

# **Peripheral Sharing Switch**

## **(PSS)**

### **For Human Interface Devices**

### **Protection Profile**



**Information  
Assurance  
Directorate**

**Version 1.2  
21 August 2008**

## Preface

### Protection Profile Title:

Peripheral Sharing Switch (PSS) for Human Interface Devices Protection Profile

### Criteria Version:

This Protection Profile “Peripheral Sharing Switch (PSS) for Human Interface Devices Protection Profile” (PP) was updated using Version 3.1 of the Common Criteria (CC).

Editor’s note: The purpose of this update was to bring the PP up to the new CC 3.1 standard without changing the authors’ original meaning or purpose of the documented requirements. The original PP was developed using version 2.x of the CC. The CC version 2.3 was the final version 2 update that included all international interpretations. CC version 3.1 used the final CC version 2.3 Security Functional Requirements (SFR)s as the new set of SFRs for version 3.1. Some minor changes were made to the SFRs in version 3.1, including moving a few SFRs to Security Assurance Requirements (SAR)s. There may be other minor differences between some SFRs in the version 2.3 PP and the new version 3.1 SFRs. These minor differences were not modified to ensure the author’s original intent was preserved.

The version 3.1 SARs were rewritten by the common criteria international community. The NIAP/CCEVS staff developed an assurance equivalence mapping between the version 2.3 and 3.1 SARs. The assurance equivalent version 3.1 SARs replaced the version 2.3 SARs in the PP.

Any issue that may arise when claiming compliance with this PP can be resolved using the observation report (OR) and observation decision (OD) process.

Further information, including the status and updates of this protection profile can be found on the CCEVS website: <http://www.niap-ccevs.org/cc-scheme/pp/>. Comments on this document should be directed to [ppcomments@missi.ncsc.mil](mailto:ppcomments@missi.ncsc.mil). The email should include the title of the document, the page, the section number, the paragraph number, and the detailed comment and recommendation.

## Revision History

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
1.1	25 July 2007	Initial version of the Protection Profile for CC version 3.1
1.2	21 Aug 2008	Updated to reflect: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Conformance claim</li><li>2. FDP_IFF.1 to reflect CC version 3.1</li><li>3. FMT_MSA.1 to reflect CC version 3.1</li><li>4. Added FMT_SMF.1 as a dependency of FMT_MSA.1</li><li>5. FDP_ETC.1 to reflect CC version 3.1</li><li>6. FDP_ITC.1 to reflect CC version 3.1</li></ol>

## Table of Contents

Preface.....	2
Revision History .....	3
Foreword.....	5
1. Introduction.....	6
1.1 Identification.....	6
1.2 Protection Profile Overview .....	6
2. Target of Evaluation Description.....	7
3. Target of Evaluation Security Environment .....	9
3.1 Secure Usage Assumptions.....	9
3.2 Threats to Security .....	9
4. Security Objectives .....	11
4.1 Security Objectives for the Target of Evaluation .....	11
4.2 Security Objectives for the Environment.....	11
5. Information Technology Security Requirements.....	12
5.1 Target of Evaluation Security Requirements .....	12
5.1.1 User Data Protection (FDP).....	12
5.1.2 Security Management (FMT) .....	13
5.1.3 Extended Requirements (EXT).....	14
5.2 Target of Evaluation Security Assurance Requirements .....	14
Class ADV: Development.....	15
Class AGD: Guidance documents .....	19
Class ALC: Life-cycle support .....	21
Class ATE: Tests.....	27
Class AVA: Vulnerability assessment .....	30
6. Rationale .....	31
6.1 Security Objectives Rationale.....	31
6.2 Environmental Objectives Rationale .....	37
6.3 Security Requirements Rationale.....	39
6.4 Dependencies Not Met.....	43
6.5 Mapping Tables .....	44
Terms of Reference.....	47
Acronyms .....	50
References.....	52

## Foreword

This publication, “Peripheral Sharing Switch (PSS) for Human Interface Devices” Protection Profile, is issued by the Information Assurance Directorate (IAD) as part of its program to promulgate security standards for the components of information assurance solutions.

The base set of requirements used in this Protection Profile are taken from the Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation, Version 2.1. Further information, including the status and updates, of both this Profile and the Common Criteria, can be found on the Internet at “<http://www.radium.ncsc.mil/tpep>”.

Words which appear in SMALL CAPITALS are those which are formally defined in the Terms of Reference section.

Comments on this document should be directed to:

National Security Agency  
9800 Savage Road, Suite 6757  
Fort George G. Meade, MD 20755-6757

or  
[ppcomments@missi.ncsc.mil](mailto:ppcomments@missi.ncsc.mil)

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Identification

Title: Peripheral Sharing Switch (PSS) for Human Interface Devices.

Assurance Level: EAL 4 augmented with ALC\_FLR.2

PP Version: 1.2, 21 August 2008.

General Status: Evaluated Products List.

Registration: PSSPP; NSA/Information Systems Security Organization.

Keywords: DEVICE sharing, multi-way SWITCH, PERIPHERAL switching,

KEYBOARD-Video-MONITOR/Mouse (KVM) SWITCH.

## 1.2 Protection Profile Overview

This Protection Profile specifies U.S. Department of Defense minimum security requirements for PERIPHERAL SWITCHES; DEVICES which enable a single set of HUMAN INTERFACE DEVICES to be shared between multiple COMPUTERS.

The Protection Profile is consistent with Common Criteria Version 3.1: Part 2, and Part 3 conformant (Evaluation Assurance Level 4).

STs that claim conformance to this PP shall meet a minimum standard of demonstrable-PP conformance as defined in Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation section D3 of part 1 (CCMB-2006-09-001).

## 2. Target of Evaluation Description

This document addresses a DEVICE, hereinafter referred to as a “Peripheral Sharing Switch” (PSS) or simply “SWITCH”--the Target of Evaluation (TOE)--permitting a single set of HUMAN INTERFACE DEVICES to be shared among two or more COMPUTERS (see Figure 1).

The TOE is normally installed in settings where a single USER with limited work surface space needs to access two or more COMPUTERS, collectively termed SWITCHED COMPUTERS (which need not be physically distinct entities). The USER may have a KEYBOARD, a visual display (e.g., MONITOR), a POINTING DEVICE (e.g., mouse), and/or alternative INPUT/OUTPUT DEVICES to interact with the COMPUTER(S). These are collectively referred to as the SHARED PERIPHERALS.

In operation, the TOE will be CONNECTED to only one COMPUTER at a time. To use a different COMPUTER, the USER must perform some specific action (e.g., push a button, turn a knob, etc.). The TOE will then visually indicate which COMPUTER was selected by the USER. Such indication is persistent and not transitory in nature.

The TOE must not have, and in fact must specifically preclude, any features that permit USER information to be shared or transferred between COMPUTERS via the TOE.

A PERIPHERAL PORT GROUP is a collection of DEVICE PORTS treated as a single entity by the TOE. There is one GROUP for the set of SHARED PERIPHERALS and one GROUP for each CONNECTED SWITCHED COMPUTER. Each SWITCHED COMPUTER GROUP has some unique associated logical ID. The SHARED PERIPHERAL GROUP ID is considered to be the same as that of the SWITCHED COMPUTER GROUP currently selected by the TOE.

**Data Separation Security Function Policy (SFP):** The TOE shall allow PERIPHERAL DATA and STATE INFORMATION to be transferred only between PERIPHERAL PORT GROUPS with the same ID.

The TOE itself is not concerned with the USER’S information flowing between the SHARED PERIPHERALS and the SWITCHED COMPUTERS. It is only providing a CONNECTION between the HUMAN INTERFACE DEVICES and a selected COMPUTER at any given instant.

SWITCHES of this type may differ significantly from the familiar “A/B” printer or serial port SWITCHES, where no constraints are placed on connections between devices. Some SWITCHES may provide enhanced features such as scanning (where it continually switches between the COMPUTERS until the USER performs an action to halt the switching), or video protocol conversion (e.g., Macintosh, Sun, PC, etc.) information in mixed COMPUTER environments. These enhancements must be examined to insure that information is not shared or transferred between COMPUTERS.




