

Certification Report

BSI-DSZ-CC-1017-2017

for

**SLS 32TLC100(M) CIPURSE™ Security Controller
V1.2.0**

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-1017-2017 (*)

SLS 32TLC100(M) CIPURSE™ Security Controller
V1.2.0

from Infineon Technologies AG
PP Conformance: None
Functionality: Product specific Security Target
Common Criteria Part 2 conformant
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 Scheme Interpretations, 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, 7 April 2017

For the Federal Office for Information Security

Joachim Weber
Head of Division

L.S.



Common Criteria
Recognition Arrangement
for components up to
EAL 4



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 BSI¹ 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 - BSI¹) 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.....	13
3. Security Policy.....	14
4. Assumptions and Clarification of Scope.....	14
5. Architectural Information.....	14
6. Documentation.....	14
7. IT Product Testing.....	15
8. Evaluated Configuration.....	18
9. Results of the Evaluation.....	18
10. Obligations and Notes for the Usage of the TOE.....	19
11. Security Target.....	19
12. Definitions.....	20
13. Bibliography.....	22
C. Excerpts from the Criteria.....	25
CC Part 1:.....	25
CC Part 3:.....	26
D. Annexes.....	33

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: Scheme documentation describing the certification process (CC-Produkte) [3]
- BSI certification: Scheme documentation on requirements for the Evaluation Facility, its approval and licencing process (CC-Stellen) [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.

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

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 "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. In addition, certificates issued for Protection Profiles based on Common Criteria are part of the recognition agreement.

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. The current list of signatory nations and approved certification schemes, details on recognition, and the history of the agreement can be seen on the website at <https://www.sogisportal.eu>.

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), CC certificates based on assurance components up to and including EAL 2 or the assurance family Flaw Remediation (ALC_FLR) and CC 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-2014 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 ADV_FSP.5, ADV_INT.2, ADV_TDS.4, ALC_CMS.5, ALC_DVS.2, ALC_TAT.2, ATE_DPT.3 and AVA_VAN.5 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 SLS 32TLC100(M) CIPURSE™ Security Controller, V1.2.0 has undergone the certification procedure at BSI. This is a re-certification based on BSI-DSZ-CC-0944-2014. Specific results from the evaluation process BSI-DSZ-CC-0944-2014 were re-used.

The evaluation of the product SLS 32TLC100(M) CIPURSE™ Security Controller, V1.2.0 was conducted by TÜV Informationstechnik GmbH. The evaluation was completed on 28 March 2017. 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 or in the CC itself.

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 7 April 2017 is valid until 6 April 2022. Validity can be re-newed by re-certification.

The owner of the certificate is obliged:

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, the Security

⁶ Information Technology Security Evaluation Facility

Target and user guidance documentation mentioned herein to any customer 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 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 where the certification of the product has assumed this confidentiality being maintained, 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 deliverables according to the Certification Report part B, or for those where no dissemination rules have been agreed on, to third parties, the Certification Body at BSI has to be informed.

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 SLS 32TLC100(M) CIPURSE™ Security Controller, V1.2.0 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 the SLS 32TLC100(M) CIPURSE™ Security Controller V1.2.0. It is a smartcard device based on the M7791 B12 and G11 hardware with a file system oriented operating system, which supports contact-less I/O communication. The device contains a software part compliant to CIPURSE™ V2, which provides a file system according to ISO/IEC 7816-4 with flexible access rights, a mutual authentication method (3-pass as per ISO/IEC 9798-2) using AES with a terminal and secure messaging for integrity and confidentiality (AES-MAC or AES-encryption).

The composite TOE comprises the M7791 B12 or G11 platform, an ISO 7816 file system, and the file system oriented operating system compliant to CIPURSE™V2. Furthermore it has a contactless ISO/IEC 14443 interface with transmission protocol. The TOE may also contain a Mifare compatible system to support migration to CIPURSE™ V2. The TOE is targeted for contact-less ticketing and payment applications compliant to CIPURSE™ V2.

The Security Target [6] is the basis for this certification. It is not based on a certified Protection Profile.

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 6.2. They are all selected from Common Criteria Part 2. Thus the TOE is CC Part 2 conformant.

