11: produced in Dresden/Germany).

In the field, the IC Embedded Software Developer can clearly identify a product in question by the ChipIdent function and the user guidance, whereas an additional RMS function provides the complete chip configuration. Thereby, the exact and clear identification of anyproduct with its exact configuration of this TOE is given. All Chip Types included in this evaluation are listed in the table 4.

Different Chip Type codes exist for different design versions (e.g. M7820 A11). The chip type, version number and the fabrication facility are coded in the chip identification data as follows [12], chapter 8.16.1.3.

The TOE consists of the hardware part, the firmware parts and the software parts. The software parts are differentiated into: the cryptographic libraries RSA, EC and SHA-2 and the supporting libraries Toolbox and Base. RSA, EC, SHA-2 and Toolbox provide certain functionality via an API to the Smartcard Embedded Software. The Base Library is only used internally by the RSA, EC and Toolbox libraries and has no user interface. If none the three libraries RSA, EC and Toolbox is delivered, also the Base Library is not on board. The SHA-2 library does not use the Base Library.

The firmware parts are the RMS library, the Service Algorithm Minimal (SAM), the STS firmware for test purpose, providing some functionality via an API to the Smartcard Embedded Software, the Flash Loader for downloading user software to the NVM and the Mifare compatible software interface. The STS is implemented in a separated Test-ROM being part of the TOE.

The Smartcard Embedded Software, i.e. the operating system and applications are not part of the TOE.

The RSA library is used to provide a high level interface to RSA (Rivest, Shamir, Adleman) cryptography implemented on the hardware component Crypto2304T and includes countermeasures against SPA, DPA and DFA attacks. The hardware Crypto2304T unit provides the basic long number calculations (add, subtract, multiply, square with 1100 bit numbers) with high performance. The RSA library is delivered as object code and in this way integrated in the user software.

| Type | Name | Version number / patch |
|----------|---|---|
| Firmware | Flash loader | V3.60.009 |
| | Flash loader patch | V3.61.006 |
| | RMS | V8000 B001B |
| | SAM | V20.22 |
| | Overall patch version (includes patches for SAM, RMS and Mifare ¹¹ compatible) | 80 47 |
| | STS | V78.01.09.09 |
| | STS patch | V800B |
| Software | RSA crypto library (optional) | RSA2048 v1.02.013 RSA4096 v1.02.013 |
| | EC library (optional) | EC v1.02.013 |
| | SHA-2 library (optional) | SHA-2 v1.01 |
| | Toolbox (optional) | Toolbox v1.02.013 |

Table 3: TOE Identification (Firmware and software parts)

The EC library is used to provide a high level interface to Elliptic Curve cryptography implemented on the hardware component Crypto2304T and includes countermeasures against SPA, DPA and DFA attacks.

The SHA-library provides the calculation of a hash value of freely chosen data input in the CPU. The SHA-library is delivered as object code and is in this way available for the user software. This secure hash-algorithm SHA-2 is intended to be used for signature generation, verification and generic data integrity checks.

The toolbox library does not provide cryptographic support or additional security functionality as it provides only the following basic long integer arithmetic and modular functions in software, supported by the cryptographic coprocessor: Addition, subtraction, division, multiplication, comparison, reduction, modular addition, modular subtraction, modular multiplication, modular inversion and modular exponentiation. No security relevant policy, mechanism or function is supported. The toolbox library is deemed for software developers as support for simplified implementation of long integer and modular arithmetic operations.

The Base Library provides the low level interface to the asymmetric cryptographic coprocessor and has no user available interface. The base library does not provide any security functionality, implements no security mechanism, and does not provide additional specific security functionality.

The cryptographic libraries RSA, EC, SHA-2 and the Toolbox library are delivery options. If one of the libraries RSA, EC and Toolbox or combination hereof are delivered, the Base Library is automatically part of it. The TOE may come with free combinations of or even without these libraries. In the case of coming without one or any combination of the cryptographic libraries RSA, EC and SHA-2, the TOE does not provide the Additional Specific Security Functionality Rivest-Shamir-Adleman Cryptography (RSA) and/or Elliptic Curve Cryptography (EC) and/or SHA-2. The Toolbox and Base Library are no cryptographic libraries and provide no additional specific security functionality. For more details please refer to [6], chapter 2.2.2.

¹¹ Note that Mifare compatible is part of the RMS and mentioned here only for sake of consistency with [12].

3. Security Policy

The Security Policy is expressed by the set of Security Functional Requirements and implemented by the TOE.

The Security Policy of the TOE is to provide basic security functionalities to be used by the smart card operating system and the smart card application thus providing an overall smart card system security. Therefore, the TOE will implement a symmetric cryptographic block cipher algorithm (Triple-DES and AES) to ensure the confidentiality of plain text data by encryption and to support secure authentication protocols and it will provide a True Random Number Generator (TRNG).

The RSA Library is used to provide a high level interface to RSA (Rivest, Shamir, Adleman) cryptography implemented on the hardware component Crypto2304T and includes countermeasures against SPA, DPA and DFA attacks. The EC Library is used to provide a high level interface to Elliptic Curve cryptography implemented on the hardware component Crypto2304T and includes countermeasures against SPA, DPA and DFA attacks.

As the TOE is a hardware security platform, the security policy of the TOE is also to provide protection against leakage of information (e.g. to ensure the confidentiality of cryptographic keys during AES, Triple-DES, RSA and EC cryptographic functions performed by the TOE), against physical probing, against malfunctions, against physical manipulations and against abuse of functionality. Hence the TOE shall

- maintain the integrity and the confidentiality of data stored in the memory of the TOE and
- maintain the integrity, the correct operation and the confidentiality of security functionalities (security mechanisms and associated functions) provided by the TOE.

4. Assumptions and Clarification of Scope

The Assumptions defined in the Security Target and some aspects of Threats and Organisational Security Policies are not covered by the TOE itself. These aspects lead to specific security objectives to be fulfilled by the TOE-Environment. The following topics are of relevance: protection during packaging, finishing and personalization, usage of hardware platform and treatment of user data. Details can be found in the Security Target [6], chapter 4.3.

5. Architectural Information

The TOE is an integrated circuits (IC) providing a platform to a smart card operating system and smart card application software. A top level block diagram and a list of subsystems can be found within the TOE description of the Security Target [6], chapter 2.1.

