NIAP CCEVS End of Evaluation Survey

To assist us in our on-going efforts to improve the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of CCEVS evaluations, please take a few minutes to complete and submit this survey.

Produc	et Name/Version/VID EAL
1.	Please rate your experience with the NIAP CCEVS program using a scale of 1 to 5 (where $1 = \text{unsatisfactory}$ and $5 = \text{outstanding}$,) or N/A
	Satisfaction with CC Lab evaluation process
	Satisfaction with the CC lab vulnerability analysis
	Satisfaction with technical expertise of CC Lab personnel
	Satisfaction with timeliness of the CC Lab evaluation
	Satisfaction with Government validation process
	Satisfaction with the Government vulnerability analysis (above EAL4)
	Satisfaction with technical expertise of Government validation personnel
	Satisfaction with Government validation timeliness
	Please share any specific good or bad experiences with this evaluation.
2.	Did the evaluation detect any vulnerabilities in your product? PES NO If yes, were they corrected prior to the conclusion of the evaluation? YES NO
3.	Did the evaluation detect any discrepancies in the evaluation documents? ¬ YES ¬ NO If yes, were they corrected prior to the conclusion of the evaluation?

	□ YES □ NO
4.	Please rate your knowledge of the following areas using a scale of 1 to 5 (where $1 = no knowledge and 5 = very knowledgeable)$
	CC Lab evaluation process
	CC assurance continuity process (Also known as assurance maintenance or certificate maintenance)
	CC Evaluation Assurance Levels (EAL)s
	CC Protection Profiles (PP)s
	CCEVS validation process
	CCEVS policy letters
	Department of Defense Policies (e.g., DODD 8500.1, DODI 8500.2)
	National Acquisition Policy NSTISSP No. 11
5.	We would like your opinion on the relative importance of each of the following proposed improvements to the CC process. Please rate the following five items using a scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 = extremely important and 5 = not important)
	Reduce documentation requirements specific to CC evaluations by using a more direct and interactive approach between vendors and evaluators
	Document evaluation results in terms of security strengths and weaknesses of the product instead of just pass/fail
	Add an in depth look at the vendors' development and flaw remediation processes to provide a basis for predictive assurance to allow certification to be extended beyond the evaluated version of the product
	Include the use of standardized tools throughout the course of the evaluation to increase consistency and efficiency
	Include and enforce more rigorous requirements for

vulne	erability analysis
Pleas of the CC	se share with us any other change(s) you would like to see in the next version C:
improve	ou for participating in this survey. Please add any comments you feel would the process, provide greater value to the end consumer of your product, or your return on investment. Your input will be used to improve CCEVS s.
ame (Optio	onal)
` •	n (Optional)
rgamzation	(Optional)
lay we cont	tact you if we have questions? Yes No
ax to CCEV mail to: IAP CCEV	VS: 410-854-6615 VS

or mail to: NIAP CCEVS c/o Department of Defense 9800 Savage Road, STE 6757 Ft. Meade, MD 20755-6757