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

TOE Security Functionality	Addressed issue
SF.Authenticate	The TOE provides a three-way cryptographic challenge-and-response mechanism. After successfully performing this challenge-and-response mechanism the TOE enters a secure state. During the authentication a session key is generated by the TOE, which is used to subsequently derive keys for secure messaging activities. The authentication is finished, once a MAC'ed response of the TOE is verified by the terminal.
SF.SM	The TOE supports secure messaging for integrity and confidentiality with AES-MAC and AES-encryption, using standardized secure messaging APDU format (denoted as SM-APDU format)
SF.Access	The TOE provides flexible access rights and secure messaging rules for each file. Up to 8 keys can be configured per application.
SF.Rollback	The TOE provides a mechanism to group commands to a transaction. The commands, which modify elementary files or directory files can be reversed or rolled back in case the transaction did not complete. This means, that either all changes to the data of the file system are reflected or none. Therefore the TOE provisionally stores intermediate results of a transaction.
SF.NoTrace	During anticollision the UID can be retrieved. The TOE can be configured such, that a randomized UID is provided instead of a fixed UID.

Table 1: TOE Security Functionalities

For more details please refer to the Security Target [6], chapter 7.1.

The assets to be protected by the TOE are defined in the Security Target [6], chapter 3.1. Based on these assets the TOE Security Problem is defined in terms of Assumptions, Threats and Organisational Security Policies. This is outlined in the Security Target [6], chapter 3.2 to 3.4.

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:

SLS 32TLC100(M) CIPURSE™ Security Controller, V1.2.0

The following table outlines the TOE deliverables:

No	Type	Identifier	Release	Form of Delivery
1	HW	M7791	B12 / G11	IC package
2	SW	CardOS	V1.2.0	Loaded in protected part of Flash EEPROM of the Hardware
3	DOC	CIPURSE™V2 Operation and Interface Specification [9a]	2.0 (2013-12-20)	Hardcopy or pdf file
4	DOC	CIPURSE™V2 Operation and Interface Specification R2.0 Errata and Precision List [9b]	1.0 (2014-09-18)	Hardcopy or pdf file
5	DOC	CIPURSE™V2 CIPURSE™ T Profile Specification [9c]	2.0 (2013-12-20)	Hardcopy or pdf file
6	DOC	CIPURSE™V2 CIPURSE™ T Profile Specification R2.0 Errata and Precision List [9d]	1.0 (2014-09-18)	Hardcopy or pdf file
7	DOC	CIPURSE™V2 Cryptographic Protocol [9e]	1.0 (2012-09-28)	Hardcopy or pdf file
8	DOC	CIPURSE™V2 Cryptographic Protocol R1.0 Errata and Precision List [9f]	1.0 (2014-09-18)	Hardcopy or pdf file
9	DOC	CIPURSE™Security Controller, SLS 32TLC100(M), Data Book [9g]	1.1 (2015-09-24)	Hardcopy or pdf file
10	DOC	CIPURSE™ Security Controller, SLS 32TLC100(M), Personalization Manual [9h]	1.0 (2015-01-25)	Hardcopy or pdf file
11	DOC	CIPURSE™ PICC, Chip Identification Guide [9i]	1.1 (2016-07-08)	Hardcopy or pdf file
12	DOC	CIPURSE™ Security Controller, SLS 32TLC100(M) V1.2.0, Release Notes [9j]	1.0 (2017-01-19)	Hardcopy or pdf file

Table 2: Deliverables of the TOE

The delivery to the customer (personalization agent) is an external delivery. The TOE is delivered from one of the following distribution centers: DHL Singapore, IFX Wuxi, K&N Großostheim and K&N Hayward. The delivery procedures are covered by the platform certificate.

The user can clearly identify the TOE by the information in the predefined file EF.ID_INFO and the Chip Identification Data. The corresponding information is given to him in [9g] and [9i]. Thereby, the exact and clear identification of any product with its exact configuration of this TOE is given.

3. Security Policy

The Security Policy is expressed by the set of Security Functional Requirements and implemented by the TOE. It covers the following issues:

- Role based access control
- Transaction mechanism with rollback functionality
- No traceability
- Mutual Authentication and Secure messaging

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:

- Secure Authentication Data: The operational environment is responsible to keep externally generated keys which are downloaded to the TOE confidential.
- Terminal-Support: The terminal ensures integrity and confidentiality by verifying data and following the minimum communication level defined by the TOE.