The TOE provides a real 16-bit CPU-architecture. The major components of the core system are the two CPUs (Central Processing Units), the MMU (Memory Management Unit) and MED (Memory Encryption/Decryption Unit). The two CPUs control each other in order to detect faults and serve by this for data integrity. The TOE implements a full 16 MByte linear addressable memory space for each privilege level, a simple scalable Memory Management concept and a scalable stack size. The flexible memory concept

consists of ROM- and Flash-memory as part of the non volatile memory (NVM), respectively Infineon® SOLID FLASH™.

The two cryptographic co-processors serve the need of modern cryptography: The symmetric co-processor (SCP) combines both AES and Triple-DES with dual-key or triple-key hardware acceleration. The Asymmetric Crypto Co-processor, called Crypto2304T in the following, is an optimized version of the Crypto@1408 used in the SLE88-family with performance improvements for RSA-2048 bit (4096-bit with CRT) and Elliptic Curve (EC) cryptography.

The software part of the TOE consists of the cryptographic RSA-, EC- and the SHA-2 libraries and the supporting Toolbox and Base libraries. If RSA or EC or Toolbox or combinations hereof are part of the shipment, automatically the Base Library is included.

For more details please refer to the Security Target [6], chapter 1.2 and 2.2.2.

6. Documentation

The evaluated documentation as outlined in table 2 is being provided with the product to the customer. This documentation contains the required information for secure usage of the TOE in accordance with the Security Target.

Additional obligations and notes for secure usage of the TOE as outlined in chapter 10 of this report have to be followed.

7. IT Product Testing

The tests performed by the developer were divided into six categories:

1. Technology development tests as the earliest tests to check the technology against the specification and to get the technology parameters used in simulations of the circuitry (this testing is not strictly related to Security Functionalities);
2. Tests which are performed in a simulation environment with different tools for the analogue circuitries and for the digital parts of the TOE;
3. Regression tests of the hardware within a simulation environment based on special software dedicated only for the regression tests;
4. Regression tests which are performed for the IC Dedicated Test Software and for the IC Dedicated Support Software on emulator versions of the TOE and within a software simulation of chip in special hardware;
5. Characterisation and verification tests to release the TOE to production:
 - a) used to determine the behaviour of the chip with respect to different operating conditions and varied process parameters (often also referred to as characterisation tests);
 - b) special verification tests for Security Functionalities which were done with samples of the TOE (referred also as developers security evaluation) and which include also layout tests by automatic means and optical control, in order to verify statements concerning the layout;
6. Functional production tests, which are done for every chip to check its correct functionality as a last step of the production process (phase 3).

The developer tests cover all security functionalities and all security mechanisms as identified in the functional specification.

The evaluators were able to repeat the tests of the developer either using the library of programs, tools and prepared chip samples delivered to the evaluator or at the developers site. They performed independent tests to supplement, augment and to verify the tests performed by the developer. The tests of the developer were repeated by sampling, by repetition of complete regression tests and by software routines developed by the evaluators and computed on samples with an evaluation operating system. For the developer tests repeated by the evaluators other test parameters were used and the test equipment was varied. Security features of the TOE realised by specific design and layout measures were checked by the evaluators during layout inspections both in design data and on the final product.

The evaluation has shown that the actual version of the TOE provides the security functionalities as specified by the developer. The test results confirm the correct implementation of the TOE security functionalities.

For penetration testing the evaluators took all security functionalities into consideration. Intensive penetration testing was planned based on the analysis results and performed for the underlying mechanisms of security functionalities using bespoke equipment and expert know how. The penetration tests considered both the physical tampering of the TOE and attacks which do not modify the TOE physically. The penetration tests results confirm that the TOE is resistant to attackers with high attack potential in the intended environment for the TOE.

8. Evaluated Configuration

This certification covers the following configurations of the TOE:

- Smartcard IC M7820 A11

Depending on the blocking configuration an M7820 product can have different user available memory sizes and can come with or without individual accessible cryptographic co-processors. For example a product with the M-number M7820 in the field can come in one project with the fully available Infineon® SOLID FLASH™ or in another project with equal or any other Infineon® SOLID FLASH™-size below the physical implementation size, depending on the user requirements. And more, the user is free to choice prior to production, whether he needs the symmetric co-processor SCP, or the asymmetric co-processor Crypto2304T, or both, or none of them. In addition, the user is also free to choice whether the TOE comes with a free combination of delivered cryptographic libraries or without any. The in the table 4 listed Chip Identifier Bytes show the TOE derivates with the belonging configuration. The product code of the TOE is M7820 A11 and produced in Dresden/Germany.

| Sales Name | Chip Identification Byte |
|----------------|--------------------------|
| SLE78CLX1440P | A0h |
| SLE78CLX1440PM | A2h |
| SLE78CLX1440PS | A3h |
| SLE78CLX1600P | A4h |
| SLE78CLX1600PM | A5h |

| Sales Name | Chip Identification Byte |
|------------------|--------------------------|
| SLE78CLX1600PS | A6h |
| SLE78CLX1280P | A7h |
| SLE78CLX1000P | A8h |
| SLE78CLX800P | A9h |
| SLE78CLX800PS | AAh |
| SLE78CLX800PM | ABh |
| SLE78CLX802P | ACh |
| SLE78CLX802PM | ADh |
| SLE78CLX780P | A Eh |
| SLE78CLX480P | AFh |
| SLE78CLX480PM | B0h |
| SLE78CLX360P | B1h |
| SLE78CLX360PM | B2h |
| SLE78CLX360PS | B3h |
| SLE78CDX1440PMS | 9Bh |
| SLE97144SE | 9Ch |
| SLE97080SE | 95h |
| SLE97144SD | 96h |
| SLE97080SD | 97h |
| SLE78CLFX1600P | 98h |
| SLE78CLFX1600PM | 99h |
| SLE78CLFX1600PSM | 9Ah |

Table 4: TOE Identification

The entire configuration is done during the manufacturing process of the TOE according to the choice of the user. All differences between the products of this TOE are realized by means of blocking without changing the hardware. Therefore, all products of this TOE are equal from hardware perspective. For more details please refer to [6], chapter 1.1.

9. Results of the Evaluation

9.1. CC specific results

The Evaluation Technical Report (ETR) [9] was provided by the ITSEF according to the Common Criteria [1], the Methodology [2], the requirements of the Scheme [3] and all interpretations and guidelines of the Scheme (AIS) [4] as relevant for the TOE.

