



ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 27 **N 6165**

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 27/WG 3 **N 905**

REPLACES: N

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 27

Information technology - Security techniques

Secretariat: DIN, Germany

DOC. TYPE: NB Comments

TITLE: Late Korean NB Comments on FCD 15408 (all parts)

SOURCE: 35th SC 27/WG 3 meeting

DATE: 2007-10-02

PROJECT: 15408

STATUS: This document was available at the above-mentioned meeting. It is being circulated for information.

ACTION: FYI

DUE DATE:

DISTRIBUTION: P-, O-, and L- Members
W. Fumy, SC 27 Chairman, M. De Soete, SC 27 Vice Chair
E. Humphreys, K. Naemura, M. Ohlin, M.C. Kang, K. Rannenber, WG-Conveners

MEDIUM: Server

NO. OF PAGES: 1 + 3

Page	comment	Type
P.9	<p>3.2.3 cohesion (also called module strength)</p> <p>the manner and degree to which the tasks performed by a single software module are related to one another;</p> <p>types of cohesion include coincidental, communicational, functional, logical, sequential, and temporal. These types of cohesion are characterised below, <u>listed in the order of decreasing desirability.</u></p> <p>→ <u>in the order of decreasing desirability : functional -> sequential -> communicational -> temporal -> logical)</u></p> <p>→ <u>but, It listed in alphabetical order. (3.2.4 coincidental cohesion, 3.2.5 communicational cohesion</u></p>	ED
P.28	<p>7.2 Dependencies between components</p> <p>...</p> <p>The functional components in ISO/IEC 15408-2 have only dependencies on other functional components and the assurance components in ISO/IEC 15408-3 have only dependencies on other assurance components. ...</p> <p>→ <u>but, In Part2, FPT_RCV has dependencies on assurance component, AGD_OPE.1.</u></p>	TE/ED?
p. 30	<p>1. At 15 lines : An ST is equivalent or more restrictive than a PP if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>all TOEs</u> that meet the <u>PP</u> also meet <u>ST</u>, and • <u>all operational environments</u> that meet the <u>ST</u> also meet the <u>PP</u>. <p>2. At 21 lines ~ 33 lines : Security problem definition/ Security objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>all TOEs</u> that would meet the security problem definition(or security objectives) in the <u>ST</u> also meet the security problem definition in the <u>PP</u>; • <u>all operational environments</u> that would meet the security problem 	TE/ED?

	<p>definition in the PP would also meet the security problem definition in the ST.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ At 1 and 2, location of PP/ST is switched. ➔ And, demonstrable conformance does <u>not</u> include guide for Security requirements. (strict conformance include guide for security requirements) 	
P.49	<p>Figure A.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ It does not include ‘security objectives for the operational environment’ <p>Figure B.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ It does not include ‘security objectives for the operational environment’ 	ED

o IS 15408-2

Page	comment	Type
P.18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FAU_STG.1.1 The TSF shall protect the stored audit records in the audit trail from unauthorised deletion. - FAU_STG.2.1 The TSF shall protect the stored audit records from unauthorised deletion. ➔ At FAU_STG.2.1 does not include ‘in the audit trail’ 	ED
P.75	<p>Figure 14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ It does not list in alphabetical order. (FPT_TEE, FPT_FLS ...) 	ED

o IS 15408-3

Page	comment	Type
P.75~77	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADV_TDS(P.75~77) - ADV_TDS.4.5C The design shall provide a description of the interactions among all subsystems of the TSF. - ADV_TDS.5.5C The design shall provide a description of the interactions among subsystems of the TSF. ➔ it does not include “all”. 	ED

	<p>– ADV_TDS.6.5C The design shall provide a description of the interactions among all subsystems of the TSF.</p> <p>→ it includes “all” again.</p>	
P.119~120	<p>14.4.5.5.3 ATE_IND.2.3E</p> <p>The evaluator shall test a subset of the <u>TSF interfaces</u> to confirm that the TSF operates as specified.</p> <p>14.4.6.5.3 ATE_IND.3.3E</p> <p>The evaluator shall test the TSF to confirm that the entire <u>TSF</u> operates as specified.</p> <p>→ It does not include “interfaces”.</p>	ED
P.163	<p>a) TSF-a needs those services that are provided by TSF-b (“A” is connected to “C”): this is straightforward: the details about “C” are in the FSP for component-b. In this instance the interfaces should all be defined in the functional specifications for the <u>component-a and component-b.</u></p> <p>→ ‘componet-a” should be deleted.</p>	ED