Details can be found in the Security Target [6] chapter 4.1.

5. Architectural Information

The TOE consists of the following subsystems:

- CIPURSE™ engine, which handles all CIPURSE™ relevant operations such as access rights control, authentication and handling of secure messaging and the file system.
- Communication interface, which implements the functionality of the contactless communication protocol and manages the incoming and outgoing communication streams.
- Mifare compatible engine (non-TSF), which supports all necessary commands of the Mifare compatible protocol.

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

7.1. Description of the evaluated TOE configuration

The ST [6] identifies different configurations of the SLS 32TLC100(M) CIPURSE™ Security Controller V1.2.0.

In accordance with the following sections 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4, the developer and evaluator tested the TOE in these configurations in which the TOE is delivered and which is described in chapter 8.

For the tests performed in the process of the current evaluation both platforms M7791 B12 and M7791 G11 were used. The software version was FF.01.02 which is identical to the final version V1.2.0 of the TOE except the version number, where FF indicates the development version. In February 2017 most of the functional tests were repeated with this final version V1.2.0.

7.2. Developer Tests

The developers testing effort can be summarized in the following aspects.

Developer's testing approach:

- All TSF and related security mechanisms, subsystems and modules are tested in order to assure complete coverage of all SFR.
- Different classes of tests are performed to test the TOE in a sufficient manner:
 - Functional tests,
 - Stress tests,
 - Performance tests,
 - Tearing tests.

Amount of developer testing performed:

- The tests are performed on security mechanisms, subsystem and module level.
- The developer has tested all security mechanisms and TSFIs.
- The developer has tested all the TSF subsystems and modules against the TOE design and against the security architecture description.

TOE security functionality tested:

- SF.Authenticate
- SF.SM
- SF.Access
- SF.Rollback
- SF.NoTrace

Overall developer testing results:

- The TOE has passed all tests defined in the developer's test plan.
- The developer's testing results demonstrate that the TSFs behave as specified.
- The developer's testing results demonstrate that the TOE behaves as expected.

7.3. Independent Evaluator Tests

Approach for independent testing:

- Examination of developer's testing amount, depth and coverage analysis and of the developer's test goals and plan for identification of gaps.
- Examination whether the TOE in its intended environment, is operating as specified using iterations of developer's tests.
- Independent testing was performed at the evaluation facility with the evaluation facility test equipment using test scripts.

TOE test configurations:

- Tests were performed with the chips SLS 32TLC100(M) CIPURSE™ Security Controller. The TOE configuration was consistent to the configuration described in ST [6].

Subset size chosen:

- During sample testing the evaluator chose to sample the developer functional tests at the evaluation facility. Because of enormous amount of functional developer tests, some of the tests were repeated.
- During independent testing the evaluator prepared own test scripts to invoke and test functionality of the TOE. Further penetration testing was done for AVA_VAN aspects. This includes the penetration with laser fault injection attacks and leakage attacks.

Interfaces tested:

- The evaluator included all TSFI into the testing subset.

Developer's tests repeated:

- The evaluator has re-implemented and performed a subset of developer's test cases including at least one test case for each TOE Security Feature described in ST [6].
- Additional developer's test cases were implemented and performed with different file attributes and command parameters compared to the attributes and parameters used by the developer.

Verdict for the activity:

- During the evaluator's TSF subset testing the TOE operated as specified.
- The results of the developer tests, which have been repeated by the evaluator, matched the results of the developer.
- The results of the specified and conducted independent evaluator tests confirm the TOE functionality as described in Security Target, Functional Specification, and TOE Design. The TSF and interfaces were found to behave as specified.

- Overall the TSF have been tested against the Functional Specification, the TOE Design and the Security Architecture Description. The tests demonstrate that the TSF performs as specified.

7.4. Penetration Testing

Overview:

- The penetration testing was performed using the test environment of the evaluation facility.
- All configurations of the TOE being intended to be covered by the current evaluation were considered for testing.
- The overall test result is that no deviations were found between the expected and the actual test results; moreover, no attack scenario with the attack potential high was actually successful.