Figure 1: A Typical Configuration of Shared Peripherals

### 3. Target of Evaluation Security Environment

#### 3.1 Secure Usage Assumptions

**A.ACCESS** An AUTHORIZED USER possesses the necessary privileges to access the information transferred by the TOE. USERS are AUTHORIZED USERS.

**A.EMISSION** The TOE meets the appropriate national requirements (in the country where used) for conducted/radiated electromagnetic emissions. [In the United States, Part 15 of the FCC Rules for Class B digital devices.]

**A.ISOLATE** Only the selected COMPUTER'S video channel will be visible on the shared MONITOR.

**A.MANAGE** The TOE is installed and managed in accordance with the manufacturer's directions.

**A.NOEVIL** The AUTHORIZED USER is non-hostile and follows all usage guidance.

**A.PHYSICAL** The TOE is physically secure.

**A.SCENARIO** Vulnerabilities associated with attached DEVICES (SHARED PERIPHERALS or SWITCHED COMPUTERS), or their CONNECTION to the TOE, are a concern of the application scenario and not of the TOE.

#### 3.2 Threats to Security

The asset under attack is the information transiting the TOE. In general, the threat agent is most likely (but not limited to) people with TOE access (who are expected to possess "average" expertise, few resources, and moderate motivation) or failure of the TOE or PERIPHERALS.

**T.BYPASS** The TOE may be bypassed, circumventing nominal SWITCH functionality.

**T.INSTALL** The TOE may be delivered and installed in a manner which violates the security policy.

**T.LOGICAL** The functionality of the TOE may be changed by reprogramming in such a way as to violate the security policy.

**T.PHYSICAL** A physical attack on the TOE may violate the security policy.

**T.RESIDUAL** RESIDUAL DATA may be transferred between PERIPHERAL PORT GROUPS with different IDs.

**T.SPOOF** Via intentional or unintentional actions, a USER may think the set of SHARED PERIPHERALS are CONNECTED to one COMPUTER when in fact they are connected to a different one.

**T.STATE** STATE INFORMATION may be transferred to a PERIPHERAL PORT GROUP with an ID other than the selected one.

**T.TRANSFER** A CONNECTION, via the TOE, between COMPUTERS may allow information transfer.

## 4. Security Objectives

### 4.1 Security Objectives for the Target of Evaluation

**O.CONF** The TOE shall not violate the confidentiality of information which it processes. Information generated within any PERIPHERAL GROUP-COMPUTER CONNECTION shall not be accessible by any other PERIPHERAL GROUP-COMPUTER CONNECTION.

**O.CONNECT** No information shall be shared between SWITCHED COMPUTERS via the TOE.

This includes STATE INFORMATION, if such is maintained within the TOE.

**O.INDICATE** The AUTHORIZED USER shall receive an unambiguous indication of which SWITCHED COMPUTER has been selected.

**O.INVOKE** Upon switch selection, the TOE is invoked.

**O.NOPROG** Logic contained within the TOE shall be protected against unauthorized modification. Embedded logic must not be stored in programmable or re-programmable components.

**O.ROM** TOE software/firmware shall be protected against unauthorized modification. Embedded software must be contained in mask-programmed or one-time-programmable read-only memory permanently attached (non-socketed) to a circuit assembly.

**O.SELECT** An explicit action by the AUTHORIZED USER shall be used to select the COMPUTER to which the shared set of PERIPHERAL DEVICES is CONNECTED. Single push button, multiple push button, or rotary selection methods are used by most (if not all) current market products. Automatic switching based on scanning shall not be used as a selection mechanism.

**O.SWITCH** All DEVICES in a SHARED PERIPHERAL GROUP shall be CONNECTED to at most one SWITCHED COMPUTER at a time.

### 4.2 Security Objectives for the Environment

All of the Secure Usage Assumptions are considered to be Security Objectives for the Environment. These Objectives are to be satisfied without imposing technical requirements on the TOE; they will not require the implementation of functions in the TOE hardware and/or software, but will be satisfied largely through application of procedural or administrative measures.

**OE.ACCESS** The AUTHORIZED USER shall possess the necessary privileges to access the information transferred by the TOE. USERS are AUTHORIZED USERS.

**OE.EMISSION** The TOE shall meet the appropriate national requirements (in the country where used) for conducted/radiated electromagnetic emissions. [In the United States, Part 15 of the FCC Rules for Class B digital devices.]

**OE.ISOLATE** Only the selected COMPUTER's video channel shall be visible on the shared MONITOR.

**OE.MANAGE** The TOE shall be installed and managed in accordance with the manufacturer's directions.

**OE.NOEVIL** The AUTHORIZED USER shall be non-hostile and follow all usage guidance.

**OE.PHYSICAL** The TOE shall be physically secure.

**OE.SCENARIO** Vulnerabilities associated with attached DEVICES (SHARED PERIPHERALS or SWITCHED COMPUTERS), or their CONNECTION to the TOE, shall be a concern of the application scenario and not of the TOE.

## 5. Information Technology Security Requirements

### 5.1 *Target of Evaluation Security Requirements*

Words which appear in italics are tailoring (via permitted operations) of requirement definitions.

#### 5.1.1 User Data Protection (FDP)

5.1.1.1 **FDP\_ETC.1** (Export of User Data Without Security Attributes)  
[Dependencies: FDP\_ACC.1 or FDP\_IFC.1]

- 1 The TSF shall enforce the Data Separation SFP when exporting user data, controlled under the SFP(s), outside of the TOE.
- 2 The TSF shall export the user data without the user data's associated security attributes.

5.1.1.2 **FDP\_IFC.1** (Subset Information Flow Control)  
[Dependencies: FDP\_IFF.1]

- 1 The TSF shall enforce the Data Separation SFP on the set of PERIPHERAL PORT GROUPS, and the bi-directional flow of PERIPHERAL DATA and STATE INFORMATION between the SHARED PERIPHERALS and the SWITCHED COMPUTERS.

5.1.1.3 **FDP\_IFF.1** (Simple Security Attributes)

[Dependencies: FDP\_IFC.1 and FMT\_MSA.3]

- 1 The TSF shall enforce the Data Separation SFP based on the following types of subject and information security attributes: PERIPHERAL PORT GROUPS (SUBJECTS), PERIPHERAL DATA and STATE INFORMATION (OBJECTS), and PERIPHERAL PORT GROUP IDs (ATTRIBUTES).
- 2 The TSF shall permit an information flow between a controlled subject and controlled information via a controlled operation if the following rules hold:  
Switching Rule:  
PERIPHERAL DATA can flow to a PERIPHERAL PORT GROUP with a given ID only if it was received from a PERIPHERAL PORT GROUP with the same ID.
- 3 The TSF shall enforce the [No additional information flow control SFP rules.]
- 4 The TSF shall explicitly authorize an information flow based on the following rules: [No additional rules.]
- 5 The TSF shall explicitly deny an information flow based on the following rules: [No additional rules.]

5.1.1.4 **FDP\_ITC.1** (Import of User Data Without Security Attributes)

[Dependencies: (FDP\_ACC.1 or FDP\_IFC.1) and FMT\_MSA.3]

- 1 The TSF shall enforce the Data Separation SFP when importing user data, controlled under the SFP, from outside the TOE.
- 2 The TSF shall ignore any security attributes associated with the user data when imported from outside the TOE.
- 3 The TSF shall enforce the following rules when importing user data controlled under the SFP from outside the TOE: [No additional rules.]

**5.1.2 Security Management (FMT)**

5.1.2.1 **FMT\_MSA.1** (Management of Security Attributes)

Dependencies: [FDP\_ACC.1 or FDP\_IFC.1],  
FMT\_SMR.1, FMT\_SMF.1

- 1 The TSF shall enforce the Data Separation SFP to restrict the ability to modify the security attributes PERIPHERAL PORT GROUP IDs to the USER.

Application Note: An AUTHORIZED USER shall perform an explicit action to select the COMPUTER to which the shared set of PERIPHERAL devices is CONNECTED.

