

Adjusting to the New cPPs



Kim Frawley Braun & Greg Lague

EWA-Canada

September 11th, 2013

Your Trusted Partner

- **Introduction**
- **TOE Compliance**
- **Breakdown by Assurance Class**
- **Conclusions**

- Canadian Common Criteria Evaluation and Certification Scheme (CCS) Instruction #2
 - Unless otherwise stated by CSEC, the CCS will only accept those IT products into the CC certification process that claim conformance to a Canadian-approved Protection Profile, with an EAL no higher than that specified in the Protection Profile.
 - At the present time, the list of Canadian-approved Protection Profiles is identical to the U.S. approved Protection Profiles, located at <http://www.niap-ccevs.org/pp>
- There are currently 18 validated Protection Profiles on that list
 - PP_ND_V1.1 – Protection Profile for Network Devices

- Developer should consult with a knowledgeable party before start of evaluation
- Does product fulfill all of the Assurance Activities
 - Additional descriptive text generated to ensure consistent and comparable evaluation results:
 - Point to evidence that should exist in the documentation
 - Testing actions to be performed by the evaluator
- Is TOE boundary well defined

Breakdown by Assurance Class

- ASE
- ALC
- AGD
- ADV
- ATE
- AVA



ASE – Security Target Evaluation

Assurance class	Assurance Family	Assurance Components by Evaluation						
		Assurance Level						
		EAL1	EAL2	EAL3	EAL4	EAL5	EAL6	EAL7
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

- No requirement for the lab to evaluate the Security Problem Definitions
 - Threats, OSPs and Assumptions are taken directly from the PPs with no modifications permitted
- Extended Component Definitions required by CSEC
- AA that overlap with ASE work unit

Assurance class	Assurance Family	Assurance Components by Evaluation Assurance Level						
		EAL1	EAL2	EAL3	EAL4	EAL5	EAL6	EAL7
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



- No Configuration Management document
 - No requirement for developer to have a CM system
 - Configuration Item List can be included in the ST
- No Delivery document
- No Development Security document
- No Site Visit

Assurance class	Assurance Family	Assurance Components by Evaluation						
		Assurance Level						
		EAL1	EAL2	EAL3	EAL4	EAL5	EAL6	EAL7
Guidance documents	AGD_OPE	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	AGD_PRE	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

- Operational user guidance and Preparative procedures are still required
 - May be an evaluator’s only method for learning how to install, configure and use the product
- Administrative Supplement guide required

Assurance class	Assurance Family	Assurance Components by Evaluation Assurance Level						
		EAL1	EAL2	EAL3	EAL4	EAL5	EAL6	EAL7
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

- No requirement for TOE Design and Security Architecture documents
- Functional Specification still required by CSEC
 - TSFIs must be identified so that evaluator can perform testing
 - Proprietary information

Assurance class	Assurance Family	Assurance Components by Evaluation						
		Assurance Level						
		EAL1	EAL2	EAL3	EAL4	EAL5	EAL6	EAL7
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

- Developer should test their product to ensure it meets all AA requirements
- No formal test document is required...However!!!
- Advanced test tools needed
- Evaluator training and knowledge

- The old way and the new way
- PP Claim + EAL
- cPP and trim the rest

Testing to cPP

- Scope of testing
- Input from ADV
- Developer obligations



Vulnerability assessment	AVA_VAN	1	2	2	3	4	5	5
--------------------------	---------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

- Vulnerability Survey
- The evaluator shall perform a search of public domain sources
- Basic attack potential

Conclusions

- Evaluation results are more tightly scrutinized
- Developer has more responsibilities than ever before to verify their product can meet the AAs before the evaluation starts
- Consultation with the lab and documentation consultants before the launch of the evaluation will make all the difference

Comments?

Contacts



Kim Frawley Braun

CC Project Manager

613-230-6067 x 1212

kbraun@ewa-canada.com

Greg Lague

CC Project Manager

613-230-6067 x 1217

glague@ewa-canada.com