Penetration testing approach:

- Systematic search for potential vulnerabilities and known attacks in public domain sources, use of a list of vulnerabilities, and from a methodical analysis of the evaluation documents.
- Analysis why these vulnerabilities are unexploitable in the intended environment of the TOE.
- If the rationale is suspect in the opinion of the evaluator penetration tests are devised.
- Even if the rationale is convincing in the opinion of the evaluator penetration tests are devised for some vulnerabilities, especially to support the argument of non practicability of exploiting time in case of SPA, DPA and FI attacks.

TOE test configurations:

- The evaluators used TOE samples for testing that were configured according to the ST [6]. The configurations that were created for testing constitute a reasonable subset of possible configurations that are allowed according to the configurations as defined in ST [6].

Verdict for the sub-activity:

- The evaluator has performed penetration testing based on the systematic search for potential vulnerabilities and known attacks in public domain sources and from the methodical analysis of the evaluation documents.
- During the evaluator's penetration testing of potential vulnerabilities the TOE operated as specified.
- All potential vulnerabilities are not exploitable in the intended environment for the TOE.
- 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:

The ST [6] identifies different configurations of the SLS 32TLC100(M) CIPURSE™ Security Controller concerning the RFI input capacity and the maximum system frequency and whether the Mifare compatible system is activated or not. Hence the TOE can be delivered with or without the functionality of Mifare and with different RFI input capacities and different maximum system frequencies.

Depending on these blocking configuration of the SLS 32TLC100(M) CIPURSE™ Security Controller product different features are available for the user as described in ST [6], chapter 1.4 and especially Table 1.

The hardware can be either M7791 B12 or M7791 G11. The difference between these two design steps is only the production site, the functionality is equal.

9. Results of the Evaluation

9.1. CC specific results

The Evaluation Technical Report (ETR) [7] 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 EAL 5 extended by advice of the Certification Body for components beyond EAL 5 and guidance specific for the technology of the product [4] (AIS 34).

The following guidance specific for the technology was used:

- (i) *Security Architecture requirements (ADV_ARC) for smart cards and similar devices (see [4], AIS 25),*
- (ii) *The application of CC to integrated circuits (see [4], AIS 25),*
- (iii) *Application of Attackpotential to Smartcards (see [4], AIS 26),*
- (iv) *Composite product evaluation for Smart Cards and similar devices (see [4], AIS 36). According to this concept the relevant guidance documents of the underlying platform and the documents ETR for Composition from the platform evaluations (see [10] and [11]), have been applied in the TOE evaluation.*
- (v) *Informationen zur Evaluierung von kryptographischen Algorithmen (see [4], AIS 46).*

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-0944-2014, re-use of specific evaluation tasks was possible. The focus of this re-evaluation was on:

- Additional functionality and fixes

APDU	Application Protocol Data Unit
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
CCRA	Common Criteria Recognition Arrangement
CC	Common Criteria for IT Security Evaluation
CEM	Common Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation
cPP	Collaborative Protection Profile
EAL	Evaluation Assurance Level
ETR	Evaluation Technical Report
IT	Information Technology
ITSEF	Information Technology Security Evaluation Facility
MF	Master File
NVM	Non Volatile Memory
PCD	Proximity Coupling Device
PICC	Proximity Integrated Circuit Card
PP	Protection Profile
RFI	Radio-Frequency Identification
SAR	Security Assurance Requirement
SFP	Security Function Policy
SFR	Security Functional Requirement
ST	Security Target
TOE	Target of Evaluation
TSF	TOE Security Functionality

