



National Information Assurance Partnership

Common Criteria Evaluation and Validation Scheme

CCEVS Policy Letter #3

4 March 2002

SUBJECT: Target of Evaluation Security Targets Claiming Conformance to Protection Profiles (Draft or Validated)

PURPOSE: To clarify the CCEVS stance on Target of Evaluation (TOE) Security Targets (STs) with protection profile conformance claims against “Draft or Validated” protection profiles. Additionally, to provide guidance on the reuse and applicability of evaluation evidence/analysis from a protection profile (PP) Assurance Protection Profile Evaluation (APE) evaluation when performing a Target of Evaluation (TOE) security target Assurance Security Target Evaluation (ASE) evaluation.

BACKGROUND: The Common Criteria ASE_PPC requirements do not specifically preclude a TOE security target from claiming conformance to a draft protection profile but do address the possible economies of scale when claiming conformance to an evaluated protection profile. With the exception of the TOE Summary Specification (TSS) the ASE and APE requirements are the same for each element of these evaluations. Therefore, it would be timely and cost effective for the Common Criteria Testing Laboratory (CCTL) to not have to repeat the analysis for ASE compliance of the corresponding APE requirements when a sponsor is claiming conformance to an evaluated protection profile. Additionally, it would be timely and cost effective for the CCTL to be able to build upon the analysis when the TOE Security Target content is a superset of the protection profile.

There are several ways in which a ST can be a superset of a PP:

- It can include functional components that are hierarchical to those of the PP;
- It can include functional requirements in addition to those specified in the PP;
- It can specify a higher EAL level than that required for compliance with the PP;
- It can specify assurance components in addition to those required by the PP.

POLICY: The CCEVS will allow sponsors of evaluations to claim conformance to both draft and validated protection profiles. For TOE security targets claiming conformance to a draft protection profile, the CCTL team must perform all ASE work units. When the security target

does not satisfy an ASE work unit the security target must be corrected even if the Draft Protection Profile is not.

When the TOE security target claims conformance to a validated protection profile and there is a direct one for one mapping with the content of a successfully evaluated protection profile the CCTL may claim conformance to the corresponding ASE requirement based on the protection profile APE evaluation evidence/analysis. This case requires no additional analysis of the ASE requirements.

If the TOE security target is a superset of the protection profile requirements, the sponsor and CCTL may claim partial conformance to the corresponding ASE requirements based on the previous PP APE evaluation evidence/analysis. In general, exceeding the PP requirements has no effect on compliance; the ST writer may include more detail and additional capabilities that exceed the minimum requirements specified in the PP and remain compliant with the PP. However, this case requires that the ST author (and the corresponding TOE developer) demonstrate that the features and capabilities that are provided in addition to what is required in the PP neither introduce security vulnerabilities nor circumvent or interfere with required security functions.

In both of the above cases where a validated PP is used, the CCTL must complete the work units for the analysis of the TSS. Additionally, for each corresponding APE/ASE work unit, the CCTL must show that a review/mapping was conducted and provide a statement as to why the PP evaluation evidence/analysis is reusable between the PP and ST.

THOMAS E. ANDERSON
Director