The Evaluation Methodology CEM [2] was used for those components up to EAL4 extended by advice of the Certification Body for components beyond EAL 4 and guidance specific for the technology of the product [4] (AIS 34).

The following guidance specific for the technology was used:

- The Application of CC to Integrated Circuits

- The Application of Attack Potential to Smartcards
- Functionality classes and evaluation methodology of physical random number generators
(see [4], AIS 25, AIS 26, AIS 31).

To support composite evaluations according to AIS 36 the document ETR for composite evaluation [9] was provided and approved. This document provides details of this platform evaluation that have to be considered in the course of a composite evaluation on top.

The assurance refinements outlined in the Security Target were followed in the course of the evaluation of the TOE.

As a result of the evaluation the verdict PASS is confirmed for the following assurance components:

- All components of the EAL 5 package including the class ASE as defined in the CC (see also part C of this report)
- The components ALC_DVS.2 and AVA_VAN.5 augmented for this TOE evaluation.

As the evaluation work performed for this certification procedure was carried out as a re-evaluation based on the certificate BSI-DSZ-CC-0829-2012, re-use of specific evaluation tasks was possible. The changes are related to Security Guidelines.

The evaluation has confirmed:

- PP Conformance: Security IC Platform Protection Profile, Version 1.0, 15 June 2007, BSI-CC-PP-0035-2007 [7],
- for the Functionality: PP conformant plus product specific extensions
Common Criteria Part 2 extended,
- for the Assurance: Common Criteria Part 3 conformant
EAL 5 augmented by ALC_DVS.2 and AVA_VAN.5.

For specific evaluation results regarding the development and production environment see annex B in part D of this report.

The results of the evaluation are only applicable to the TOE as defined in chapter 2 and the configuration as outlined in chapter 8 above.

9.2. Results of cryptographic assessment

The strength of the cryptographic algorithms was not rated in the course of this certification procedure (see BSIG Section 9, Para. 4, Clause 2). But Cryptographic Functionalities with a security level of lower than 100 bits can no longer be regarded as secure without considering the application context. Therefore, for these functionalities it shall be checked whether the related crypto operations are appropriate for the intended system. Some further hints and guidelines can be derived from the 'Technische Richtlinie BSI TR-02102' (<https://www.bsi.bund.de>).

Any Cryptographic Functionality that is marked in column '*Security Level above 100 Bits*' of the following table with '*no*' achieves a security level of lower than 100 Bits (in general context).

| Purpose | Cryptographic Mechanism | Standard of Implementation | Key Size in Bits | Security Level above 100 Bits |
|-------------------------|--|----------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Key Agreement | ECDH | [ANS X9.63] | Key sizes corresponding to the used elliptic curves P-192, K-163 [FIPS186-4] and brainpoolP{160, 192}r1, brainpoolP{160, 192}t1 [RFC5639] | No |
| | ECDH | [ANS X9.63] | Key sizes corresponding to the used elliptic curves P-{224, 256, 384, 521}, K-{233, 409}, B-{233, 283, 409} [FIPS186-4], brainpoolP{224,256,320,384,512}r1, brainpoolP{224,256,320,384,512}t1 [RFC5639] | Yes |
| Cryptographic Primitive | TDES | [NIST SP800-67] | k = 112 | No |
| | TDES | [NIST SP800-67] | k = 168 | Yes |
| | AES | [FIPS197] | k = 128, 192, 256 | Yes |
| | RSA encryption / decryption / signature generation / verification (only modular exponentiation part) | [PKCS #1] | Modulus length = 1024 - 1975 | No |
| | RSA encryption / decryption / signature generation / verification (only modular exponentiation part) | [PKCS #1] | Modulus length = 1976 - 4096 | Yes |
| | ECDSA signature generation / verification | [ANS X9.62] | Key sizes corresponding to the used elliptic curves P-192, K-163 [FIPS186-4] and brainpoolP{160, 192}r1, brainpoolP{160, 192}t1 [RFC5639] | No |
| | ECDSA signature generation / verification | [ANS X9.62] | Key sizes corresponding to the used elliptic curves P-{224, 256, 384, 521}, K-{233, 409}, B-{233, 283, 409} [FIPS186-4], brainpoolP{224,256,320,384,512}r1, brainpoolP{224,256,320,384,512}t1 [RFC5639] | Yes |
| | Physical True RNG PTG.2 | [AIS31] | N/A | N/A |
| | SHA-{256, 512} | [FIPS180-4] | None | Yes |

Table 5: TOE cryptographic functionality

- [ANS X9.62] American National Standard for Financial Services ANS X9.62-2005, Public Key Cryptography for the Financial Services Industry, The Elliptic Curve Digital Signature Algorithm (ECDSA), November 16, 2005, American National Standards Institute.
- [ANS X9.63] American National Standard for Financial Services X9.63-2001, Public Key Cryptography for the Financial Services Industry: Key Agreement and Key Transport Using Elliptic Curve Cryptography, November 20, 2001, American National Standards Institute.
- [FIPS 186-4] Federal Information Processing Standards Publication FIPS PUB 186-4, Digital Signature Standard (DSS), July 2013, U.S. department of Commerce / National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).
- [RFC5639] RFC 5639 - Elliptic Curve Cryptography (ECC) Brainpool Standard Curves and Curve Generation, IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors, March 2010.
- [NIST SP800-67] NIST Special Publication 800-67, Recommendation for the Triple Data Encryption Algorithm (TDEA) Block Cipher, Revised January 2012, Revision 1, National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Technology Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.
- [AIS31] Anwendungshinweise und Interpretationen zum Schema (AIS), AIS 31, Funktionalitätsklassen und Evaluationsmethodologie für physikalische Zufallszahlengeneratoren, Version 3, 2013-05-15, Bundesamt für Sicherheit in der Informationstechnik.
- [FIPS197] Federal Information Processing Standards Publication 197, November 26, 2001, Announcing the ADVANCED ENCRYPTION STANDARD (AES), National Institute of Standards and Technology.
- [PKCS#1] PKCS #1: RSA Cryptography Standard, v2.1, June 14, 2002, RSA Laboratories
- [FIPS180-4] Federal Information Processing Standards Publication FIPS PUB 180-4, Secure Hash Standard (SHS), March 2012, Information Technology Laboratory National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).