5.1.2.2 **FMT\_MSA.3** (Static Attribute Initialization)

[Dependencies: FDP\_MSA.1 and FMT\_SMR.1]

- 1 The TSF shall enforce the Data Separation SFP to provide restrictive default values for security attributes that are used to enforce the SFP.  
Application Note: On start-up, one and only one attached COMPUTER shall be selected.
- 2 The TSF shall allow the *none* to specify alternative initial values to override the default values when an object or information is created.

5.1.2.3 FMT\_SMF.1 Specification of Management Functions  
[Dependencies: No dependencies]

- 1 The TSF shall be capable of performing the following management functions: [None].

**5.1.3 Extended Requirements (EXT)**

5.1.3.1 **EXT\_VIR.1** (Visual Indication Rule)  
[No dependencies]

- 1 A visual method of indicating which COMPUTER is CONNECTED to the shared set of PERIPHERAL DEVICES shall be provided.  
Application Note: Does not require tactile indicators, but does not preclude their presence. The indication shall persist for the duration of the CONNECTION.

**5.2 Target of Evaluation Security Assurance Requirements**

This section defines the assurance requirements for the TOE. The table below summarizes the components for EAL4 augmented. The augmented requirements are in bold print.

**Table 1 Assurance Requirements**

Assurance Class	Assurance Components	Assurance Components Description
<b>Development</b>	ADV_ARC.1	Security Architectural Description
	ADV_FSP.4	Complete Functional Specification
	ADV_IMP.1	Implementation of the TSF
	ADV_TDS.3	Basic modular design
<b>Guidance Documents</b>	AGD_OPE.1	Operational user guidance
	AGD_PRE.1	Preparative User guidance

<b>Assurance Class</b>	<b>Assurance Components</b>	<b>Assurance Components Description</b>
<b>Life Cycle Support</b>	ALC_CMC.4	Product support, acceptance procedures and automation
	ALC_CMS.4	Problem tracking CM coverage
	ALC_DEL.1	Delivery procedures
	ALC_DVS.1	Identification of security measures
	<b>ALC_FLR.2</b>	<b>Flaw Reporting Procedures</b>
	ALC_LCD.1	Developer defined life-cycle model
	ALC_TAT.1	Well-defined development tools
<b>Tests</b>	ATE_COV.2	Analysis of coverage
	ATE_DPT.2	Testing: security enforcing modules
	ATE_FUN.1	Functional testing
	ATE_IND.2	Independent testing - sample
<b>Vulnerability Assessment</b>	AVA_VAN.3	Focused vulnerability analysis

**Class ADV: Development**

ADV\_ARC.1 Security architecture description

Dependencies: ADV\_FSP.1 Basic functional specification

ADV\_TDS.1 Basic design

Developer action elements:

ADV\_ARC.1.1D The developer shall design and implement the TOE so that the security features of the TSF cannot be bypassed.

ADV\_ARC.1.2D The developer shall design and implement the TSF so that it is able to protect itself from tampering by untrusted active entities.

ADV\_ARC.1.3D The developer shall provide a security architecture description of the TSF.

Content and presentation elements:

ADV\_ARC.1.1C The security architecture description shall be at a level of detail commensurate with the description of the SFR-enforcing abstractions described in the TOE design document.

ADV\_ARC.1.2C The security architecture description shall describe the security domains maintained by the TSF consistently with the SFRs.

ADV\_ARC.1.3C The security architecture description shall describe how the TSF initialization process is secure.

ADV\_ARC.1.4C The security architecture description shall demonstrate that the TSF protects itself from tampering.

ADV\_ARC.1.5C The security architecture description shall demonstrate that the TSF prevents bypass of the SFR-enforcing functionality.

Evaluator action elements:

ADV\_ARC.1.1E The evaluator *shall confirm* that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

ADV\_FSP.4 Complete functional specification

Dependencies: ADV\_TDS.1 Basic design

Developer action elements:

ADV\_FSP.4.1D The developer shall provide a functional specification.

ADV\_FSP.4.2D The developer shall provide a tracing from the functional specification to the SFRs.

Content and presentation elements:

ADV\_FSP.4.1C The functional specification shall completely represent the TSF.

ADV\_FSP.4.2C The functional specification shall describe the purpose and method of use for all TSFI.

ADV\_FSP.4.3C The functional specification shall identify and describe all parameters associated with each TSFI.

ADV\_FSP.4.4C The functional specification shall describe all actions associated with each TSFI.

ADV\_FSP.4.5C The functional specification shall describe all direct error messages that may result from an invocation of each TSFI.

ADV\_FSP.4.6C The tracing shall demonstrate that the SFRs trace to TSFIs in the functional specification.

Evaluator action elements:

ADV\_FSP.4.1E The evaluator *shall confirm* that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

ADV\_FSP.4.2E The evaluator *shall determine* that the functional specification is an accurate and complete instantiation of the SFRs.

ADV\_IMP.1 Implementation representation of the TSF

Dependencies: ADV\_TDS.3 Basic modular design  
ALC\_TAT.1 Well-defined development tools

Developer action elements:

ADV\_IMP.1.1D The developer shall make available the implementation representation for the entire TSF.

ADV\_IMP.1.2D The developer shall provide a mapping between the TOE design description and the sample of the implementation representation.

Content and presentation elements:

ADV\_IMP.1.1C The implementation representation shall define the TSF to a level of detail such that the TSF can be generated without further design

decisions.

ADV\_IMP.1.2C The implementation representation shall be in the form used by the development personnel.

ADV\_IMP.1.3C The mapping between the TOE design description and the sample of the implementation representation shall demonstrate their correspondence.

Evaluator action elements:

ADV\_IMP.1.1E The evaluator shall confirm that, for the selected sample of the implementation representation, the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

ADV\_TDS.3 Basic modular design

Dependencies: ADV\_FSP.4 Complete functional specification

Developer action elements:

ADV\_TDS.3.1D The developer shall provide the design of the TOE.

ADV\_TDS.3.2D The developer shall provide a mapping from the TSFI of the functional specification to the lowest level of decomposition available in the TOE design.

Content and presentation elements:

ADV\_TDS.3.1C The design shall describe the structure of the TOE in terms of subsystems.

ADV\_TDS.3.2C The design shall describe the TSF in terms of modules.

ADV\_TDS.3.3C The design shall identify all subsystems of the TSF.

ADV\_TDS.3.4C The design shall provide a description of each subsystem of the TSF.

ADV\_TDS.3.5C The design shall provide a description of the interactions among all subsystems of the TSF.

ADV\_TDS.3.6C The design shall provide a mapping from the subsystems of the TSF to the modules of the TSF.

ADV\_TDS.3.7C The design shall describe each SFR-enforcing module in terms of its purpose and interaction with other modules.

ADV\_TDS.3.8C The design shall describe each SFR-enforcing module in terms of its SFR-related interfaces, return values from those interfaces, interaction with and called interfaces to other modules.

ADV\_TDS.3.9C The design shall describe each SFR-supporting or SFR-non-interfering module in terms of its purpose and interaction with other modules.

ADV\_TDS.3.10C The mapping shall demonstrate that all behavior described in the TOE design is mapped to the TSFIs that invoke it.

Evaluator action elements:

ADV\_TDS.3.1E The evaluator *shall confirm* that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

ADV\_TDS.3.2E The evaluator *shall determine* that the design is an accurate and complete instantiation of all security functional requirements.

**Class AGD: Guidance documents**

AGD\_OPE.1 Operational user guidance

Dependencies: ADV\_FSP.1 Basic functional specification

Developer action elements:

AGD\_OPE.1.1D The developer shall provide operational user guidance.

