



EPOCHE & ESPRI



Practical reading of the CC, success stories in the evaluation of complex products





E P O C H E & E S P R I

Abstract.

This presentation focuses on success factors that lead to satisfied CC users.



Fact 1.

The CC is a technology independent evaluation criteria.

Which means that technology specific knowledge has to be applied in an evaluation, which not going to be provided by the CC



Fact 1.

The CC is a technology independent evaluation criteria.

Supporting documents have proven to be a driven factor for success stories, mainly in the smart card area.



Fact 1.

The CC is a technology independent evaluation criteria.

Labs and consultancy companies that define their evaluation effort within the CC defined texts provide no added value, yet are able to get CC certificates.



Fact 1.

The CC is a technology independent evaluation criteria.

The so called “check-list approach”, which so much money is costing and generating, is the main dissatisfaction factor.



Assertion 1.

The CC as evaluation criteria + specific evaluation technical knowledge leads to sound and useful results.

As it has been repeatedly stated at this conference, the vulnerability analysis is the goal evaluator actions. A technically sound evaluator, guided by the CEM, achieves better results than the black-box blind analyst.



Assertion 1.

The CC as evaluation criteria + specific evaluation technical knowledge leads to sound and useful results.

If we had to choose, we prefer technical competence vs checklist capabilities. However, they do not result in internationally recognized certificates. The proper balance is key for a successful evaluation.



Fact 2.

The CC forces to think and justify the design and features of a product.

The developer may have to think in advance, in concurrent fashion, or post-mortem, but the CC forces things to be coherent.



Fact 2.

The CC forces to think and justify the design and features of a product.

That is why it is said not to match with modern development practices.



Fact 2.

The CC forces to think and justify the design and features of a product.

That is why it is being successfully applied in product areas where security is a key selling factor or an upfront requirement.



Fact 2.

The CC forces to think and justify the design and features of a product.

That is why it is so costly if the developer has to perform a retrofit, and still wants to claim the highest assurance level for marketing reasons.



Assertion 2.

The CC shines where the developer applies sound security engineering practices.

The concepts and the requirements are usually in place, even if they have different names.



Assertion 2.

The CC shines where the developer applies sound security engineering practices.

These engineering practices may cover everything that the CC is asking for, without the CC forcing any particular order or development cycle.



Conclusion 1

The CC as evaluation criteria + specific evaluation technical knowledge leads to sound and useful results.

The CC shines where the developer applies sound security engineering practices.



Conclusion 2

Applying the CC without technical competence, which is out of the scope of the standard, and on a product badly developed leads to catastrophic or misleading results.



E P O C H E & E S P R I

Thanks for your attention!

Miguel Bañón

Epoche & Espri, S.L.U.
Avda. de la Vega, 1
28108, Alcobendas,
Madrid, Spain.

mbp@epoche.es