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, Version 3.1, Revision 4, September 2012
Part 2: Security functional components, Version 3.1, Revision 4, September 2012
Part 3: Security assurance components, Version 3.1, Revision 4, September 2012
<http://www.commoncriteriaportal.org>
- [2] Common Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation (CEM), Evaluation Methodology, Version 3.1, Rev. 4, September 2012,
<http://www.commoncriteriaportal.org>
- [3] BSI certification: Scheme documentation describing the certification process (CC-Produkte) and Scheme documentation on requirements for the Evaluation Facility, approval and licencing (CC-Stellen), <https://www.bsi.bund.de/zertifizierung>
- [4] Application Notes and Interpretations of the Scheme (AIS) as relevant for the TOE⁸
<https://www.bsi.bund.de/AIS>
- [5] German IT Security Certificates (BSI 7148), periodically updated list published also on the BSI Website, <https://www.bsi.bund.de/zertifizierungsberichte>
- [6] Security Target BSI-DSZ-CC-1017-2017, Version 1.0, 2017-01-31, SLS 32TLC100(M) CIPURSE™ Security Controller V1.2.0, Compliant to OSPT™ Alliance CIPURSE™ T Profile, Optimized for Contactless Transport & Ticketing Applications, ISO/IEC 14443 Type A Contactless Interface, ISO/IEC 14443 Type A Contactless Interface, Infineon Technologies AG
- [7] Evaluation Technical Report, Version 5, 2017-03-15, Evaluation Technical Report Summary, TÜV Informationstechnik GmbH (confidential document)
- [8] Configuration list for the TOE (confidential documents)
a) Configuration item list, Version 1.2.0, 2016, Infineon Technologies AG
b) Development Tool List, 2017-03-15, Infineon Technologies AG
c) Document References, Version 0.3, 2016-11-17, Infineon Technologies AG
- [9] Guidance documentation for the TOE
a) CIPURSE™ V2 Operation and Interface Specification, Version 2.0, 2013-12-20
b) CIPURSE™ V2 Operation and Interface Specification R2.0 Errata and Precision List, Version 1.0, 2014-09-18

⁸specifically

- 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 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 36, Version 4, Kompositionsevaluierung including JIL Document and CC Supporting Document
- AIS 38, Version 2, Reuse of evaluation results

- c) CIPURSE™V2 CIPURSE™ T Profile Specification, Version 2.0, 2013-12-20
 - d) CIPURSE™V2 CIPURSE™ T Profile Specification R2.0 Errata and Precision List, Version 1.0, 2014-09-18
 - e) CIPURSE™V2 Cryptographic Protocol, Version 1.0, 2012-09-28
 - f) CIPURSE™V2 Cryptographic Protocol R1.0 Errata and Precision List, Version 1.0, 2014-09-18
 - g) CIPURSE™ Security Controller, SLS 32TLC100(M), Data Book, Version 1.1, 2015-09-24
 - h) CIPURSE™ Security Controller, SLS 32TLC100(M), Personalization Manual, Version 1.0, 2015-01-25
 - i) CIPURSE™ PICC, Chip Identification Guide, Version 1.1, 2016-07-08
 - j) CIPURSE™ Security Controller, SLS 32TLC100(M) V1.2.0, Release Notes, Version 1.0, 2017-01-19
- [10] Certification Report BSI-DSZ-CC-0963-V2-2017, Infineon smartcard IC (Security Controller) M7791 B12 and G11 with specific IC-dedicated firmware, 2017-02-22, Bundesamt für Sicherheit in der Informationstechnik
- [11] ETR for composite evaluation according to AIS 36 for the Product M7791 B12 and G11, Version 1, 2017-01-24, TÜV Informationstechnik GmbH (confidential document)
- [12] Certification Report BSI-DSZ-CC-0944-2014, SLS 32TLC100(M) CIPURSE™ Security Controller v1.00.00, Infineon Technologies AG, 2014-10-29, Bundesamt für Sicherheit in der Informationstechnik.

This page is intentionally left blank.

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:	AGD_OPE.1 Operational user guidance
Guidance documents	AGD_PRE.1 Preparative procedures
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
	ASE_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-1017-2017

Evaluation results regarding development and production environment



The IT product SLS 32TLC100(M) CIPURSE™ Security Controller, V1.2.0 (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 Scheme Interpretations, by advice of the Certification Body for components beyond EAL 5 and CC Supporting Documents for conformance to the Common Criteria for IT Security Evaluation (CC), Version 3.1.

As a result of the TOE certification, dated 7 April 2017, 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:

- a) Augsburg – Infineon Technologies AG, Alter Postweg 101, 86159 Augsburg, Germany (Development)
- b) Bangalore – Infineon Technologies India Pvt. Ltd., Kalyani Platina, Sy. No. 6 & 24, Kundanahalli Village, Krishnaraja Puram Hobli, Bangalore, India, 560066 (Development and Testing)
- c) Graz – Infineon Technologies Austria AG, Development Center Graz, Babenbergstr. 10, 8020 Graz, Austria (Development)
- d) Munich Infineon Technologies AG, Am Campeon 1-12, 85579 Neubiberg, Germany (Development)

For development and production sites regarding the platform please refer to the certification report BSI-DSZ-CC-0963-V2-2017 [10].

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.