10. Obligations and Notes for the Usage of the TOE

The documents as outlined in table 2 contain necessary information about the usage of the TOE and all security hints therein have to be considered. In addition all aspects of Assumptions, Threats and OSPs as outlined in the Security Target not covered by the TOE itself need to be fulfilled by the operational environment of the TOE.

The customer or user of the product shall consider the results of the certification within his system risk management process. In order for the evolution of attack methods and techniques to be covered, he should define the period of time until a re-assessment of the TOE is required and thus requested from the sponsor of the certificate.

The limited validity for the usage of cryptographic algorithms as outlined in chapter 9 has to be considered by the user and his system risk management process.

Some security measures are partly implemented in the hardware and require additional configuration or control or measures to be implemented by the IC Dedicated Support Software or Embedded Software.

For this reason the TOE includes guidance documentation (see table 2) which contains guidelines for the developer of the IC Dedicated Support Software and Embedded

Software on how to securely use the microcontroller chip and which measures have to be implemented in the software in order to fulfil the security requirements of the Security Target of the TOE.

In the course of the evaluation of the composite product or system it must be examined if the required measures have been correctly and effectively implemented by the software. Additionally, the evaluation of the composite product or system must also consider the evaluation results as outlined in the document ETR for composite evaluation [10].

In addition, the following aspects need to be fulfilled when using the TOE:

- All security hints described in the delivered documents [11] to [17] have to be considered.

The Composite Product Manufacturer receives all necessary recommendations and hints to develop his software in form of the delivered documentation.

- All security hints described in [18] have to be considered.

In addition the following hint resulting from the evaluation of the ALC evaluation aspect has to be considered:

- The IC Embedded Software Developer can deliver his software either to Infineon to let them implement it in the TOE (in Flash memory) or to the Composite Product Manufacturer to let him download the software in the Flash memory.
- The delivery procedure from the IC Embedded Software Developer to the Composite Product Manufacturer is not part of this evaluation and a secure delivery is required.

11. Security Target

For the purpose of publishing, the Security Target [6] of the Target of Evaluation (TOE) is provided within a separate document as Annex A of this report.

12. Definitions

12.1. Acronyms

| | |
|--------------|---|
| ACM | Advance Communication Mode (ACM) |
| AES | Advanced Encryption Standard |
| AIS31 | “Anwendungshinweise und Interpretationen zu ITSEC und CC Funktionalitätsklassen und Evaluationsmethodologie für physikalische Zufallszahlengeneratoren” |
| APB™ | Advanced Peripheral Bus |
| API | Application Programming Interface |
| AXI™ | Advanced eXtensible Interface Bus Protocol |
| BSI | Bundesamt für Sicherheit in der Informationstechnik / Federal Office for Information Security, Bonn, Germany |
| BSIG | BSI-Gesetz / Act on the Federal Office for Information Security |
| CC | Common Criteria for IT Security Evaluation |
| CEM | Common Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| CI | Chip Identification Mode (STS-CI) |
| CIM | Chip Identification Mode (STS-CI), same as CI |
| CPU | Central Processing Unit |
| CCRA | Common Criteria Recognition Arrangement |
| Crypto2304T | Asymmetric Cryptographic Processor |
| CRC | Cyclic Redundancy Check |
| CRT | Chinese Remainder Theorem |
| DCLB | Digital Contactless Bridge |
| DES | Data Encryption Standard; symmetric block cipher algorithm |
| DPA | Differential Power Analysis |
| DFA | Differential Failure Analysis |
| EAL | Evaluation Assurance Level |
| EC | Elliptic Curve Cryptography |
| ECC | Error Correction Code |
| ECDH | Elliptic Curve Diffie–Hellman |
| ECDSA | Elliptic Curve Digital Signature Algorithm |
| EDC | Error Detection Code |
| EDU | Error Detection Unit |
| EEPROM | Electrically Erasable and Programmable Read Only Memory |
| EMA | Electro Magnetic Analysis |
| FW | Firmware |
| Flash EEPROM | Flash Memory |
| HW | Hardware |
| IC | Integrated Circuit |
| ICO | Internal Clock Oscillator |
| ID | Identification |
| IMM | Interface Management Module |
| IT | Information Technology |
| ITSEF | Information Technology Security Evaluation Facility |
| ITP | Interrupt and Peripheral Event Channel Controller |
| I/O | Input/Output |
| IRAM | Internal Random Access Memory |
| MED | Memory Encryption and Decryption |
| MMU | Memory Management Unit |
| NVM | Non-Volatile Memory |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| OS | Operating system |
| ST | Security Target |
| PEC | Peripheral Event Channel |
| PP | Protection Profile |
| PRNG | Pseudo Random Number Generator |
| PROM | Programmable Read Only Memory |
| RAM | Random Access Memory |
| RMS | Resource Management System |
| RNG | Random Number Generator |
| ROM | Read Only Memory |
| RSA | Rives-Shamir-Adleman Algorithm |
| SAM | Service Algorithm Minimal |
| SCP | Symmetric Cryptographic Processor |
| SF | Security Feature |
| SFR | Special Function Register, as well as Security Functional Requirement, the specific meaning is given in the context |
| SPA | Simple Power Analysis |
| STS | Self Test Software |
| SW | Software |
| SO | Security Objective |
| SOLID FLASH™ | Infineon Trade Mark and stands for Flash EEPROM technology |
| TOE | Target of Evaluation |
| TM | Test Mode (STS) |
| TSF | TOE Security Functions |
| TRNG | True Random Number Generator |
| TSC | TOE Security Functions Control |
| TSF | TOE Security Functionality |
| UART | Universal Asynchronous Receiver/Transmitter |
| UM | User Mode (STS) |
| UmSLC | User Mode Security Life Control |
| WDT | Watch Dog Timer |
| XRAM | eXtended Random Access Memory |
| 3DES | Triple DES Encryption Standards |

12.2. Glossary

Augmentation - The addition of one or more requirement(s) to a package.

Collaborative Protection Profile - A Protection Profile collaboratively developed by an International Technical Community endorsed by the Management Committee.

Extension - The addition to an ST or PP of functional requirements not contained in CC part 2 and/or assurance requirements not contained in CC part 3.

