



# ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 27/WG 3 **N 1692**

REPLACES:

## ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 27/WG 3

Information technology – Security techniques – Security evaluation, testing and specification

Convenorship: AENOR, Spain, Vice-convenorship: JISC, Japan

**DOC. TYPE:** Liaison Organization Contribution

**TITLE:** **CCUF Liaison Statement to ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 27/WG3**

**SOURCE:** CCUF Liaison representative

**DATE:** 2019-03-31

**PROJECT:** **All projects**

**STATUS:** This document has been forwarded for consideration at the forthcoming 58<sup>th</sup> SC 27/WG 3 meeting in Ramat Gan / Tel-Aviv, Israel, April 1st – 5th 2019. It is circulated within SC 27/WG 3 for information.

**ACTION:** **INFO**

**DUE DATE:**

**DISTRIBUTION:** M. Bañón, N. Kai, WG 3 Experts

**MEDIUM:** <http://isotc.iso.org/livelink/livelink/open/jtc1sc27wg3>

**NO. OF PAGES:** 1 + 1

## LIAISON STATEMENT

FROM: CCUF  
TO: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 27/WG 3



CCUF thanks ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 27/WG 3 for their liaison statement circulated as ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 27/WG 3 N1647 dated October 4, 2018.

The CCUF appreciates the establishment of an external Category C liaison between the CCUF and ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 27/WG 3 in accordance with ITTF's notification. CCUF is an unincorporated non-profit association. The CCUF mission is to provide a voice and communications channel between the CC community and the CC organizational committees, CCRA member organizations, and policy makers.

A membership of the CCUF is currently over 800 people representing 37 nations. Most of these people work in the technical communities developing the specifications (e.g. Protection Profiles) based on ISO/IEC 15408, 18045. The membership is made of professionals working in the domain of the standards and represents all the categories of the various stakeholders. The liaison between CCUF and SC 27/WG 3 can facilitate the effective accomplishment of the objectives of both organizations

The CCUF sincerely expresses its thanks to WG 3 for inviting comments on current WG 3 work items. The CCUF has been carefully reviewed the particular on-going editing project (specifically ISO/IEC 15408, 18045, and associated TR 22216). This liaison statement from the CCUF provides a response to the SC 27/WG 3 request for a return liaison statement.

### ISO/IEC TR 22216

The CCUF attach comments in regard to ISO/IEC TR 22216.

### ISO/IEC 15408-2

In regarding to comment request for the new SFR called FPT\_INI in ISO/IEC 15408-2, the DSC expert group of CCUF will submit additional suggested input in time for the editors to include in the next draft if it is available. TPM experts of CCUF provided the review comment as following;

1. The first comment (043) states:  
"The term "unicity" is not self-explanatory and raises questions how to evaluate it."  
  - Review comment
    1. Replace "unicity" (rare and obsolete) with the correct synonym "uniqueness" (per OED and Merriam-Webster dictionaries)
2. The second comment (044) states  
 "Element FPT\_INI.1.3 seems inconsistent: if a TOE initialization completes successfully despite errors and failures, its security value is questionable when property "integrity" and/or "authenticity" was chosen in FPT\_INI.1.1.  
 This element lacks measures for successful errors in case of error.  
 It is recommended to rewrite this SFR as a selection and to introduce management and auditing activities to this component."  
  - Review comment
    1. The proposed change of 044 was "The TOE initialization function shall detect and respond to errors and failures during initialization such that the TOE [selection choose one of: is halted, successfully completes initialization with [assignment: [selection: reduced functionality, signalling error state, list of actions]]".
    2. The TPM expert agreed with propose rewrite. However, the expert noted that this CANNOT be implemented w/ a TCG TPM 2.0, because Secure Boot is binary - reduced functionality concept is out-of-scope. Also, the ISO 15408-2

concept of "Secure Initialization" is also ambiguous, because it conflates 1st stage Secure Boot w/ 2nd stage Measured Boot.

3. In TCG TPM 2.0 there are two initialization stages:
  - Secure Boot (MUST complete entirely w/out errors or else a hard fault occurs and fall-back to reduced functionality is undefined)
  - Measured Boot (late-loading drivers and applications - MAY record errors, but continue w/out associated functionality)

3. The third comment (045) states

"There is an overlap between FPT\_INI.1 and ADV\_ARC.1.3C in ISO/IEC 15408-3. For example;

[line 5969 in 15408-3]

*the security architecture description also includes an explanation of how the TSF is protected against this initialisation code that does not run in the evaluated configuration.*

The above may be covered by FPT\_INI.1.4

[line 5976 in 15408-3]

*There must also be an explanation of how the trusted initialisation code will maintain the integrity of the TSF (and of its initialisation process) such that the initialisation process is able to detect any modification that would result in the TSF being spoofed into believe it was in an initial secure state.*

The above may be covered by FPT\_INI.1.2"

- Review comment
  1. The proposed change of this comment was "It's not proposed change to the 15408-2 but JP NB recommends removing ADV\_ARC.1.3C in ISO/IEC 15408-3 because this assurance component can be replaced with FPT\_INI.1 and secure initialization may not be necessary for all type of the TOEs (e.g. one-way H/W data diode or trusted biometrics recognition application running on the mobile (mobile OS is responsible for securely initializing the trusted apps))"
  2. However, TPM expert disagreed with removal of ADV\_ARC.1.3C from ISO 15408-3. It is not fully redundant with FPT\_INI.1.4 in ISO 15408-2 because of "Secure Initialization" ambiguity above.

CCUF thanks ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 27/WG 3 for the updates of the dates and locations of its forthcoming meetings. These are noted and the CCUF requests that SC 27/WG 3 continue to include information about their future meetings in their future liaison statements.

#### The CCUF Future meetings

The CCUF includes information regarding its future meetings in their liaison statements and would like to inform SC 27/WG 3 of the following events planned for 2019.

- April 9-11, The 15<sup>th</sup> CCUF Workshop, Rome, Italy
- October 25-28, the 16<sup>th</sup> CCUF Workshop, Singapore

Further information is available from <http://www.ccusersforum.org/>. Please let us know if there is any additional information you may need regarding the CCUF.

#### Attachments

- Review comments for the TR 22216