Content and presentation elements:

- AGD\_OPE.1.1C The operational user guidance shall describe, for each user role, the user-accessible functions and privileges that should be controlled in a secure processing environment, including appropriate warnings.
- AGD\_OPE.1.2C The operational user guidance shall describe, for each user role, how to use the available interfaces provided by the TOE in a secure manner.
- AGD\_OPE.1.3C The operational user guidance shall describe, for each user role, the available functions and interfaces, in particular all security parameters under the control of the user, indicating secure values as appropriate.
- AGD\_OPE.1.4C The operational user guidance shall, for each user role, clearly present each type of security-relevant event relative to the user-accessible functions that need to be performed, including changing the security characteristics of entities under the control of the TSF.
- AGD\_OPE.1.5C The operational user guidance shall identify all possible modes of operation of the TOE (including operation following failure or operational error), their consequences and implications for maintaining secure operation.
- AGD\_OPE.1.6C The operational user guidance shall, for each user role, describe the security measures to be followed in order to fulfill the security objectives for the operational environment as described in the ST.
- AGD\_OPE.1.7C The operational user guidance shall be clear and reasonable.

Evaluator action elements:

- AGD\_OPE.1.1E The evaluator shall confirm that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

AGD\_PRE.1 Preparative procedures

Dependencies: No dependencies.

Developer action elements:

AGD\_PRE.1.1D The developer shall provide the TOE including its preparative procedures.

Content and presentation elements:

AGD\_PRE.1.1C The preparative procedures shall describe all the steps necessary for secure acceptance of the delivered TOE in accordance with the developer's delivery procedures.

AGD\_PRE.1.2C The preparative procedures shall describe all the steps necessary for secure installation of the TOE and for the secure preparation of the operational environment in accordance with the security objectives for the operational environment as described in the ST.

Evaluator action elements:

AGD\_PRE.1.1E The evaluator shall confirm that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

AGD\_PRE.1.2E The evaluator shall apply the preparative procedures to confirm that the TOE can be prepared securely for operation.

**Class ALC: Life-cycle support**

ALC\_CMC.4 Production support, acceptance procedures and automation

Dependencies: ALC\_CMS.1 TOE CM coverage

ALC\_DVS.1 Identification of security measures

ALC\_LCD.1 Developer defined life-cycle model

ALC\_CMC.4.1D The developer shall provide the TOE and a reference for the TOE.

ALC\_CMC.4.2D The developer shall provide the CM documentation.

ALC\_CMC.4.3D The developer shall use a CM system.

Content and presentation elements:

ALC\_CMC.4.1C The TOE shall be labeled with its unique reference.

ALC\_CMC.4.2C The CM documentation shall describe the method used to uniquely identify the configuration items.

ALC\_CMC.4.3C The CM system shall uniquely identify all configuration items.

ALC\_CMC.4.4C The CM system shall provide automated measures such that only authorized changes are made to the configuration items.

ALC\_CMC.4.5C The CM system shall support the production of the TOE by automated means.

ALC\_CMC.4.6C The CM documentation shall include a CM plan.

ALC\_CMC.4.7C The CM plan shall describe how the CM system is used for the development of the TOE.

ALC\_CMC.4.8C The CM plan shall describe the procedures used to accept modified or newly created configuration items as part of the TOE.

ALC\_CMC.4.9C The evidence shall demonstrate that all configuration items are being maintained under the CM system.

ALC\_CMC.4.10C The evidence shall demonstrate that the CM system is being operated in accordance with the CM plan.

Evaluator action elements:

ALC\_CMC.4.1E The evaluator shall confirm that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

ALC\_CMS.4 Problem tracking CM coverage

Dependencies: No dependencies.

Developer action elements:

ALC\_CMS.4.1D The developer shall provide a configuration list for the TOE.

Content and presentation elements:

ALC\_CMS.4.1C The configuration list shall include the following: the TOE itself; the evaluation evidence required by the SARs; the parts that comprise the TOE; the implementation representation; and security flaw reports and resolution status.

ALC\_CMS.4.2C The configuration list shall uniquely identify the configuration items.

ALC\_CMS.4.3C For each TSF relevant configuration item, the configuration list shall indicate the developer of the item.

Evaluator action elements:

ALC\_CMS.4.1E The evaluator shall confirm that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

ALC\_DEL.1 Delivery procedures

Dependencies: No dependencies.

Developer action elements:

ALC\_DEL.1.1D The developer shall document procedures for delivery of the TOE or parts of it to the consumer.

ALC\_DEL.1.2D The developer shall use the delivery procedures.

Content and presentation elements:

ALC\_DEL.1.1C The delivery documentation shall describe all procedures that are necessary to maintain security when distributing versions of the TOE to the consumer.

Evaluator action elements:

ALC\_DEL.1.1E The evaluator *shall confirm* that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

ALC\_DVS.1 Identification of security measures

Dependencies: No dependencies.

Developer action elements:

ALC\_DVS.1.1D The developer shall produce development security documentation.

Content and presentation elements:

ALC\_DVS.1.1C The development security documentation shall describe all the physical, procedural, personnel, and other security measures that are necessary to protect the confidentiality and integrity of the TOE design and implementation in its development environment.

Evaluator action elements:

ALC\_DVS.1.1E The evaluator shall confirm that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

ALC\_DVS.1.2E The evaluator shall confirm that the security measures are being applied.

ALC\_FLR.2 Flaw reporting procedures

Dependencies: No dependencies.

Developer action elements:

ALC\_FLR.2.1D The developer shall document flaw remediation procedures addressed to TOE developers.

ALC\_FLR.2.2D The developer shall establish a procedure for accepting and acting upon all reports of security flaws and requests for corrections to those flaws.

ALC\_FLR.2.3D The developer shall provide flaw remediation guidance

addressed to TOE users.

Content and presentation elements:

ALC\_FLR.2.1C The flaw remediation procedures documentation shall describe the procedures used to track all reported security flaws in each release of the TOE.

ALC\_FLR.2.2C The flaw remediation procedures shall require that a description of the nature and effect of each security flaw be provided, as well as the status of finding a correction to that flaw.

ALC\_FLR.2.3C The flaw remediation procedures shall require that corrective actions be identified for each of the security flaws.

ALC\_FLR.2.4C The flaw remediation procedures documentation shall describe the methods used to provide flaw information, corrections and guidance on corrective actions to TOE users.

ALC\_FLR.2.5C The flaw remediation procedures shall describe a means by which the developer receives from TOE users reports and enquiries of suspected security flaws in the TOE.

ALC\_FLR.2.6C The procedures for processing reported security flaws shall ensure that any reported flaws are remediated and the remediation procedures issued to TOE users.

ALC\_FLR.2.7C The procedures for processing reported security flaws shall provide safeguards that any corrections to these security flaws do not introduce any new flaws.

ALC\_FLR.2.8C The flaw remediation guidance shall describe a means by which TOE users report to the developer any suspected security flaws in the TOE.

Evaluator action elements:

ALC\_FLR.2.1E The evaluator shall confirm that the information provided meets

all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

ALC\_LCD.1 Developer defined life-cycle model

Dependencies: No dependencies.

Developer action elements:

ALC\_LCD.1.1D The developer shall establish a life-cycle model to be used in the development and maintenance of the TOE.

ALC\_LCD.1.2D The developer shall provide life-cycle definition documentation.

Content and presentation elements:

ALC\_LCD.1.1C The life-cycle definition documentation shall describe the model used to develop and maintain the TOE.

ALC\_LCD.1.2C The life-cycle model shall provide for the necessary control over the development and maintenance of the TOE.

Evaluator action elements:

ALC\_LCD.1.1E The evaluator *shall confirm* that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

ALC\_TAT.1 Well-defined development tools

Dependencies: ADV\_IMP.1 Implementation representation of the  
TSF

Developer action elements:

ALC\_TAT.1.1D The developer shall identify each development tool being used for the TOE.

ALC\_TAT.1.2D The developer shall document the selected implementation-dependent options of each development tool.

Content and presentation elements:

ALC\_TAT.1.1C Each development tool used for implementation shall be well-defined.

ALC\_TAT.1.2C The documentation of each development tool shall unambiguously define the meaning of all statements as well as all conventions and directives used in the implementation.

ALC\_TAT.1.3C The documentation of each development tool shall unambiguously define the meaning of all implementation-dependent options.