Formal - Expressed in a restricted syntax language with defined semantics based on well-established mathematical concepts.

Informal - Expressed in natural language.

Object - A passive entity in the TOE, that contains or receives information, and upon which subjects perform operations.

Package - named set of either security functional or security assurance requirements

Protection Profile - A formal document defined in CC, expressing an implementation independent set of security requirements for a category of IT Products that meet specific consumer needs.

Security Target - An implementation-dependent statement of security needs for a specific identified TOE.

Semiformal - Expressed in a restricted syntax language with defined semantics.

Subject - An active entity in the TOE that performs operations on objects.

Target of Evaluation - An IT Product and its associated administrator and user guidance documentation that is the subject of an Evaluation.

TOE Security Functionality - Combined functionality of all hardware, software, and firmware of a TOE that must be relied upon for the correct enforcement of the SFRs.

13. Bibliography

- [1] Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation, Version 3.1,
Part 1: Introduction and general model, Revision 4, September 2012
Part 2: Security functional components, Revision 4, September 2012
Part 3: Security assurance components, Revision 4, September 2012
- [2] Common Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation (CEM),
Evaluation Methodology, Version 3.1, Rev. 4, September 2012
- [3] BSI certification: Technical information on the IT security certification of products,
protection profiles and sites (BSI 7138) and Requirements regarding the Evaluation
Facility for the Evaluation of Products, Protection Profiles and Sites under the CC
and ITSEC (BSI 7125)
- [4] Application Notes and Interpretations of the Scheme (AIS) as relevant for the TOE¹².
- [5] German IT Security Certificates (BSI 7148), periodically updated list published also
in the BSI Website
- [6] Security Target BSI-DSZ-CC-0829-V2-2015, M7820 A11 including optional Software
Libraries RSA – EC – SHA-2 – Toolbox, Version 1.9, 2015-07-14, Infineon
Technologies AG
- [7] Security IC Platform Protection Profile, Version 1.0, 15 June 2007,
BSI-CC-PP-0035-2007
- [8] Evaluation Technical Report, M7820 A11, Version 5, 2015-07-16, TÜV
Informationstechnik GmbH – Evaluation Body for IT Security (confidential
document)
- [9] ETR for composite evaluation according to AIS 36 for the Product M7820 A11,
Version 5, 2015-07-16, TÜV Informationstechnik GmbH, Evaluation Body for IT
Security (confidential document)
- [10] Configuration Management Scope M7820 A11 including optional Software Libraries
RSA – EC – SHA-2 – Toolbox, Version 1.2, 2015-06-25, Infineon Technologies AG
(confidential document)

¹²specifically

- AIS 25, Version 8, Anwendung der CC auf Integrierte Schaltungen including JIL Document and CC Supporting Document
- AIS 26, Version 9, Evaluationsmethodologie für in Hardware integrierte Schaltungen including JIL Document and CC Supporting Document
- AIS 31, Version 3, Funktionalitätsklassen und Evaluationsmethodologie für physikalische Zufallszahlengeneratoren
- AIS 32, Version 7, CC-Interpretationen im deutschen Zertifizierungsschema
- AIS 34, Version 3, Evaluation Methodology for CC Assurance Classes for EAL 5+ (CCv2.3 & CCv3.1) and EAL 6 (CCv3.1)
- AIS 35, Version 2, Öffentliche Fassung des Security Targets (ST-Lite) including JIL Document and CC Supporting Document and CCRA policies
- AIS 36, Version 4, Kompositionsevaluierung including JIL Document and CC Supporting Document
- AIS 38, Version 2, Reuse of evaluation results

- [11] M7820 Controller Family for Security Application Security Guidelines, 2015-06-19, Infineon Technologies AG
- [12] SLx 70 Family Hardware Reference Manual, 2010-11-18, Infineon Technologies AG
- [13] M7801 / M7820 Controller Family for Security Applications Errata Sheet, 2013-04-17, Infineon Technologies AG
- [14] SLE 70 Family Programmer's Reference User's Manual, 2012-03-19, Infineon Technologies AG
- [15] SLx70 Family Secure Hash Algorithm SHA-2 (SHA 256/224, SHA 512/384) Library Version V1.01, 2009-11, Infineon Technologies AG
- [16] Crypto@2304T User Manual, 2010-03-23, Infineon Technologies AG
- [17] SLE70 Crypto Library for Crypto@2304T RSA / ECC / Toolbox User Interface (v1.02.013), Version 1.02.013, 2011-06-07, Infineon Technologies AG
- [18] SLx 70 Family Production and Personalization, 2012-06-27, Infineon Technologies AG.

C. Excerpts from the Criteria

CC Part 1:

Conformance Claim (chapter 10.4)

“The conformance claim indicates the source of the collection of requirements that is met by a PP or ST that passes its evaluation. This conformance claim contains a CC conformance claim that:

- describes the version of the CC to which the PP or ST claims conformance.
- describes the conformance to CC Part 2 (security functional requirements) as either:
 - **CC Part 2 conformant** - A PP or ST is CC Part 2 conformant if all SFRs in that PP or ST are based only upon functional components in CC Part 2, or
 - **CC Part 2 extended** - A PP or ST is CC Part 2 extended if at least one SFR in that PP or ST is not based upon functional components in CC Part 2.
- describes the conformance to CC Part 3 (security assurance requirements) as either:
 - **CC Part 3 conformant** - A PP or ST is CC Part 3 conformant if all SARs in that PP or ST are based only upon assurance components in CC Part 3, or
 - **CC Part 3 extended** - A PP or ST is CC Part 3 extended if at least one SAR in that PP or ST is not based upon assurance components in CC Part 3.

Additionally, the conformance claim may include a statement made with respect to packages, in which case it consists of one of the following:

- Package name Conformant - A PP or ST is conformant to a pre-defined package (e.g. EAL) if:
 - the SFRs of that PP or ST are identical to the SFRs in the package, or
 - the SARs of that PP or ST are identical to the SARs in the package.
- Package name Augmented - A PP or ST is an augmentation of a predefined package if:
 - the SFRs of that PP or ST contain all SFRs in the package, but have at least one additional SFR or one SFR that is hierarchically higher than an SFR in the package.
 - the SARs of that PP or ST contain all SARs in the package, but have at least one additional SAR or one SAR that is hierarchically higher than an SAR in the package.

