National Information Assurance Partnership
Common Criteria Evaluation and Validation Scheme

CCEVS Policy Letter #2

4 March 2002

SUBJECT: Reuse of Previous Evaluation Results and Evidence

PURPOSE: Provide clarification on the Common Criteria Evaluation and Validation Scheme (CCEVS) approach for the reuse of previous evaluation results and evidence and to outline the minimum requirements necessary to facilitate this approach.

BACKGROUND: Previous evaluation results and evidence of a TOE can be used to the extent available to minimize duplication of evaluation costs and efforts. The sponsor of an information technology product evaluation is responsible for providing all evidence for the evaluation, including any previous evaluation results and evidence that they want to be used in the current evaluation. For the current evaluation the evidence items can include evaluation results and evidence produced by an evaluation facility as the result of an earlier evaluation.

Sponsors of evaluations need to understand there are a number of components to any Target of Evaluation (TOE) evaluation conducted against Common Criteria functional and assurance requirements. The six primary components to any evaluation include:

1) Product and supporting documentation
2) Security Target
3) Evaluation Work Packages
4) Evaluation Technical Report
5) Certification/Validation Report
6) Common Criteria Certificate

Access to these components varies depending on whether the components are publicly available or have proprietary ownership. Of these components the Security Target, Certification/Validation Report, and Common Criteria Certificate are all publicly available non-proprietary documents. The Evaluation Work Packages and the Evaluation Technical Report (ETR) are typically generated by the evaluation facility and in most cases are considered to be proprietary to that facility just the same as the product and support documentation are proprietary to the vendor of the product undergoing evaluation.

If the goal of an evaluation sponsor is to build upon a successfully completed evaluation reusing to the maximum extent possible the analysis from that evaluation, they need to consider including

ownership or rights to certain components of an evaluation in their contractual relationship with any evaluation facility. The ability of a sponsor to provide the necessary information upon which future evaluation activities can be built may be directly related to the contractual agreement for the initial evaluation.   This is especially important in two cases: 1) if the sponsor of a previously completed CCEVS evaluation is considering utilizing a different CCEVS evaluation facility for a re-evaluation of the TOE, and 2) the sponsor has a TOE that was successfully evaluated under a different Common Criteria Recognition Arrangement (CCRA) Scheme for which they would like to have a re-evaluation of the TOE conducted under the CCEVS (e.g., re-evaluation of product with new features or assurances, increasing Evaluated Assurance Level (EAL) beyond what is covered by the CCRA, etc.).

POLICY: In the U.S. the minimum components necessary for building upon a previously conducted evaluation, regardless of where it was conducted, re-utilizing to the maximum extent previous analysis and evidence are:

> 1) Product and supporting documentation
> 2) New Security Target
> 3) Original Security Target
> 4) Original Evaluation Technical Report
> 5) Original Certification/Validation Report
> 6) Original Common Criteria Certificate
> 7) Original Evaluation Work Packages (If available)

The evaluation facility would be required to perform a delta analysis between the new security target and the original security target to determine the impact of changes on the analysis and evidence from the original evaluation.   When undergoing the current evaluation, all of the requirements in the updated security target must be satisfied—including those that were unchanged from the previous version. However, the evaluation facility conducting the current evaluation should not have to repeat analysis previously conducted where requirements have not changed nor been impacted by changes in other requirements (i.e., an increase in dependencies). Thus, many of the requirements previously met during the original evaluation may still be satisfied and new work packages for these requirements will not be required.

Work packages, which are developed from a previous evaluation, may be helpful in providing information on how the previous evaluation team reached their conclusions and may also provide helpful information in assessing compliance to the new requirements. With this in mind, if the previous evaluation work packages are available they should be used to the maximum extent possible.   Generally, the laboratory conducting the current evaluation should use any evidence brought forward from the prior evaluation where beneficial either to reduce costs or to help ensure a technically sound evaluation. When generating a new Evaluation Technical Report for the current evaluation effort the evaluation facility can use a combination of previous work packages or Evaluation Technical Report sections (in the absence of work packages) coupled with new evaluation work packages.

THOMAS E. ANDERSON
Director