Evaluator action elements:

ALC\_TAT.1.1E The evaluator *shall confirm* that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

**Class ATE: Tests**

ATE\_COV.2 Analysis of coverage

Dependencies: ADV\_FSP.2 Security-enforcing functional specification

ATE\_FUN.1 Functional testing

Developer action elements:

ATE\_COV.2.1D The developer shall provide an analysis of the test coverage.

Content and presentation elements:

ATE\_COV.2.1C The analysis of the test coverage shall demonstrate the correspondence between the tests in the test documentation and the TSFIs in the functional specification.

ATE\_COV.2.2C The analysis of the test coverage shall demonstrate that all TSFIs in the functional specification have been tested.

Evaluator action elements:

ATE\_COV.2.1E The evaluator shall confirm that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

ATE\_DPT.2 Testing: security enforcing modules

Dependencies: ADV\_ARC.1 Security architecture description

ADV\_TDS.3 Basic modular design

ATE\_FUN.1 Functional testing

Developer action elements:

ATE\_DPT.2.1D The developer shall provide the analysis of the depth of testing.

Content and presentation elements:

ATE\_DPT.2.1C The analysis of the depth of testing shall demonstrate the correspondence between the tests in the test documentation and the TSF subsystems and SFR-enforcing modules in the TOE design.

ATE\_DPT.2.2C The analysis of the depth of testing shall demonstrate that all TSF subsystems in the TOE design have been tested.

ATE\_DPT.2.3C The analysis of the depth of testing shall demonstrate that the SFR-enforcing modules in the TOE design have been tested.

Evaluator action elements:

ATE\_DPT.2.1E The evaluator *shall confirm* that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

ATE\_FUN.1 Functional testing

Dependencies: ATE\_COV.1 Evidence of coverage

Developer action elements:

ATE\_FUN.1.1D The developer shall test the TSF and document the results.

ATE\_FUN.1.2D The developer shall provide test documentation.

Content and presentation elements:

ATE\_FUN.1.1C The test documentation shall consist of test plans, expected test results and actual test results.

ATE\_FUN.1.2C The test plans shall identify the tests to be performed and describe the scenarios for performing each test. These scenarios shall include any ordering dependencies on the results of other tests.

ATE\_FUN.1.3C The expected test results shall show the anticipated outputs from a successful execution of the tests.

ATE\_FUN.1.4C The actual test results shall be consistent with the expected test results.

Evaluator action elements:

ATE\_FUN.1.1E The evaluator shall confirm that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

ATE\_IND.2 Independent testing - sample

Dependencies: ADV\_FSP.2 Security-enforcing functional specification

AGD\_OPE.1 Operational user guidance

AGD\_PRE.1 Preparative procedures

ATE\_COV.1 Evidence of coverage

ATE\_FUN.1 Functional testing

Developer action elements:

ATE\_IND.2.1D The developer shall provide the TOE for testing.

Content and presentation elements:

ATE\_IND.2.1C The TOE shall be suitable for testing.

ATE\_IND.2.2C The developer shall provide an equivalent set of resources to

those that were used in the developer's functional testing of the TSF.

Evaluator action elements:

ATE\_IND.2.1E The evaluator *shall confirm* that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

ATE\_IND.2.2E The evaluator shall execute a sample of tests in the test documentation to verify the developer test results.

ATE\_IND.2.3E The evaluator shall test a subset of the TSF to confirm that the TSF operates as specified.

**Class AVA: Vulnerability assessment**

AVA\_VAN.3 Focused vulnerability analysis

Dependencies: ADV\_ARC.1 Security architecture description  
ADV\_FSP.2 Security-enforcing functional specification  
ADV\_TDS.3 Basic modular design  
ADV\_IMP.1 Implementation representation of the TSF  
AGD\_OPE.1 Operational user guidance  
AGD\_PRE.1 Preparative procedures

Developer action elements:

AVA\_VAN.3.1D The developer shall provide the TOE for testing.

Content and presentation elements:

AVA\_VAN.3.1C The TOE shall be suitable for testing.

Evaluator action elements:

AVA\_VAN.3.1E The evaluator **shall confirm** that the information provided meets all requirements for content and presentation of evidence.

AVA\_VAN.3.2E The evaluator **shall perform** a search of public domain sources to identify potential vulnerabilities in the TOE.

AVA\_VAN.3.3E The evaluator **shall perform** an independent vulnerability analysis of the TOE using the guidance documentation, functional specification, TOE design, security architecture description **and implementation representation** to identify potential vulnerabilities in the TOE.

AVA\_VAN.3.4E The evaluator **shall conduct** penetration testing, based on the identified potential vulnerabilities, to determine that the TOE is resistant to attacks performed by an attacker possessing **Enhanced-Basic** attack potential.

*Application Note: The evaluator should test the system for buffer overflows, heap overflows, and string format problems.*

## 6. Rationale

### 6.1 Security Objectives Rationale

Threat	Objective	Rationale
<p><b>T.BYPASS</b></p> <p>The TOE may be bypassed, circumventing nominal SWITCH functionality.</p>	<p><b>O.INVOKE</b></p> <p>Upon switch selection, the TOE is invoked</p>	<p><b>O.INVOKE:</b> The TOE must be invoked whenever a switch selection is made.</p>
<p><b>T.INSTALL</b></p> <p>The TOE may be delivered and installed in a manner, which violates the security policy.</p>	<p><b>OE.MANAGE</b></p>	
<p><b>T.LOGICAL</b></p> <p>The functionality of the TOE may be changed by reprogramming in such a way as to violate the security policy.</p>	<p><b>O.NOPROG</b></p> <p>Logic contained within the TOE shall be protected against unauthorized modification. Embedded logic must not be stored in</p>	<p><b>O.NOPROG:</b> The functional capabilities of the TOE are finalized during manufacturing. The configuration of the TOE (operating parameters and other control information)</p>

	<p>programmable or re-programmable components</p> <p><b>O.ROM</b></p> <p>TOE software/firmware shall be protected against unauthorized modification. Embedded software must be contained in mask-programmed or one-time-programmable read-only memory permanently attached (non-socketed) to a circuit assembly.</p>	<p>may change.</p> <p><b>O.ROM:</b> Any software/firmware affecting the basic functionality of the TOE must be stored in a medium which prevents its modification</p>
<p><b>T.PHYSICAL</b></p> <p>A physical attack on the TOE may violate the security policy.</p>	<p><b>O.CONF</b></p> <p>The TOE shall not violate the confidentiality of information, which it processes. Information generated within any PERIPHERAL GROUPCOMPUTER CONNECTION shall not be accessible by any other PERIPHERAL GROUP-COMPUTER CONNECTION.</p> <p><b>O.NOPROG</b></p> <p>Logic contained within the TOE shall be protected against unauthorized modification. Embedded logic must not be stored in programmable or re-programmable components</p>	<p><b>O.CONF:</b> If the PERIPHERALS can be CONNECTED to more than one COMPUTER at any given instant, then a channel may exist which would allow transfer of information from one to the other. This is particularly important for DEVICES with bi-directional communications channels such as KEYBOARD and POINTING DEVICES. Since many PERIPHERALS now have embedded microprocessors or microcontrollers, significant amounts of information may be transferred from one COMPUTER system to another, resulting in compromise of sensitive information. An example of this is transfer via the buffering mechanism in</p>

	<p><b>O.ROM</b></p> <p>TOE software/firmware shall be protected against unauthorized modification. Embedded software must be contained in mask-programmed or one-time-programmable read-only memory permanently attached (non-socketed) to a circuit assembly.</p>	<p>many KEYBOARDS.</p> <p><b>O.NOPROG:</b> The functional capabilities of the TOE are finalized during manufacturing. The configuration of the TOE (operating parameters and other control information) may change.</p> <p><b>O.ROM:</b> Any software/firmware affecting the basic functionality of the TOE must be stored in a medium which prevents its modification</p>
<p><b>T.RESIDUAL</b></p> <p>RESIDUAL DATA may be transferred between PERIPHERAL PORT GROUPS with different IDs</p>	<p><b>O.CONF</b></p> <p>The TOE shall not violate the confidentiality of information, which it processes. Information generated within any PERIPHERAL GROUPCOMPUTER CONNECTION shall not be accessible by any other PERIPHERAL GROUP-COMPUTER CONNECTION.</p> <p><b>O.CONNECT</b></p> <p>No information shall be shared between SWITCHED COMPUTERS in the TOE. This includes STATE INFORMATION, if such is maintained within the TOE.</p>	<p><b>O.CONF:</b> If the PERIPHERALS can be CONNECTED to more than one COMPUTER at any given instant, then a channel may exist which would allow transfer of information from one to the other. This is particularly important for DEVICES with bi-directional communications channels such as KEYBOARD and POINTING DEVICES. Since many PERIPHERALS now have embedded microprocessors or microcontrollers, significant amounts of information may be transferred from one COMPUTER system to another, resulting in compromise of sensitive information. An example of this is transfer via the buffering mechanism in many KEYBOARDS.</p>