Note that when a TOE is successfully evaluated to a given ST, any conformance claims of the ST also hold for the TOE. A TOE can therefore also be e.g. CC Part 2 conformant.

Finally, the conformance claim may also include two statements with respect to Protection Profiles:

- PP Conformant - A PP or TOE meets specific PP(s), which are listed as part of the conformance result.
- Conformance Statement (Only for PPs) - This statement describes the manner in which PPs or STs must conform to this PP: strict or demonstrable. For more information on this Conformance Statement, see Annex D.”

CC Part 3:

Class APE: Protection Profile evaluation (chapter 10)

“Evaluating a PP is required to demonstrate that the PP is sound and internally consistent, and, if the PP is based on one or more other PPs or on packages, that the PP is a correct instantiation of these PPs and packages. These properties are necessary for the PP to be suitable for use as the basis for writing an ST or another PP.

| Assurance Class | Assurance Components |
|--|--|
| Class APE: Protection Profile evaluation | APE_INT.1 PP introduction |
| | APE_CCL.1 Conformance claims |
| | APE_SPD.1 Security problem definition |
| | APE_OBJ.1 Security objectives for the operational environment APE_OBJ.2 Security objectives |
| | APE_ECD.1 Extended components definition |
| | APE_REQ.1 Stated security requirements APE_REQ.2 Derived security requirements |

APE: Protection Profile evaluation class decomposition”

Class ASE: Security Target evaluation (chapter 11)

“Evaluating an ST is required to demonstrate that the ST is sound and internally consistent, and, if the ST is based on one or more PPs or packages, that the ST is a correct instantiation of these PPs and packages. These properties are necessary for the ST to be suitable for use as the basis for a TOE evaluation.”

| Assurance Class | Assurance Components |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Class ASE: Security Target evaluation | ASE_INT.1 ST introduction |
| | ASE_CCL.1 Conformance claims |
| | ASE_SPD.1 Security problem definition |
| | ASE_OBJ.1 Security objectives for the operational environment ASE_OBJ.2 Security objectives |
| | ASE_ECD.1 Extended components definition |
| | ASE_REQ.1 Stated security requirements ASE_REQ.2 Derived security requirements |
| | ASE_TSS.1 TOE summary specification ASE_TSS.2 TOE summary specification with architectural design summary |

ASE: Security Target evaluation class decomposition

Security assurance components (chapter 7)

“The following Sections describe the constructs used in representing the assurance classes, families, and components.”

“Each assurance class contains at least one assurance family.”

“Each assurance family contains one or more assurance components.”

The following table shows the assurance class decomposition.

| Assurance Class | Assurance Components |
|-------------------------|---|
| ADV: Development | ADV_ARC.1 Security architecture description |
| | ADV_FSP.1 Basic functional specification ADV_FSP.2 Security-enforcing functional specification ADV_FSP.3 Functional specification with complete summary ADV_FSP.4 Complete functional specification ADV_FSP.5 Complete semi-formal functional specification with additional error information ADV_FSP.6 Complete semi-formal functional specification with additional formal specification |
| | ADV_IMP.1 Implementation representation of the TSF ADV_IMP.2 Implementation of the TSF |
| | ADV_INT.1 Well-structured subset of TSF internals ADV_INT.2 Well-structured internals ADV_INT.3 Minimally complex internals |
| | ADV_SPM.1 Formal TOE security policy model |
| | ADV_TDS.1 Basic design ADV_TDS.2 Architectural design ADV_TDS.3 Basic modular design ADV_TDS.4 Semiformal modular design ADV_TDS.5 Complete semiformal modular design ADV_TDS.6 Complete semiformal modular design with formal high-level design presentation |
| | AGD: Guidance documents |
| ALC: Life cycle support | ALC_CMC.1 Labelling of the TOE ALC_CMC.2 Use of a CM system ALC_CMC.3 Authorisation controls ALC_CMC.4 Production support, acceptance procedures and automation ALC_CMC.5 Advanced support |
| | ALC_CMS.1 TOE CM coverage ALC_CMS.2 Parts of the TOE CM coverage ALC_CMS.3 Implementation representation CM coverage ALC_CMS.4 Problem tracking CM coverage ALC_CMS.5 Development tools CM coverage |
| | ALC_DEL.1 Delivery procedures |
| | ALC_DVS.1 Identification of security measures ALC_DVS.2 Sufficiency of security measures |
| | ALC_FLR.1 Basic flaw remediation ALC_FLR.2 Flaw reporting procedures ALC_FLR.3 Systematic flaw remediation |
| | ALC_LCD.1 Developer defined life-cycle model |

| Assurance Class | Assurance Components |
|-------------------------------|---|
| | ALC_LCD.2 Measurable life-cycle model |
| | ALC_TAT.1 Well-defined development tools ALC_TAT.2 Compliance with implementation standards ALC_TAT.3 Compliance with implementation standards - all parts |
| | ATE_COV.1 Evidence of coverage ATE_COV.2 Analysis of coverage ATE_COV.3 Rigorous analysis of coverage |
| ATE: Tests | ATE_DPT.1 Testing: basic design ATE_DPT.2 Testing: security enforcing modules ATE_DPT.3 Testing: modular design ATE_DPT.4 Testing: implementation representation |
| | ATE_FUN.1 Functional testing ATE_FUN.2 Ordered functional testing |
| | ATE_IND.1 Independent testing – conformance ATE_IND.2 Independent testing – sample ATE_IND.3 Independent testing – complete |
| | |
| AVA: Vulnerability assessment | AVA_VAN.1 Vulnerability survey AVA_VAN.2 Vulnerability analysis AVA_VAN.3 Focused vulnerability analysis AVA_VAN.4 Methodical vulnerability analysis AVA_VAN.5 Advanced methodical vulnerability analysis |

Assurance class decomposition

Evaluation assurance levels (chapter 8)

“The Evaluation Assurance Levels (EALs) provide an increasing scale that balances the level of assurance obtained with the cost and feasibility of acquiring that degree of assurance. The CC approach identifies the separate concepts of assurance in a TOE at the end of the evaluation, and of maintenance of that assurance during the operational use of the TOE.

It is important to note that not all families and components from CC Part 3 are included in the EALs. This is not to say that these do not provide meaningful and desirable assurances. Instead, it is expected that these families and components will be considered for augmentation of an EAL in those PPs and STs for which they provide utility.”

Evaluation assurance level (EAL) overview (chapter 8.1)

“Table 1 represents a summary of the EALs. The columns represent a hierarchically ordered set of EALs, while the rows represent assurance families. Each number in the resulting matrix identifies a specific assurance component where applicable.

As outlined in the next Section, seven hierarchically ordered evaluation assurance levels are defined in the CC for the rating of a TOE’s assurance. They are hierarchically ordered inasmuch as each EAL represents more assurance than all lower EALs. The increase in assurance from EAL to EAL is accomplished by substitution of a hierarchically higher assurance component from the same assurance family (i.e. increasing rigour, scope, and/or depth) and from the addition of assurance components from other assurance families (i.e. adding new requirements).

These EALs consist of an appropriate combination of assurance components as described in Chapter 7 of this CC Part 3. More precisely, each EAL includes no more than one

component of each assurance family and all assurance dependencies of every component are addressed.

While the EALs are defined in the CC, it is possible to represent other combinations of assurance. Specifically, the notion of “augmentation” allows the addition of assurance components (from assurance families not already included in the EAL) or the substitution of assurance components (with another hierarchically higher assurance component in the same assurance family) to an EAL. Of the assurance constructs defined in the CC, only EALs may be augmented. The notion of an “EAL minus a constituent assurance component” is not recognised by the standard as a valid claim. Augmentation carries with it the obligation on the part of the claimant to justify the utility and added value of the added assurance component to the EAL. An EAL may also be augmented with extended assurance requirements.

Evaluation assurance level 1 (EAL 1) - functionally tested (chapter 8.3)

“Objectives

EAL 1 is applicable where some confidence in correct operation is required, but the threats to security are not viewed as serious. It will be of value where independent assurance is required to support the contention that due care has been exercised with respect to the protection of personal or similar information.

EAL 1 requires only a limited security target. It is sufficient to simply state the SFRs that the TOE must meet, rather than deriving them from threats, OSPs and assumptions through security objectives.

EAL 1 provides an evaluation of the TOE as made available to the customer, including independent testing against a specification, and an examination of the guidance documentation provided. It is intended that an EAL 1 evaluation could be successfully conducted without assistance from the developer of the TOE, and for minimal outlay.

An evaluation at this level should provide evidence that the TOE functions in a manner consistent with its documentation.”

Evaluation assurance level 2 (EAL 2) - structurally tested (chapter 8.4)

“Objectives

EAL 2 requires the co-operation of the developer in terms of the delivery of design information and test results, but should not demand more effort on the part of the developer than is consistent with good commercial practise. As such it should not require a substantially increased investment of cost or time.

EAL 2 is therefore applicable in those circumstances where developers or users require a low to moderate level of independently assured security in the absence of ready availability of the complete development record. Such a situation may arise when securing legacy systems, or where access to the developer may be limited.”

Evaluation assurance level 3 (EAL 3) - methodically tested and checked (chapter 8.5)

“Objectives

EAL 3 permits a conscientious developer to gain maximum assurance from positive security engineering at the design stage without substantial alteration of existing sound development practises.

EAL 3 is applicable in those circumstances where developers or users require a moderate level of independently assured security, and require a thorough investigation of the TOE and its development without substantial re-engineering.”

Evaluation assurance level 4 (EAL 4) - methodically designed, tested, and reviewed (chapter 8.6)

“Objectives

EAL 4 permits a developer to gain maximum assurance from positive security engineering based on good commercial development practises which, though rigorous, do not require substantial specialist knowledge, skills, and other resources. EAL 4 is the highest level at which it is likely to be economically feasible to retrofit to an existing product line.

EAL 4 is therefore applicable in those circumstances where developers or users require a moderate to high level of independently assured security in conventional commodity TOEs and are prepared to incur additional security-specific engineering costs.”

Evaluation assurance level 5 (EAL 5) - semiformally designed and tested (chapter 8.7)

“Objectives

EAL 5 permits a developer to gain maximum assurance from security engineering based upon rigorous commercial development practises supported by moderate application of specialist security engineering techniques. Such a TOE will probably be designed and developed with the intent of achieving EAL 5 assurance. It is likely that the additional costs attributable to the EAL 5 requirements, relative to rigorous development without the application of specialised techniques, will not be large.

EAL 5 is therefore applicable in those circumstances where developers or users require a high level of independently assured security in a planned development and require a rigorous development approach without incurring unreasonable costs attributable to specialist security engineering techniques.”

Evaluation assurance level 6 (EAL 6) - semiformally verified design and tested (chapter 8.8)

“Objectives

EAL 6 permits developers to gain high assurance from application of security engineering techniques to a rigorous development environment in order to produce a premium TOE for protecting high value assets against significant risks.

EAL 6 is therefore applicable to the development of security TOEs for application in high risk situations where the value of the protected assets justifies the additional costs.”

Evaluation assurance level 7 (EAL 7) - formally verified design and tested (chapter 8.9)

“Objectives

EAL 7 is applicable to the development of security TOEs for application in extremely high risk situations and/or where the high value of the assets justifies the higher costs. Practical application of EAL 7 is currently limited to TOEs with tightly focused security functionality that is amenable to extensive formal analysis.”

| Assurance Class | Assurance Family | Assurance Components by Evaluation Assurance Level | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | EAL 1 | EAL 2 | EAL 3 | EAL 4 | EAL 5 | EAL 6 | EAL 7 |
| Development | ADV_ARC | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | ADV_FSP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| | ADV_IMP | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| | ADV_INT | | | | | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| | ADV_SPM | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | ADV_TDS | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Guidance Documents | AGD_OPE | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | AGD_PRE | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Life cycle Support | ALC_CMC | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| | ALC_CMS | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | ALC_DEL | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | ALC_DVS | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| | ALC_FLR | | | | | | | |
| | ALC_LCD | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | ALC_TAT | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Security Target Evaluation | ASE_CCL | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | ASE_ECD | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | ASE_INT | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | ASE_OBJ | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | ASR_REQ | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | ASE_SPD | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | ASE_TSS | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Tests | ATE_COV | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| | ATE_DPT | | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| | ATE_FUN | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| | ATE_IND | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Vulnerability assessment | AVA_VAN | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 |

Table 1: Evaluation assurance level summary”

Class AVA: Vulnerability assessment (chapter 16)

“The AVA: Vulnerability assessment class addresses the possibility of exploitable vulnerabilities introduced in the development or the operation of the TOE.”