		<p><b>O.CONNECT:</b> The purpose of the TOE is to share a set of PERIPHERALS among multiple COMPUTERS. Information transferred to/from one SWITCHED COMPUTER is not to be shared with any other COMPUTER</p>
<p><b>T.SPOOF</b></p> <p>Via intentional or unintentional actions, a USER may think the set of SHARED PERIPHERALS are CONNECTED to one COMPUTER when in fact they are connected to a different one.</p>	<p><b>O.INDICATE</b></p> <p>The AUTHORIZED USER shall receive an unambiguous indication of which SWITCHED COMPUTER has been selected.</p> <p><b>O.SELECT</b></p> <p>An explicit action by the AUTHORIZED USER shall be used to select the COMPUTER to which the shared set of PERIPHERAL DEVICES is CONNECTED. Single push button, multiple push button, or rotary selection methods are used by most (if not all) current market products. Automatic switching based on scanning shall not be used as a selection mechanism.</p>	<p><b>O.INDICATE:</b> The USER must receive positive confirmation of SWITCHED COMPUTER selection.</p> <p><b>O.SELECT:</b> The USER must take positive action to select the current SWITCHED COMPUTER</p>
<p><b>T.STATE</b></p>	<p><b>O.CONF</b></p> <p>The TOE shall not violate</p>	<p><b>O.CONF:</b> If the PERIPHERALS can be CONNECTED to more than</p>

<p>STATE INFORMATION may be transferred to a PERIPHERAL PORT GROUP with an ID other than the selected one.</p>	<p>the confidentiality of information, which it processes. Information generated within any PERIPHERAL GROUPCOMPUTER CONNECTION shall not be accessible by any other PERIPHERAL GROUP-COMPUTER CONNECTION.</p> <p><b>O.CONNECT</b></p> <p>No information shall be shared between SWITCHED COMPUTERS in the TOE. This includes STATE INFORMATION, if such is maintained within the TOE.</p>	<p>one COMPUTER at any given instant, then a channel may exist which would allow transfer of information from one to the other. This is particularly important for DEVICES with bi-directional communications channels such as KEYBOARD and POINTING DEVICES. Since many PERIPHERALS now have embedded microprocessors or microcontrollers, significant amounts of information may be transferred from one COMPUTER system to another, resulting in compromise of sensitive information. An example of this is transfer via the buffering mechanism in many KEYBOARDS.</p> <p><b>O.CONNECT:</b> The purpose of the TOE is to share a set of PERIPHERALS among multiple COMPUTERS. Information transferred to/from one SWITCHED COMPUTER is not to be shared with any other COMPUTER</p>
<p><b>T.TRANSFER</b></p> <p>A CONNECTION, via the TOE, between COMPUTERS may allow information transfer.</p>	<p><b>O.CONF</b></p> <p>The TOE shall not violate the confidentiality of information, which it processes. Information generated within any PERIPHERAL</p>	<p><b>O.CONF:</b> If the PERIPHERALS can be CONNECTED to more than one COMPUTER at any given instant, then a channel may exist which would allow transfer of information from one to the</p>

	<p>GROUPCOMPUTER CONNECTION shall not be accessible by any other PERIPHERAL GROUP-COMPUTER CONNECTION.</p> <p><b>O.CONNECT</b></p> <p>No information shall be shared between SWITCHED COMPUTERS in the TOE. This includes STATE INFORMATION, if such is maintained within the TOE.</p> <p><b>O.SWITCH</b></p> <p>All DEVICES in a SHARED PERIPHERAL GROUP shall be CONNECTED to at most one SWITCHED COMPUTER at a time.</p>	<p>other. This is particularly important for DEVICES with bi-directional communications channels such as KEYBOARD and POINTING DEVICES. Since many PERIPHERALS now have embedded microprocessors or microcontrollers, significant amounts of information may be transferred from one COMPUTER system to another, resulting in compromise of sensitive information. An example of this is transfer via the buffering mechanism in many KEYBOARDS.</p> <p><b>O.CONNECT:</b> The purpose of the TOE is to share a set of PERIPHERALS among multiple COMPUTERS. Information transferred to/from one SWITCHED COMPUTER is not to be shared with any other COMPUTER</p> <p><b>O.SWITCH:</b> The purpose of the TOE is to share a set of PERIPHERALS among multiple COMPUTERS. It makes no sense to have, for example, video CONNECTED to one COMPUTER while a POINTING DEVICE is CONNECTED to another</p>
--	--	---

		COMPUTER

## 6.2 Environmental Objectives Rationale

All of the Security Objectives for the Environment are considered to be Secure Usage Assumptions.

These objectives on the environment do not contain any IT security requirements because they are non-IT related objectives. Thus, the CC does not mandate it map to any requirements.

Assumption	Environmental Objective Addressing the Assumption	Rationale
<p><b>A.ACCESS</b></p> <p>An AUTHORIZED USER possesses the necessary privileges to access the information transferred by the TOE. USERS are AUTHORIZED USERS.</p>	<p><b>OE.ACCESS</b></p> <p>The AUTHORIZED USER shall possess the necessary privileges to access the information transferred by the TOE.</p> <p>USERS are AUTHORIZED USERS.</p>	<p>All authorized users are trustworthy individuals, having background investigations commensurate with the level of data being protected, have undergone appropriate training, and follow all user guidance.</p>
<p><b>A.EMISSION</b></p> <p>The TOE meets the appropriate national requirements (in the country where used) for conducted/radiated electromagnetic emissions. [In the United States, Part 15 of the FCC Rules for Class B digital devices.]</p>	<p><b>OE.EMISSION</b></p> <p>The TOE shall meet the appropriate national requirements (in the country where used) for conducted/radiated electromagnetic emissions. [In the United States, Part 15 of the FCC Rules for Class B digital devices.]</p>	<p>Restates the assumption.</p>

Assumption	Environmental Objective Addressing the Assumption	Rationale
<p><b>A.ISOLATE</b></p> <p>Only the selected COMPUTER'S video channel will be visible on the shared MONITOR.</p>	<p><b>OE.ISOLATE</b></p> <p>Only the selected COMPUTER'S video channel shall be visible on the shared MONITOR.</p>	<p>Restates the assumption.</p>
<p><b>A.MANAGE</b></p> <p>The TOE is installed and managed in accordance with the manufacturer's directions.</p>	<p><b>OE.MANAGE</b></p> <p>The TOE shall be installed and managed in accordance with the manufacturer's directions.</p>	<p>Restates the assumption.</p>
<p><b>A.NOEVIL</b></p> <p>The AUTHORIZED USER is non-hostile and follows all usage guidance.</p>	<p><b>OE.NOEVIL</b></p> <p>The AUTHORIZED USER shall be non-hostile and follow all usage guidance.</p>	<p>Restates the assumption.</p>
<p><b>A.PHYSICAL</b></p> <p>The TOE is physically secure.</p>	<p><b>OE.PHYSICAL</b></p> <p>The TOE shall be physically secure.</p>	<p>The TOE, is assumed to be protected from physical attack (e.g., theft, modification, destruction, or eavesdropping). Physical attack could include unauthorized intruders into the TOE environment, but it does not include physical destructive actions that might be taken by an individual that is authorized to access the TOE environment.</p>