Vulnerability analysis (AVA_VAN) (chapter 16.1)

“Objectives

Vulnerability analysis is an assessment to determine whether potential vulnerabilities identified, during the evaluation of the development and anticipated operation of the TOE or by other methods (e.g. by flaw hypotheses or quantitative or statistical analysis of the security behaviour of the underlying security mechanisms), could allow attackers to violate the SFRs.

Vulnerability analysis deals with the threats that an attacker will be able to discover flaws that will allow unauthorised access to data and functionality, allow the ability to interfere with or alter the TSF, or interfere with the authorised capabilities of other users.”

D. Annexes

List of annexes of this certification report

Annex A: Security Target provided within a separate document.

Annex B: Evaluation results regarding development
and production environment

This page is intentionally left blank.

Annex B of Certification Report BSI-DSZ-CC-0829-V2-2015

Evaluation results regarding development and production environment



The IT product Infineon smart card IC (Security Controller) M7820 A11 with optional RSA2048/4096 v1.02.013, EC v1.02.013, SHA-2 v1.01 and Toolbox v1.02.013 libraries and with specific IC dedicated software (Target of Evaluation, TOE) has been evaluated at an approved evaluation facility using the Common Methodology for IT Security Evaluation (CEM), Version 3.1 extended by advice of the Certification Body for components beyond EAL 5 and guidance specific for the technology of the product for conformance to the Common Criteria for IT Security Evaluation (CC), Version 3.1.

As a result of the TOE certification, dated 3 August 2015, the following results regarding the development and production environment apply. The Common Criteria assurance requirements ALC – Life cycle support (i.e. ALC_CMC.4, ALC_CMS.5, ALC_DEL.1, ALC_DVS.2, ALC_LCD.1, ALC_TAT.2)

are fulfilled for the development and production sites of the TOE listed below:

| Name of site / Company name | Address | Type of site |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Agrate - DNP | DNP Photomask Europe S.p.A. Via C. Olivetti 2/A 20041 Agrate Brianza Italy | Mask Production |
| Augsburg | Infineon Technologies AG Alter Postweg 101 86159 Augsburg Germany | Development |
| Bangalore | Infineon Technologies India Pvt. Ltd. Kalyani Platina, Sy. No. 6 & 24 Kundanahalli Village Krishnaraja Puram Hobli Bangalore "India – 560066 India" | SW Development and Testing |
| Bangkok - SmarTrac covered by [AIS47] | Smartrac Technology Ltd. 142/121/115 Moo Hi-Tech Industrial Estate Tambon Ban Laean Amphor Bang-Pa-In 13160 Ayutthaya Thailand | Inlay Mounting |
| Bukarest | Infineon Technologies Romania Blvd. Dimitrie Pompeiu Nr. 6 Sector 2 020335 Bucharest Romania | Development |

| Name of site / Company name | Address | Type of site |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Burlington - ASK | ASK-intTag, LLC Building 966 1000 River St., Essex Junction, Vermont 05452 USA | Inlay Mounting |
| Corbeil Essones - Toppan | Toppan Photomask, Inc. European Technology Center Boulevard John Kennedy 224 91105 Corbeil Essonnes France | Mask Production |
| Dresden | Infineon Technologies Dresden GmbH & Co. OHG Königsbrücker Str. 180 01099 Dresden Germany | Wafer Production, Initialization and Pre-personalization |
| Dresden - Toppan | Toppan Photomask, Inc Rähnitzer Allee 9 01109 Dresden Germany | Mask Production |
| Graz / Villach / Klagenfurt | Infineon Technologies Austria AG Development Center Graz Babenbergerstr. 10 8020 Graz Austria Infineon Technologies Austria AG Siemensstr. 2 9500 Villach Austria Infineon Technologies Austria AG Lakeside B05 9020 Klagenfurt Austria | Development, IT |
| Großostheim - K&N | Infineon Technology AG DCE Kühne & Nagel Stockstädter Strasse 10 – Building 8A 63762 Großostheim Germany | Distribution Center |
| Hayward - K&N | Kuehne & Nagel 30805 Santana Street Hayward, CA 94544 USA | Distribution Center |
| Hsin-Chu - ARDT | Ardentec Corporation No. 3, Gungye 3 rd Rd., Hsin-Chu Industrial Park, Hu-Kou, Hsin-Chu Hsien, Taiwan 30351, R.O.C. Taiwan 30351, R.O.C. | Wafer Test |

| Name of site / Company name | Address | Type of site |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Manila - Amkor | Amkor Technology Philippines Km. 22 East Service Rd. South Superhighway Muntinlupa City 1702 Philippines Amkor Technology Philippines 119 North Science Avenue Laguna Technopark, Binan Laguna 4024 Philippines | Module Mounting |
| Morgan Hill | Infineon Technologies North America Corp. 18275 Serene Drive Morgan Hill, CA 95037 USA | Inlay Testing, Distribution Center |
| Munich | Infineon Technologies AG Am Campeon 1-12 85579 Neubiberg Germany | Development |
| Regensburg-West | Infineon Technologies AG Wernerwerkstraße 2 93049 Regensburg Germany | Module Mounting, Inlay Mounting, Distribution Center |
| Round Rock - Toppan | Toppan Printing Company America, Inc. Round Rock Site 2175 Greenhill Drive Round Rock, Texas 78664 USA | Inlay Mounting |
| Singapore - DHL | DHL Exel Supply Chain Richland Business Centre 11 Bedok North Ave 4, Level 3, Singapore 489949 | Distribution Center |
| Singapore Kallang | Infineon Technologies Asia Pacific PTE Ltd. 168 Kallang Way Singapore 349253 | Module Mounting, Electrical module testing |
| Wuxi | Infineon Technologies (Wuxi) Co. Ltd. No. 118, Xing Chuang San Lu Wuxi-Singapore Industrial Park Wuxi 214028, Jiangsu P.R. China | Module Mounting, Distribution Center |

For the sites listed above, the requirements have been specifically applied in accordance with the Security Target [6]. The evaluators verified, that the threats, security objectives and requirements for the TOE life cycle phases up to delivery (as stated in the Security Target [6]) are fulfilled by the procedures of these sites.

This page is intentionally left blank.