Assumption	Environmental Objective Addressing the Assumption	Rationale
<p><b>A.SCENARIO</b></p> <p>Vulnerabilities associated with attached DEVICES (SHARED PERIPHERALS or SWITCHED COMPUTERS), or their CONNECTION to the TOE, are a concern of the application scenario and not of the TOE.</p>	<p><b>OE.SCENARIO</b></p> <p>Vulnerabilities associated with attached DEVICES (SHARED PERIPHERALS or SWITCHED COMPUTERS), or their CONNECTION to the TOE, shall be a concern of the application scenario and not of the TOE.</p>	<p>Restates the assumption.</p>

### 6.3 Security Requirements Rationale

Objective	Requirements Addressing the Objective	Rationale
<p><b>O.CONF</b></p> <p>The TOE shall not violate the confidentiality of information, which it processes. Information generated within any PERIPHERAL GROUPCOMPUTER CONNECTION shall not be accessible by any other PERIPHERAL GROUP-COMPUTER CONNECTION.</p>	<p><b>FDP_ETC.1</b> (Export of User Data Without Security Attributes)</p> <p><b>FDP_IFC.1</b> (Subset Information Flow Control)</p> <p><b>FDP_IFF.1</b> (Simple Security Attributes)</p> <p><b>FDP_ITC.1</b> (Import of User Data Without Security Attributes)</p>	<p><b>FDP_ETC.1:</b> In typical TOE applications, USER data consists of HUMAN INTERFACE DEVICE control information. Also included is configuration information such as KEYBOARD settings that must be reestablished each time the TOE switches between COMPUTERS. These DEVICES neither expect nor require any security ATTRIBUTE information. The information content of the data passed through a CONNECTION is ignored.</p> <p><b>FDP_IFC.1:</b> This captures the policy that no information flows between different</p>

Objective	Requirements Addressing the Objective	Rationale
		<p>PERIPHERAL PORT GROUP IDS.</p> <p><b>FDP_IFF.1:</b> This requirement identifies the security ATTRIBUTES needed to detail the operation of a switch and the rules allowing information transfer. This requirement is a dependency of FDP_IFC.1.</p> <p><b>FDP_ITC.1:</b> In typical TOE applications, USER data consists of HUMAN INTERFACE DEVICE control information. These DEVICES neither expect nor require any security ATTRIBUTE information.</p>
<p><b>O.CONNECT</b></p> <p>No information shall be shared between SWITCHED COMPUTERS via the TOE. This includes STATE INFORMATION, if such is maintained within the TOE.</p>	<p><b>FDP_ETC.1</b> (Export of User Data Without Security Attributes)</p> <p><b>FDP_IFC.1</b> (Subset Information Flow Control)</p> <p><b>FDP_IFF.1</b> (Simple Security Attributes)</p> <p><b>FDP_ITC.1</b> (Import of User Data Without Security Attributes)</p>	<p><b>FDP_ETC.1:</b> In typical TOE applications, USER data consists of HUMAN INTERFACE DEVICE control information. Also included is configuration information such as KEYBOARD settings that must be reestablished each time the TOE switches between COMPUTERS. These DEVICES neither expect nor require any security ATTRIBUTE information. The information content of the data passed through a CONNECTION is ignored.</p> <p><b>FDP_IFC.1:</b> This captures the policy that no information flows between different</p>

Objective	Requirements Addressing the Objective	Rationale
		<p>PERIPHERAL PORT GROUP IDS.</p> <p><b>FDP_IFF.1:</b> This requirement identifies the security ATTRIBUTES needed to detail the operation of a switch and the rules allowing information transfer. This requirement is a dependency of FDP_IFC.1.</p> <p><b>FDP_ITC.1:</b> In typical TOE applications, USER data consists of HUMAN INTERFACE DEVICE control information. These DEVICES neither expect nor require any security ATTRIBUTE information.</p>
<p><b>O.INDICATE</b></p> <p>The AUTHORIZED USER shall receive an unambiguous indication of which SWITCHED COMPUTER has been selected</p>	<p><b>EXT_VIR.1</b> (Visual Indication Rule)</p>	<p><b>EXT_VIR.1:</b> There must be some positive feedback from the TOE to the USER to indicate which SWITCHED COMPUTER is currently CONNECTED.</p> <p>Part 2 of the Common Criteria does not provide a component appropriate to express the requirement for visual indication.</p>
<p><b>O.INVOKE</b> Upon switch selection, the TOE is invoked.</p>	<p><b>ADV_ARC.1</b> (Security architecture description)</p>	<p><b>ADV_ARC.1:</b> addresses the non-bypassability and domain separation aspects of the TSF. The architecture will contribute to this objective by ensuring that the TSF can protect itself from users. The Data Separation SFP must be enforced at all times during TOE operation. This requires that the TSP</p>

Objective	Requirements Addressing the Objective	Rationale
		functions always be invoked.
<p><b>O.NOPROG</b></p> <p>Logic contained within the TOE shall be protected against unauthorized modification. Embedded logic must not be stored in programmable or re-programmable components.</p>	<p><b>ADV_ARC.1</b> (Security architecture description)</p>	<p><b>ADV_ARC.1:</b> addresses the non-bypassability and domain separation aspects of the TSF. The architecture will contribute to this objective by ensuring that the TSF can protect itself from users. The TSF needs to ensure that it protects itself against changes, which might compromise its security functionality.</p>
<p><b>O.ROM</b></p> <p>TOE software/firmware shall be protected against unauthorized modification. Embedded software must be contained in mask-programmed or one-time-programmable read-only memory permanently attached (non-socketed) to a circuit assembly.</p>	<p><b>ADV_ARC.1</b> (Security architecture description)</p>	<p><b>ADV_ARC.1:</b> addresses the non-bypassability and domain separation aspects of the TSF. The architecture will contribute to this objective by ensuring that the TSF can protect itself from users. The TSF needs to ensure that it protects itself against changes, which might compromise its security functionality.</p>
<p><b>O.SELECT</b></p> <p>An explicit action by the AUTHORIZED USER shall be used to select the COMPUTER to which the shared set of PERIPHERAL DEVICES is CONNECTED. Single push button, multiple push button, or rotary selection methods are used by most (if not all) current market</p>	<p><b>FMT_MSA.1</b> (Management of Security Attributes)</p> <p><b>FMT_MSA.3</b> (Static Attribute Initialization)</p>	<p><b>FMT_MSA.1:</b> This restricts the ability to change selected PERIPHERAL PORT GROUP IDs to the AUTHORIZED USER. This requirement is a dependency of FMT_MSA.3.</p> <p><b>FMT_MSA.3:</b> The TOE assumes a default PERIPHERAL PORT GROUP selection based on a</p>

Objective	Requirements Addressing the Objective	Rationale
products. Automatic switching based on scanning shall not be used as a selection mechanism.		physical switch position or a manufacturer's specified sequence for choosing among the CONNECTED COMPUTERS (CONNECTED here implies powered on). This requirement is a dependency of FDP_IFF.1 and FDP_ITC.1.
<p><b>O.SWITCH</b></p> <p>All DEVICES in a SHARED PERIPHERAL GROUP shall be CONNECTED to at most one SWITCHED COMPUTER at a time.</p>	<p><b>FDP_IFF.1</b> (Simple Security Attributes)</p>	<p><b>FDP_IFF.1:</b> This requirement identifies the security ATTRIBUTES needed to detail the operation of a switch and the rules allowing information transfer. This requirement is a dependency of FDP_IFC.1.</p>

The set of security functional requirements can be partitioned into the following areas, analytically determined to be mutually exclusive and internally consistent.

Information Flow: FDP\_ETC.1  
FDP\_IFC.1  
FDP\_IFF.1  
FDP\_ITC.1

Group ID Management: FMT\_MSA.1  
FMT\_MSA.3

## 6.4 Dependencies Not Met

### **FMT\_SMR.1** (Security Roles)

The TOE is not required to associate USERS with roles; hence, there is only one "role", that of USER. This deleted requirement, a dependency of FMT\_MSA.1 and FMT\_MSA.3, allows the TOE to operate normally in the absence of any formal roles.

## 6.5 Mapping Tables

The indicated mappings do not necessarily imply that all aspects of the relations are resolved. For example, in Table 1, T.PHYSICAL is only partially addressed by O.NOPROG.

	O.CONF	O.CONNECT	O.INDICATE	O.INVOKE	O.NOPROG	O.ROM	O.SELECT	O.SWITCH		OE.MANAGE
T.BYPASS				X						
T.INSTALL										X
T.LOGICAL					X	X				
T.PHYSICAL	X				X	X				
T.RESIDUAL	X	X								
T.SPOOF			X				X			
T.STATE	X	X								
T.TRANSFER	X	X						X		

**Table 1: Mapping of Threats to Objectives**

	O.CONF	O.CONNECT	O.INDICATE	O.INVOKE	O.NOPROG	O.ROM	O.SELECT	O.SWITCH
FDP_ETC.1	X	X						
FDP_IFC.1	X	X						
FDP_IFF.1	X	X						X
FDP_ITC.1	X	X						
FMT_MSA.1							X	
FMT_MSA.3								X
ADV_ARC.1				X				
ADV_ARC.1					X	X		
EXT_VIR.1			X					

**Table 2: Mapping of Security Functional Requirements to Objectives**

Dependency	FDP_IFC.1	FDP_IFF.1	FDP_ITC.1		FMT_MSA.1	FMT_MSA.3	FMT_SMR.1
FDP_ETC.1	X						
FDP_IFC.1		X					
FDP_IFF.1	X					X	
FDP_ITC.1	X					X	
FMT_MSA.1	X						X
FMT_MSA.3					X		X
EXT_VIR.1							

**Table 3: Mapping of Security Functional Requirements Dependencies**

## Terms of Reference

### **Attribute**

(See Peripheral Port Group ID)

### **Authorized User**

A USER who has been granted permission to interact with the TOE and all of its CONNECTED PERIPHERALS.

### **Computer**

A programmable machine. The two principal characteristics of a computer are: it responds to a specific set of instructions in a well-defined manner, and It can execute a prerecorded list of instructions (a software program). For the purposes of this document, any electronic DEVICE controlling the MONITOR, and accepting signals from the KEYBOARD and POINTING DEVICE (if any) will qualify. Examples of computers under this definition are IBM-class personal computers (and so-called clones), desktop workstations, and control console INTERFACES into “mainframe” computers.

### **Connected**

A state in which information can be intentionally transferred.

### **Connection**

A path for information flow between two or more DEVICES.

### **Device**

A unit of hardware, outside or inside the case or housing for the essential COMPUTER that is capable of providing INPUT to the essential COMPUTER or of receiving OUTPUT or both. The term PERIPHERAL is sometimes used as a synonym for device or any INPUT/OUTPUT unit.

### **Group**

(See Peripheral Port Group)

### **Human Interface Devices**

Those PERIPHERALS which primarily allow a USER to directly observe and/or modify the operation/status of a COMPUTER. Examples include a keyboard, video MONITOR, mouse, and an optical head tracker. Modems, printers, hard drives, and scanners are not such devices.

### **Input Device**

Any machine that feeds data into a COMPUTER. This includes scanners, touch screens, and voice response systems.

### **Interface**

The CONNECTION and interaction between hardware, software, and the USER.

### **Keyboard**

A DEVICE which converts the physical action of a USER such as the depressing of one or more buttons into electronic signals corresponding to the bitwise symbol for a character in some form of electronic alphabet. The most common example is the typewriter-like keyboard found on most home COMPUTERS, but the definition also includes braille keypads among other DEVICES.

### **Monitor**

A COMPUTER OUTPUT surface and projecting mechanism that show text and other graphic images from a COMPUTER system to a user, using a Cathode Ray Tube (CRT),

Liquid Crystal Display (LCD), Light-Emitting Diode (LED), gas plasma, active matrix, or other image projection technology. The display (the terms display and monitor are often used interchangeably) is usually considered to include the screen or projection surface and the DEVICE that produces the information on the screen. In some COMPUTERS, the display is packaged in a separate unit called a monitor. Displays (and monitors) are also sometimes called Video Display Terminals (VDTs). Also included in this category are tactile braille OUTPUT DEVICES.

**Object**

(See Peripheral Data and State Information)

**Output Device**

Any machine capable of representing information from a COMPUTER. This includes display screens, printers, plotters, and synthesizers.

**Peripheral**

A DEVICE that is logically and electrically (or electromagnetically) CONNECTED to a COMPUTER, but normally mounted outside of the COMPUTER enclosure. MONITORS, KEYBOARDS, and POINTING DEVICES are all peripherals.

**Peripheral Data**

Information, including [buffered] STATE INFORMATION, sent from or to a PERIPHERAL.

**Peripheral Port Group**

(“Group”)/ **Peripheral Port**

**Group ID**

A collection of HUMAN INTERFACE DEVICE PORTS treated as a single entity by the SWITCH. There is one Group for the set of SHARED PERIPHERALS and one Group for each SWITCHED COMPUTER directly CONNECTED to the SWITCH. Each SWITCHED COMPUTER Group has a unique logical ID. The shared Group ID is the same as that of the SWITCHED COMPUTER Group currently selected by the SWITCH.

**Pointing Device**

A DEVICE, which converts relative positioning motion from a human operator into positioning information on a MONITOR. Examples of Pointing Devices include a mouse, trackball, joystick, and touchpad.

**Port**

An external socket for plugging in communications lines and/or PERIPHERALS.

**Residual Data**

Any PERIPHERAL DATA stored in a SWITCH.

**Shared Peripheral**

(See Peripheral Port Group)

**State Information**

The current or last-known status, or condition, of a process, transaction, or setting. “Maintaining state” means keeping track of such data over time.

**Subject**

(See Peripheral Port Group)

**Switch**

A DEVICE permitting a single set of PERIPHERALS to be shared among two or more COMPUTERS. Synonymous with TOE in this document.

**Switched Computer**

(See Peripheral Port Group)

**User**

The human operator of the TOE.

## Acronyms

**CCIB** Common Criteria Implementation Board

**CCIMB** Common Criteria Interpretations Management Board

**CM** Configuration Management

**CRT** Cathode Ray Tube

**DAC** Discretionary Access Control

**EAL** Evaluation Assurance Level

**FCC** Federal Communications Commission

**FFRDC** Federally Funded Research and Development Center

**ID** Identification

**IEC** International Electro-technical Commission

**ISO** International Standards Organization

**ISSE** Information Systems Security Engineer[ing]

**ISSO** Information Systems Security Organization

**IT** Information Technology

**KVM** Keyboard-Video-Mouse

**LCD** Liquid Crystal Display

**LED** Light-Emitting Diode

**MAC** Mandatory Access Control

**PP** Protection Profile

**PSS** Peripheral Sharing Switch

**SFP** Security Function Policy

**ST** Security Target

**TOE** Target of Evaluation

**TSC** TSF Scope of Control

**TSF** TOE Security Functions

**TSP** TOE Security Policy

**VDT** Video Display Terminal

## References

1. Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation, Version 3.1 Revision 1, CCIB-2006-09-001, 002, 003), September 2006.
2. ISSE Analysis - Electronic Computer Peripheral Switches, NSA/V23, draft dated 12 March 1999.
3. ISSE Analysis/Keyboard-Video-Mouse (KVM) Switches, NSA/V23, draft dated 5 August 1999.
4. Network Security Framework Forum (renamed the Information Assurance Framework Forum), <http://www.nsff.org>
5. Network Security Framework Robustness Strategy (Chapter 4.4), Release 1.1 3 December 1998
6. [http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/david\\_fletcher1/Fletcher2/encyclp.htm](http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/david_fletcher1/Fletcher2/encyclp.htm) Over 10,000 computer terms and definitions.
7. <http://www.pcwebopaedia.com> online encyclopedia and search engine.
8. <http://www.whatis.com> Computer-related term definitions.
9. Title 47 CFR, Chapter 1 (FCC), Part 15 (Radio Frequency Devices); <http://www.fcc.gov/oet/info/rules/part15/part15-mar99.pdf>